

UDC 301.85:347.6

Shumeiko O. – Postgraduate Student of the Department of Philosophy of Law and Legal Logic of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, Kyiv, Ukraine

TOLERANCE AS VALUABLE REFERENCE POINT FOR MODERN FAMILY

In the article are investigating the approaches of tolerance understanding, tolerance in family interactions. Family as a base institute of socialization postulates the system of values of separately taken person and society as the whole.

Keywords: family, tolerance, valuable reference-points, equality, freedom.

Modern transformation processes of Ukrainian society, its social structure and institutes are determined by both national sociocultural problems and changes in the vital functions of the family, its values, norms, and standards of behavior. Family, coming forward as a base institute of socialization, postulates the system of values of separately taken person and society as the whole. Valuable reference-points have considerable influence on making decision of personality in the sphere of family interactions that in modern family foremost are based on individual necessities and interests.

It is impossible to imagine our existence in harmonic development without the valuable reference points that take their beginning in ontology of individual and public life. Coming forward as maximum grounds of the system of adjusting and self-regulation of vital functions and behaviour of a man the valuable reference-points help to perfect the system of interpersonal relations in family. That's why, very important is an analysis of philosophical mechanisms of co-operation, an interplay of normative values of culture (family, social group, society) and individual values and valuable orientations that are created, assimilated and broadcasted into an activity of a person.

The system of values – it is one of major constituents of underlying structure of personality that gives an opportunity to the personality to define what is important and meaningful for her in family life. The motivation of her activity that is the conscious ground

of necessity of realization of those or other actions, flows out from the system of values of personality. For example, a decision about getting marriage or its stopping flows out the hierarchy of values that is based on system of socially meaningful necessities of the person. Together with that, for modern family tolerance appears as the initial valuable reference-point. Thus, the consequence of process of realization of values in family relations is a display of tolerant attitude toward family members in the concrete situations of existence of family, and also his comprehension in the context of correlation of own values with the principles and norms of organization of family generally accepted in a certain association.

Continuing the illustration of the role of tolerance principle in the vital functions of society on the whole, it is needed to point the opinion of modern researcher A. Bandruka who considers that tolerance in general is the «universal norm of relations in modern social space» [1, p. 150]. Even more, today tolerance has the reflection in the idea of justice and in principle freedom, freedom of choice, the respect to the other's outlook.

Taking into account the high level of development of society and civilization there is a question if is the industrialization related to tolerance? In fact such development of society violates the natural surrounding world, and also personal, public and political relations. In this case elimination of structures and forms of life is opposite because it is considered tolerance as condition of civilization. It is showed up where there is the varied filling of personal and social historical self-realization is realized as a task, and simultaneously as a chance of creative humanity and free confession [2, p. 28].

In our research we determine the basic valuable reference-points of modern Ukrainian family, that have found their fixing in such categories as tolerance, equality of rights and freedom of choice.

There are various approaches to the research of the phenomenon and concept of tolerance in modern scientific literature:

– the general philosophical aspects of methodology research of tolerance are reasonable in works of O. Banduras, Y. Bromley, I. Gasanova, M. Kapustina, M. Kostytskyi, V. Lektorskyi, M. Mchedlov, L. Skvortsov; the problems of tolerance forming in family are investigated by G. Olport, G. Klaud, A. Skok; the attention to the sociocultural and ethnic aspects of tolerance is paid in the publications of V. Shalin and others; tolerance understanding as tolerance to any differences such as ethnic, national, religious, racial

(A. Bandura, D. Brodskyy, A. Gerber, N. Moldengauer, V. Petrenko and others); tolerance understanding as firmness to the conflicts (A. Asmolov);

– psychological aspects of tolerance forming as a factor of unpropensity to external influences clarified (F. Gorbov, E. Milerian, V. Suvorova, A. Petrovskiy, and others); as firmness to manipulation and opposition to influence was studied (E. Sydorenko, A. Panasiuk, I. Sheburakov and others), psychological firmness in destructive situations (G. Platonov and others), psycho-pedagogical problems (K. Graumanova, D. Zinovyeva, P. Komogorova, K. Wayn);

– the theoretical and legal aspects of tolerance are determined in «Declaration of principles of tolerance (UNESCO, 1995)», where a term «tolerance» is interpreted as the valued and social norm of civil society that appears in a right to be another and provides stable harmony and structural co-operation among different social classes, respect to the variety of different world cultures, civilizations and people, readiness to understanding and skill of cross-cultural co-operation. So, the question is about perception and understanding of various cultures of our world, forms of self-expression and acceptance of human individuality, and it maybe on principles of development of knowledge, frankness, freedom of idea, conscience and persuasions, that allow to see not only differences in the pluralism of the world but also the unity in a variety [3, p. 22]. Tolerance is the sign of confidence of a person in reliability of the positions, the absence of fear in comparing and competition to other persuasions, fear to lose the own differences [4].

Having regard to the amount of scientific literature, we can establish diversity of research approaches of the role of tolerance in society and in socialization of personality that matters very much for the analysis of the valuable reference-points of modern Ukrainian family. Among them we can distinguish the following:

– in the philosophical understanding there is a term that marks benevolent or at least restrained attitude toward individual and group differences (religious, ethnic, cultural, civilization). World view basis of tolerance is the appreciation of the varieties – natural, individual, public, cultural. The limits of possible tolerance depend on social norms that operate in this society (and, thus, in the basis they have a cultural origin); however, within the limits of operating social norms there are more possible tolerant and less tolerant variants of the personal and group behavior. In particular, individuals or group of

people can come forward as initiators of revision of such customs and norms, that they estimate as cruel (untolerant) [5, p. 642];

– in the legal understanding, tolerance is an original form of individual or collective display that is formed on the basis of co-operation and mutual relations between different parts (by individuals, by social groups and others like that), and also is demonstrated by each of them, showing tolerance in relation to a difference in views, presentations, behavior, positions, actions and others like that in relation to an opposite side. Practical realization of tolerant attitude toward the participants of events, relations, conflicts and others like that takes place in declarative, relational and action forms. The declarative form of tolerance envisages demonstration of perception and patience by proclamation of statements, declarations, memorandums and others like that. Relational tolerance, in opposite, does not require an application of active actions or statements from participants. Action tolerance shows up exceptionally activation of any actions from the side of participants of process [6, p. 709–710];

– in the historical understanding it is a tolerance to the other's position, different from own one [7]. In the researches historians distinguish ethnic tolerance – (from lat. *tolerantis* – that, who stands tolerance) is absence of negative attitude toward other ethnic culture, presence of positive character of other ethno-culture at maintenance of positive perception of the own. It is absence or weakening of reacting on the difference of interactive ethnic cultures [8];

– in reference editions for sociology understanding tolerance is interpreted at the level of co-operation of equal social groups (international, interethnic, cross-cultural, between the ages, religious and others) and determines it as ability to accept the people of other behavior, beliefs and customs, feelings, ideas as equal in rights citizens. Conceptions of pluralism and social freedom are the keys for principle of tolerance in sociology, and a collaboration and partnership are the important terms of her realization. (S. Matskovskiy) – «in the psychological understanding tolerance is absence or weakening of reacting on some unfavorable factor in a result of declinence of sensitiveness to its' actions» [10, p. 70].

Tolerant behavior is possible as a result of actualization, first of all, such personality resource, as valued-semantic reference-points. One of topical practical questions that is related to the purposeful forming of tolerance in an interpersonality communication, is the

following: under what circumstances these values can be mastered, actualized, occupy the dominant position in the hierarchy of valuable reference-points to the orientation of the personality, to grow into the higher values of the person. Answering a question about the necessary terms of actualization and strengthening of tolerance in family relations, we go to the research of K. Rojers regarding to the differentiation of the valued structure and valued process [11]. The valued structure personifies generally accepted values. The valued process is the living, fluid, continuous becoming of values, their registration in bygone and realized vital experience. In this process personality preferentially behaves to the selection of values and elects those, that answer already existing for her psychological options, emotions in a greater degree, only, by sense and others like that.

Thus, the consequence of process of realization of values in family relations is a display of tolerant attitude toward family members in the concrete situations of family entity, and also its comprehension in the context of correlation of own values with the principles and norms of organization of family generally accepted in a certain association.

Determination of tolerance as the valued basis of family relations requires the confession of partner as free and equal in rights personality that has dignity and right to form personal persuasions, and lives in accordance to them. In relation to family interactions, tolerance must show up not only from the side of individual as the personal position but also as public and civil principle. These two forms must stipulate and complete each other. In order to guarantee tolerance as principle of compatible life and mutual respect, it is needed to admit it as a legal duty and as the personal necessity.

When we talk about spreading of unconventional marriages in Europe and even in Ukraine, then exactly tolerance must head the list among all other principles. The limit of tolerance can be a requirement not to allow the limitation of the freedom and dignity to anybody, if it does not limit freedom of others (a right on life, aspiration of development and freedom). When freedom and dignity of the person are violated, tolerance is ended, it's hard to imagine it only as means of decision of conflicts in family, general life, confession of equality of rights and mutual understanding. Using the ability to put itself at a place of the other person, to understand, to cognize, to change itself due to new situations and new knowledge,

to information. Valuable tolerance is based on readiness and ability to join the other's way of life, his outlook.

Tolerance carries in itself the charge of the civilized communication between people, due to it, general life in family, marriage, in society, in the state becomes possible and acceptable. More important form of tolerance – is free confession of the other, his individualities – has sense of dignity and freedom for every individual basis. Without mutual confession of personalities their harmonious general life is impossible [2, p. 22].

Confession of tolerance is not only the world setting but also a legal duty for what it is important an observance of legal order in the state. The institutional guaranteeing of tolerance as an inalienable right of man is a political task. Exactly in the criterion of freedom of equality, that is fixed in Declaration of human rights, there is the greatest principle of justice. In fact the measure of tolerance is put into freedom and justice and indissolubly related to the human rights. Tolerance as state principle is expressed in a free acceptance for itself of legal duty as moral virtue of citizen. The realization of tolerance principle in life of family is related to other valued options – equality of rights and freedom of choice.

Yes, the famous scientist J. Lокк considered that «natural freedom of a man is considered to be free of any higher power on earth and does not submit to a will or legislature of the other man, but follows natural laws only. A freedom of a man is considered not to submit to any other legislature body except that what is set by approbation in the state, and is not in the submission of somebody's will and unreserved not a single law, except those that will be set by a certain legislative body in accordance with the trust» [12, p. 135–405].

Freedom of a man in society comparatively with natural freedom appears limited to the law, set and confessed by the legislative body. Although, a law narrows freedom of a man in sort, substantial indemnification for it is a removal of threat of self-willed compulsion from the side of other people, guaranteeing equal rights, inclusive with a right on freedom to every adult member of society.

When we talk about freedom and equality in Ukrainian family, then it is envisaged in the 51 paragraph of the Constitution of Ukraine, that marriage is based on free consent of woman and man, so no a single compulsion can be applied in relation to getting marriage, it is also set in this paragraph that each of the married couples has equal rights and duties in marriage and family [13, p. 15–16]. In support, the

basic law of the country in the 7 paragraph, the 6 point of the Family Code of Ukraine it becomes firmly established also that a woman and man have equal right and duties in family relations, marriage and family [14, p. 6].

Can we talk about equality of rights in family in the real life? In opinion of J. Mill [15, p. 412], if marriage was an equal agreement in rights that it is not envisaged to the duty of obedience; if a marriage union left off to be a duty for those, for whom he became the real trouble, and a divorce would be possible for every woman that has a moral right on it; and if she could after that find deserving employment, the same accessible for her as well as for men, – then a woman in marriage shouldn't use the professional capabilities for her own defence.

When a woman takes marriage, then she can be identified with a man that elects a profession: she chooses a supervision upon children, family and housekeeping as a basic application of her efficacy; she lays on this work so many years of her life, how many may be needed for it completion; and renounces not all other aims and employments, but only those that conflict with the requirements of primary objective. According to such principle, for most women the possibility of any systematic activity is eliminated out of family, and any possibility valuably to work in a group and achieve certain career advancement. Certainly now we take into account 80 % of women, that get minimum or a bit higher minimum salary and profit of their family does not allow to use services of nurses, maids and private child's establishments. And however there must be the widest possibility of adaptation of general rules to the individual features. Nothing must interfere to develop the capabilities in any other field on natural calling, without regard to marriage duties; in case of possible failures it is necessary to envisage other sources of support of woman in her vital functions. Time both shows, these problems as were actual many years ago and are actual today.

Nobody will agree to partnership, if the condition of him or her will be complete subordination to the first person and right and duties of clerk or agent. If a law behaved to other contracts the same as it behaves to marriage, then would decree that one of the partners can be a general business owner so, as if it is his private enterprise, and to other partners power can be only delegated; and that one must be chosen as a legal advantage of general character – for example, to be senior on age. A law will never support such actions: there is no a

single necessity for existence of legal inequality in rights between partners; partnership needs no other terms, except those, that they are folded by partners as the contractual articles [15, p. 404].

A man and woman after a mutual consent have a right to conclude a marriage treaty (contract). A division of rights must naturally suit the division of duties and functions, and it is also done by approbation – in any event not through a law, but following general customs that can be changed by approbation and by the personal interest of parts. As J. Mill states, there are such men and women that are not arranged by equality in rights: they will not make it up for anything with that somebody's ideas or desires can be matched against theirs. Such people are the typical subjects of law on a divorce, they are capable only for lonely life, and nobody can be compelled to bind an own fate with them. But legal subordination of women predisposes them to develop such character in a greater degree, than men. Therefore for our society that incarnates in itself «totality of contradictions»: there is freedom-loving, rebellious, rectilinear, trustful, selfless, so, yet long time such type of agreement as marriage contract will not be actual. Not determining rights for a wife and in theory not giving her them quite, asserts actually, that she has the same rights that she is able to and will manage to get on.

The equality of the married couples before a law is not only this special type of relationships that allows to co-ordinate with the requirement of identical justice for both parts and not only assists their happiness; it only gives an opportunity to make everyday life of people like school of moral culture, in fact only school of the real moral feelings is an association of equal. Till this time a moral education of humanity goes mainly out of the law of force, that is why it relates to those relations that is generated by force almost exceptionally. In backward societies people practically do not acknowledge equal rights in relations.

We approach to such order of things, when a justice again acquires a primary value: as well as in the past, it is based on equality, but now it is based on irrational sense – sympathy between the members of society; not an instinct of self-defence of equal, but cultivated sympathy between them becomes its source already; and not a single human creature will be left out of association, but an identical measure will be used to all. The real virtue of society is ability to live together on equality, requiring nothing instead from each

other; examining any command as a fact of exceptional necessity and, at least, as the temporal phenomenon.

The calls of contemporaneity are turned to the attempt of analysis of the modern state of family politics in Ukraine, the inalienable necessity of time is fixing at legislative level of the new conceptions, based on common to all mankind values, gender equality, priorities of interests of child and his parents, defence of family, maternity, paternity and childhood. A public family policy comes forward as component of social politics of Ukraine and presents a complete integral system of tasks, principles and social measures that are sent to the improvement of terms and upgrading the life, including internalss of family life.

REFERENCES

1. Bandurka, A.S. (2013). *Strokata kovdra multykulturalizmu [Pied blanket of multiculturalism]*. O.V. Tshagla (Eds.). Kharkiv: Zolota myllia [in Ukrainian].
2. Heffe, O. (1991). Pluralizm i tolerantnost: k legitimizacii v sovremennom mire [Pluralism and Tolerance: Legitimation in the Modern World]. *Filosofskie nauki, Philosophical sciences*, 12, 16-28 [in Russian].
3. Deklaratsiia pryntsyviv tolerantnosti [Declaration of Principles of Tolerance]. (n.d.). zakon2.rada.gov.ua. Retrieved from http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_503 [in Ukrainian].
4. Mchedlova, M.P. (Ed.). (2004). *Tolerantnost [Tolerance]*. Moscow: Respublika. Retrieved from http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Sociolog/toler/index.php [in Russian].
5. Ōzadovka, L.V., Polishchuk, N.P., & Shynkaruk, V.I. (Ed.). (2002). *Filosofskiyi entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary]*. Kyiv: Abrys [in Ukrainian].
6. Surmin, Yu.P., Bakumenko, V.D., Myhnenko, A.M. (etal.). (2010). *Entsiklopedychyi slovnyk z derzhavnoho upravlinnia [Encyclopedic Dictionary of Public Administration]*. Yu.V. Kovbasiuk, V.P. Troshynskiy, Yu.P. Surmin (Ed.). Kyiv: NADU [in Ukrainian].
7. Yarmolenko, M.D. (Ed.). (2001). *Pedahohichnyi slovnyk [Pedagogical dictionary]*. Kyiv: Pedahohichna dumka [in Ukrainian].
8. Istoriiia Ukrain [History of Ukraine]. (n.d.). history.vn.ua. Retrieved from <http://history.vn.ua/book/dictionary/149.html> [in Ukrainian].

9. Mackovskii, M.S. Tolerantnost kak obekt sociologicheskogo issledovaniia [Tolerance as an Object of Sociological Research]. *Vek tolerantnosti, The Age of Tolerance, 3-4*. Retrieved from <http://www/tolerance.ru/p-mag-last.shtml> [in Russian].

10. Holovin, S.Yu. (2001). *Slovar prakticheskogo psihologa [Dictionary of practical psychologist]*. Minsk [in Russian].

11. Rodjers, K. (2002). *Psihologiiia suprujeskih otnoshenii. Vozmojnye alternativy [Psychology of marital relations. Possible alternatives]*. (V. Havrylova, Trans.). Moscow: Eksmo [in Russian].

12. Lokk, Dj. (1988). *Dva traktata o pravlenii [Two treatises on the board]*. (Vol. 3). Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].

13. *Konstytutsiia Ukrainy: vid 28 cherv. 1996 r. [Constitution of Ukraine from June 28, 1996]*. Kyiv: Yurinkom [in Ukrainian].

14. *Simeinyi kodeks Ukrainy [Family Code of Ukraine]*. Kyiv: Palyoda A.V. [in Ukrainian].

15. Mil, J.S. (2001). *Pro svobodu: Esse [About freedom: esse]*. (S. Pavlychko, Trans.). Kyiv: Osnovy [in Ukrainian].

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 18.10.2017

Шумейко О. В. – аспірант кафедри філософії права та юридичної логіки Національної академії внутрішніх справ, м. Київ

Толерантність як ціннісний орієнтир для сучасної сім'ї

Досліджено підходи до розуміння толерантності в сімейних взаєминах. Визначено, що сім'я є базовим інститутом соціалізації, який постулює систему цінностей кожної окремо взятої людини та суспільства загалом.

Ключові слова: сім'я, толерантність, ціннісні орієнтири, рівність, свобода.