

Proactive tolerance as a way to peace

A Christian Social Ethical Definition of Tolerance as a conceptual basis for the project "Tolerance at the Borders of Europe - the Ukrainian Dimension"

Draft from 18.03.2019

Markus Vogt, Rolf Husmann,

with contributions by Michael Fetko and Felix Geyer, Ivo Frankenreiter, Ihor Vegesh, Marianna Kolodiy and Alexander Bokotai

A. Aim of the text

This text was developed during a project conducted at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, Germany (LMU) and the National University of Uzhorod in Transcarpathia, Ukraine (UzhNU). This project is sponsored by the German Ministry of Foreign Affairs and part of a long term academic cooperation. The text is meant to be a systematic development of a concept of tolerance that can be applied practically in education and civil projects in Ukraine, especially in Transcarpathia in order to promote tolerance in a time of growing fear, discrimination and aggression. Therefore it wants to elaborate, what tolerance can mean and how it could be communicated being challenged by the concrete situation in Ukraine and growing doubts in society.

Although tolerance is seen as a key value in the Western hemisphere, many doubts arise, sometimes fueled by propaganda, whether tolerance would rather be a merely Western idea that enforces Western imperialism. On the other hand a lot of criticism may occur on a religious field as tolerance could easily be misunderstood as indifference or relativism. Thirdly, people might wonder if a religious approach is suitable when developing a universal tolerance model. Our aim is to show that those arguments cannot convince.

1. There are many different reasons that make tolerance a universal and indispensable concept: political-pragmatic reasons (securing peace), epistemological reasons (there is no last intersubjective knowledge of the truth) or ethical reasons (protection of freedom and human rights). Having said that tolerance is necessary in a democratic state: As democracy gets its dynamic from the controversy of opinions, dissenting opinions neither can be excluded without examination nor can be accepted without expressing dissent. In so far both sides of tolerance (passive in the sense of non-exclusion, (pro-)active in the sense of dealing with different opinions) are a condition of democratic behavior. Democracy needs a culture of dialogue that prevents violent conflicts (not conflicts at all) and tensions from evolving hostility but that allows to transform these into understanding, cooperation and development. Tolerance can be a framework of this transformation and the virtue of democracy.

- 37 2. Concerning the fear of relativism one can state that the concept of tolerance should
38 not be confused with a lack of interest or with indifference, since the agents of
39 tolerance (except for the state) are not required to give up their personal point of view
40 and the truth claims linked to their personal stance. Especially in the view of religious
41 people one has to highlight that tolerance does not mean to give up religious truth
42 claims. On the contrary: One can continuously see his or her religious world view as
43 the truth and consider other opinions as false, but tolerance allows a religious person
44 to find arguments that make dissenting opinions appear tenable despite of the
45 personal convictions. For example: Although a person does not believe in God, I as a
46 theist can accept his/her humanism as I see the good effects of it.
- 47 3. Our intention is that this text can be accepted universally by all people despite their
48 religious or philosophical stance. Nevertheless we consider a Christian approach as an
49 essential contribution to a concept of tolerance. The Christian approach to an
50 understanding and a practice of tolerance is fundamental especially because it can turn
51 out to be problematic as history has already shown. The Christian approach has been
52 full of tensions and shows a late learning-process. The question of tolerance has often
53 escalated in the context of religion. A theory of tolerance without any theologically
54 grounded relation to religious truth claims and its problematic side would overlook a
55 real history of conflict and would therefore be ethically unsatisfying and incomplete.
56 Nevertheless, the ambiguous history of Christianity, a history of both tolerance and
57 intolerance, leads us to the logical core of a tolerance-concept: One should not play
58 off strong convictions that are often linked to a religion against the willingness to deal
59 with dissenting opinions, convictions and practice. Strong convictions are an
60 indispensable part of societies that will not go extinct. Instead, tolerance is a way of
61 peaceful coexistence of dissenting strong convictions that is demanding every agent in
62 society (also the churches) to contribute to. Finally, Christian narratives and principles
63 can promote tolerance as well as secular and humanistic perspectives. The aim is to
64 arrive at a “humanism of the other human being” (Levinas). This is at the heart of the
65 biblical faith and goes even beyond tolerance in so far as it aims at radical openness to
66 other human beings: especially foreigners, those of a different belief and those who
67 suffer. This could be a common ideal for both Christians and humanists.

68 Having clarified the necessity of a concept of tolerance, we want to describe a model of
69 tolerance that we consider appropriate for the situation in Ukraine.

70

71

72

73

74 **B. Systematic Development of the term**

75 ***B.1 Differentiations concerning the term “tolerance”***

76 From the original understanding of the term, ‘tolerance’ had a narrow scope and meant to
77 endure a physical or moral harm. It merely related to the discrepancy from target values. Due
78 to some experience of religious intolerance the term tolerance became one of the crucial
79 political concepts in the Age of Enlightenment. Today the meaning of the concept has
80 broadened: It now refers to respectful acceptance of diversity of individuals, groups and
81 organizations in a community that may arise from different religious attitudes, worldviews,
82 ethnicities, languages, sexual orientation, opinions, behavior and values.

83 We consider tolerance to be an attitude and behavior that a subject conducts in the view of
84 different objects of tolerance. As we have already seen, the objects of tolerance can range
85 from characteristics and opinions to behavior of another person or group of people. This
86 extensive meaning is highlighted in The UNESCO Declaration of Principles of Tolerance (1995)
87 as follows: “Tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our
88 world's cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human” (Art. 1 I). Only those
89 characteristics can serve as objects of tolerance that make a difference between the tolerated
90 individual and the tolerating subject.

91 Tolerance as attitude and behavior is a complex phenomenon as it contains two contrasting
92 components. There is of course a denial component in the sense that one does not agree with
93 the opinion or behavior of someone else and considers it to be false. On the other hand this
94 denial does not go so far that there is no place for acceptance. One can still find arguments
95 (that might not count as much as those against the dissenting stance) for the dissenting
96 opinion or the different behavior so that one can accept other positions as tenable despite
97 disagreeing with them (acceptance component). This might seem paradoxical at first sight but
98 the reasons for accepting or denying lie on different levels: As the reasons for denying are part
99 of an individual and particular ethos, the reasons for accepting an opinion belong to a
100 universal moral that is based on the idea of mutuality and reciprocity. The particular ethos
101 relies on cultural aspects and individual values, on that not everyone is agreeing, whereas
102 moral depends on a universal view and therefore is based on a formal moral that everyone
103 can logically comprehend. Moral arguments will and should not reverse the individual
104 disagreement but allow everyone to accept a plurality of behavior and opinions.

105 The tolerant attitude and behavior are also complex as they can be differentiated by the
106 motivations the subject of tolerance shows when acting tolerant. Those motivations can be
107 systematized in a three stage model as the following chart points out:

108

109

1. passive tolerance	mere toleration
2. active tolerance	respect
4. proactive tolerance	appreciation

110

111 It begins with a first passive stage, which is about merely tolerating behavior, opinions,
112 attitudes, etc. of other human beings and about foregoing violence. It is not about finding
113 positive aspects in dissenting opinions or different behaviors. A merely tolerating subject only
114 intends to swallow down aggression. This is basically tolerant behavior because of pragmatic
115 reasons, such as the necessity to live together in a community or the aim of a peaceful
116 coexistence of different groups in a society. It is considered to be a passive tolerance because
117 it is not focused on getting engaged with people but rather to coexist with them peacefully.

118 In addition there is a second level of tolerance that is based on respect for individuals: Respect
119 for each personality forces everyone to give reciprocal and universal reasons for everyone's
120 duties. As I realize that every human being has equal rights, it becomes obvious that every
121 duty that I want others to comply with forces me to comply with them, too. Moreover, respect
122 includes that the truth claim of the individual ethos is not exclusive but open so that in the
123 eyes of the individual human being dissenting opinions appear tenable. Tolerance lives up to
124 the capacity and willingness to take the stance of another person and to respect different
125 experience and the independent individuality of every person. This stage can be defined as
126 active as it demands a communication between the different groups and individuals in society.
127 In this sense the UNESCO understands tolerance as "active attitude" (Art. 1, II).

128 Finally, there is a third concept of tolerance that characterizes tolerance as appreciation. This
129 means to recognize different opinions as expression of a pluralistic society and as riches to a
130 community. This stage goes beyond the respect concept as it does not only recognize the
131 dignity of the person but also recognizes the worth of the different opinions and actions. This
132 stage can be characterized as proactive because it prevents the growth and escalation of
133 conflicts by building up trust between different groups through communication. Proactively
134 tolerant people seek communication because of a free, self-determined decision and because
135 they have a positive interest in other human beings.

136 Those two concepts of respect and appreciation require an openness to have the own pictures
137 and convictions changed. This is intrinsically linked on the one hand to the insight that one
138 sometimes may misjudge and on the other hand to the readiness to learn continuously. The
139 active and proactive tolerance can be characterized as openness to dialogue. Respect can be
140 seen as openness to the necessary social dialogue that manages the way different people can
141 get along with each other securing individual freedom, equal rights and respect. Appreciation
142 instead goes even beyond because dialogue is highly esteemed by the people as a form of
143 individual enrichment. Although both types of tolerance aim at dialogue, they are neither

144 aiming at giving up one's own point of view nor at equalizing one's opinion with another. On
145 the contrary (pro)active tolerance demands a settled identity that cannot be shaken by a
146 dissenting opinion or different behavior in order to enable them to take part in a dialogue that
147 allows a change of perspective and a learning process. Moreover, (pro-)active tolerance allows
148 taking an individual stance and deciding for an individual practice more consciously. Active
149 and proactive tolerance mean to defend tolerance by advocating the protection of freedom
150 rights. Only because of the (pro-)active component tolerance can be distinguished from mere
151 indifference, lack of principles or the non-committal avoiding of decisions and demarcations.

152

153 ***B.2 Ethical assumptions and rules of the concept of tolerance***

154 After we have defined tolerance as a broad concept that refers to nearly every kind of
155 difference between two individuals and described the components and the different stages of
156 tolerant behavior, we would like to highlight those theoretical assumptions and principles that
157 underlie our concept.

158 Our concept of tolerance is based on three ethical assumptions:

- 159 1. Tolerance is a "**conflict-term**" (Rainer Forst) because it is only relevant in situations of
160 dispute between different convictions, interests and practices. Tolerance does not
161 dissolve those conflicts but limits the destructivity of the dispute or – in the best case –
162 brings about a positive dynamic. (Therefore we spoke about tolerance as a means to
163 prevent violent conflicts.) Tolerance as a conflict-term means that tolerant behavior can
164 only be analyzed in contrast to intolerance. Therefore it is important to examine all
165 parameters that determine intolerant attitudes of one social group towards another. This
166 allows us to propose new methods and ways of implementation in societies of all different
167 kinds.
- 168 2. The concrete shape of tolerance has to be adapted to a specific **situation** since it is a
169 practical demand of conflict parties. Therefore a concept of toleration has to formulate
170 concrete recommendations and imperatives (contextuality and concretion). It is most
171 likely that there is a variety of possibilities how to implement an adequate concept of
172 tolerance in a distinct society. Although a concrete concept may differ from the others
173 there is a core of the concept that cannot be given up.
- 174 3. From an epistemic point of view the term 'tolerance' alludes to a **tolerance of ambiguity**
175 in the view of the meaningfully plural reality (Thomas Bauer). Therefore there is a certain
176 acceptance of the ambiguous in order to cope with reality. Christian tolerance opposes a
177 naive and fundamentalist thinking reducing the complexity of the world to clearness. This
178 way of thinking is currently exercised by the identitarian movement and threatens the
179 social coherence. Tolerance is required in order to see the plurality of cultures, worldviews
180 and conceptions of man in a society not as a threat but as riches. It can be stated that
181 identities in themselves show tensions and are complex and dynamic so that they often

182 cannot be put in an antagonistic contrast to other identities. Fights between social groups
183 become severe when the definition of an identity becomes hermetically secluded.

184

185 The concept of tolerance as it is presented in this text contains some normative rules:

186 1. Tolerance is based on the principle of **reciprocity**: I must concede those rights that I demand
187 for myself also to others. This corresponds with the Golden Rule that can be found in most of
188 the cultures and religious communities (e.g. in the Bible: Matthew 7:12 and Luke 6:31). The
189 decisive means to promote tolerance is open and sincere dialogue. This includes the right to
190 a personal opinion that is not waived when one is mistaken. Without such a right (with
191 limitations) a pluralistic society cannot develop. Reciprocity means that every person has the
192 same rights and therefore every action or decision that might limit the freedom of another
193 person has to be justified either by the state or an individual person that is imposing a limit to
194 this very freedom. On the other side every person whose freedom has been limited has a right
195 to ask for a justification. This justification can only be given by universal moral arguments that
196 reflect the equality of human beings. Such a justification cannot be founded on particular
197 ethical values and therefore only formal moral arguments on the basis of the idea of equality
198 can convince. If someone is denying the “right to justification” (Rainer Forst) and therefore
199 the relevance of moral reasoning, his understanding of tolerance remains void and injustice is
200 an imminent danger.

201 2. Tolerance as a communicative phenomenon can be described as a mutual process.
202 Mutuality demands to indicate that all communication participants are equally important for
203 establishing tolerance. Therefore tolerance is based on the idea of parity that can be
204 promoted through a process in which all communication partners make use of the opportunity
205 to take part in this process. Securing and using the opportunities of active participation is
206 necessary in order to balance the communication process. Tolerance can never be one-sided
207 and has to be mutual.

208 3. Tolerance does **not mean acceptance without limits**: Social injustice does not fall within
209 the scope of tolerance. The UNESCO sees the violation of human rights as boundaries of
210 tolerance: “Consistent with respect for human rights, the practice of tolerance does not mean
211 toleration of social injustice or the abandonment or weakening of one’s convictions.” (Art. 1
212 IV).

213 4. Tolerance must be understood as a “**fundamental demand for justice**” (Rainer Forst). It
214 helps to operationalize the often undefined use of the term “justice” by focusing on a criticism
215 of injustices that deprive people from their rights to freedom and participation. Tolerance
216 gains social effects when it prevails in the fight against social injustices with adequate means
217 and does not lead to indifference in the view of injustice. Moreover, the protection of
218 minorities belongs to the primary principles of justice according to this concept of tolerance.
219 This idea will be explained more detailed in a following passage.

220 The concept of this text is put into a Christian perspective of fulfillment and progression that
221 goes even beyond tolerance and connects the concept intrinsically with the aim of peace. This
222 implies some key points:

223 1. From a Christian perspective tolerance is to be put into an **eschatological horizon**: Till the
224 fulfillment of the world there will be differences in opinion: Therefore until then everyone is
225 urged to exercise tolerance. As long as the kingdom of God has not come to its fulfillment and
226 is only secretly present, tolerance is seen as a crucial Christian virtue. The Christian reasons
227 for tolerance are not based on an epistemological skepticism or a particularistic relativism, but
228 on the acceptance that intersubjective reason is limited in ethical questions of truth, so that a
229 space for reasonable differences is gained (**pluralism**). Tolerance as virtue requires the
230 capacity to take distance from one's own point of view and to recognize the limits of one's
231 judgment.

232 2. Tolerance includes a non-secluded dynamic of an **intensifying process** of tolerance. With
233 this in mind tolerance can be seen as a pragmatic reasonable rule or behavior on a first step.
234 On a second step it can be characterized as a moral duty in the language of fundamental-
235 ethical discourse.

236 3. From a Christian point of view the **biblical peace ethics** can provide a chance to develop the
237 understanding of tolerance with success. Peace ethics understood as the method of "love of
238 de-enemification" (Lapide) expresses a practical and deep meaning of tolerance. This ethics
239 aims at overcoming hostility by not getting involved into the propagation of violence and
240 disregard. Gandhi is a formidable example. By acting peacefully he showed the world and his
241 oppressors that their behavior is unjust and victimizes him. By that he made injustice as such
242 visible and allowed his oppressors to find a way out of the friend-enemy-thinking pattern.

243 4. Especially in the context of a so-called *clash of civilizations scenario* the here presented
244 understanding of tolerance can show its **importance on the field of peace politics** as it helps
245 to reveal and overcome problematic thinking patterns (e.g. friend - enemy). By deconstructing
246 thinking patterns (as e.g. a conception of an enemy) tolerance supports an appreciation of
247 plurality and aims at a constructive dealing with differences. The outcome is peace within a
248 community as well as outside.

249

250 **C. Practical Reasoning**

251 The discourse cannot stop with a theoretical reflection on tolerance but has to put the
252 question of application. The essential question of the application-discourse is that of the
253 context of a specific conception of tolerance. For different networks and kinds of human
254 relationships, for different societies, situations and ages the adequate concept of tolerance
255 looks different.

256 In order to adapt the abstract concept to the concrete requirements of a certain society a
257 practical conception of tolerance has to cope with four challenges:

- 258 1. It has to specify the framework that is needed in a society so that tolerant behavior
259 can evolve. This is mainly a question of discourse-conditions. It should be guaranteed
260 in a society that there is freedom of speech, effective protection of personal rights.
261 Tolerance is intrinsically connected also with some core values, such as domestic
262 security, justice, peace as well as inclusion, integration and social cohesion in a
263 polyethnic, multi-religious and multicultural modern society.
 - 264 2. A practical concept of tolerance has to specify the basis model: Therefore one has to
265 ask for concrete reasons that can be given in a society in order to promote the
266 necessary component of acceptance: Why should someone tolerate a dissenting
267 stance? It should analyze the reasons of denial and differentiate between acceptable
268 and immoral reasons (e.g. racism, because it neglects the dignity of every human
269 being). Also it should formulate specific demarcations of tolerance: What kind of
270 opinion or behavior cannot be tolerated because it is social injustice?
 - 271 3. A concept needs to consider the relevant agents in a society that can contribute to the
272 development of tolerance. Therefore it is important to formulate concrete duties and
273 tasks.
 - 274 4. A concept of tolerance can only be implemented if tolerant behavior is motivated
275 strongly. Therefore the concept has to deal with the question how it is possible to
276 motivate tolerant behavior and which means can be successful in a specific society to
277 motivate individuals.
- 278 The last two aspects of a practical conception of tolerance need further explanation that shall
279 follow in the following chapter.

280

281 ***C.1 Analysis of agents***

282 The application discourse about tolerance remains shapeless if the principles of responsibility-
283 ethics are not considered and the question of subjects and objects of tolerance is not
284 addressed. Subjects of tolerance are persons as natural conviction-holders, associations of
285 people, societies and states. Objects of tolerance are opinions, actions, aims and convictions.
286 Only by addressing the subjects and objects of tolerance the term 'tolerance' can be given a
287 concrete and committal status in society.

288 In the following the text focuses on different agents in society and their contributions, duties
289 and rights in the context of tolerance.

290

291 **C.1.1 Agent state**

292 An important agent is the state as it can guarantee the framework of tolerance but has to act
293 very prudently in order to save the free and democratic society:

- 294 1. The state should be neutral in the view of religion and worldviews. Only a neutral state
295 saves the right to a religious and cultural self-determination of the people. It makes a
296 peaceful coexistence within a pluralistic society possible as the power of the state
297 cannot be misused to discriminate against a specific minority. In this context only those
298 rules should be made law by the State that are based on reciprocal, universal reasons
299 that principally everyone can. This safeguards the state's neutrality.
- 300 2. There is only tolerance in a world of conflicts and powers. Therefore tolerance bears
301 also a component of power. As the state is a major bearer of power it should make
302 only prudent use of it. Legislation and restrictions should be minimized to those areas
303 where it is necessary for the common good and for the protection of the rights of
304 individuals. Only if the state keeps a liberal and free regime tolerance can flourish.
- 305 3. The boundaries of tolerance are the boundaries of justice. Therefore the state should
306 comply with the idea of equal treatment. Applying the principle of differentiated equal
307 treatment, it becomes clear that equal things have to be treated equally and
308 objectively unequal things unequally so that tolerable opinions and behaviors are to
309 be tolerated whereas intolerable things cannot be tolerated (Rainer Forst). Having this
310 in mind the state must forbid discrimination and protect minorities, especially in the
311 view of political rights, and concede to them a certain degree of autonomy in a
312 (federal) society, a right to political representation and a certain basic support that
313 might be necessary to persist in a different majority-society.
- 314 4. A major task of the state is to establish the framework that is needed for a liberal and
315 plural society. Basically this means at least to create opportunities that allow
316 communication between different groups in a society. Tolerance can only be achieved
317 if a peaceful coexistence can be secured for different social groups and if a dialogue
318 between those groups can be made possible. Moreover, it is essential to form a
319 cooperation based on the mutual values among all social subjects irrespective of their
320 distinguishing features and positions in society. Furthermore, the state should watch
321 over the political process that the interests of minorities are treated respectfully.
- 322 5. Those abstract duties of the state mean for the concrete process of legislation:
323 Tolerance cannot be made a detailed legal duty by state law so that the individual
324 freedom extinguishes. Only severe violations against rights of others can be sanctioned
325 by state. Moreover, as tolerance is a key aim for a peaceful pluralistic society, the state
326 is urged to promote social commitment for tolerance by creating a framework that
327 allows learning and practicing tolerance. This includes government funding for projects
328 that are promoting tolerance.
- 329 6. Tolerance is not everything. Tolerance can secure a peaceful coexistence of several
330 different groups in a society. But it cannot achieve political, social and cultural
331 integration. For this a basic consensus on justice is needed in society as well as a culture
332 of communication about the different ideas of a good and meaningful life. Therefore

333 the capacities of the state are limited, too. The state needs civil commitment and social
334 agents like churches that bring about change in a society. In this sense the former
335 German Constitutional Justice *Böckenförde* is right that the state lives from conditions
336 that it cannot guarantee by its own legal means.
337

338 C.1.2 Agent citizens

339 In our concept of tolerance a major role is attributed to the citizens as the state cannot
340 guarantee tolerance in the end. There are four main tasks that citizens can fulfill:

- 341 1. Citizens should commit themselves to the cause of tolerance, especially if tolerance
342 and liberal democracy are threatened. Therefore tolerance can be seen as a civic virtue
343 because it demands the citizens to fight courageously against violations of tolerance
344 and to take responsibility for each other. A liberal democracy has to be defended when
345 the foundations of tolerance are questioned and intolerant and illegal behavior is
346 spreading in the shadow of tolerance.
- 347 2. Citizens should be open to dialogue. As we have already pointed out, tolerance can
348 only evolve in a society if there is a sincere and respectful dialogue between the
349 different individuals and social groups.
- 350 3. Citizens should reflect critically on their behavior and ask themselves if their
351 expectations for legislation respect the principle of reciprocity. They should wonder if
352 restrictions that might be imposed on the liberties of individuals can be justified by
353 reciprocal und universal arguments.
- 354 4. Pluralism in a society will never be without frictions. Therefore a society does not only
355 need respectful behavior but also some wiggle room for every individual. Citizens
356 should pay attention to the insight that every individual needs a certain degree of
357 distance (especially in the urban context) so that different lifestyles can coexist in
358 everyday life (Uwe Wenzel).
359

360 C.1.3 Agent science

361 For the application of a tolerance concept in a society the interdisciplinary dialogue especially
362 with political science, sociology, social psychology and history is needed. Leading questions
363 and priorities for a scientific dialogue about tolerance are:

- 364 1. It is necessary to analyze how societies deal with ethnical, linguistic and sexual
365 pluralism, how the relation between the majority and minorities in a society develops
366 and which historical events and narratives influence tolerance or intolerance in a
367 society.
- 368 2. Scientists should consider the deep structure of intolerance. Especially discrimination
369 in everyday life is a hidden source of intolerance that has to be unveiled. All social-
370 psychological deep phenomena have to be taken into consideration in order to

371 understand why human beings tend to make someone a scapegoat or develop a
372 concept of an enemy.

373 3. The most important roots of intolerance are fear and unsettled identities. In the
374 context of general social modernization of humanity, societies all over the world
375 struggle with various types of xenophobia. In the view of building identities and
376 personal behavior within a society insecurity and lack of orientation contribute to
377 unsettled identities and finally to a growing intolerance towards alien convictions and
378 behaviors. A practically orientated model of tolerance has to cope with these
379 challenges in order to promote tolerance effectively in society.

380 4. Researchers should focus on limits and boundaries of tolerance which are determined
381 by the system of values and norms of a particular society. Due to the contextuality of
382 tolerance it is necessary to specify not only particular conditions and rules but also
383 definite factors, states and properties of societies which either support the
384 development of tolerance or impede it. In a second step one should add practical
385 measures that can be taken in a particular society in order to promote tolerance.

386 5. For the purpose of an adequate concept it is very important that scientists cooperate
387 with local professionals because they provide special knowledge of regional conditions
388 of tolerance formation.

389

390 **C.1.4 Agent churches, religious communities and theology**

391 As cultural identity is often linked to religious content, there are major tasks that have to be
392 undertaken by churches, religious communities and theology.

393 1. Religious leaders should clarify that tolerance should not be misunderstood as
394 indifference or relativism. The prejudice that tolerance is nothing but the loss of truth
395 is an obstacle to tolerance in a pluralistic society.

396 2. Tolerant behavior can be trained by dialogue. Therefore religious groups should install
397 dialogue panels on all levels from the leaders to the members of a parish so that
398 prejudices between different religious groups can diminish.

399 3. Religion can contribute by motivating tolerant behavior. Why motivation is needed
400 and how it promotes tolerant behavior is explained in the following chapter.

401

402 **C.2 Resources and motivation for a tolerant behavior**

403 It belongs to the practical dimension of a tolerance concept that it has to fit in the concrete
404 situation of an ethical pluralistic society. A formal concept that essentially is based on the
405 principles of reciprocity and universality in the view of legislation tends to run dry in a
406 pluralistic society as the formal principles are not supported by the ethical convictions of
407 different social groups. Therefore pedagogical, religious and civil motivation of tolerant
408 behavior plays a major role.

409 As a consequence the moral and formal concept of tolerance needs to be completed by a
410 narrative ethics that provides resources and motivation. It is required to develop individual
411 ethical points of views so that all individuals can appreciate the formal process of organizing
412 a fair life in society and the formal rules of a tolerant cooperation. A narrative ethics can fulfill
413 four functions: It can give reasons for an ethical behavior, it can train the moral perception of
414 reality, it can give orientation in life and serve as the symbolic horizon of meaning for a human
415 existence (Johannes Fischer). The narrative ethics can contribute an affective and motivational
416 component (personal meaning, personal orientation in life, values) in order to make people
417 approve the formal moral concept of tolerance. Educational programs, religious practice and
418 civil commitment can support the necessary learning process of passive, active and proactive
419 tolerance.

420

421 **D. The tolerance-concept and the situation in Ukraine**

422 The cultural diversity in the multi-ethnic border area Ukraine belongs to its strengths. For
423 centuries different ethnical and religious groups have lived peacefully together. Especially
424 Transcarpathia has become a laboratory of interconfessional, interreligious and intercultural
425 communication because of its history. A current source for motivation for tolerant behavior
426 can be seen in the experience that tolerance worked out and peace in society prevailed.

427 Therefore one can state with good reasons that multiculturalism has the potential to build up
428 a tolerant society. This idea can serve as the basis for solutions of many Ukrainian problems.
429 The pluralism of political, confessional, ethnical identities is a mere reality in Ukraine. The
430 coherence and peace in society need an effective concept of tolerance.

431 Social ethics has developed a three steps model to deal with practical challenges: See,
432 evaluate, act.

433

434 ***D.1 See & evaluate***

435 It is necessary to see and to understand the specific problems and challenges in order to
436 recognize the hidden potentials that enable us to find a solution. These solutions can only be
437 find by a in depth analysis. After having analyzed the situation one has to evaluate the findings
438 on the basis of the ethical groundings we presented above. In the view of the situation of
439 Transcarpathia and Ukraine we would like to highlight the following aspects of tolerance as a
440 way to peace:

441 1. The society needs and has the right to oppose the hybrid warfare, which manipulates
442 opinions and stimulates separatism and internal tensions, as well as the military
443 aggression and the disregard of the territorial integrity of the country. One has to take
444 into consideration that a war cannot be won only by military means. The internal

445 feeling of uncertainty has to be fought against. In the end the question is about the
446 identity of Ukraine in between Europe and Russia. As Ukraine is marked by Eastern and
447 Western characteristics due to its history, the unity can only prevail under the
448 condition of tolerance of ambiguity and hybrid identities.

449 2. Describing the theme of tolerance in Ukraine *in the light of the armed conflict between*
450 *Russia and Ukraine* demands to emphasize both the hybrid nature of Ukraine and the
451 process of forming a negative image of Ukraine and Ukrainians in the eyes of Russians
452 and vice versa. The practical study of tolerance will facilitate resistance to negative
453 imagery on which Russian propaganda is based.

454 3. Corruption and opaque networks of power and dependency, the lack of stable
455 structures in the state and in the civil society of Ukraine as well as the fast economic,
456 social and ecological transformation-process leave many people unsettled. Tolerance
457 needs foremost civil courage in connection with the rule of law and freedom as well as
458 a modernized administration that allows on top of that the establishment of dialogue-
459 processes between state and citizens. Tolerance should not be confused with
460 indifference but show an active commitment in favor of human rights as the value
461 basis of a tolerant society.

462 4. There is an imminent danger that the suggestion of reconciliation between Russia and
463 Ukraine turns out to play down the committed injustice and could discourage
464 Ukrainians that suffer from the unlawful actions undertaken by Russia. In this sense a
465 concept of tolerance for Ukraine has to highlight the boundaries of tolerance: Right
466 does not have to give way to injustice. Hostile aggression that threatens the territorial
467 and political integrity of a state is not tolerable and has to be named injustice and to
468 be condemned as such. At the same time everyone has to hold out his hand to the
469 people in Ukraine that sympathize culturally with Russia. Protection of minorities is an
470 indispensable component! Refusing intolerable behavior does not mean that one loses
471 respect for the legitimate wishes of other people in a society. This is a complicated
472 mission!

473 5. The analysis should focus on the significance of *ethnic stereotypes and prejudice for a*
474 *growing intolerance in Ukraine*. Moreover an interethnic relations study on various
475 levels at the same time in polyethnic and multi-religious Transcarpathia can bring
476 about new insights as well as a comparison between the situation in Ukraine (which is
477 divided today by people's attitude to "the Russian world") and modern Europe, where
478 definite difficulties occurred in the process of supranational community creation.
479 Russia is not only manipulating Ukrainian society but also other European societies.
480 The Russian Federation supports the right-wing parties in Europe. The Russian state
481 aims at splitting the European community and *deepening the interior conflicts by*
482 *fueling xenophobia*. Those means belong to the arsenal of hybrid warfare that is
483 impeding tolerance significantly.

484 6. As part of the civil society churches can assume an important role as they could
485 highlight the importance of tolerance. In order to fulfill this task the churches should

486 overcome the interior conflicts first. Moreover, new divisions should be avoided and
487 tolerance in face of conflicts (e.g. of interests and identities among the people) should
488 be trained. As churches enjoy high esteem and trust they can easily become places
489 where tolerance can be trained: e.g. in sermons, educational work for tolerance in
490 schools and in the media, training of mediators and establishment of effective
491 communication platforms.

492

493 ***D.2 Act: Perspectives for implementation of tolerance***

494 After analyzing and evaluating, concrete measures should be proposed in order to implement
495 a model of tolerance. We would like to propose an educational model that could be one
496 conclusion to the analysis of the situation in Ukraine. Ukraine needs a broad educational and
497 pedagogical program in order to promote tolerance. This project should focus on four tasks:

498 1. Rules for social interaction should be defined. As we have pointed out before,
499 tolerance needs a respectful dialogue that is based on rules. These rules have to be
500 reciprocal and universal. The need for universally acceptable rules should be explained
501 in this context.

502 2. The participants in this program should learn about the historical, social, psychological and
503 political backgrounds of intolerance. It should take into consideration *the problems of particular*
504 *ethnic minorities of Transcarpathia*. This can make them more resistant to intolerance.

505 3. The participants should build up their own identity and learn about different
506 identities. This allows them to formulate reasonable arguments why they disagree with
507 dissenting opinions (denial-component of tolerance). On the other hand this allows
508 them to formulate arguments why they think the dissenting opinion is tenable and
509 acceptable (acceptance-component of tolerance). In this context it could play an
510 important role to deal with building up a nation's identity that can contribute to a
511 positive personal formation as long as the nation's identity is not discriminative. 4. The
512 project should offer different arguments and narratives that can motivate tolerant behavior so
513 that the participants are not only informed but also encouraged to behave tolerantly.

514 The educational project should be developed as a *practical and theoretical program for*
515 *Ukrainian higher education institutions* as well as a program for *families, territorial*
516 *communities and organizations* that focuses on the specific requirements of these institutions.

517 The proposed education program is one measure that should be applied in order to promote
518 tolerance in a society under pressure. It is obvious that it is only a contribution to a complex
519 and long process but we strongly believe that it is a necessary step to take in order to secure
520 peace.