

gumanitarnye znaniya, Social and humanitarian knowledge, 2: 80-100.

21. Weizsäcker, E. U., Wijkman, A. 2018. Come on! Capitalism, Short-termism, Population and Destruction of the Planet. A Report to the Club of Rome. Springer Science+Business Media LLC. DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-7419-1

22. Ясцепс, К. 1991. *Smycl i naznachenie icypii* [The Origin and Goal of History]. M.: Politizdat.

23. Yanickij, O. N. 1994. "Industrializm i invajronmentalizm: Rossiya na rubezhe kultur" [Industrialism and Environmentalism: Russia at the Frontier of Cultures]. *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya, Sociological Studies*, 3: 3-14.

А. М. Клешня

КОЭВОЛЮЦИЯ СИСТЕМЫ «ЧЕЛОВЕК – ОБЩЕСТВО – ПРИРОДА»

Аннотация. Статья посвящена осмыслению места человека в системе «человек – общество – природа» в аксиологическом пространстве постсовременности, обремененном экономическими, социальными и политическими кризисами глобализированного мира, которые продуцируют разнообразные экологические угрозы. Обосновывается тезис, что противоречия внутри исследуемой системы обусловлены ошибочной ценностной ориентацией современного человека на удовлетворение собственных потребностей за счет чрезмерной эксплуатации природы. Осуществлена попытка переосмысления биологической роли человечества как части природы и обновления на этих принципах мировоззренчески-аксиологических установок в соответствии с вызовами современности.

Ключевые слова: аксиология, инвайронментализм, экология, консьюмеризм, культура, человек, общество, система «человек – общество – природа», философия.

H. Kleshnia

CO-EVOLUTION OF THE "MAN – SOCIETY – NATURE" SYSTEM

Introduction. In his effort to subjugate nature, man violates the existing natural balance. As a result, ecosystems which are necessary to maintain the vital activity of the biocenosis, are under irreversible changes. **The aim** of the study is to comprehend the place of man in the classic triangle "man – society – nature" in the context of the anthropological and ecological crisis of the globalized world. **The task** is to substantiate the expediency of replacing the anthropocentric concept with the concept of social ecology (environmentalism). Research methods are a set of philosophical and general scientific approaches and methods of consistency, objectivity, convergence from the abstract to the concrete. The study uses an interdisciplinary synergistic methodology to understand the dynamics of self-organization in the "man – society – nature" system. **Research results.** The dialectical contradiction of development is in the fact that, striving for the highest possible satisfaction of needs, man creates obstacles to achieve a strategically defined goal or even threatens to his very existence. The overcoming of the revealed contradictions is associated with the rejection of man's consumer attitude to nature, the formation of the strategy of the "man – society – nature" relations, and the limit of economic (industrial) growth. In such conditions, a timely choice how to meet the needs of nature and society is a solution to the ecological crisis. **Discussion.** Th. Malthus pointed to the emergence of epidemics that affect the regulation of the population. The logic of the development of world civilization led to the formation of the "paradigm of human exclusivity" (O. Yanitsky). Data of the growing of a number of people and decreasing the species of animals and plants have caused a number of theories describing the origin of numerous risks (U. Beck, H. Arendt, Ch.P. Snow, and others). The alternatives to the endless consumerism having restored harmonious relations with nature, society, and oneself, were proposed by J. Baudrillard, D. Vannes, T. Naylor, J. Heath, E. Potter, and others. Under such conditions, it seems logical to change the dominant worldview anthropocentric concept. **Conclusion.** The modern anthropocentric ecological situation is caused by the long-term domination of the technocratic system of values. However, technocracy as a worldview and cultural paradigm has shown its inconsistency. Recognition of nature as the core of axiological space is a step caused by the realized need to preserve the human habitat in the form of a biological species. In the current situation, politics is considered to be the main tool for greening social consciousness and introducing environmentalism as the basic ideological value of a globalized society.

Keywords: axiology, environmentalism, ecology, consumerism, culture, man, society, the system "man – society – nature", philosophy.

UDC 141.319.8:316.647.5:001.3

R. I. Kuzmenko

TOLERANCE IN THE REALM OF SCIENCE

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: raisa.kuzmenko.kiev@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4881-1879

The article examines the features of the phenomenon of tolerance in the scientific field, its essential characteristics, and the main features of its philosophical interpretations. The actualization of the study of the problem of identifying tolerance in the field of scientific activity is caused by the rapid transformation processes at both the global and national levels associated with the transition of developed countries to the technologies of the fourth industrial revolution. It is substantiated that tolerance is one of the key principles of effective development of scientific sphere, and the creative activity of a particular subject of scientific activities. Progress in various fields of education and science, and the development of democratic relations in society depend on the manifestations of tolerance or intolerance to the opinion of the Other. Tolerant attitude to the Other contributes to the achievement of positive results in joint activities, encourages the discovery of new forms of communication, expanding contacts in the field science between scientists in the world and establishing partnerships.

Keywords: tolerance, intolerance, science, scientific paradigm, interpretation, understanding, cooperation, objective knowledge.

Introduction.

Science in modern society plays an important role in all sectors and spheres of human life. Consequently, the level of its development is the main indicator of both the development of society and the development of the state. All the achievements that man has today are due to the

achievements of science, technical progress, and the further development of society depends on it closely. On the one hand, the development of science is the most important factor in the renewal of all spheres of human life. On the other hand, science is one of the most important forms of the culture of society. Modern science

forms the worldview of a person, to solve all the problems facing humanity.

The aim of this article is to the analysis the phenomenon of tolerance in scientific sphere. To achieve the goal and solve the tasks in the paper hermeneutic and comparative approaches were used. These methods made it possible to carry out the tasks: to analyze the concepts of the phenomenon of tolerance, tendencies of its comprehension and interpretation, and see the role that it plays in the sphere of science.

Research methods

In the modern scientific paradigm, tolerance is considered through the prism of the works of G. Marcuse, M. Walzer, M. Heidegger, J. Habermas, and others. Among domestic researchers, the specifics of manifestations of tolerance in various spheres of human existence were studied by V. Kremen, M. Kozlovets, S. Krylova, V. Oliynyk, P. Saukh, T. Stefanenko, N. Khamitov, and others. Although the essential manifestations of tolerance and intolerance in the scientific sphere are reflected in the works of the founders of modern philosophy of science (K. Popper, T. Kuhn, P. Feyerabend), in the Ukrainian scientific paradigm there are still no attempts to systematically analyze the specifics of tolerance in science. In the paper an effort to describe the role of tolerance in science using such methods as hermeneutic and comparative was made. They gave us opportunity to understand the concepts of the phenomenon of tolerance, trends in its understanding and interpretation. The dialectical method, which is especially relevant in times of transformation in a globalized world, has contributed to the understanding of the active nature of tolerance in the context of understanding the Other, dialogue, cooperation, co-creation in education and science.

Research results

The update of research on the problem of tolerance in science is caused by rapid transformation processes at both the global and national levels, associated with the transition of developed countries since 2011, to the technologies of the fourth industrial revolution. Attributive features of this stage of the technological revolution are total robotization, internetization and digitalization of production and services. Along with the natural improvement of the quality of life in the developed countries of the world Industry 4.0. poses a number of social challenges to their governments, the main one being the steady rise in unemployment in both the domestic labor market and the global labor force. These processes once again actualize the study of the problem of responsibility of scientists for the results of their scientific activities and for the survival of human civilization as a whole. Massive growth of unemployment, intensification of spontaneous migration processes, struggle for natural resources will in the long run lead to reduced controllability of even stable social systems and natural aggravation of social antagonisms in the spheres of economic, political, legal, religious existence of man. Mankind needs to develop not only the latest strategy of tolerant interaction between representatives of different social groups and strata, different ethnic groups and nations, representatives of different religions and denominations in a situation of growing competition for jobs, but also to develop a strategy

of tolerating modern man due to the development of artificial intelligence.

Science is considered to be a highly specialized activity for the production of objective knowledge about the world, including the person himself. But is it ethical to conduct scientific research, even extremely interesting, the fruits of which could be dangerous to humans? But is science always safe for humanity? Based on this, should we always be tolerant in any scientific discoveries?

Identifying the specifics of tolerance in the creative activity of scientists requires reference to the structure of this phenomenon. As already mentioned, tolerance in the social life of man is manifested in two main planes - at the individual and social levels. Public tolerance, depending on the forms of social expression, can be moral, religious, scientific, legal, political, economic in nature. In the field of introduction and observance of the legislation which guarantees equality of the rights and freedoms of citizens in various spheres of social existence, the subject of introduction of tolerance is the state.

We should note that it is science as an important area of sociality largely determines the quality of life of modern man. At the level of public consciousness, it is scientists who must stand for the protection of objectivity and truth in assessing the social significance not only of the latest technologies and devices, but also of the potential threat of destructive worldviews. Appropriate in this context, the opinion of scientist P. Tishchenko: "A scientist who plugs a "hole" in theory with reference to divine providence is a briber, as is a theologian who uses scientific arguments to pillar and affirm the truth: they act irresponsibly, without worrying about their own beliefs or beliefs of Another" (Tishchenko, 2007: 43). In some cases, excessive tolerance, especially of scientists and intellectuals in general, becomes a threat to society as a whole. Thus, in the world of consumerism, as H. Marcuse aptly puts it, tolerance of radical evil is presented as a good that seems to serve the movement from prosperity to even greater prosperity. This tolerance is manifested in the systematic fooling of both children and adults through advertising or other forms of commercial fraud (Marcuse, 2011: 101). In the modern information space, these trends are embodied in the promotion through the media, especially the Internet media, pseudo-effective diets, dietary supplements, the promotion of pseudo-diseases with their subsequent "miraculous" treatment, and others. Unfortunately, guided by selfish motives, some scientists not only promote pseudo-diets and pseudo-drugs, but also cooperate with pharmacological companies and beauty salons that provide fictitious, unsubstantiated services.

Declaration in item 3.4 of Art. 3 states "the need for appropriate research and networking to coordinate the activities of the international community, including analysis in the context of the social sciences of the root causes of this phenomenon, effective countermeasures, as well as research and monitoring" (Declaration, 1996). In the future, these studies should contribute to the development of policy practices in the field of dissemination of the principles of tolerance as fundamental to the sustainable development of democracies.

Openness to discussion in the scientific sphere, respect for the opinion of the Other is defined in the declaration and the fact that everyone is "free to adhere to their beliefs and

recognize the same right for others”, while “the views of one person can not be imposed on others” (Declaration, 1995).

Thus, the discussion in the scientific sphere should take place on the basis of taking into account the principles of pluralism and democracy, which began to take shape as criteria for scientific activity in antiquity. At the same time, a fruitful discussion of the scientific problem is impossible without overcoming the dogmatization of knowledge and attempts to impose absolute truth. The perception or denial of another's specific idea, concept, theory should be based on logical arguments and beliefs, not coercion or imposition.

In this regard, it seems reasonable to conclude that only in a really democratic society, where there is tolerance to the opinion of the Other, it is possible to form a community of professional colleagues-scientists who are able to independently regulate relations in their environment. It is only in this environment since ancient times in the scientific field began to establish one of the unwritten, according to T. Kuhn, the rules of coexistence of scientific society - the ban “on appeals to heads of a state or the masses about the question of science” (Kuhn, 2001: 181). This position gave members of the scientific community the status of a single competence group capable of solving problems in a particular field of knowledge.

Scientists in the process of developing “normal” science are to some extent forced to show a high level of tolerance for scientific anomalies, reconciling established theories and real facts. However, not all contradictions in theory can be considered anomalies that can cause a crisis of the paradigm.

The scientist, according to T. Kuhn, “must show a certain degree of tolerance for contradictions, because there are always some difficulties in establishing the correspondence of the paradigm with nature. Most of them are eliminated sooner or later. A scientist who interrupts his work to analyze every observed anomaly, rarely achieves significant success” (Kuhn, 2001: 97). Thus, the period of development of “normal” science is marked by a fairly high level of tolerance of the dominant theory and researchers who adhere to it.

Discussion

The scientific community has a significant degree of tolerance and mutual understanding during the period of domination of the scientific paradigm, because a scientist at this time “works only for an audience of colleagues who share his/her own assessments and beliefs. The scientist can accept a single system of standards without proof. And he may not care what some other groups of scientists or schools will think” (Kuhn, 2001: 177). This increases the efficiency of a scientist's work, because he/ she can solve scientific problems faster than those who work with an audience that still needs to be convinced of the prospects of the latest scientific research. Tolerance for the uncertainty of the future can be manifested in the scientific sphere in another plane. In addition, tolerance for uncertainty, according to a researcher O. Zotova, can save the researcher from stopping at a single version of the study (Zotova, 2005: 149). However, the scientist might spray his/her attention on a significant number of research options, spending much more time on it.

In the field of science, dogmatism and traditionalism must be inferior to pluralism and democracy. This is due to

the fact that the institutionalization of scientific research, according to J. Habermas, helps to weaken the link between competing theories and practical interests. The scientist states that “in any case, even in relation to competing approaches that claim to be true, participants in scientific discussions should defend their position as hypothetical” (Habermas, 2006: 49). At the same time, researchers can refrain from the practice of combining their scientific conclusions with those ideas that lie outside the scope of their scientific activity. Given the theoretical nature of the discussions, the functional specification of scientific work creates, according to J. Habermas, the prerequisites for the neutralization of conflicts related to the worlds of life. Instead, in the field of interreligious discussions, such neutralization is destroyed due to the direct relevance of the truths of the faith (Habermas, 2006: 49). In the scientific field, the level of tolerance becomes much lower only when research activities (such as in the case of stem cell research, embryo research) touch on the field of religious and moral principles.

In a broad sense, tolerance can only emerge when the position of the Other, which also claims to be true, can be justified. The paradox of tolerance is that “in any of its acts must be introduced characteristics that must be accepted and tolerated, and thus tolerance must have its limitations. There is no involvement without exception” (Habermas, 2006: 46). If the demarcation is carried out at the level of authoritarianism, it has clear signs of arbitrariness. Instead, in democratic societies, these criteria for the introduction of tolerance are usually developed gradually, taking into account the interests of the Other. However, it should be born in mind that in the process of leveling the conflict situation of tolerance involves not so much a change of beliefs, especially scientific, as abstinence from radical statements and actions to maintain calm at the level of social interaction.

Scientist H. Marcuse connects the very existence of tolerance with the existence of objective truth. This type of truth exists, and it can be achieved only through knowledge, the study of what is and what can be done to improve lives of most people. “The goal of tolerance is the truth” (Marcuse, 2011: 107). In this regard, J. Mill's position that both the achievement of truth and freedom of thought in scientific discussion are possible only if its irrational component is rejected seems appropriate. According to the thinker, free discussion can take place only if it is rational, that is, if it is the embodiment of independent thought, free from indoctrination, manipulation, external authorities. “Our mind,” continues the English philosopher, “corrects errors” through discussion and experience. One experience is not enough. Discussions are needed to show how to interpret the experience. False ideas and practices are gradually giving way to facts and evidence, but these facts and evidence should be provided first” (Marcuse, 2011: 14). In other words, freedom of discussion can help reveal the truth only if it is independent and there is no threat of manipulation. It should also be borne in mind that the discussion of even misconceptions is productive, because even a misconception can contain part of the truth.

Conclusion

Tolerance is one of the key principles of effective development scientific sphere in general, and the creative initiative of a particular subject of scientific activity.

Progress in various fields of science, and the development of democratic relations in society depend on the manifestations of tolerance, or intolerance to the opinion of the Other. A tolerant attitude to the Other contributes to the achievement of positive results in joint activities, brings success, encourages finding new forms of communication, expanding contacts in the field of education, and science between scientists in the world and establishing partnerships. Thus, effective discussion of scientific problems is impossible without overcoming dogmatization of knowledge, and attempts of planting of the absolute truth. In turn, the perception or denial of a particular idea, concept, theory should be based on logical arguments and beliefs, not coercion or imposition. At the same time, the ability to pluralism and overcoming dogmatism in thinking became the basis for securing for scientists the status of a single competence group capable of solving problems in a particular field of scientific knowledge.

Literature

1. Декларация принципов терпимости. Утверждена резолюцией 5.61 Генеральной конференции Юнеско от 16 ноября 1995 [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_503
2. Зотова Е. Ю. Современные исследования толерантности к неопределенности в зарубежной психологии / Е. Ю. Зотова // Вестник НГУ. Серия Психология. – 2009. –Т. 3. Выпуск 1. – С. 147-155.
3. Кун Т. Структура научных революций / Т. Кун. – Port-Royal, 2001. – 228 с.
4. Маркузе Г. Репрессивная толерантность. Критическая теория общества / Г. Маркузе // Избранные работы по философии и социальной критике; пер.с англ. А. А. Юдина. – М. : АСТ, Астрель, 2011. – С. 97-136.
5. Милль Дж. О свободе; пер. с англ. А. Фридман / Дж. Милль // Наука и жизнь. 1993. – № 11. – С. 10-15.
6. Тищенко Ю. А. Генезис феномену толерантности: від філософської категорії до політичного чинника у сфері міжетнічних відносин / Тищенко Ю. А. // Стратегічні пріоритети: науково-аналітичний щоквартальний збірник. Нац. ін-т стратег. досліджень. – К.: НІСД, 2007. – № 4 (5) . – С. 62-68.
7. Хабермас Ю. Когда мы должны быть толерантными? О конкуренции видений мира, ценностей и теорий / Ю. Хабермас // Социологические исследования. – 2006. – №1. – С. 45-53.

References

1. General Conference of UNESCO. 1995. Deklaratsiia printsipov terpmosti [Declaration of Principles on Tolerance]. 5.61, November 16. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_503Deklarasci
2. Zotova, E. Yu. 2009. "Sovremennyye issledovaniia tolerantnosti k neopredelionnosti v zarubezhnoi psikhologii" [Modern research into uncertainty tolerance in foreign psychology]. *Vestnik NGU. Seriya Psikhologiya, Vestnik NSU. Series: Pshychology*, 1(3): 147-155.
3. Kun, T. 2001. *Struktura naukovuh revoluscii* [The structure of scientific revolutions]. Kiev: Port-Royal.
4. Marcuze, H. 2011. *Repressivnaya tolerantnost. Kriticheskaya teoriya obshchestva* [Repressive tolerance. Critical theory of society]. In *Izbrannyye raboty po filosofii i sotsialnoy kritike, Selected Works on Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 97-136. Moscow: AST, Astrel.
5. Mill, D. 1993. *O svobode* [On Liberty]. *Nauka i zhizn, Science and Life*, 11: 10-15.
6. Tishchenko, Yu. A. 2007. "Henezys fenomeny tolerantnosti: vid filosofskoi katehorii do politychnoho chynnyka u sferi mizhetnichnykh vidnosyn" [The genesis of the phenomenon of tolerance: from the philosophical category to the political factor in the field of interethnic relations]. *Stratehichni prioriteti, Strategic priorities*, 4 (5): 62-68.
7. Habermas, Yu. 2006. "Kogda my dolzhny byt tolerantnymi? O konkurentsii videniy mira. tsennostey i teorii" [When should we be tolerant? About the competition of visions of the world. values and theories]. *Sosiolohicheskie issledovaniia, Sociological Studies*1: 45-53.

Р. И. Кузьменко

ТОЛЕРАНТНОСТЬ В СФЕРЕ НАУКИ.

Аннотация. В статье исследуются особенности феномена толерантности в научной сфере, его сущностные характеристики и основные черты философских интерпретаций. Актуализация исследования проблемы выявления толерантности в сфере научной деятельности обусловлена стремительными трансформационными процессами, как на глобальном, так и на национальном уровнях, связанными с переходом развитых стран к технологиям четвертой индустриальной революции. Обосновано, что толерантность является одним из ключевых принципов эффективного развития научной сферы, творческой активности того или иного субъекта научной деятельности. Прогресс в различных областях науки, а также развитие демократических отношений в обществе зависят от проявлений толерантности или нетолерантности к мнению Другого. Толерантное отношение к Другому способствует достижению положительных результатов в совместной деятельности, установлению новых форм общения, расширению контактов в области науки между учеными мира и установлению партнерских отношений.

Ключевые слова: толерантность, нетолерантность, наука, научная парадигма, интерпретация, понимание, сотрудничество, объективное знание.

Р. І. Кузьменко

ТОЛЕРАНТНІСТЬ У СФЕРІ НАУКИ

Вступ. У статті досліджуються особливості феномену толерантності в науковій сфері, його сутнісні характеристики і основні риси філософських інтерпретацій. **Мета і завдання.** Метою цієї статті є аналіз феномену толерантності у науковій сфері. **Методологія дослідження.** Для досягнення мети та вирішення поставлених у роботі завдань були використані герменевтичний та порівняльний підходи. Вони дозволили проаналізувати феномен толерантності, тенденції його осмислення та тлумачення, а також побачити роль, яку він відіграє у науковій сфері. **Результати дослідження.** Актуалізація дослідження проблеми виявлення толерантності у сфері наукової діяльності обумовлена стрімкими трансформаційними процесами як на глобальному, так і на національному рівнях. Толерантність у стосунках між ученими є необхідною умовою успішної наукової співпраці. Обґрунтовано, що толерантність є одним із ключових принципів ефективного розвитку наукової сфери, творчої активності того чи іншого суб'єкта наукової діяльності. **Обговорення.** Прогрес у різних галузях науки, а також розвиток демократичних відносин у суспільстві залежать від проявів толерантності або нетолерантності до думки Іншого. **Висновки.** Толерантне ставлення до Іншого сприяє досягненню позитивних результатів у спільній діяльності, установленню нових форм спілкування, розширенню контактів у сфері науки між ученими світу і встановленню партнерських відносин.

Ключові слова: толерантність, нетолерантність, наука, наукова парадигма, інтерпретація, розуміння, співробітництво, об'єктивне знання.