

THE CONCEPT OF TOLERANCE AND TRUTH EVALUATION

A.Simonyan

д.ф.н., профессор, заведующая кафедрой теории языка и межкультурной коммуникации Российско-Армянского университета, тел. 374-91-43-20-08, e-mail sim-var@hotmail.com

Annotation. Tolerance in political discourse is viewed as a result of inner negotiation or compromise, it is a moral value derived from the interaction of different aspects of truth. To achieve this goal, the concept of tolerance is analyzed at the lexical, syntactic and communicative-pragmatic levels. Tolerance in politics could be viewed as an iceberg, the visible part of which remains neutral, while the unseen is formed by manipulation between objective, subjective and social aspects of truth evaluation.

Key words: tolerance, political discourse, cultural tolerance, linguistic tolerance, concept, value, truth.

Аннотация. Концепт *толерантность* в политическом дискурсе рассматривается как некий внутренний компромисс, как моральная ценность, полученная в результате взаимодействия истины и правды. Для реализации данной цели толерантность анализируется на лексико-семантическом, синтаксическом и коммуникативно-прагматическом уровнях. Толерантный дискурс - это своеобразный айсберг информации, вершина которого остается нейтральной, в то время как остальная часть формируется путем манипуляции между объективной, субъективной и социальной правдой.

Ключевые слова: толерантность, политический дискурс, культурная толерантность, лингвистическая толерантность, концепт, ценность, истина, правда.

Tolerance - is a complex and multi-faceted term used in various branches of human sciences. The primary meaning of tolerance comes from Latin word *tolerantia*, which means patience (Sykes, 1126). Tolerance is defined as forbearance in judging opinions, customs, or acts of others; freedom from bigotry or from racial or religious prejudice; the act of enduring, or the capacity for endurance (The New International Webster's Comprehensive Dictionary, 1320). The phenomenon of tolerance is widely analyzed in the field of ethics, psychology, sociology, politics, education etc. Tolerance is regarded as a complicated phenomenon with controversial value. From one point of view, it is something negative, closely related to discomfort and disagreement. It causes conflict in one's mind, hidden resentment which is sometimes even difficult to conceal. From the other point of view, it has positive evaluation and shows constructive approach to somebody or something

Tolerance should be developed as a value, it should be implemented in any society as a moral and psychological readiness for the sake of mutual understanding between ethnic and social

groups, in the name of positive interaction with people of different cultural, religious, or social environment (Вахрушев, 57).

Nowadays it is essential to talk not only about tolerance in its broad sense but about some of its forms. In this respect from the aspect of value-loading, the most acknowledged ones are defined as cultural and linguistic tolerance. Cultural tolerance could be viewed as the demonstration of a good attitude or approach towards other cultures and members of different social groups. It mainly concerns countries with a multicultural society.

Linguistic or language tolerance is the realization of this phenomenon in languages, in this respect tolerance is viewed from the angle of a diversity of its linguistic manifestations. At the same time, we have to admit that the language of tolerance doesn't cover human communication on the whole.

The language of tolerance or tolerance is broadly classified according to biological and sociopsychological factors. Linguistic tolerance is not much a way of removing the communication conflicts, it is not a set of simple rules that every speaker should follow in his speech, but it is a kind of human activity that involves dialogues with interlocutors based on language knowledge, moral position, cultural, ideological beliefs and rules of communication. Of course, it would be beneficial in its global sense to elaborate norms of communication of linguistic tolerance in accordance with the positive and creative social interaction. We can definitely assume that the language of tolerance should avoid manifestation of hate speech, the negative intention should be diminished at least to neutral, and implied negative intention should never be verbalized. In addition to a verbal manifestation of tolerance, non-verbal means of communication should be regarded as valid as well. Non-verbal level of linguistic tolerance should avoid certain cases gestures, actions that can be treated as offensive. For example, in special rituals of greetings underestimation of inherent cultural peculiarities might have insulting meaning for the addressee.

Linguistic analysis of tolerance focuses on two aspects of investigation: cognitive and communicative. Cognitive approach reveals universal and ethno-cultural values that determine a person's identity and his relationship with others. The conceptual framework of tolerance implies a large number of semantic representations. Located in the center of a semantic diagram the lexical unit "tolerance" acts as the source for other lexical units. Semantic units that are associated with the meaning of the concept help to build the cognitive map, which represents people's attitudes to this particular phenomenon and express the level of their social and spiritual growth. The analysis allows building cognitive maps based on semantic representations of the conceptual framework of "tolerance" scheme of lexical-semantic fields studied the concept in compared languages.

Demand for tolerance in political communication arises when two sides have conflicting views of what is wrong or right. Tolerant position results in avoidance of conflict. The politician accepts the right of other political system to live their own life by their own value system. The

liberal approach is a way of dealing with the coexistence of conflicting views. Tolerance is a necessary constituent in contemporary political communication. Tolerance as a value belongs to universal value system but as a political value, it is mostly related to Western political culture. Tolerance breeds the idea of sharing global discourse.

Let's see how the concept of tolerance is represented in the interview with Margaret Thatcher. We have tried to analyze the concept of tolerance based on the frames of objective, subjective and social truth.

The world of objective truth corresponds or equals the same factual knowledge which exists or is widely accepted in the field of politics. While expressing the objective truth, a politician in most cases lacks personal evaluation and thus she might demonstrate a wide range of tolerance starting from the absolute lack of tolerance up to expressively tolerant approach.

The social truth is designated for framing people's political ideas and concepts. Social truth from the point of view of tolerance is very important, as it is to be appropriate, relevant and should reflect the main political trend of the country. A politician has to make explicit effort to behave and sound tolerant.

The world of subjective truth is not so much cherished by any politician. This is the hidden world which is to be kept aside, in most cases, the subjective truth goes against the ideas supported by the majority. So it is of great importance to show tolerant and understanding behavior to the opposite point of view.

A political interview, as an entity of objective, subjective and social truths, is the result of several interactions. There is an interaction between the journalist and the politician, interaction between journalist and the audience and the interaction between the politician and the audience.

On Sunday, June 29, 1992 CNN reporter Bernard Shaw addressed Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. The interview was structured by a question and answer format. It started like this.

Shaw: Lady Thatcher, from America to India to Jamaica, points in between and, now, Hong Kong. Your thoughts on losing another British colony?

At the beginning of the interview the interviewer uses some introductory parts which involve ideas which are sure to be known for the audience. After the introduction come the first question, an explicit interrogative part (Your thoughts on losing another British colony?) which demanded a straightforward reply from Margaret Thatcher.

Her answer follows:

Thatcher: Particularly sad, the circumstances are unique, all the other things that you mentioned ... we did rule over for a time and brought each to independence, because we were able to do that.

The word-combination *particularly sad*, linguistically expressed by the combination of the intensifier and the adjective, reveals her personal evaluation of the problem. But this estimation belongs not only to the subjective perception of Margaret Thatcher but it also reflects the feelings of the whole nation. The collapse of the British Empire was and has been a serious blow for Britain's continued economic domination in the world. From the point of view of democratic values, imperial policy is not appreciated, at the same time this was the glorious part of the history of Great Britain. So the experienced politician has to demonstrate a tolerant approach to the imperial policy of Great Britain diminishing its negative sides.

Here we witness an open and explicit link between subjective and objective fields of truth evaluation.

In the next sentence Margaret Thatcher uses emphatic construction *we did rule* followed by the word of apparent positive evaluation *independence*, and afterwards, comes modal expression *we were able to do that*. Here the author addressing the audience re-establishes the values which should be known and appreciated by the nation. This is the sphere of the social truth. According to Margaret Thatcher, the prominent politician, British people must focus their attention mainly on the fact that Great Britain brought these nations to independence implementing democracy and parliamentary system. This was the answer to the first part of the question where she managed to combine different aspects of the concept of *truth*. Meanwhile, she demonstrated the ability to preserve tolerance and neutrality in her answers.

The second part of the answer starts with a question addressed to the interviewer and the audience. *What's different, you'll say with Hong Kong?* Margaret Thatcher uses the strategy of reformulation. She speaks about Hong Kong as the subject of three agreements made many years ago. According to the last one, Britain had to return to China Hong Kong on the 30th of June 1997. She summarizes the passage with these words *"Only, it's not barren land. It is a prosperous, thriving community; it is Chinese talent, British administration, liberty, justice and rising democracy – has been wonderful for Chinese people"*.

Margaret Thatcher managed to demonstrate tolerance and neutrality in her answer. At first she was emotional but afterwards, she was able to calm herself down and preserve neutrality acting in an unemotional and more argumentative manner. The use of different tenses ranging from the Past Indefinite up to the Present Indefinite and the Present Perfect puts stress or emphasis on the length of the relations. In the final sentence, Margaret Thatcher comments on the current situation in Hong Kong using the words of obvious positive evaluation such as *liberty, justice, and democracy*.

The political interview becomes interesting for the audience if there is much explicitness. Meanwhile, the politician's goal is to sound tolerant and neutral. Neutrality leads to the sphere of social

truth. This is the truth that is needed for the society. By the way, we have to differentiate between politicians of ruling party and the opposition, as the members of the opposition use other strategies in their speech.

To make the interview sharper and more emotional the interviewer challenges Margaret Thatcher.

Shaw: *Lady Thatcher, in the scenario you just painted, you make it sound as if all of this was with China's consent. The fact of the matter is you fought two wars, you came in and you took Hong Kong.*

To achieve his goal, the journalist uses several strategies. In formulating the question, he addresses the Prime Minister directly by her surname (*Lady Thatcher*), then he expressed his disagreement saying (*in the scenario you just painted, you make it sound as if all of this was with China's consent*) and the final part manifests a kind of attack on her (*the matter is you fought two wars, you came in and you took Hong Kong*).

The parallel repetition of the pronoun *you*, intensifies the idea and strengthens its impact on the listener.

Her answer is: *We did indeed take two wars, yes. We were, in fact, trading. There was, I'm afraid, some trade in drugs. None of us would defend that now. We have learnt a great deal in the 100–150 years and I can only wish that Mainland China had so much. If so we would never have had Tiananmen Square. We would never have had a cultural revolution.*

Margaret Thatcher using personal pronoun *we* and emphatic construction *did take* expresses political unity with the history of Britain. The pronoun *we* in this context is historically expanded, generalized. The truth expressed in this sentence is objective and Margaret Thatcher doesn't want to deviate, she uses emphatic verbal construction and concludes the sentence with the word *yes*. But immediately in the following sentence she tries to evade, changing the direction of the communication.

We were, in fact, trading. There was, I'm afraid, some trade in drugs.

The Prime Minister doesn't want to focus the attention of the audience on some details from the history of the British Empire. By changing the modality of her talk she puts the stress on lexical units that stand for the subjective evaluation of events. The phrase *I'm afraid* expresses uncertainty. As we know, in linguistics modals of a broader category are called hedges. Hedges do not just single out the level of uncertainty. They can also be used to show a polite unwillingness to criticize others. In this way, Margaret Thatcher passes from the objective reality to the field of subjective evaluation. But as an experienced politician, she has to refer to the sphere of social truth preserving tolerance and neutrality of her speech. In order to keep alert the attention of the audience, she changed the grammatical mood of the passage.

The sentence *I wish that Mainland China had so much* shows that the action expressed by the verb is presented as something imaginary or desired. She didn't say anything about the economic situation in China. But changing the mood she easily creates the image of a country far from being desirable. The effect is strengthened in the sentences with unreal condition referring to the past (*If so we would never have had Tiananmen Square. We would never have had a cultural revolution*).

Margaret Thatcher in her answer proves that language behavior should be of social relevance. Revealing the derogatory sides of China and hiding the imperial essence of the British Empire she demonstrates the benefits of their policy.

During the whole interview, Margaret Thatcher avoids expressing her own opinion about the leader of China.

And when the interviewer asked his question in a very direct way which runs.

Shaw: *You don't trust him, do you?*

Margaret Thatcher answers: *I don't trust a communist, do you?*

To preserve tolerance Margaret Thatcher uses a rhetorical question, which by its intonation contour and the tag implies or presupposes the answer *no*. There is an indirect conceptualization and a kind of warning in her reformulated question. The focus shifts from Deng Xiaoping to the concept of communism. Even in this case Margaret Thatcher without expressing her own opinion about him wants to preserve tolerance and neutrality which is a kind of manifestation of respect and politeness.

To show firm tolerance she turns to objective reality and quotes well-known values. For example, when the interviewer asks:

Shaw: *In your judgment, why does China have such paroxysms over the concept of human rights?*

Thatcher: *...Human rights really come from the biblical view. In the Old Testament, the 10 Commandments are addressed to each person.... We have the biblical view of the Old Testament that each person matters and the biblical view of the New Testament of mercy and redemption.*

In the next part to prove her idea Margaret Thatcher brings an example from chemistry.

The IR's question is. Shaw: *Is it conceivable the Hong Kong fever will spread across China's triggering social reform regardless of whether the Chinese leadership wanted them.*

Margaret Thatcher answers: *Yes. That is the hope. It is just like putting one little crystal in a big solution. You know all of the rest of the solution – in chemistry – crystallizes onto the one crystal. So ... if you transfer that to China, the kind of administration, the kind of rule of law, the kind of respect for the individual, they too could be a massive Hong Kong.*

Afterwards, to sound objective she refers to history.

The IR asks. Shaw: *What is the difference between negotiations, say, with the Russians and*

the Chinese?

Margaret Thatcher answers: *...Russia proved what we always said would happen, although it came quicker than we thought. Mr. Gorbachev ... realized the communist system wasn't working economically...It doesn't produce prosperity because it offers no stimulus or incentive to people to build up their own prosperity. China has no history of liberty at all. She has always been under tyranny.*

As an experienced politician Margaret Thatcher has to preserve tolerance and neutrality of her speech and interrupting the journalist's question she says:

Communism will eventually collapse. ...They are born traders the Chinese. Beijing is so different from what it was in 1977. ...Law is coming to China, initiative is coming to China, enterprise is coming to China. It won't stop.

Margaret Thatcher referring in this interview to history, science and the Bible tries to direct her own thoughts to the spheres of objective, even universal truth.

Margaret Thatcher managed to forecast and predict the economic boom of China long ago. In her interview, she tried to be neutral and tolerant manipulating between the objective, subjective and the social fields of truth evaluation.

The relationship between the political concept of tolerance and tolerance as a moral value is of great importance. The attractive goal to share the same global discourse for the sake of mutual understanding and cooperation could be achieved if tolerance is implemented in any society.

References

1. Вахрушев А. А. Вербальная агрессия и языковая толерантность в межкультурном деловом общении [Текст] / А. А. Вахрушев // Вестн. Челяб. гос. ун-та. - 2010. - № 4. - С. 53 - 58.
2. The new international Webster's comprehensive dictionary of the English language: Deluxe encyclopaedic edition. Naples: Trident Press International, 1999.
3. Sykes, J., B. (Ed.). The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. London: Guild Publishing, 1987.