

## **TOLERANCE AND APPROACHES TO ITS INTERPRETATION**

**Raisa Kuzmenko<sup>1</sup>**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-126-8-24>

The word «tolerance» is gaining popularity and is used more and more often in the modern world: both in the scientific discussion and in colloquial speech. What is meant by this concept?

Many scientists have addressed the issue of their study to tolerance. Thus, various aspects of manifestations of tolerance as tolerance for the position of the Other are reflected in the works of J.-J. Rousseau, L. Tolstoy, M. Montessori, A. Schweitzer, M. Buber, M. Walzer, G. Marcuse, S. Amonashvili and others. However, this approach is most fully implemented in Walzer's monograph «About Tolerance», where tolerance is determined by a number of attributive features. Rising among them is «moral stoicism», which presupposes the principled recognition of the rights of the Other, humble acceptance of the Other for the sake of peace and even passive indifference to another person [8, p. 10–11]. However, such a broad understanding of tolerance by M. Walzer has significant heuristic potential, because it indicates the presence of various manifestations of tolerance in different spatio-temporal dimensions of socio-cultural life, thus preparing the ground for fundamental recognition of pluralistic approaches to its understanding.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Pedagogical Drahomanov University, Ukraine  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4881-1879>

According to the English researcher K. McKinnan, «tolerance is a contradictory value» [5, p. 3]. Analyzing this concept, the researcher notes: «Tolerance is a question you have to put up with when you are against it: the motto of a tolerant person is live and let live. Even the fact that a person allows to live, shocks, angers, frightens him, or causes him disgust [5, p. 5]. An interesting approach to the vision of tolerance is found in E. Cohen's works, who argues that tolerance is the «intentional and fundamental deterrence of the agent» agent «from interfering with disagreement (or opposite behavior, etc.) in situations of diversity, when he believes he has the opportunity to intervene» [2].

At the same time, it should be emphasized that in some studies the position on the erroneous identification of tolerance with tolerance is substantiated. It is followed in particular by D. Leontiev, who notes that tolerance does not reflect the full meaning of the concept of «tolerance» [4, p. 5]. This is due, first of all, to the semantics of the word «suffer», according to which this word denotes the external aspect of restraining the real attitude of the subject of activity to the Other.

In this context, the ideas of M. Buber seem appropriate, who considers tolerance as a special organic part of the dialogue between «I and You», when there is a real meeting of two people in a concrete interaction, positions and opportunities [1, p. 56]. In this sense, tolerance is manifested only when a person is open to the position of the Other.

At the same time, tolerance can in no way be seen as the basis of a condescending attitude towards the Other or a feigned reconciliation with forms of activity that are unacceptable from the standpoint of morality. In a broader context, V. Stets considers tolerance, which proposes to analyze tolerance from the standpoint of attitude to the Other, awareness of one's own responsibility for «neighbor», for one's country, for its future [7, p. 109].

Ukrainian scientist M. Prepotenska believes that tolerance is an urgent need of public life, and in particular the man of the metropolis, and notes that it opposes: «showiness of politics and reduced media vocabulary, mass culture, aggressive advertising content» [6]. In the Ukrainian scientific paradigm, the analysis of the interdependence of the level of tolerance of the population and the actualization of elements of European identity became the subject of research of M. Kozlovets and N. Kovtun in the monograph «National identity in Ukraine in the context of globalization». Its authors rightly conclude, stating: «It is education that is connected with the modern tasks of consolidation of Ukrainian society, preservation of its single socio-cultural space, formation of a value system – open, varied, spiritually and culturally rich and tolerant [3, p. 321]. In the long run, this can ensure not only the formation of true citizenship and patriotism, but also a holistic national identity.

So, we consider that tolerance a universal value, the ability to perceive a person as he/she is, capable of constructive interaction with the Other, based on equality, respect for the individuality, understanding, openness, friendliness, and desire to act together.

### References:

1. Buber M. (1993) *Me and You*; lane. M.: Higher school, 175 p.
2. Cohen, Andrew Jason. «Toleration». *The International Encyclopedia of Ethics*. Ed. La Follette, Hugh. Oxford: Blackwell, 201 p.
3. Kozlovets M.A., Kovtun N.M. (2010) National identity in Ukraine in the context of globalization: Monograph. K.: PARAPAN, 348 p.
4. Leontev D.A. (2009) About operationalization of the Concept of «Tolerance». *Questions of psychology*. No 5. P. 3–16.
5. McKinnon Catriona (2006) *Toleration: a Critical Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, 218 p.
6. Prepotenska M.P. (2014) *Homo Urbanus: the Human Phenomenon of the Metropolis: a monograph*. Dnepropetrovsk: Ed. Serednyak TK, 420 p.
7. Stets V. (2013) The Phenomenon of Tolerance in the Modern World. *Anthropological Studies*. Issue 28. Philosophy. Pp. 101–110.
8. Walzer M. (2000) *On tolerance*. Mürnberg. M.: Idea-Press, House of Intellectual Books, 160 p.