
© OLGA A. SELIVANOVA

towerred1966@mail.ru

УДК 323.2

PROBLEMS OF PREVENTION OF INTOLERANT RELATIONSHIP IN HIGH SCHOOL

SUMMARY. The article deals with the problem of low efficiency of preventive measures in institutes of higher education. These measures are connected with intolerant behavior of educational process subject. The author of the article also describes the most important direction of the construction of complex preventive system of these negative phenomena in institutes of higher education; definite methods, technologies and organization forms of this process are characterized as well.

KEY WORDS. Aggression, tolerance, prevention, xenophobia, extremism.

Tolerance and intolerance are fundamental constituents of the modern world. The Declaration of Principles of Tolerance by UNESCO (1995) states: «The world is impossible without tolerance, development and democracy is impossible without peace» [1].

Intolerance (from Lat. *Intolerantia* intolerance, intolerance) as a social and cultural phenomenon is complex and heterogeneous. And if the main component of the concept of «tolerance» is the active position of moral personality and psychological readiness to cooperate with people of other cultures, beliefs, convictions, it is necessary to recognize that the basis of intolerance is the position of an individual and psychological readiness for rejection, intolerance of people of other cultures, beliefs. It is often based on the idea that 'his' and 'our' — is normal and natural. The consequence of this may be the calls for aggressive, discriminatory, violent acts against others, «not ours», the approval of discriminatory measures against them, etc.

The reasons for the growth of extremism in the modern society is largely related to the decline in the moral consciousness of young people, the deterioration of the quality of education, reduction of political and legal freedoms (the declaration of the success of action for all of these areas) against a background of increasing migration of people from the economically underdeveloped republics and district centers Russia. The lack of moral and spiritual education in schools, the cult of force and a strong personality, promoted by the media, freedom in its lowest manifestation (such as promiscuity and indulgence of base instincts), the political and legal illiteracy — are the factors that largely influence the emergence of new extremist youth organizations, the growth of xenophobia, aggression, brutality, violence, hooliganism, crime, religious, ethnic or political grounds [2].

If we talk about intolerant behavioral manifestations in youth, then we should acknowledge that it is — often a very poorly differentiated form of conscious activity of young people having the support of or in the form of a coherent concept of ideological (nationalism, fascism, Islamism, panslavyanizm, etc.) or — more likely — in the form of fragmentary symbols, archetypes, slogans, which go beyond the generally accepted at the interpersonal and group level of interaction norms of behavior. Extreme behavioral manifestations of intolerance in the modern world are acts of extremism. In general, under the extremism we may assume a biological and socio-psychological phenomenon, which is based on the excess of allowable limits in the presence of evil intent or meaning [3]. More specifically, extremism is interpreted as a commitment to extreme measures and the views that are radically denying rules and regulations of a society. It is a set of violent manifestations, committed by individuals or specially organized illegal groups and communities.

The spread of this phenomenon among college students is a dangerous trend.

Most part of the members of the youth intolerant and extremist groups is characterized by a very vague idea about the ideological underpinnings of extremist movements, orientation is often only a resounding rhetoric, the external attributes, and other accessories, or the desire to join a certain «secret society», the space of the university (if subject to an uncontrolled operation) itself has the potential of a qualitatively different level of development of the above phenomena (enough to hold the historical parallels: high schools throughout the history of our country in the crucial moments of a sphere of forming ideas opposed to the current political and social order). Reducing the prestige of higher education, the growth of pragmatism, and formalism in relation to the prospects of getting it, which is a characteristic feature of the last few decades in our country, is, in fact, a key value of the graded high school — professionalism of a specialist \ explorer \ scientist etc. Against this background, in the student's environment, unfortunately, national-religious contexts of identity are rapidly updated that can not but lead to an exacerbation of interpersonal relationships Enhancing the capacity of universities as spaces of cultural and historical wealth of the nation, the space forming the future intellectual and professional elite of the country, using this potential for the formation of not only a graduate with high rates of «residual knowledge», but with a deeply humane individual value system, but an individual socially responsible, with an active citizenship. This is the most important task of the system of higher education of our state, which is inconceivable in the present conditions without the formation of an integrated system of preventional intolerant trends. The solution to this problem involves a number of problems.

1. A major problem that complicates the prevention and correction of intolerant behavior in the society in general and in the student and teaching environment of higher education in particular is a substantial lack of differentiation of key terms associated with intolerance and extremism, «Violence», «extreme», «extremism» and «tolerance» «intolerant», «counter-terrorism», «prevention of terrorism», and others (for example, the legal definition of extremism in the federal law «On Countering Extremist Activity» 2002 is not a definition

in the strict sense of the word that discloses the essence of this phenomenon, but it only lists the forms, along with this law in the Russian legislation, there are more than twenty federal laws that contain anti-extremist position). This ambiguity leads to a very loose interpretation of the concepts and, consequently, are often not correct or contain not adequate evaluation of various phenomena in the college environment. This requires substantial harmonization of the key concepts.

2. Equally important is the development of a clear system of public evaluation of the facts of intolerant, extremist manifestations in the environment of the university. It is ironic that the tolerance could effectively carry out its functions, it should include the essential elements of intolerance, if any, or even be based on it. Such a paradoxical dialectic involves a combination of tolerance of intolerance to the phenomena, which laid the destructive potential: crime, terrorism, xenophobia and intolerance. K. Popper put it as the «paradox of tolerance»: Unlimited tolerance should lead to intolerance. When being tolerant to the intolerant — he says — the latter will inevitably prevail. «May tolerance declare the right not to be tolerant to the intolerant... We should proclaim the right to suppress them if necessary even by force» [4]. A mandatory condition for the effectiveness of preventive measures in the college environment is the development and consistent implementation of a clear and coherent policy with the main actors of the educational environment of «zero tolerance»: making hard, definitive measures with respect to the facts of various forms of xenophobia, extremism and other members of the educational process should be aware of the inability to display certain forms of action within the university.

3. Unfortunately, various forms of «correction,» «re-education» and «impact» used to «violators» of the order in the university often state almost artificially the problem of extremism in many cases that are only ordinary interpersonal conflict situations and intergroup interactions. This kind of demonstrative «action» is just to attract the attention of others. Administration officials, teaching staff, should seek to point out some universal human conflict \ general social context (in the humiliation of a person it is important and it should be evaluated the fact of the degradation of the person, not his religion, nationality, etc.), changing the situational and organizational conditions in such a way that it would have nullified the possibility of their manifestation in the future. Attempts to separate social groups, such as nationally oriented student groups, to take one or another “social space” (the space in parking lots, in the dining room tables, etc.) can be prevented through the restructuring of the space: a ban on parking in the locality, in general, or the priority of the car of the university faculty through the equipment of nominal parking areas, etc., setting limits, making it impossible, and above all pointless in the context of the time factor «taking» a table «for us», etc. It is also important that such actions are not directed at the particular group (national \ religious, etc.) but the entire student population (as in the first example, the criterion of demarcation is transferred to the status: a teacher \ student. Secondly, it makes no sense for the grouping non-obviousness in a view of the national principle as the benefits of, or inability to demonstrate this benefit to others, as in similar situations in the dining room).

4. There is no single ideological basis for the formation of a tolerant, non-extremist behavior. The individual elements (the ideas of tolerance, ethnic and religious tolerance, social responsibility, etc.) with varying degrees of relevance, consistency and commitment (very fragmentary) are presented in a variety of targets, substantial and formal components of educational programs, etc., are not accounted for, as a unity.

5. There is a serious problem of forming tolerant and constructive relations between the actors of the educational process of the university, especially in schools with multicultural, multireligious students (In 2011, nine high schools with students of the Tyumen region in more than 60 nationalities). Ideas declared in numerous papers «... tolerance, national Russian identity and civic culture, ethnic diversity, multi-confessional spiritual environment, the wealth of cultural and historical heritage of the peoples of Russia...» With all their appeal, being not a reflection of existing social reality, they can not serve as the basis for the formation of motivation non-extremist, tolerant behavior among college students. It is essential not only to include these ideas and values in the content of the most important regulations of the university, but also to create the university system in the space of real social and professional relationships governed by these norms and values that will ensure the process of internalization of the majority of participants in the educational process.

6. It is necessary to strengthen a structural component of motivation of non-extremist, socially and personally responsible behavior among students and other members of the university educational environment, which is now often based only on a set of negative factors of the plan (the possible negative consequences of joining one or another extremist organization, the threat of deterioration of the social / professional status, dismissal, etc.). In the context of preventive legal measures, this relationship is very organic and highly effective. The success of social prevention is very ambiguous: we know that the factor of «banned», «segregated» often leads young people to the idea of joining such a course of either organization, perceived by them as an «island of protest, of the truth», etc.

7. It is also required to solve the problem in the area of the university system of institutional approval, encouragement and support of «non-extremist» tolerant behavior of an individual or a group. «Systematically» developed skills of tolerance (training tolerance in schools, etc.), socially responsible behavior and constructive coping strategies, skills of effective behavior in conflict situations, etc. are usually not included in a secret set of personal qualities, providing a vertical social mobility of students / teachers (career and professional growth, social success, etc.).

8. It is still not up to the level in higher education; the information policy of saturation of national / religious / cultural and other phenomena with positive semantic contents is very weak, consequently, most of them are in the wake of rising xenophobia in the society have become increasingly negative. In the minds of students and teachers it is necessary to create a system of positive national and religious contexts, equally representing major cultural and national groups involved in the educational process of high school (the best students, socially active students, gifted, etc.).

9. One of the most prominent causes of the spread of intolerant behavior and extremist ideas is socio-psychological problems of an individual (poor living conditions, subjectively perceived prospects in life, the existence of personal problems and other psychological plan). This often provokes a rise in dissatisfaction, anger, intolerance and aggression. It is impossible in the space of a single institution that there are no such problems (student respondents who report negative assessments on the conditions to realize their life plans, are more willing to actively protest actions: 11% of them are willing to defend its position by any means, even illegal means). One of the major tasks of a preventive institution of higher education is the development of the university system in the space of individual and group assistance to students and faculty who are in difficult situations (counseling services, services that help to solve conflicts, support funds, etc.).

10. The work on the reorientation of the potential of extremist youth groups and its individual members, unfortunately, is often limited to a «redirection» of physical energy in a socially positive direction without affecting the cognitive component. It is necessary for the university to develop professional psychopedagogical, social, educational activities and forms of work.

It is only the beginning of an idea of different levels of manifestation of intolerance of extremism in the behavior of young people and as a consequence, the concept of tiered prevention of this phenomenon in the environment of the university. It is obvious that the content of measures in the levels of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of intolerant and extremist behavior should be different. The absence of such a distinction is usually applied to the inadequacy of the measures and, as a consequence, their low overall efficiency. The differentiation program of prevention measures is the most important task of the university. Intolerant forms of relationships and the various manifestations of extremist activity in the environment of the university should be implemented at three levels:

- Primary prevention of anti-extremist - a system of measures aimed at prevention of an extremist activity, including the identification and subsequent elimination of the causes and conditions to the conduct of an extremist activity: counteraction to the development of conflict in a community college, easing social tensions, the spread of the value orientations, awareness of teachers, students and parents about the activities of extremist organizations and counter-measures taken by government agencies, university administration, continuous monitoring of public opinion;

- Secondary prevention — a system of measures aimed at preventing individual cases of conflict, intolerant, aggressive manifestations in the behavior of students, as well as preventing the access of religious / national / political, etc. components to the motivation of aggressive behavior. Detection and prevention of an extremist activity, counteraction to the processes that create conditions for the preparation and commission of unlawful acts in the area of the university.

- Tertiary prevention — a system of measures aimed at the reintegration in the area of the university the officials who had experience of intolerant behavior, prevention of recurrence of such a behavior.

The main directions to counter manifestations of intolerant and extremist activities in the university, in our opinion, should be:

-Scientific-methodological and analytical support for the prevention of extremism,

-Regulatory support system for the prevention of extremism,

-Maintaining an organizational system for the prevention of extremism,

-Staffing of the system preventing extremism.

The implementation of activities in these areas must necessarily take into account most of the specifics and potential of high school as the focus of intellectual, technical and other resources.

REFERENCES

1. Declaration of Principles on Tolerance, adopted Resolution 5.61 of the General Conference of UNESCO on November 16, 1995.

2. Baev, L.V. Extremism: the nature and forms of expression // Mode of access. URL: http://www.aspu.ru/images/File/ilil/Bayeva__extremizm.pdf

3. Tomalintsev, V.N. Introduction to Social ekstremologiyu: studies. book / VN. Tomalintsev AA Kozlov Saint-Petersburg. Univ of St. Petersburg. Press, 2005.

4. Karl Popper. The Open Society and Its Enemies. M., 1992. V. 1.