

UDC 159.9:316.6:316.4V. M. RUBSKYI^{1*}^{1*}Odesa National Maritime University (Odesa, Ukraine), e-mail pavv@te.net.ua, ORCID 0000-0003-3225-8287**Psychological and Philosophical Problems of Tolerance**

Purpose. The purpose of the article is to formulate the uncontroversial principle of tolerance, taking into account the internal philosophical and psychological difficulties associated with its implementation in practice. **Theoretical basis.** The author proceeds from the insoluble problem of the very concept of "tolerance" and its psychological implementation. Not classical, but post-metaphysical psycho-religious method of promoting the idea of tolerance is proposed. This method was stated in the works by J. Derrida, P. Ricker, J. Caputo, G. Vattimo, R. Kearney, A. Shepherd, E. Newman, M. Moyaert, and others. The historical Christian type of tolerance (implementation of the principle of love for one's neighbour) retains a significant potential for hidden aggression. This can be traced in the texts of the Holy Scripture and the fathers of the church. The division into friends and strangers based on the principle of confession remains relevant to this day. In addition, the religious component of tolerance tends to present it as self-worth, and not just an important socio-psychological parameter. The author points out that the application of Christian post-metaphysical approaches to this problem is the most philosophically coherent and psychologically effective. **Originality.** The article examines the internal semantic paradox of the idea of tolerance and methods of its promotion. The promotion of tolerance gives a rise to the suspicion of intolerance, which, being inherently intolerant, turns out to be a necessary component of the spread of the idea of tolerance. Typology of methods of introduction and promotion of tolerance (authoritarian, passive, psychological and religious), their main disadvantages and advantages are given. The main problems arising only at the level of philosophy and psychology are indicated. **Conclusions.** Historical Christianity is ineffective in achieving tolerance for a number of reasons: it is not sufficiently attentive to the individual, as it preserves the reasoning about the person in the categories of social formations (chosen people, etc.). The reality of God in classical texts was manifested by His violence in the past or in the future. The metaphysical basis of the principle of tolerance and the post-metaphysical understanding of hospitality return tolerance to its natural origin and provide a relevant basis for both interreligious dialogue and the removal of psychological tension between different cultural codes. The former models, which are proposed in the UNESCO Declaration, have a number of internal contradictions and are not effective enough in practice.

Keywords: tolerance; postmetaphysics; Christianity; dialogueness; authoritarianism; xenophobia

Introduction

The psychological concept of tolerance is somewhat new and contains a number of internal problems. Despite the almost worldwide popularity of the idea of tolerance, it still remains a "crude" philosophical idea and a poor psychological attitude. The concept of tolerance in psychology contains a fundamental paradox. Attempts to promote tolerance face a fundamental obstacle: if we truly accept another person for who they are, we must also accept their possible intolerance of others. After all, prejudice and rejection of the "other" are often an integral part of that person's identity and worldview. The paradox is that in this case, preaching tolerance is tantamount to proclaiming intolerance.

The idea of tolerance is associated with targeted psychological work, as it is not a basic attitude of the human psyche. As a rule, people brought up in a tolerant environment increase their level of empathy and are more inclined to analyse events from different perspectives. In this vein, tolerance can be understood as a positive psychological mechanism, as it supports the acceptance and use of individual differences between people. Numerous studies (Koriakina et al., 2019; Kozachenko, 2022; Marchuk, 2019; Tsvietkova, 2020; Verkuyten, 2022; Zhornova, 2014) and others show that tolerant people have a higher level of everyday happiness, are less prone to depression and the impact of social crises. In general, modern psychologists now see the im-

portance of tolerance in maintaining mental health. They emphasise that without tolerance, a person ceases to understand the views of others and their behaviour. Tolerance does help build more open relationships with other people. In addition, the presumption of acceptance of the other can help create a more sustainable social order.

Purpose

In view of the above, the purpose of the article is to formulate a psychologically and philosophically consistent principle of tolerance, taking into account the internal problems in defining the term and the practical difficulties associated with its implementation in society. This implies a sequential solution to the following tasks: a) to provide an overview of modern research (by psychologists, philosophers, sociologists) that has made a relevant contribution to solving the above problems and the diversity of their approaches; b) to conduct a philosophical analysis of the term "tolerance" in relation to the methods of its social implementation; c) to analyse psychological barriers in the secular and religious perception of tolerance as a social virtue and call; d) to propose the least traumatic way of implementing the principles of tolerance, taking into account all existing ideas in contemporary humanitarian science.

Statement of basic materials

In the most famous studies by contemporary psychologists on the problem of tolerance, we find a very mixed assessment of the methods and internal coherence of this social phenomenon. For example, a major collective monograph of 2022, *Psychology of Prejudice and Discrimination* (Kite et al., 2022), gives us a broad overview of what psychological research can say about the nature of tolerance and discrimination. The authors (Mary E. Kite, Bernard E. Whitley, Jr., Lisa S. Wagner) have conducted a detailed comparative analysis of theories of intolerance. The book begins by analysing the nature of prejudice and discrimination, as well as the psychological basis of stereotypes and prejudice and modern theories of prejudice. The issue of discrimination covers such aspects as gender identity, sexual orientation, age, ability and appearance. The authors offer a series of prejudice reduction exercises (the final topic of the book) to help overcome racism, sexism and prejudice that lead to various forms of social discrimination.

Susan Fiske's (2018) book *Social Beings: Core Motives in Social Psychology* explores the basic motives and goals that shape human interaction with self and others. The author draws on the latest research in social psychology and analyses key psychological concepts such as belonging, understanding, self-improvement, and trust. By delving into the motives of attraction, prejudice, and persuasion, Fiske helps us understand the complex interaction of internal and external influences on the degree of tolerance for others. The main emphasis of the book is on the application of social psychology to everyday life.

The book *The Social Psychology of Tolerance* by Maykel Verkuyten (2022) is also worthy of attention. The author offers the reader a thorough study of the social dimension of the psychology of tolerance. Verkuyten uses case studies to discuss the various reasons why tolerance is vital for modern societies. Sociologists and CBT psychologists are increasingly talking about the flip side of diversity – xenophobia and its consequences. When people, having realised significant differences, seek to preserve their national and cultural world, the question of tolerance arises. In general, this applies not only to religious, cultural and ideological differences, but also to everyday things such as other people's manners, attitudes and behaviour.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

The psychological consequences of tolerance at the personal, interpersonal and intergroup levels were considered in another study by Maykel Verkuyten, co-authored with Kumar Yogeeswaran and Levi Adelman, "The Social Psychology of Intergroup Tolerance and Intolerance" (Verkuyten et al., 2023) and the article "The Negative Implications of Being Tolerated: Tolerance from the Target's Perspective" (Verkuyten et al., 2020). Exploring intergroup tolerance, the authors of these articles argue that in addition to the freedoms that tolerance implies, it also implies risks to social identity that threaten certain psychological needs (belonging, control, confidence). The psychological consequences of tolerance and the factors influencing it are considered at the personal, interpersonal and intergroup levels. In general, these works now provide a counterbalance to the negative effects of the idea of religious tolerance in different nations.

Three years ago, our Polish colleagues published a comprehensive book *The Psychology of Tolerance in Times of Uncertainty* by Malgorzata Kossowska, Ewa Szumowska, and Paulina Szwed (2020). In the final chapter nine, the authors refer to a psychological experiment with a sample of American Christian believers and Iranian Shiites. Everyone knows about the considerable tension between these groups. And although intolerant preconditions are often formed by cultural clichés, the media, religion and politics, the authors emphasise that this can be corrected by developing educational programmes in higher education institutions.

The same M. Verkuyten, co-authored with R. Kollar, published the study "Tolerance and Intolerance: Cultural Meanings and Discursive Usage" (2021), in which the authors focused on the cultural understanding of tolerance and how these terms are used in national discourses. They draw attention to how lay people use the concept of tolerance in national issues. Verkuyten and Kollar (2021) analyse how different understandings of intolerance are used in different ways to discursively distinguish between "we and they". The conclusion is that the concepts of "tolerance" and "intolerance" have different cultural meanings that can be used for both progressive and repressive purposes.

Michael Hjerm and his co-authors (2020) in their article "A New Approach to the Study of Tolerance: Conceptualizing and Measuring Acceptance, Respect, and Appreciation of Difference" ambitiously argue that all previous empirical studies of tolerance suffer from a number of shortcomings, the most serious of which is the conceptual and practical conflation of intolerance and prejudice. Hjerm and his co-authors make an analytical distinction between these two phenomena, referring to tolerance as a value orientation. The authors conducted two surveys, one national (Sweden) and one international (Australia, Denmark, Great Britain, Sweden and the United States). The results of the study show that tolerance is best perceived as a three-dimensional concept that includes acceptance, respect and appreciation of differences. The data analysis shows that measures of tolerance retain their metric invariance across countries. To understand the causes and consequences of tolerance, it is necessary to measure it in a way that differs from the study of prejudice.

A number of researchers propose to limit the scope of the principle of tolerance, but they always lack specific criteria that each person could be guided by. For example, Nadiia Kozachenko (2022) in her work "Tolerance and criticality: intolerance to falsehood" devotes section 1.3 to the thesis: "*Tolerance has limits*" (p. 247). In section 3.3, "Critical thinking assesses the conditions and limits of tolerance" (Kozachenko, 2022, p. 255), the author suggests limiting the action of the tolerance imperative. "First of all, critical thinking should answer the question: what are we dealing with: the other or the wrong? That is, whether the position presented as different is not in fact an error, a fake, disinformation in the same conceptual scheme in which our own position functions" (transl. by V. R.) (Kozachenko, 2022, p. 256).

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

In the philosophical context, the definition of tolerance becomes problematic for modern psychologists. There is a basic contradiction in the concept itself: the struggle for tolerance in various spheres of society raises suspicions of the absence of tolerance. And such suspicion, being intolerant by its very nature, is a necessary component of expanding the field of tolerance. In addition, in expanding the field of tolerance, it always risks becoming a value in itself.

These paradoxes can be described in Lacan's logic as the paradoxes of "empty space". In his report at the Rome Congress at the Institute of Psychology on 27 September 1953, "I empty speech and full speech in the psychoanalytic realisation of the subject" Lacan introduced the concept of "empty space" – something that cannot be filled with content or endowed with certain meanings. Jacques Lacan notes that in an effort to make an adequate description of itself, society inevitably constructs an unattainable object of itself. This happens because it is impossible to want an object and describe its logic in the same logic. That is why tolerance cannot be defined in strict concrete terms, since tolerance is a symbol of the systemic impossibility of society's self-description.

Let us classify possible means of promoting tolerance. There may be several of them:

1) Coercive approach (top-down) – characterised by the use of force against those who disagree. This provokes resistance and reciprocal aggression, which underscores the controversy of this method.

2) Liberal approach – based on voluntariness, without coercive mechanisms. It is the lack of compulsion that makes this method ineffective.

3) Spiritual approach – presents tolerance as a divine commandment and the highest value. The limitation of this method is that it does not resonate with secular society and has no enforcement mechanisms.

4) Personal approach – considers tolerance as a way to self-realisation in the modern European context. The disadvantage of this approach is that traditional cultures offer other ways of self-realisation, in particular, through the image of the warrior.

The UNESCO Declaration of Principles on Tolerance (1995) combines all these approaches, making it internally contradictory. For example, the document simultaneously proclaims respect for diversity and freedom of thought (liberal approach), calls tolerance a moral obligation (spiritual approach) and demands that individuals, groups and states respect it (coercive approach).

For example, subsection 1.1 of the document states that "Tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human". The document emphasises the fundamental importance of "freedom of thought, conscience and belief". This approach reflects a "passive" strategy of introducing tolerance, which can only lead to peaceful "harmony in diversity". However, in the same section, there is a change in rhetoric – tolerance is already defined as a "moral duty" and "virtue". This indicates the authors' transition to a pragmatic and theological way of promoting the concept of tolerance (Karhyna & Rubskyi, 2020, p. 146). Such a combination of different approaches to understanding tolerance can be explained by the influence of the Christian cultural tradition that has been formed from the Renaissance to the present.

In subsection 1.2, the tone of the document changes – the authors resort to coercive rhetoric, arguing that "tolerance is to be exercised by individuals, groups and States". This creates a clear contrast with the previous section: the addressee, who was initially offered the ideals of harmony and freedom of thought, is suddenly confronted with a "must" imperative. Moreover, this obligation extends not only to the individual, but also to social groups and state institutions.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Subsection 1.3 further reinforces the imperative nature of the document by defining tolerance as a mandatory requirement ("Tolerance is a duty"). The document calls for a "rejection of dogmatism, of the absolutisation of truth". However, this creates a significant contradiction, since for many cultures and peoples, dogmatic beliefs and absolute truths are the foundation of their worldview. Such a call to abandon these foundations actually demonstrates the intolerant attitude of the authors of the Declaration towards their audience. Moreover, if this logic is consistently followed, then tolerance itself as the highest value should be questioned, along with other fundamental principles of different cultures and subcultures.

Subsection 1.4 demonstrates another paradox: the authors return to the assertion that "tolerance does not mean toleration of social injustice or the abandonment or weakening of one's convictions", although this is exactly what they urged in the previous section. This raises a logical contradiction: how can an exclusive principle be promoted in an inclusive context? After all, if tolerance rejects racism and nationalism, then it inevitably requires the rejection of those beliefs (own or those of others) that contain racist or nationalist elements.

The text of the Declaration creates a paradoxical situation: on the one hand, it proclaims that "one is free to adhere to one's own convictions" and "one's views are not to be imposed on others" (§ 1.4). On the other hand, this freedom is restricted when a person's beliefs contain elements of intolerance towards others. In this case, a person is effectively deprived of the right to his or her own views. It is this contradiction that lies at the heart of the inter-racial, inter-ethnic and inter-national conflicts that tolerance is supposed to resolve. However, the UNESCO document, due to its multi-voiced and declarative nature of mutual influence, avoids addressing this fundamental problem.

The document continues to reinforce the imperative tone: section 2.1 states that "tolerance at the state level requires", and paragraph 2.3 categorically states: "Without tolerance there can be no peace".

The content analysis reveals the need to consider the concept of tolerance in its natural context. The coercive approach effectively introduces the idea, but its mandatory nature inevitably leads to the use of punitive measures against those individuals, groups or states that fundamentally reject this concept (§ 1.2).

At the same time, the liberal approach to tolerance contains an internal contradiction: while trying to protect the freedom of thought and uniqueness of the Other, it is forced to accept manifestations of intolerance in their worldview. Therefore, a soft approach to promoting tolerance faces a paradox: it must simultaneously defend the value of tolerance and accept intolerance as an integral element of the Other's individuality.

Thus, every method of promoting tolerance has its limitations. A coercive approach generates resistance. A liberal approach, trying to preserve the uniqueness of everyone, is forced to accept even intolerant views. This creates a paradoxical situation: preaching tolerance should include both the idea of tolerance and the acceptance of intolerance as part of human diversity.

In addition to logical contradictions, there are natural psychological obstacles to tolerance, and they are much more important. First of all, it is the civic altruism rooted in culture, which is parochial in nature (from the Greek *para* – near, beside, *oikos* – place of residence). From the general premises of psychology, it is known that there is no altruism directed to everyone: altruism is always directed to a group that a person defines as his or her own (Kalmykova et al., 2021). The reference group can be large or small, but it always exists and its boundaries are defined.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

In the course of evolution, the altruistic component developed as a result of the social way of survival: to succeed, it was necessary to help other members of one's tribe, even sometimes to the detriment of one's personal interests. Under the influence of the same factor, the opposite trait – dislike of outsiders – also developed. That is, it is only formally opposed, as it is a natural process of grouping. The desire for equality developed within the group in its social stratum. It is logical that a tribe will be more stable with an even distribution of resources.

In the course of evolution, these phenomena (preference for friends, contempt for stranger, and the desire for an even distribution of benefits within the tribe) were fixed at the genetic level. Modern man understands altruism and the desire for equality as natural. Thus, love for insiders and rejection of outsiders have historically developed as part of the same adaptation mechanism and remain inseparable from each other to this day. They have a common basis, and if we strengthen one position, we strengthen the other. And when we find people who are extremely kind to their own circle and equally hostile to those they consider outsiders, there is no contradiction.

The biological basis of parochial groups is oxytocin. It simultaneously improves a person's attitude towards insiders and increases aggression towards outsiders. When there are calls on the streets to join something and unite around something (church, politics, nationality, gender), this is an attempt to activate oxytocin associations. Such associations lead to an increase in aggression towards those whom these people do not consider their friends. Lawrence Keeley, studying mortality and the level of aggression towards outsiders among Paleolithic groups, uses the concept of "groupthink" to describe the simultaneous effect of internal cohesion and external aggression in primitive societies.

In view of the above, the most organic context for the spread of tolerance is religious post-metaphysical discourse. It may sound philosophical and even deconstructionist, as in the recent article by J. Caputo (2022) "Unconditional Hospitality – When the Other is Not Welcome". J. Caputo (2007) analyses the concept of unconditional hospitality and considers the philosophical aspects of accepting unwanted guests. He develops the theme of hospitality as a Christian philosophical principle, which he wrote about in his earlier book *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?*. Hospitality welcomes the stranger who may be dangerous, because everything of value involves risk, and we take risks even when we love and trust someone (Caputo, 2007, pp. 76-77). The Christian motive is the most concrete here. In the Gospel we find: "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another" (John 13:34, 15:12, 15:17) "By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 13:35). "Beloved, let us love one another, because love is from God, and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God. Anyone who does not love does not know God, because God is love" (1 John 4:7). And further: "God is love, and whoever abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him... And this commandment we have from him: whoever loves God must also love his brother" (1 John 4:16, 4:21). In the interpretation of the words "you shall love your neighbour as yourself" (Luke 10:27), the neighbour is any person you meet, even an ethnic or ideological rival (Luke 10:33). Radical hospitality, which is opposed to social adaptation, is presented to us in the words of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: "When you give a dinner or a banquet, do not invite your friends or your brothers[a] or your relatives or rich neighbours, lest they also invite you in return and you be repaid. 13 But when you give a feast, invite the poor, the crippled, the lame, the blind" (Luke 14:12-13). The apostle calls on Christians to "seek to show hospitality" (Romans 12:13), "Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares" (Hebrews 13:2).

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Reading these and similar calls for tolerance, it seems to be born of religion, but it is not. Typical religion produces indulgence, mercy, but not equality in diversity – which is what tolerance proclaims. Historical Christianity has been ineffective in promoting tolerance for three reasons:

1) Orthodox Christianity pays no attention to the individual. It thinks in terms of "Jews", "Gentiles", "chosen people", "new Israel", i.e., an ethnic or ideological community. (We can recall the parable of the judgment, where the Lord judges the nations; His promise to the apostles to judge the nations).

2) Christianity began as a vindication of Israel's God, who had been frustratingly inactive during the long period of Roman occupation. Jewish apocalyptic literature was full of hopes for the resuscitation of God in His power and glory.

3) In Christianity (as in Judaism), the manifestation of God's authenticity was a demonstration of His violence (e.g., the exodus of the Jews from Egypt, the executions of the apocalypse in Christendom).

Postmodern theologians tend to see early Christian hospitality as a way of participating in the work of God. Through Christians, God welcomed all people, regardless of whether they were worthy of the Good News. Jesus was a creature of hospitality, since he depended on the generosity of others, and he himself "had no place to lay his head" (Luke 9:58).

In his work *Hospitality*, Derrida, making a distinction between the "law of unconditional hospitality" and the "laws of conditional hospitality", calls for "hospitality beyond hospitality", i.e. radical hospitality that pushes to its own limits.

Derrida also applied this to democracy (Caputo, 2022, p. 92). It is not something that is or should be, tolerance is a need that gives rise to this concept. Its applied meaning is secondary, even if the concept proves to be useful in practice. Opponents of tolerance can reasonably point to the fact that the Other is a threat and a disorder. There are many such facts. But as J. Caputo (2022) writes, "The unconditional does not exist; it insists" (p. 93). This is where religion intertwines with post-Christian philosophy in the thesis: "the appeal of the *à venir* makes itself felt... Forgiveness, *s'il y en a*, means the forgiveness to come, *à venir*, with all the (weak) force of the appeal of the *à venir*, which calls upon us, which calls to us, which calls for us to recall the dead, to keep the future open" (Caputo, 2022, p. 97).

Caputo puts forward a number of axioms that reveal the essence of tolerance not as a requirement, rule or regulation, but as an unbridled desire to keep the future open. Yes, we must calculate risks wherever possible, but we cannot close the door on what cannot be calculated. J. Caputo (2022) states: "Nothing says this will not have been an evil spirit, that the event will not be a disaster, that we will not in our attempt to reinvent ourselves expose ourselves to the wolves of the worst evils" (p. 100).

Gianni Vattimo connects the idea of hospitality with the situation of weakening "strong structures of being" that assert universal truths for all. In his most famous book *After Christianity* he insists that in the current situation, only mutual understanding and the priority of dialogue can become common basic values (Vattimo, 2002, p. 10). For Vattimo, the revival of Christianity is similar to its new emergence. By analogy with the conclusion of the Third Testament after the Old and New one (similar to the teachings of the Catholic monk Joachim of Fiore). That is, for Vattimo (2002), it is a new "divine revelation" that will become the basis for the revival of religion (p. 22).

Andrew Shepherd (2014) in his book *The Gift of the Other: Levinas, Derrida, and a Theology of Hospitality* disagrees with the ideas of Derrida and Levinas (p. 13). They initially proceed

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

from conflict as an organic part of the universe and, according to Shepherd, are fundamentally unable to reach its resolution. Instead, he proposes to rely on the Christian Trinitarian ontology with its centre in the relationship of freely given love of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. In J. Zizioulas' interpretation, communion and otherness coexist harmoniously in the Trinity. Human relationships should also be characterised by mutual self-giving and love (Shepherd, 2014, p. 124). Andrew Shepherd uses J. Milbank's idea of a "purified gift-exchange". Christianity preaches an asymmetrical exchange of gifts based on freedom, love and joy (Shepherd, 2014, p. 217).

Originality

Modern thinking is hierarchical, and therefore will defend hierarchy in everything. Whereas tolerance stands for equality and generally tends to have a flat ontology. Thus, in order to avoid a conflict between the method of promoting tolerance and its essence, a postmodern approach is needed.

The post-metaphysical religious approach to the problem of tolerance provides an original philosophical justification for unconditional hospitality towards alien cultural elements, since the term "unconditional" belongs to a different order of meaning-making. It does not answer the question "what is it?" but speaks of what it entails and what it is born of.

The policy of tolerance, which is perceived as a new order and regulations for enforcing respect, is not a regulation and a requirement, but a dream and a need. If we calculate all the dangers of openness to the Other (immigrants, neighbours, people of other identities) and, as a result of mathematical risks, close the Other as a psychological perspective, we will lose the openness of the future, which is ultimately the most valuable thing. It participates in shaping the present, even if it never comes. Thus, the idea of tolerance is more valuable than its practicality, and it will not be practical as long as we perceive it only pragmatically.

If we understand it as a need of the psyche, it is in itself an event that shapes the events of the present.

Conclusions

If we find in the term "tolerance" the implicit premise of unconditional tolerance (as an ideal), we will discover its religious basis. *Unconditional tolerance* is a way of accepting the alien when real conditions cross out half of one's prospects. Then its only real support is the religious dimension of man and the equality of all before God.

In this case, God is a necessary component of the coherence of the idea of tolerance, since there is no equality of people in relation to every subject, class, and even nation, and there should not be. Each person has those who appeal to him or her more than others. Likewise, people of the same nationality and culture cannot perceive foreigners as their equals. But before God (even if He does not exist), they are equal and responsible for each other's good. "In the framework of evolutionism, there is no space for the need for a concrete and unique 'I' of the Other. It is possible only with the assumption of metaphysical premises or in religious discourse" (Rubskyi, 2019).

REFERENCES

Caputo, J. (2007). *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?: The Good News of Postmodernism for the Church*. Baker Academic. (in English)

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Caputo, J. (2022). Unconditional Hospitality – When the Other is not Welcome. *Theological Reflections: Eastern European Journal of Theology*, 20(2), 91-102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29357/2789-1577.2022.20.2.7> (in Ukrainian)
- Fiske, S. (2018). *Social Beings: Core Motives in Social Psychology* (4th ed.). Wiley. (in English)
- Hjerm, M., Eger, M. A., Bohman, A., & Fors Connolly, F. (2020). A New Approach to the Study of Tolerance: Conceptualizing and Measuring Acceptance, Respect, and Appreciation of Difference. *Social Indicators Research*, 147(3), 897-919. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02176-y> (in English)
- Kalmykova, L., Kharchenko, N., & Mysan, I. (2021). "I-language" i. e. "Individual language": The Problem of Functional Generalization. *PSYCHOLINGUISTICS*, 29(1), 59-99. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2021-29-1-59-99> (in Ukrainian)
- Karhyna, N. V., & Rubskyi, V. N. (2020). Psychological problems of the foundations of ethics and morality. *Habitus*, (15), 143-147. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32843/2663-5208.2020.15.23> (in Russian)
- Kite, M. E., Whitley, B. E., & Wagner, L. S. (2022). *Psychology of Prejudice and Discrimination* (4th ed.). Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367809218> (in English)
- Koriakina, A. A., Tretyakova, T. V., Ignatiev, V. P., & Olesova, S. G. (2019). Formation of tolerance in multicultural educational environment. *Revista ESPACIOS*, 40(9). Retrieved from <https://www.revistaespacios.com/a19v40n09/a19v40n09p16.pdf> (in English)
- Kossowska, M., Szumowska, E., & Szwed, P. (2020). *The Psychology of Tolerance in Times of Uncertainty*. Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367821487> (in English)
- Kozachenko, N. (2022). Tolerance and criticality: intolerance to falsehood. *Actual Problems of Mind*, (23), 243-265. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31812/apm.7634> (in Ukrainian)
- Marchuk, L. (2019). Language means of dichotomy realization of "tolerance / hostility" in ways of communication of mass media. *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia*, 7(2), 85-89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14746/sup.2019.7.2.08> (in Ukrainian)
- Rubskyi, V. M. (2019). Communication levels of the individual. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (16), 24-32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i16.150217> (in English)
- Shepherd, A. (2014). *The Gift of the Other: Levinas, Derrida, and a Theology of Hospitality*. Pickwick Publications. (in English)
- Tsvietkova, Y. V. (2020). *Pravova tradytsiia relihiinoi tolerantnosti v derzhavakh Yevropy z federatyvnym ustroiem (V st. do n. e. – XVII st.)*. Kyiv: Talkom. (in Ukrainian)
- UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of Principles on Tolerance*. Retrieved from <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000151830>
- Vattimo, G. (2002). *After Christianity* (L. D'Isanto, Trans.). Columbia University Press. (in English)
- Verkuyten, M. (2022). *The Social Psychology of Tolerance*. Routledge. (in English)
- Verkuyten, M., & Kollar, R. (2021). Tolerance and intolerance: Cultural meanings and discursive usage. *Culture & Psychology*, 27(1), 172-186. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X20984356> (in English)
- Verkuyten, M., Yogeewaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2020). The Negative Implications of Being Tolerated: Tolerance From the Target's Perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(3), 544-561. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619897974> (in English)
- Verkuyten, M., Yogeewaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2023). The social psychology of intergroup tolerance and intolerance. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 34(1), 1-43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2022.2091326> (in English)
- Zhornova, M. M. (2014). Tolerantnist yak bahatorivneva kharakterystyka osobystosti studenta. *Aktualni problemy psykholohii v zakladakh osvity*, 4, 43-49. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31812/psychology.v4i.7425> (in Ukrainian)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Caputo J. *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?: The Good News of Postmodernism for the Church*. Baker Academic, 2007. 160 p.
- Капуто Д. Безумовна гостинність: коли Іншого не приймають. *Богословські роздуми: Східноєвропейський журнал богослов'я*. 2022. Т. 20, № 2. С. 91–102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29357/2789-1577.2022.20.2.7>
- Fiske S. *Social Beings: Core Motives in Social Psychology*. 4th ed. Wiley, 2018. 592 p.
- Hjerm M., Eger M. A., Bohman A., Fors Connolly F. A New Approach to the Study of Tolerance: Conceptualizing and Measuring Acceptance, Respect, and Appreciation of Difference. *Social Indicators Research*. 2020. Vol. 147, Iss. 3. P. 897–919. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02176-y>

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Калмикова Л., Харченко Н., Мисан І. "Я-мова" і.е. "Індивідуальна мова": проблема функціональної генералізації. *PSYCHOLINGUISTICS*. 2021. Т. 29, № 1. С. 59–99. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2021-29-1-59-99>
- Каргина Н. В., Рубский В. Н. Психологические проблемы основания этики и морали. *Габимус*. 2020. № 15. С. 143–147. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32843/2663-5208.2020.15.23>
- Kite M. E., Whitley B. E., Wagner L. S. *Psychology of Prejudice and Discrimination*. 4th ed. Routledge, 2022. 734 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367809218>
- Koriakina A. A., Treutyakova T. V., Ignatiev V. P., Olesova S. G. Formation of tolerance in multicultural educational environment. *Revista ESPACIOS*. 2019. Vol. 40, No. 9. 9p. URL: <https://www.revistaespacios.com/a19v40n09/a19v40n09p16.pdf>
- Kossowska M., Szumowska E., Szwed P. *The Psychology of Tolerance in Times of Uncertainty*. Routledge, 2020. 208 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367821487>
- Козаченко Н. Толерантність і критичність: нетолерантність до хибі. Актуальні проблеми духовності. 2022. № 23. С. 243–265. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31812/apm.7634>
- Марчук Л. Мовні засоби реалізації дихотомії "толерантність / ворожість" у ЗМК. *Studia Ukrainica Posnaniensia*. 2019. Т. 7, № 2. С. 85–89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14746/sup.2019.7.2.08>
- Rubskyi V. M. Communication levels of the individual. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2019. No. 16. P. 24–32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i16.150217>
- Shepherd A. *The Gift of the Other: Levinas, Derrida, and a Theology of Hospitality*. Pickwick Publications, 2014. 276 p.
- Цветкова Ю. В. *Правова традиція релігійної толерантності в державах Європи з федеративним устроєм (V ст. до н. е. – XVII ст.)*. Київ : Талком, 2020. 512 с.
- Declaration of Principles on Tolerance. *UNESCO*. 1995. URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000151830>
- Vattimo G. *After Christianity* / trans. by L. D'Isanto. Columbia University Press, 2002. 156 p.
- Verkuyten M. *The Social Psychology of Tolerance*. Routledge, 2022. 264 p.
- Verkuyten M., Kollar R. Tolerance and intolerance: Cultural meanings and discursive usage. *Culture & Psychology*. 2021. Vol. 27, Iss. 1. P. 172–186. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X20984356>
- Verkuyten M., Yogeeswaran K., Adelman L. The Negative Implications of Being Tolerated: Tolerance From the Target's Perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2020. Vol. 15, Iss. 3. P. 544–561. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619897974>
- Verkuyten M., Yogeeswaran K., Adelman L. The social psychology of intergroup tolerance and intolerance. *European Review of Social Psychology*. 2023. Vol. 34, Iss. 1. P. 1–43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2022.2091326>
- Жорнова М. М. Толерантність як багаторівнева характеристика особистості студента. Актуальні проблеми психології в закладах освіти. 2014. Т. 4. С. 43–49. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31812/psychology.v4i.7425>

В. М. РУБСЬКИЙ^{1*}

^{1*}Одеський національний морський університет (Одеса, Україна), ел. пошта pavv@te.net.ua, ORCID 0000-0003-3225-8287

Психологічні та філософські проблеми толерантності

Мета. Стаття спрямована на формулювання несуперечливого принципу толерантності з урахуванням внутрішніх філософських та психологічних труднощів, пов'язаних з її реалізацією на практиці. **Теоретичний базис.** Автор виходить із нерозв'язної проблемності самого поняття "толерантність" і її психологічної реалізації. Запропоновано психорелігійний метод просування ідеї толерантності, але не класичний, а пост-метафізичний. Цей метод був заявлений у роботах Ж. Дерріди, П. Рікера, Дж. Капуто, Дж. Ваттімо, Р. Керні, Е. Шеперда, Е. Ньюмена, М. Мюєрта та ін. Історичний християнський тип толерантності (реалізації принципу любові до ближнього) зберігає в собі значний потенціал прихованої агресії. Це простежується у текстах Писання та святих отців. Розподіл на своїй і чужих за принципом сповідання залишається актуальним і досі. До того ж релігійний компонент толерантності має тенденцію представляти її як самоцінність, а не просто важливий соціально-психологічний параметр. Автор вказує на те, що застосування християнських постметафізичних підходів до цієї проблеми є найбільш філософсько цілісним та психологічно ефективним. **Наукова новизна.** У статті розглянуто внутрішній смисловий парадокс ідеї толерантності та методів її про-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

сування. Просування толерантності породжує підозру в нетолерантності, яка, будучи нетолерантною за своєю суттю, виявляється необхідним компонентом поширення ідеї толерантності. Подано типологізацію методів упровадження та просування толерантності (авторитарний, пасивний, психологічний та релігійний), їх основні недоліки й переваги. Означено основні проблеми, що виникають лише на рівні філософії та психології. **Висновки.** Історичне християнство малоефективне задля досягнення толерантності з низки причин: воно недостатньо уважне до особистості, оскільки зберігає міркування про людину в категоріях соціальних формацій (обраний народ тощо). Справжність Бога в класичних текстах маніфестувалась Його насильством у минулому чи майбутньому. Метафізична основа принципу толерантності та постметафізичне розуміння гостинності повертають толерантність до свого натурального витоку та дають релевантну основу як міжрелігійному діалогу, так і зняттю психологічної напруги між різними культурними кодами. Колишні моделі, які запропоновані в Декларації ЮНЕСКО, мають низку внутрішніх протиріч і недостатньо ефективні практично.

Ключові слова: толерантність; постметафізика; християнство; діалогічність; авторитаризм; ксенофобія

Received: 27.08.2023

Accepted: 15.11.2024