

R. M. Aleynik

Apology Tolerance in the Contemporary Philosophy of Human*

***Abstract.** Tolerance — passive patience, attitude to another as a decent person. This is a deliberate suppression of feelings of rejection views of manners and habits of the other. An appeal to it was dictated by changes in a church, political and scientific life. The essence and validity of several philosophical positions in justifying the vital problem of tolerance is investigated: above all, tolerance stated by J. Locke and P. Bayle in XVII; an embodiment of the tolerance in the project of multiculturalism and its destiny; culture-centrist and naturalistic concepts. Postmodern deconstruction project as a critic of thinking patterns that leads to dogmatism and intolerance is analysed, and so is the interpretation of tolerance as equality conceptual projects and value systems underlying the different cultures. The different beliefs systems cannot communicate because of they are locked-in. According Derrida to E. Levinas the roots of violence in the 20th century are originated in philosophy — from failure to respect the Other, and the domination of generalisation over individual and personal. The tolerance is needed because it is a virtue against fanaticism, sectarianism and authoritarianism (A. Comte-Sponville). Naturalistic project proposes to consider human only as a form of the biological life, and one should not oppose culture to biology, nature and wildness. When the human feels as a part of the living world, he ceases to be Aggressive? And he is more able to engage in a dialogue and interaction.*

***Keywords:** tolerance, contemporary philosophy, human, postmodernism, practical humanism, new naturalism, culture, fanaticism, sectarianism, authoritarianism.*

Tolerance — passive patience, attitude to another as a decent person. This is a deliberate suppression of feelings of rejection views of manners and

habits of the other. An appeal to it was dictated by changes in the church, political and scientific life.

The question of tolerance raised in the era of bourgeois revolutions has long migrated from

* The main provision this article have been presented by the author report to the XXIII World Congress of Philosophy in Athens in August 2013.

ALEYNIK Raisa Michailovna— Doctor of Sciences in Philosophy, Professor, Chair of Philosophy, D. I. Mendeleev University of Chemical Technology of Russia.
125047, Russia, Moscow, Miusskaya sq., 9.
[raleynik@yandex.ru]

the sphere of religion to other areas. Today, in response to the globalization, sectarianism became widespread. If the sectarianism is in opposition the society receives terrorism, and if it is in power it faces totalitarianism. Tolerance has become particularly important in the world. In Russia, a special training program for the tolerance was been created. But this is not enough. There are some unclarities in the program and in the role that it can play to improving relations between people and cultures, and in the developing the culture itself. Can philosophy, and to what extent, help in solving these social problems?

In the history of thought there are several types of tolerance. Earliest type of its interpretation is associated with the names of J. Locke¹ and P. Bayle, who first formulated it as a tolerance for the existence of individual and collective beliefs which do not affect the fundamental questions of the truth and morality. The tolerance as a disinterest to the otherness of others' positions is in its essence. Formed on its basis was the policy of the "melting pot", in which all of the cultural, religious and ethnic differences would have disappeared. The history has shown the utopian of this project. The individual and group differences affecting the essential characteristics of the life and thoughts of people in understanding the world do not disappear in time but identify with its own identity. Close to this view is the project of multiculturalism which is based on the principle of co-existence of the cultures within one country and, as we know, has also not justified itself.

Among the latest trends with their own problem-solving the positions of postmodernism, practical humanism and new naturalism stand out. They are made with a variety of value and ontological grounds and able to clarify our problem. Postmodernism has generated a lot of myths about itself, was heterogeneous, and varied in their development process. Among its main representatives there is J. Derrida demonstrating that the modern philosophy is the imperial "ideology" of the Western ethnic group, where the

private discourse claims to be the absolute, and the paradigms of social science are to establish a filter of the ontological, methodological, linguistic orders, which are to corrected representation of the object of the scientific knowledge. The world of the social knowledge is transformed into a world of "simulacra", and the human mind is opaque to himself. All this cannot not to influence the attitudes of a man and his political practice. The world cannot be understood upon the end. Therefore relativism is recognized as an epistemological and valuable setup that determinate both individual and collective identity. With such a perception different worldviews systems cannot interact. Sensing a handicap in this position, Derrida refers to the creation of E. Levinas, the thinker who more deeply than anyone else in the twentieth century approached the topic of violence and ways out of it². He is convinced that the roots of the violence in the society are in the philosophy that forms "the rule of generalization over individual and personal." The philosopher strives to enrich the knowledge of modern intellectual experience with simple Old Testament commandment of love of neighbour. He recalls that the highest point of the Old Testament is not the love to somebody who is same as you but to someone else — a stranger, a needy, a sufferer. And Derrida in his book "Farewell to Emmanuel Levinas" noted that Levinas defined a new vector of responsibility in ethics — responsibility for the Other and in front of the Other. Today, more than ever, it is important to recognize the right of the Other to be different from the way we are, even if he disagrees with us.

Levinas's position does not contradict the position of someone who has positioned himself as a materialist and Marxist, and "practical humanist" — A. Comte-Sponvil. He argues that the intolerance in the public opinion tends to totalitarianism, just as in religion the intolerance does to fundamentalism. Dictatorship imposed by a force is despotism; dictatorship imposed by an ideology is totalitarianism. In modern societies

¹ Locke J. Works in 3 V. (In Russian). V. 3. M.: Mysl, 1988. P. 91–134.

² Derrida J. Violence and Metaphysics. Essay on Emmanuel Levinas through // Derrida J. Writing and difference. (In Russian). Moscow: Academic-Proect, 2000. P. 124–249.

of communication the despotism tends to totalitarianism. One way out is the fight against the intolerance, dogmatism, and fanaticism. First the totalitarianism acts on behalf of “science”, and then begins a “brainwashing.” But in the genuine science one cannot govern in the name of truth. The truth obeys no one and does not force anyone to anything. No science can replace democracy, nor for the people, not for the individuals. The truth is not accepted by a majority and cannot govern society, in contrast to government, which should be formed legally. The problem of the tolerance by Comte-Sponvil appears when it is all about the view, the form of the subjective knowledge. Each one is convinced of the truth of their opinions. But if he is honest and loves the truth more than his confidence he has to recognize the personal inability to persuading people with other beliefs, including the educated and conscientious ones. Every self-righteous person has to admit that he cannot prove the truth and, therefore, is on equal footing with their opponents. Tolerance is a practical force, based on our inability to reach the absolute truth and the incapacity to love and respect the opponents. One can prevent a person to express himself, but cannot stop him from thinking. The mind cannot develop without the right to a free expression of opinions, and the society cannot develop without smart people. The intolerance besots. The intolerance at the state level, in the long term, leads to the state’s weakening¹. And the freedom of citizens who may have different valuables makes the state strong. This difference is the reason to be tolerant. The truth is needed but it does not impose anything on anyone. Laws are needed in the areas that are common to us, and the politics and culture have to follow it. If the freedom of opinion and faiths are legal there is no need in the tolerance but rather in the respect and strict observance of justice.

If the previous positions can be considered as culture-centric, then these are opposed by the position of the new naturalism by J. M. Schaeffer. Schaeffer sees the cause of a disorder of the human

community in a particular ontological dimension of human and the idea of its exclusivity among living beings. This is an attitude that goes back from Descartes and led to the dichotomy of nature and culture. In the Western world the dichotomy of nature and culture coincides with the difference in human and non-human. But in most cultures including Chinese and Indian the reality is conceived without an ontology, and not as a set of unity, but as a process. In fact, we should consider the problem of human identity through the evolution of forms of biological life. This will help to solve many problems, both anthropological and cultural. Social and biological features do not take a human out from biological existence. The naturalism studies humans only as a form of biological life on Earth. This will allow no longer oppose the culture to biology, nature, wilderness and civilization. It is vital that we not only have an adequate view of the world in which we live, but also have the opportunity to equip our inner world. We live in the human world where, time and time again, the scene unfold tension between worldviews that serve the people support, and empirical knowledge on the world in which they live and die. A worldview, although it is not innate to the individual, but rather is obtained, is transmitted in the form of a closed system and, in fact, gives human an excuse to the reality. The entire world, from this point of view, is only secondarily a truth function and serves to maintain our inner identity in a stable condition. The worldviews are able to avoid overlap with the exogenous harmful experience, and, thus, protect us from mood fluctuations between euphoric and dysphoric states that could lead to a state of permanent representations of stress. The function of these “beliefs” is a means of the stabilization of our mental world.² Therefore it is incompetent to measure their suitability in terms of truth and falsity. The most important function of worldviews relates to worldly wisdom and care, rather than theoretical doctrines. Our fundamental ways of seeing the world are never consciously willed constructs; they are passed through the

¹ Comte-Sponville A. Small treatise on the great virtues or How to use the philosophy of everyday life. (In Russian). Moscow: Eterna, 2012. P. 173–190.

² Schaeffer J. M. The end of human exceptionalism. (In Russian). Moscow: UFO, 2010. P. 307–308.

individual filters, which are particularly effective in times of crisis. Today we have entered a phase of instability and “regime with aggravation”. The tolerance is only an interim solution until people learn to understand each other. When a human, in the first instance, feels as part of the natural world, he ceases to be more aggressive and is capable to a dialogue and interaction more than those who see a human as an exceptional being. Philosophers, starting from ancient Greece, more successfully than others demonstrate the ability to a dialogue, mutual enrichment and self-development. Each of the above mentioned attitudes makes contribu-

tion to the understanding of the tolerance and its justification.

The coexistence of people with different history, culture and identity — tremendous achievement of mankind. From the above it follows the tolerance is the sign of self-confidence, lack of fear of losing face in intellectual competition. This is the condition for the existence of life on earth. Today in a world a sense of civility and mutual respect, is sadly lacking, philosophy should serve as a counter-instance. And today philosophy remains the guide of life.

References

1. Bayle P. Historical and critical dictionary. V. 1–2. (In Russian). Moscow, 1968.
2. Comte-Sponville A. Small treatise on the great virtues or How to use the philosophy of everyday life. (In Russian). Moscow, Eterna, 2012.
3. Derrida J. Violence and metaphysics. Essay on Emmanuel Levinas thought. // Derrida J. Writing and difference. (In Russian). Moscow: Academic Project, 2000.
4. Locke J. Works a 3 Vol. (In Russian). V. 3. M.: Mysl, 1988.
5. Locke J. Works a 3 Vols. V. 3. (In Russian). Moscow, 1988.
6. Schaeffer J. M. The end of human exceptionalism. (In Russian). Moscow: UFO, 2010.