Tolerance as a Voice in the Intercultural Dialogue of Humanity

Nina Zlateva Ilieva

South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Blagoevgrad, BULGARIA
Faculty of Philosophy

Abstract

The common horizon and path of different cultures outlined by modernity includes listening, understanding, dialogue, interaction and cooperation. A person's life in society, engaging and joining him means living with others, accepting differences (ethnic, political, cultural, educational), but also upholding one's own uniqueness. The culture of tolerance and cooperation is built around ethical phenomena that regulate interpersonal relationships, and considering the relationship of freedom and responsibility, both in human behavior and in situations of personal choice helps to realize the "identity" and "otherness" as two persons of the same human being, realized and seen from different points of view.

Keywords: tolerance, voice, intercultural dialogue, humanity.

1. Introduction

The time in which we live confidently carries out the processes of globalization in economic, socio-political and cultural life. The expectations from the second half of the last century for "opening" the borders between the communities are a reality for a large part of humanity.

2. Tolerance and education

Different cultures are embarking on a path that includes listening, understanding, dialogue, interaction and cooperation. The constant monopolization of culture generates the mutual penetration and mixing between different cultures, which leads to the emergence of new ones. How does a person live in society, how does he/she engage and join him/her, if this inclusion means living with others, accepting differences (ethnic, political, cultural, educational), but also implies upholding one's own uniqueness?

The placement of a person in the world and the stability of the chosen place in it, presupposes a new quality of evaluation and transformation abilities, which are the basis of value orientation, the choice of social values, the ability to identify.

This raises the question of education, which aims to develop the transformative abilities not only of society as a whole but also of the individual. Value-oriented education

Correspondence: Nina Zlateva Ilieva, South-West University "Neofit Rilski", Faculty of Philosophy, Blagoevgrad, BULGARIA. E-mail: ninail@abv.bg.

_____

preserves the age-old need for philosophical completeness and integrity of knowledge while creating appropriate conditions for cultivating human diversity. Such conditions open horizons for counteracting technological nation and alienation, because they do not just teach, but build education around the tolerance for difference and otherness needed today.

Tolerance requires respect for others but does not underestimate self-esteem and thus affirms universal values. Tolerance is manifested in the dialogue on the problems of culture, education and different visions for them.

The postmodern mindset is the bearer of the hope that cognitive activity has the potential to finally reveal what it is capable of and what it is called for – to provoke creativity, to form skills for "impact on life" (Jose Ortega y Gasset), to form a sense of truth, which is a condition for achieving freedom (Karl Jaspers). In this way, she would confirm the words of Tsvetan Todorov that "the path to freedom passes through education." And for those who are not tempted by such issues, it is not difficult to notice that in recent years specialties are preferred, ensuring rapid professional realization and prosperity, which is justified not only in terms of human well-being, but in years like these, and human survival.

Educational strategies are aimed primarily at mastering knowledge and skills that ensure resilience in an unstable world but seem to miss the "insertion" of man in the same world.

Insertion, which implies a choice of social values, identification skills, and value orientation. The development of such skills determines the modern model of education, without breaking its ties with the roots of education from the past, but in the direction of rethinking education. Like a book that, although you have read, opens up new directions for you.

"The library is boundless and periodic. If an eternal traveler goes in any direction, he would be convinced after many centuries that the same books are repeated in the same disorder (which with repetition becomes order – the order). This exquisite hope is a consolation for my loneliness" (Borges, 1989: 119).

Can this hope be a consolation today?

The idea of the future as a choice and building one of the opportunities that human life offers, even more urgently requires a rethinking of education itself.

The value significance of such a rethinking stands out more prominently when it refers to the traditional center of the educational process – learning. Any approach to him today cannot fail to take into account the radically different self-esteem with which he participates in the same process. The value significance of such a rethinking stands out more prominently when it refers to the traditional center of the educational process – learning. Any approach to him today cannot fail to take into account the radically different self-esteem with which he participates in the same process. This new confidence (sometimes incomprehensible from the point of view of the traditional notion of mastered knowledge) is accompanied by the emergence of a new sensitivity, which defines education not only as an objective fact but as a continuous process of birth and "gathering" (M. Heidegger) of the human world.

3. Tolerance, culture and art

The presentation of philosophical knowledge in its various dimensions and interpretations as a focus of the humanities and arts is a crucial factor in the formation of skills and abilities to "impact life". In this respect, its teaching is of particular importance, although in fact, his teaching has always been important. The topicality of the topic of the meaning of education justifies the efforts to rethink it in terms of our time filled with twists and turns, which

will increasingly need an education that allows a person to see himself and his place in the world, but also the world of others in it.

In the context of the above, the understanding of philosophy lies in its equality in a kind of "scientific cooperation" (see Habermas, 1999), and not as usurpation of power and totalizing claims, because this not only excludes the idea of tolerance of difference and otherness but and because it itself (philosophy) is its bearer. In itself, this reinforces the value of philosophy and justifies the efforts to include it in the evaluation of education, in the disclosure of its essential human dimensions.

In an effort to distinguish methods and approaches in the process of teaching young people that meet the changed modern conditions, pedagogical efforts often lead to the renaming of otherwise known and established in practice methods.

For example, interactive methods and techniques (discussion, debate, solving moral dilemmas) have always been a prerequisite for the formation of first philosophical temptation and later philosophical education (at different educational levels).

Knowledge of the "new" methods does not replace the fact that it is more important whether and how they are used. Educational practice has long unequivocally suggested that it is not important what you teach, but how you do it. What conditions are created in order to know things not only externally, but also "the meaning achieved by human, their meaning" (Jaspers, 1995: 92).

The ability to judge depends on understanding the meaning, and the comprehensible meaning, as Jaspers define it, is "not beautiful or ugly, noble or simple, good or bad," it depends on the interfering forces of truth. which is not one. By this, "which forces of truth I will feel, which I will identify with, which I will repel, determines freedom" (Jaspers, 1995: 92). Understanding meaning as a "touch of freedom", and hence building one's own assessment of what is happening, paves the way for finding one's own meaning in the seemingly meaningless human world.

The understanding of philosophy as a "voice in the conversation of humankind", as a mediator in the relationship between people and especially as a universal link in the mutual understanding of these same people belongs to Richard Rorty. He is the philosopher who shows the real and technical motives in philosophy (as well as other pragmatic philosophers) that discredit metanarratives. His project is to "destroy" all previous philosophy as the embodiment of metaphysics, transcendentalism and fundamentalism. These incarnations lead to a distortion of man's "self-image" as a creative being, as a being who does not need absolutes. Rorty's ideas are an expression of the communist idea in modern philosophy. His is the developed version of pragmatist hermeneutics, which lays down the concept of complete dependence of interpretations on the text, as well as on the needs of the one who interprets the text or the community to which it belongs. According to Rorty, a true liberal-democratic society does not accept any power or unification, it only listens to the common interest of the people who communicate with each other. "There is no human nature that has been or is still chained. Rather, since there is a language, our species builds its nature. This nature develops through a growing, richer, more indivisible and painful synthesis of opposing values" (Rorty, 1995: 33).

His concept of language finds application in "developing a specific idea of the role of philosophy in the modern world" (Rusev, 2005: 144), and it is political, consisting in exposing various forms of "Human suffering and oppression" and – through this – in helping to achieve their 'historical' and not just 'logical' death" (Rusev, 2005: 144).

Rorty's concept is complemented by that of Habermas in support of "a utilized form of philosophy" whose potential is "Achieving" maximum happiness for a maximum number of people (*Ibid.*: 146). And such a society needs free and cultured people who reveal themselves not only to themselves but also (mostly) in their relationships with others. The dialogical nature of human

_____

existence can remove the barriers that hinder the formation of sincere relationships between people.

"The real coordination of people comes from the fact that everyone is first and foremost a language circle and that these circles are increasingly touching and uniting. What emerges in this way is always a language with its own vocabulary and grammar, as it has always been and never without the inner infinity of conversation, which is a movement between each speaker and his partner. This is the fundamental dimension of the hermeneutic. True speaking, which has something to say and therefore does not give pre-established signals, but seeks words to reach the other – this is the general human task, it is the special task of the theologian, who is entrusted with the transmission of a written message" (Gadamer, 1994: 220).

The words with which to reach the other imply understanding, which is a way of existence of the knowing, acting and evaluating a person. Defining hermeneutics primarily as a practice, Gadamer connects its realization with the implementation of the activity of making sense of a text, and outside the activity of it loses its specificity. Philosophical hermeneutics is not limited to the development of a methodology for understanding texts but is a special kind of philosophy of understanding.

"I nominate it a hermeneutic experience. Because the process described in this way is constantly repeated in the most intimate. What is always new in our experience is something that interprets the world in our relationships, something that overturns our expectations so far and only rearranges itself in the overturn. It is not the misunderstanding or the alien that is primary so that preventing misunderstanding is a task, but on the contrary – consent, that the main thing is close, makes it possible to go to the alien and expand our own experience of the world" (*Ibid*.: 218).

Understanding as a universal way of mastering the world is concretized by Gadamer as "experience", and the main mechanisms for its formation are embedded in language.

Turning to language is seen as an authentic way of revealing the truth of being. Unlike the previous hermeneutics, which distinguishes between understanding, interpretation (interpretation) and application (application) as relatively independent procedures, Gadamer affirms their identity – understanding is always "interpretive" and interpretation "understanding"; understanding is possible only as an application, which means relating the content to the cultural experience of the present.

The interpretation of the text is understood not as recreating the primacy of the text, but as creating its meaning again. The interpretation of cultural tradition is in fact a dialogue between the past and the present. Like any dialogue, it is realized in the form of "questions and answers", but it is important not only to reconstruct the question (the answer is the text), but also to relate this question to yourself. For Gadamer, dialogue with tradition is not only a culturological task but also a cognitive one, because it is a source of philosophical knowledge.

In this respect (of the understanding of philosophizing as dialogue) the significance of Plato is intransigent. Of course, dialogue is not just about asking questions and getting answers (as a method of learning too), because the dialogue of this kind would not be a source of knowledge. The task of leading the dialogue turns out to be far more difficult.

"Because I am a Platonist, I love some unforgettable scenes from Plato's dialogues, especially those in which Socrates argues with omniscient sophists and leads them to despair with his questions, until finally, unable to bear it any longer, they begin to claim the role of the questioner, which seems so easy to them. And what happens then? They simply do not think of anything to ask in such a way that it is worthwhile to deal with it and persistently seek an answer" (Gadamer, 1994: 215).

_____

The advantage of the dialogical model of philosophizing over the monologue of any grandiose system is clearly emphasized.

Today, when opportunities are sought to reform education and improve its quality, we cannot help but realize that dialogue with cultural tradition is at the heart of education. Despite the technological nation of everything and everyone around us, man has always differed from electronic systems, which are increasingly replacing him, in their creativity. It is associated with the ethereality of feelings and imagination, which distinguishes it from any system, even more so than the technological one.

As a confirmation of Nietzsche's prophetic words that perhaps the task of education "will, it seems to me, be to transform the whole man into a living and mobile solar-planetary system and to discover the law of its higher mechanics" (Nietzsche, 1992: 165)

The modern learner deserves to participate directly in the "dialogue" with the tradition in order to "understand" it and to be realized as an active, knowledgeable and appreciative person. A man who will seek his own way out of the crash and from whom we would not have the right to take responsibility for missing or destroyed values – we are not part of his world because he belongs to the future and if we do not impose monologue models from the past alone will discover its value bases.

Habermas defines communicative behavior as the basis for the formation of stable, legitimized interpersonal relationships, and stable personal structures capable of development and self-realization. The source of the crisis in the modern world for him is the main contradiction between the institutional structures of society and the socio-cultural "lifeworld". Of the two types of behavior, he identified – communicative and strategic, the second aims to pursue "interest", which in turn leads to systematically distorted communication.

Its consequences are fatal for society, culture and the individual. Communicative behavior is what is able to form an orderly normative environment and stable personality structures. For Habermas, the existing pluralism in social action does not mean the interruption of historical and post-industrial society, it is possible to achieve a total reason, a "universal discourse" between individual communicative acts or discourses. With this understanding, he is in controversy with Lyotard's concept of the postmodern and his view of modern society as a network of independent "linguistic discourses" that act as a multitude of "local determinisms." For Lyotard, reaching a general consensus is unattainable due to the very nature of the social system of postmodern society. Habermas is convinced that communicative action always takes place in a general normative context, hence the contradiction between the theory of communicative behavior and Lyotard's theory of legitimation of knowledge. An important prerequisite for the communicative action is the preservation of the identity of the participant in it

According to Habermas, human existence is such that one cannot be obliged to be identical to oneself. Everyone achieves their identity not without their interaction with other people, but precisely in these relationships. Building a personality through interaction with others, on the one hand, means accepting the responsibilities imposed, and on the other hand, respecting the autonomy of the other person. This acceptance of "foreign" autonomy does not mean an interrupted process, but socialization that connects the individual with history. Habermas defines as the ultimate goal of communicative action as the achievement of a universal "discourse of arguments", which by virtue of its universality has the status of a norm. The unity of the communicative process is achieved through the normative determination of the set of possible interpersonal relationships (recognized as legitimate in the common life world). In general, communicative action is aimed at reaching consensus, which in turn will mean the sustainability of the social system (in contrast to Lyotard, for whom consensus is temporary and reflects only temporarily the state of the system).

_____

With regard to teaching, teachers face the need to include in curricula not only the cognitive aspect but to find their place in the forms of critical and self-reflective thinking, learners to be encouraged to talk about themselves, to exchange experiences and opinions between you are. The emphasis should be on greater dialogue and independent research in various fields. The discursive theory considers the need for credibility relating to different spheres of reality – social, subjective and objective as symmetrical.

Pedagogy assumes that some people act as instructors and others as learners. The asymmetry between these roles is justified if it exists only as a criterion for the difference in the modes of communicative action. In order to reach the ideal communicative situation, the instructor must believe in the ability of those he teaches to appreciate the importance of reciprocity, equality, responsibility and autonomy of others.

It is no coincidence that the leading goal of ethics education is to promote a culture of tolerance, cooperation and non-violence. The expected results formulated by the educational standards are related to the knowledge of ethical phenomena, regulating mainly interpersonal relations. Considering the relationship of freedom-responsibility both in human behavior and in situations of personal choice forms the understanding of "identity" and "otherness" as the two faces of a human being, realized and seen from different points of view.

"The imperialism of intolerance is based on the exceptional valuation of one's own choices against what others may think, believe, do or be. At its center is an identification of human values with me, with all my personal, ethnic, cultural, religious and historical characteristics, to the point that the self ultimately coincides with the good of humanity as such. At the heart of any intolerance is a claim to the possession of some privileged model" (Hersh, 2002: 142).

4. Conclusion

Building a culture of tolerance, likewise, rejects the preconception of a horizon or a privileged scientific approach because its imposition is in itself intolerant. It is rooted in the understanding of tolerance not as indifferent tolerance, which "freezes" your soul, but as an attitude towards the Other, as an opening to the Other, as an understanding of Him, as equality with Him, which does not harm, threatens, but manifests its own identity.

References

Borges, H. L. (1989). *The library of Babylon*. [Борхес, Х.Л. Вавилонската библиотека. Издателство "Народна култура". София.] "Folk Culture" Publishing House. Sofia. Bulgaria.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1984). *History and hermeneutics*. [Гадамер, Х.-Г. История и херменевтика. Издателска къща „ГАЛ-ИКО". София.] "GAL-IKO" Publishing House. Sofia. Bulgaria.

Nietzsche, F. (1992). Schopenhauer as an educator. In *Untimely reflections*. [Ницше, Ф. Шопенхауер като възпитател. В: Несвоевременни размишления. ИК „Св. Климент Охридски“. София.] Publishing Complex "St. Kliment Ohridski". Sofia. Bulgaria.

Rorty, R. (1995). Cosmopolitanism without emancipation: In response to Jean-François Lyotard. In: *American philosophy in the late twentieth century*. [Рорти, Р. Космополитизъм без еманципация: в отговор на Жан-Франсоа Лиотар. В: Американската философия в края на XX в. Издателство „Просвета“. София.] "Prosveta" Publishing House. Sofia. Bulgaria.

Rusev, R. (2005). *The philosophy and structure of modernity*. [Русев, Р. Философията и структурата на модерността. Издателска къща „Изток-Запад“. София.] "East-West" Publishing House. Sofia. Bulgaria.

Hersh, J. (2002). Tolerance between freedom and truth. In *Philosophy of tolerance*. [Херш, Ж. „Толерантността между свободата и истината". В: сб. Философия на толерантността. Издателство на НБУ. София.] NBU Publishing House. Sofia. Bulgaria.

Jaspers, K. (1995). *A little school of philosophical thinking*. [Ясперс, К. Малка школа за философско мислене. Издателска къща „ГАЛ-ИКО“. София] GAL-IKO" Publishing House. Sofia. Bulgaria.