Conference Paper

Concept and Structure of Tolerance (Experience of Theoretical Research)

Konstantin Dmitrievich Goncharenko, Alexander Ardalionovich Taradanov, and Anastasia Aleksandrovna Gizatulina

Chelyabinsk State University, Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation

Corresponding Author:
Konstantin Dmitrievich
Goncharenko
kodmgo@mail.ru

Abstract

Norms and values in societies are different in civilizational, historical, and ethnical aspect because they were formed according to the specific historical needs of each society. They contain the requirements for both intolerant and tolerant attitude towards 'others'. The modern concept which social scientists use to try to grasp the sense of "peaceful coexistence in a multicultural society" is the concept of 'tolerance'. Social science borrowed the concept of tolerance from medicine where tolerance is defined as a neutral or insignificant reaction of a living being to biologically active substances and objects that enter it. In social science itself, tolerance appears as a compromise (conflict-free) behavior in a multicultural society. According to the principles of organization, tolerance is divided into radical (fundamental non-violence) and moderate (civil society). Based on behavior, tolerance represents four levels: 1) unconscious tolerance (symbiosis); 2) conscious (educated) tolerance (indifference, conformism, understanding, consent); 3) self-serving (interaction, cooperation, solidarity); 4) actual (emotional) tolerance (affection, reciprocity, infatuation, love). In total, we get 22 (4 conscious + 3 self-serving + 4 actual) × 2 (radical and moderate) types of tolerance, plus unconscious tolerance/symbiosis. The problem of tolerance is the problem of the correlation of good and harm arising from compromise (conflict-free) behavior in a multicultural society. Therefore, tolerance is an individual measure of good/harm arising from compromise (conflict-free) behavior in a multicultural society. Values can be normative (individual measure of good/harm corresponding to their social measure) and non-normative (individual measure of good/harm not corresponding to their social measure). The absence of a definition of tolerance in modern legislation indicates the normative nature of this value. Consequently, tolerance is a non-normative value of compromise (conflict-free) behavior in a multicultural society. Aim: theoretical study and definition of the concept and structure of tolerance.

Keywords: tolerance, value, norm, structure of tolerance.

1. Introduction

The modern concept which social scientists use to try to grasp the sense of "peaceful coexistence in a multicultural society" is the concept of "tolerance". The absence of its definition in modern legislation tells a lot about its importance. "The concept of tolerance remains extremely vague; there are no specific universally recognized characteristics,

it has not been differentiated scientifically by levels or by forms of manifestation, and in relation to many terms that are semantically close" [3].

2. Methodology and Methods

Theoretical analysis, isolation and discussion of basic concepts from the field of tolerance relations have been used, as well as the structural genetic approach, that is, establishing more specific concepts from the general ones.

Main body of article. It is known that in ancient Sparta, "weak children were killed immediately after birth" [27]. F. Uspensky cites "religious and national hostility to Islam ..." as one of the main reasons for the Crusades, but this religious and national hostility "was just a pretext — the real reason was the desire... to give power to independent princes in the East, the conquest of Byzantium, and gaining advantage in trade throughout the entire region". [38]

The Massacre of St. Bartholomew took place because "the masses were tired of living in poverty due to constant wars, and they saw the Protestants as the root of all evil. Besides, they thought that the Protestants invoked the wrath of God onto them, and the only way out was to completely annihilate them; the King just gave them a push. On the other hand, there were Catholics who were appalled by this massacre — they knew that God's commandments and human laws had been trampled on". [28] "The consequences of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew were terrible. It is believed that some two thousand noblemen Huguenots and members of their families were killed. Overall, at least five thousand people died during the riots that took place in late August and early September". [28]

The Bolshevist "expropriation of expropriators" was aimed at making the private the public. [17] "Holocaust was based on the theory of superiority of Arians to other races and ethnicities. Nazis thought that the Gypsies and the Jews were "impure nations" and, therefore, were to be destroyed. More than 6 million Jews were killed during the Holocaust". [26]

On the other hand, for quite a long time in the humanitarian society there has been an understanding of the need to solve the problem of "peaceful coexistence" between different cultures. The Gospel of Matthew says: "If you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments: Thou shalt not kill, you shall not commit adultery; you shall not steal; you shall not bear false witness; honor your father and your mother; and you shall love your neighbor as yourself". [2] According to I. Kant, "we cannot tolerate one who cannot endure the imperfections of others without hatred." J. Locke wrote about

"perfect tolerance", according to which the ruler does not have the right to impose religious opinions and beliefs but should protect against intolerance, unless they "lead to unrest in the state and bring more harm than good to society". [18]

Mahatma Gandhi formulated and implemented the concept of non-violent resistance and fight for independence, which, in his words, is "as ancient as mountains". [34] Here is what Martin Luther King wrote about it: "Before reading Gandhi, I came to the conclusion that the morality of Jesus is effective only for personal relationships… and in case of a conflict between racial groups or nations, a different and more realistic approach was needed. After reading Gandhi, I realized that I was completely mistaken". [3] "In the 1960s, using the union of church organizations for civil rights, or the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, as a foundation for non-violent resistance, King conducted a series of campaigns for civil rights aimed at eliminating racial segregation in public transportation, theaters, cinemas, restaurants, etc." [39]

On the contrary, the concept of "proletarian internationalism" by K. Marx is based upon the belief that it is possible to achieve "peaceful coexistence…" only after the establishment of a communist system in a society where class contradictions and economic competition, which is the basis for social conflicts, disappear [19]. To achieve that, means of production should be made public instead of private. Thus, during the transitional period from capitalism to communism, proletarian violence (the "dictatorship of the proletariat") is perfectly acceptable [19].

Social studies have borrowed the concept of tolerance from medicine. The term "tolerance" was first coined by the immunologist Peter Medawar in 1953 to mean "toleration of the body's immune system to transplanted foreign tissues". [24] "Usually the human immune system destroys the disease by eliminating the pathogens — microorganisms that caused this disease. However, in the case of tuberculosis, a completely different picture is often observed — a person may be infected with Mycobacterium tuberculosis, but his body does not destroy the pathogen. This 'latent tuberculosis' is a good example of disease tolerance… By examining the body's tolerance to tuberculosis, a team of scientists from the United States has found that the body's ability to overcome the pathogen instead of fighting it can prevent the spread of infection. Moreover, the presence of high levels of T cells, which are known to be the key in the fight against infection, can do more harm than good". [33]

Immunologists R. Burnet, R. Billingham, L. Brent, and M. Hasek, disciples of Peter Medawar, finalized the definition of tolerance as "the ability of a body to endure potentially unfavorable environmental factors such as a decrease in the sensitivity of the

body, cells, and tissues to the impact of a substance, which helps maintain homeostasis". [42]

From then on, the concept of tolerance has been borrowed by pharmacology, medicine, and psychiatry. Pharmacologist S. Kutsienko defines tolerance as "a decrease in the response to repeated administration of drugs or psychoactive substances which requires an increased dosage to attain the effect inherent in the substance". [14]

A psychiatric dictionary defines tolerance as "the ability to tolerate the effects of therapeutic dosages of drugs without noticeable therapeutic or toxic effect. In a broader sense, there is therapeutic tolerance in cases of untreated mental illness". [4]

In endocrinology, a glucose tolerance test is used to diagnose diabetes and its stages, and it is also used to determine prediabetes, or "carbohydrate metabolism disorders associated with a change in glucose tolerance and leading to the development of diabetes mellitus". [23]

Thus, in medicine, tolerance is defined as a neutral or an insignificant reaction of a body to biologically active substances and objects that enter it. Doctors distinguish useful (for instance, to a transplanted organ in transplantology) and harmful tolerance — a neutral or insignificant reaction of a body to pathogens, such as diabetes mellitus, tuberculosis.

In social sciences, tolerance is determined through the concept of forbearance. "Tolerant is patient, tolerate, tolerance is patience, forbearance towards someone or something" [13]; "tolerance (Latin tolerantia, "patience") — forbearance towards others' opinions, convictions, or beliefs". [1]

In Dahl's dictionary, "to tolerate" means "to endure, to bear, to acquit, to man up, to take courage to be meek, to be humble". [30] Ozhegov's dictionary defines "to tolerate" as "to submissively endure anything, to put up with the existence of someone or something, to experience something, usually unpleasant or hard". [31] In this regard, N. Melnikov says: "Dictionaries reflect the meaning of tolerance through the ability to endure something or someone, to take into account the opinion of another; as toleration towards other people's behavior, way of life, customs, feelings, opinions, beliefs, and ideas". [21]

However, in Sponville's philosophical dictionary, tolerance in the social aspect is defined as "disapproval and not even neutrality. To practice tolerance means to allow others to do what you could prevent it and leave unpunished what would be punished". [29] Thus, definitions of tolerance with the emphasis on consciousness have appeared. Collier's Encyclopedia defines tolerance as "the desire and ability to establish and maintain commonness with people who are different in some respects from the prevailing

type or do not adhere to the generally accepted opinions". [43] P. Nicholson defines tolerance as an ability to refrain from exerting influence on an aspect which differs from a person's views. [41] M. Walzer considered tolerance as a humble attitude to the differences in the name of preserving peace. [37]

In parallel, however, A. Pertsev points out that "tolerance should not be considered a cure for all social evils. This is an intermediate stage in transfer from conflict to valid mutual understanding and interaction. Tolerance does not resolve a conflict but deflects its development in a relatively peaceful, non-violent direction". [25] M. B. Khomyakov believes that tolerance in its proper sense is only required for things which generally cannot be tolerate; thus the volume of this concept shrinks to zero. [41]

Therefore, tolerance in social studies is presented as a compromise (conflict-free) behavior in a multicultural society.

Among the most prominent approaches to the establishment of tolerance is a concept of non-violence. Here are its basic principles: "1. Policy of non-violence is not the way of cowards — this is the way of strong people; this is not the way of dormant passivity or a passive non-resistance to evil — it is active, but nonviolent resistance to evil. 2. The purpose is not to destroy, defeat, or humiliate the enemy, but to win his love and understanding. 3. Action must be taken against the very forces of evil, not against specific people who embody it. Non-violence is fighting against evil, not those who are its victims. 4. Willingness to accept suffering with no hope of retribution, willingness to take blows and not to return them. Undeserved suffering is redemption. 5. Policy of non-violence excludes not only all external physical violence but also internal violence over the spirit of man. Proponents of non-violence not only refuse to kill your opponent — they refuse to hate him. 6. The world order is on the side of justice". [11]

However, European culture adheres to the concept of equality of all before the law and social well-being. Its main provisions are presented by international documents:

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948 [32];

- UN Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1963. Article 1 [8];

- Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities, 1992, Article 1 [9];

- Declaration of Principles on Tolerance, 1995, Article 1 [10];

- Constitution of the Russian Federation, 1993, Article 2 [12];

- Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, Article 282.1 [36].

Therefore, according to the principles of organization, tolerance is divided into radical (fundamental non-violence) and moderate (civil society).

Analysis of the motivation for tolerance allows to distinguish its four levels, each of which comes from the previous one and includes its qualities. These are: 1) unconscious tolerance; 2) conscious tolerance; 3) self-serving tolerance; 4) actual tolerance.

Unconscious tolerance (for example, children from different cultures playing together) is based on symbiosis as a mechanism of natural selection when the acceptance of some "others" turns into biological benefits like food, safety, mating, physical development and communication. These are more likely to be received by tolerant individuals or communities.

Conscious tolerance (individual patience towards various inconveniences of multicultural society to prevent even greater inconvenience or damage due to intercultural conflicts) is based on upbringing. Unlike unconscious tolerance, conscious tolerance already has several levels:

- indifference ("they are by themselves, we are by ourselves");

- conformism ("they are different, we'll let them be");

- understanding ("they are different because...");

- consent ("they are different — so what?").

Self-serving tolerance is based on direct benefit and also has several levels:

- interaction ("they are different — but they can do it too...");

- cooperation ("they are different, which means they will expand our capabilities by adding their own");

- solidarity ("they are different, which means that our cooperation will increase our overall well-being due to the synergy of our experiences and achievements).

Actual ("ideal or meta-tolerance") tolerance is based on an emotional connection. It has four levels:

- affection ("they are different, therefore it is more interesting with them than without them");

- reciprocity ("it's good that they are different");

- infatuation ("they are different, and this is wonderful!");

- love ("they are different!!!").

Hence, we get a classification of types of tolerance, consisting of at least 22 (4 conscious + 3 self-serving + 4 actual) × 2 (radical and moderate) types. It is impossible to subdivide unconscious tolerance into radical and moderate just because of its unconsciousness.

There is heated active debate in today's world over the optimal ratio of types and principles of tolerance in a society. [16]

"Vector of tolerance politics in Germany: the impact of migration crisis" notes: "The immigration crisis is a serious problem not only for Germany but for the whole European Union. The flow of refugees is growing rapidly, increasing crime and raising discontent among the population, leading to the spread of the Nazi movement within the country and the emergence of alternative political movements such as Pegida (*Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes* — Patriotic Europeans against the Islamization of the West). But what are the results of Germany's migration policy and often 'too tolerant' attitude of the government towards this problem?" [6]

"Migration policy of Angela Merkel caused discontent among the population. According to the survey conducted by Civey, 87.4% of Germans have voiced their displeasure, which significantly undermines the authority of Merkel. The evidence of that are the Landtag elections — the Christian Democratic Union has lost the elections in Merkel's home state of Mecklenburg to the "Alternative for Germany" party, having finished third with just 19% of the votes. CDU also lost the elections in Berlin, finishing second with 18%". [5, 9] "Too tolerant attitude towards migrants has caused a lot of problems, not only throughout Europe, but also serious contradictions within the country. Discontent of the population grows, the number of crimes and financial costs increase, and there is an increased number of rallies and strikes against the current state policy. Whether Germany would fix their mistakes, and what are other possible effects of this crisis remains to be seen". [6]

Thus, the problem of tolerance is the problem of correlation between good and harm, deriving from compromise (conflict-free) behavior of individuals in a multicultural society. Therefore, the tolerance is an individual measure of good and harm [35], originating from a compromise (conflict-free) behavior of individuals in a multicultural society.

Values can be normative (individual measure of good/harm corresponding to their social measure) and non-normative (individual measure of good/harm not corresponding to their social measure). [35] The absence of a definition of tolerance in modern legislation indicates the normative nature of this value.

Consequently, tolerance is a non-normative value of compromise (conflict-free) behavior in a multicultural society.

3. Conclusions

Tolerance is a non-normative value of compromise (conflict-free) behavior in a multicultural society.

Structurally, tolerance can be divided into radical (fundamental non-violence) and moderate (civil society).

As far as the behavior is concerned, four levels of tolerance are distinguished: 1) unconscious tolerance (symbiosis); 2) conscious (educated) tolerance (indifference, conformism, understanding, consent); 3) self-serving (interaction, cooperation, solidarity); 4) actual (emotional) tolerance (affection, reciprocity, infatuation, love).

In total, we get 22 (4 conscious + 3 self-serving + 4 actual) × 2 (radical and moderate) types of tolerance, plus unconscious tolerance/symbiosis.

References

[1] Bachinin, V. A. (2005). Ethics. Encyclopedic dictionary, M.: Publishing house V.A. Mikhailova p. 241.

[2] The Book of Matthew. Retrieved October 20, 2019 from http://apologetica.ru/biblie/matf19.html, Chapter 19

[3] Bondyreva, S. K. and Kolesov, D. V. (2003). *Tolerance (introduction).* Izdatelstvo: Moscow psychology-social Institute, p. 240.

[4] Bracher, V. M. and Kruk, I. V. (1995). Dictionary of psychiatric terms. Retrieved December 16, 2019 from http://bookitut.ru/Tolkovyj-slovarj-psikhiatricheskikh-terminov.1.html

[5] The Universal Declaration of human rights. Retrieved January 12, 2010 from http://www.ifapcom.ru/files/Documents/udhrights.pdf.

[6] Golovko, A. I. (2017). Vector of tolerance in the policy of Germany: the effects of a migration crisis. *Conference Europe, Russia, Asia: Cooperation, contradictions, conflicts. Ryazan,* pp. 181–184

[7] The Declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/minority_rights.shtml

[8] UN Declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. Retrieved December 16, 2019 from https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/r18_1904.shtml

[9] The Declaration of principles of the person. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from http: //www.tolerance.ru/toler-deklaraciya.php

[10] The Declaration of principles of tolerance. Retrieved April 7, 2016 from http://www. tolerance.ru/toler-deklaraciya.php

[11] King M. L. (1960) Pilgrimage to nonviolence. Retrieved April 7, 2016 from http://www. gumer.info/bogoslov_ Buks/protestant/King_PalomNenasil.php

[12] The Constitution of the Russian Federation. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from http: //www.constitution.ru/

[13] Krysin, L. P. (2008). The explanatory dictionary of foreign words - (Library of dictionaries). M.: Eksmo,. 944.

[14] Kutsenko, S. A. (2003). Fundamentals of toxicology. vol. 4,, Northern (Arctic) Federal University. M.V. Lomonosov, Saint-Petersburg, p. 119.

[15] Lebedeva, I. (2015). The policy of multiculturalism in Germany: yesterday and today. *Modern science and innovation*, vol. 3, p. 142.

[16] Lebedeva, I. (2015). The policy of multiculturalism in Germany: yesterday and today. Modern science and innovation, vol. 3, p. 143.

[17] Lenin, V. I. (1917). The state and revolution. The Marxist theory of the state and the tasks proletariat in the revolution. Petrograd, p. 184. Printed in 1918 as a separate brochure in ed. "Life and Knowledge". Retrieved January 16, 2020 from https://www. marxists.org/russkij/lenin/works/lenin007.htm

[18] Locke, J.(1988). The experience of religious tolerance. Works, vol. 3, p. 70. Retrieved January 16 https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/istorija_novoe_vremja/lokk

[19] *Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1955). Works. 23rd ed., vol. 4, Retrieved January 16, pp. 772–773 https://www.marxists.org/russkij/marx/cw/*

[20] Menshikova, N. S. (2015). *The phenomenon of "tolerance": the essential characteristics and legal bases of formation of culture of tolerance in the age of multiculturalism.* Petersburg, vol. 3, pp. 15–18.

[21] Nesterov, M. A. (2018). The Holocaust in the occupied Soviet territories during the great Patriotic war: causes and extent. Economics and society: prospects of development. Economy and society prospects for development. The collection of materials of the 2nd All-Russian scientific conference. Syzran. Syzran, pp. 194-198.

[22] Nikonova, L. G. (2011). Structural and functional features of elements of the pancreas in animals with different glucose tolerance. *Medical Almanac*, vol. 5, issue 18, pp. 161–164.

[23] Park, D. V., Uteshen, B. S. and Babichev, V. A. (1975). Biochemistry of foreign compounds. *Developlments in allergy*, vol. 18, pp. 43–96.

[24] Pertsev, A. V. (2003). *Life strategy of tolerance: the problem of formation in Russia and in the West*. UMDK. Ekaterinburg, Pp. 5–7.

[25] *Pershin, Y. V. (2018). The religious roots of the Holocaust. Topical issues of modern science and education. MFUA. Kirov, pp. 73-81.*

[26] Rahmaylov, E. V. (2014). Eugenics and racial hygiene as a sociophilosophical ideology of fascism. *Science and world*, vol. 10, issue 14, pp. 104-107.

[27] Semikin, A. A. (2019). The lessons of history — the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. *Rostov Scientific Journal,* vol. 2, pp. 30–38.

[28] Dictionary Academician. (2012) Retrieved January 16, 2020 from https://philosophy_sponville.academic.ru/2096/Терпимост

[29] Dictionary Academician. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from https://dic.academic.ru/searchall.php?SWord=терпеть&from=xx&to=ru&did=&stype=

[30] Dictionary Academician. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ogegova/278870.

[31] Dictionary Academician. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from https://philosophy_sponville.academic.EN/2096/Tolerance.

[32] On tolerance to disease. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from http://medic.ua/tolerantnost-k-boleznyam-mozhet-byt-klyuchom-k-lecheniyu-tuberkuleza/.

[33] Talati, A. I. (2017). The sources of the theology of Martin Luther King. *Conference on Christian values in the culture of today's youth*, pp. 150–155

[34] Taradanov, A. A. (2018). The logic of the social. The experience of theoretical reconstruction of anthroposociology. publisher Chelyabinsk State University, Chelyabinsk p. 123.

[35] Criminal code of the Russian Federation Retrieved December 01, 2019 from http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_10699/

[36] Walter, M. (2000). Tolerance. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Polit/Walzer/index.php

[37] Uspenskii, F. I. (2000) "History of the Crusades". Retrieved December 01, 2019 from https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Fedor_Uspenskij/istorija-krestovyh-pohodov/1#sel

[38] Fedyaev, A. I. (2010). Sociophilosophical ideas of non-resistance to evil. *Journal of Chuvash University*, vol. 2, pp. 123–128.

[39] Khomyakov, M. B. (2003). Tolerance: the paradoxical value. *The limits of tolerance in modern society: materials of an international scientific conference*. Saint–Petersburg, pp. 37–53.

[40] Khomyakov, M. B. (2011). Tolerance and its limits. *National psychological journal*, vol. 2, issue 6, pp. 25-34.

[41] Chebykina, O. A. (2012). System analysis of approaches to the concept of "tolerance". Retrieved December 16, 2019 from http://www.psyedu.ru/files/articles/psyedu_ru_2012_2_2928.pdf

[42] Colliers' Encyclopedia. Retrieved January 16, 2020 from http://www.onlinedics.ru/slovar/colier/t/tolerantnost.html