FORMATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE IN THE SYSTEM OF SOCIO-CULTURAL RELATIONS

Obidov Asliddin Shavkatovich
Head of the Department of Social Sciences, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)
"Alfraganus University" Private Higher Education Organization,

ABSTRACT

The article seeks to explore the philosophical features of the emergence of the principles of religious tolerance. Furthermore, the important aspects of tolerance in the system of social and cultural relations are comparatively analyzed through the doctrines of philosophers. While at the same time, it highlights the social aspects of the philosophers' ideas on religious tolerance in the new era and the most recent era. Additionally, documents on tolerance at the international level are put to a philosophical analysis.

Keywords: the concept of tolerance, religious tolerance, inter-religious, interpersonal harmony, freedom of thought, freedom of assembly.

INTRODUCTION

In a number of studies in the fields of social and humanitarian sciences, special attention is paid to the fact that the role of the religious factor in the life of modern society is increasing dramatically in the context of globalization. But the study of the importance of the religious factor in the life of society is not a new problem that has arisen today. As it is known from the history of human society, it can be observed that the religious factor has acquired a dominant character in the structure of socio-cultural relations during the social development period.

The current times, which have reached a new stage of development, is characterized by the strengthening of the role of religion in the life of society. In this sense, interrelationships between different religions, religious tolerance, and religious tolerance are becoming extremely important today. Based on this, the principle of religious tolerance (religious tolerance) can be described in the form of tolerant relations based on the principle of mutual respect, mutual recognition of the right to live and work between believers of different religions and confessions, religious associations.

The concept of "tolerance", has a wide and varied meaning. According to the declaration of principles of tolerance adopted in 1995, it means "respect, acceptance and proper understanding of our world's richly diverse cultures, forms of self-expression and ways of expressing human individuality". Therefore, we can rest assured that the lowest level of tolerance means tolerance, that is, the readiness to recognize the right to exist of beliefs that are not aimed at violating the basic principles of tolerance. It also must be noted that religious tolerance is somewhat different from secular forms of tolerance, such as cross-cultural and political.

The sacred texts of Christianity and Islam also call for inter-religious and interpersonal harmony and reconciliation. Therefore, it is not for nothing that verses related to this issue are cited in various verses. The axiological approach of secular culture is not a strictly hierarchical structure, because it is based on diverse principles of values and views, which leads to the recognition of the relativity of any ideal and reality. It allows the acceptance of "alien" values,

attitudes and behavior characteristics that are equivalent to "own" values, attitudes and behavior in a secular culture. Therefore, secular culture is defined as "tolerance of other people's thoughts, beliefs and behavior." In contrast, religious tolerance refers to the absence of words or actions that may be considered offensive or offensive to members of a foreign religion and that are intended to violate the rights of religious freedom. After all, any religious culture, in contrast to secular culture, is a strictly structured single sacred center, but this is interpreted differently in different religions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

According to Katie Baxter, vice president of the Interfaith Youth Center in Chicago, US, "It is necessary to know the history and modern trends of the development of religious processes in the country and the world, the nature and manifestation of interfaith tolerance, and the culture of interfaith relations" [Baxter, K. B. 2013. - P. 259-266].

Religious tolerance does not aim at relative tolerance, rapprochement of religious beliefs, and recognition of their equal values. Therefore, religious intolerance should not be attributed to behavior patterns of religious people, such as showing a certain level of alienation towards another religion, its teachings, representatives and rituals. Based on this, it is appropriate not to equate exclusivism (religious people's belief that the religion they believe in is the only true religion and denying other forms of belief) with religious intolerance.

Furthermore, it is necessary to pay attention to the mutual tolerant relationship between those who believe in a particular religion and those who do not believe in any religion at all. In this regard, there are still disputes, for example, the dispute between the same religion and atheism. It is difficult to show a period in the history of socio-cultural relations where religious disagreements, intolerance, religious persecution and religious conflicts did not occur. In particular, the Canaanites, the native inhabitants of Palestine, were killed by the Israelites, the early Christians were killed by the Israelites, and later by the ancient Romans, the Protestants by the Catholics, and the Catholics by the Protestants, the Muslims by the Christians, and the Christians by the Muslims, the Anabaptists by the Lutherans, the Sufis by the official orthodox Islamic scholars, the Quakers in England. many examples can be cited, such as the persecution of Buddhists by the Puritans and Shintoism in Japan. and from the recent history, it is possible to show incidents such as the expulsion of the Baha'is from Iran, the bloody persecution of Christians in Sudan, and the conflicts in Afghanistan and Syria.

Summarizing the analysis of the above historical materials and the facts related to modern reality, it can be said that if the history of religions is considered as the history of socio-cultural relations, then the history of all countries is full of conflicts, disagreements, wars and conflicts caused by religious reasons. Mutual harmony and tolerance in the religious sense is a relatively rare phenomenon in history. Over the centuries, religious intolerance has created the basis for ethnic, racial, and political conflicts, and has created conditions for socio-political discrimination of people and groups of other faiths or professions.

Religion's objection to exclusivism creates a certain opportunity for the emergence of religious intolerance. This means that "every religion has an absolute character of understanding the universe and reality. Each claims to be the only true and correct form of belief, and each demands to be recognized as such. The absolute nature of truth in religious teachings has served

as the ideological basis for religious disagreements and intolerance for centuries. The higher truths and goals accepted in religious traditions have created intolerance for the existence of opposing views on religious doctrine and practice" [Wood.E. 1997. – C.13.]

As noted sociologist Ernst Trelch, "all religions arise with the characteristic of absolutism, because they are in accordance with a noble irrational purpose, express the truth that requires faith, recognize not only the truth, but also its values" [Wood.E. 1997. – p.14.] This principle applies not only to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, which are recognized as Abrahamic religions, but also to Eastern religions, such as Buddhism, Daoism, and Confucianism, whose representatives are open to understanding the truths of other religions. Even in Eastern religions, there are objections to the extraordinary absoluteness of another religion.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The causes and conditions that cause intolerance in the religious sense are diverse and multi-valued. Exclusivism in each religion's claim to the absolute and universal importance of its teachings has served as the basis for the origin of intolerance towards the ideas of other religions in the past. After all, every religion fought for the recognition of its teaching as the absolute truth, the only right way.

The intrusion of another religion was perceived as a threat to national unity and state integrity. Protecting the integrity of the state was considered the most important task not only in ancient times, but also throughout the development of social and cultural relations. In ancient times, even in the Middle Ages, power assumed a divine character, and it was interpreted as a crime against the state not to believe in God, not to follow what he said, or to believe in another god. Thus, for a long time, religion served as a social institution that ensured national unity and state integrity. Different forms of belief are considered a threat to the integrity of the state.

In Europe, the philosophers of the new era led to the formation of the following stages of the development of socio-cultural relations, such as the tolerant attitude towards other religious beliefs and their representatives, as well as freedom of conscience. Only with the new era, the situation began to change. Because by this time (J. Locke, D. Hume, I. Kant and others) the principle of ideological pluralism was developed thanks to the efforts of many thinkers.

Moreover, by this time, both politicians and common people were tired of the bloody religious wars that spread across the territory of Western Europe, causing poverty and suffering to people. As a result, both statesmen and philosophers have come to the unanimous conclusion that there are questions that no one has been able to answer through the limited capacity of the human mind. Among such questions were questions about religious belief, religious profession, and worldview in general. More precisely, both thinkers and politicians have come to the conclusion that no religious idea can be absolute truth, that all of them contain certain elements of truth, and therefore that they all have the right to co-exist.

In other words, it should be emphasized that religious tolerance in general, the principle of freedom of conscience, was introduced not by the initiatives of religious people with official authority, but rather by the demands and efforts of the persecuted religious minority deprived of civil rights. More precisely, one should not forget the fact that the decisive decisions regarding the implementation of the principle of religious tolerance and freedom of conscience in the life

of society were not made by religious leaders and leaders, but by legislative bodies, courts and parliaments.

The concept of "tolerance" appeared in Europe as a result of the compromise between Catholics and Protestants in connection with the religious wars that took place in France in the 16th century. It was the welcome response of the fledgling society of civil republics to three decades of bloody religious wars.

In addition, the principles of tolerance and civil harmony found expression in the liberal mind of the Enlightenment. Famous scholars of the 17th and 18th centuries spoke out against violent religious conflicts and religious intolerance. The most important result of their work was the recognition of tolerance as a universal value and a fundamental component of peace and harmony between religions, peoples and other social groups.

In the history of England in the 17th century [Barg M.A. 1991. – C.24.] period Oliver Cromwell made a fundamental turn in the establishment of the principle of tolerance in socio-cultural relations. At that time, among the various Puritan sects that were part of O. Cromwell's army, only independent and level-headed people were supporters of freedom and tolerance. According to them, there is no such thing as a perfect form of religious belief that sacrifices all other beliefs.

J. Locke's "Experience of Endurance" and "Letter on Endurance" [Locke Dj. 1988. – C.93.] works were widely known in the age of enlightenment. according to his opinion, every person has freedom of thought and religion, if he does it sincerely and conscientiously before God, he can use it regardless of anyone. According to J. Locke, tolerance has a two-sided character. On the one hand, it is a value that should be applied in relations between people of different religions, on the other hand, tolerance is the result of a social contract that is a component of the law that justifies freedom of thought, freedom of assembly, freedom of conscience. [Baeva L.V. 2009. – C.11].

The idea of cultural tolerance appears for the first time in the works of the French enlightener Jean Jacques Rousseau. First of all, he sharply criticized theocracy, religious fanaticism, and then, in addition to religious matters, he emphasized the importance of civil tolerance. Rousseau supported the ideas of the secular state and the social contract, emphasizing the mutual equality of people.

The great German enlightener, humanist and agnostic I. Kant had his own approach to the problem of respecting the equality and freedom of all. "The concept of freedom," writes I. Kant "In the Metaphysics of Morals" [Kant I. 1994. – C.242-243.] is a pure concept, therefore it is transcendental for theoretical philosophy, that is, no example from possible experience can correspond to it, therefore, it does not constitute the subject of possible theoretical knowledge for us, and classifies that it has meaning, not as an absolutely constitutive, but only as a regulative principle, that is, as a purely negative principle of speculative reason.

B.C. Solovyov, the thinker who studied the problems of tolerance the most among Russian philosophers, distinguishes the concepts of "patience" and "tolerance". By patience, he understands the painful side of this spiritual quality, which in its active manifestation is called generosity, and sometimes spiritual courage. According to B.C. Solovyov, tolerance is a kind of patience, and it is defined as recognition of another person's freedom. [Baeva L.V. 2009. – C.13.]

In the 20th century, when humanity was seriously faced with the problem of tolerance, Claude Lévi-Strauss, the founder of structural anthropology, began to criticize Eurocentrism in order

to overcome the ethnocentrism of Western thought. His philosophical outlook on intercultural communication, the importance of preserving identity, cultural diversity, and the interdependence of historical development serve as a methodological framework for understanding tolerance. One of the most influential thinkers of our time, the German philosopher and sociologist Jurgen Habermas, has repeatedly addressed the issue of tolerance in his works. Analyzing social development as a continuous communicative interaction, as a constant negotiation of all members of society, and problems that arise in solving problems together, Habermas understands tolerance as a phenomenon that occurs as a result of equal rights of equal subjects, representatives of a civil, democratic society. Only under these conditions will the definition of tolerance be correct. According to the scientist, when people who do not have equal opportunities enter into the process of interaction, these relations are likely to be based on coercion, negligence on the one hand, and submission on the other. "On the basis of mutual recognition of the rules of tolerance relations," says Habermas, "the paradox that seems to prompt Goethe to reject tolerance as an insulting slander and kindness can be resolved" [Habermas Yu. 2006. – C.43.] explains.

Therefore, in his opinion, problems related to freedom of conscience can be solved only in a state where citizens of a democratic society provide religious freedom for each other. This is especially important for Habermas, because when he considers the issue of tolerance, he is primarily based on the religious origin of this problem. "Religious tolerance has not only historical foundations. Religious tolerance, as an impartial attitude towards people of other faiths, has now been raised to the level of tolerance towards dissidents in general.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, it should be said that the principle of tolerance is not a theoretical development or a utopian ideal artificially created by a particular thinker, philosophical school or social group. This principle was formed due to historical necessity in the structure of the system of socio-cultural relations. The fact that it has acquired a multi-faceted, diverse character, and even has mutually exclusive interpretations, is explained by the fact that it has undergone a long-term evolution as an element of the structure of the system of socio-cultural relations. Moreover, if it is assumed that there are different systems of socio-cultural relations in different societies, it is natural that the principle of tolerance, which is its structural element, takes different forms even in today's modern era.

In the system of socio-cultural relations, the idea of interreligious tolerance means that people of different religious beliefs live together in one land, one Motherland, on the path of noble ideas and good intentions. All religions of the world are based on the idea of virtue, which relies on several virtues such as honesty, peace, kindness and friendship.

REFERENCES

1. Baxter, K. B. (2013). Measuring student learning of interfaith cooperation: The pluralism and worldview engagement rubric. Journal of College and Character, p. 259 – 266.
2. Вуд Дж.Э. Право человека на свободу религии в исторической и международной перспективе // Диа-Логос. Религия и общество. М., 1997. С. 13.

3. Барг М. А. Великая английская революция в портретах ее деятелей. М., 1991. Павлова Т. А. Кромвель. М., 1980.
4. Локк Дж. Послание о веротерпимости // Сочинения в 3 т. – М.,1988. Т.3. – С.93.
5. Баева Л.В. Толерантность: идея, образы, персоналии [Текст]: монография / Л.В.Баева. – Астрахань: Издательский дом «Астраханский университет», 2009. – С. 11.
6. Хабермас Ю. Когда мы должны быть толерантными? О конкуренции видений мира, ценностей и теорий // Социс. 2006. №1. С. 43.