



BUILDING TOLERANCE IN A GLOBALIZED SOCIETY

Khurshid A. Mirzakhmedov
Basic Doctoral Student
of Namangan State University
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6026-2262

ANNOTATION

Today we live at a historical stage of human development, in which there are sharp turns. The problem of conflicts of modern international relations covers almost all processes. The resolution of conflicts with different substantive bases is possible by changing the configuration of the corresponding spaces, which must be taken into account in each specific case. Tolerance as such is a characteristic of the way of communication or the conflict culture of subjects who occupy different ideological positions. Manipulations of the population's consciousness led to antagonism and aggressiveness. One of the causes of terrorism in the modern world is manipulation in the cultural space of resource - bearing entities pursuing corporate goals. A fundamental solution to the problem of the conflict of the modern world is possible due to an adequate understanding of the formation of the information society and the corresponding reform of the space of subjectivity and resourcefulness on a global scale.

KEYWORDS: *Tolerance, society, conflict, culture, information society*

DISCUSSION

Today we live at a historical stage of human development, in which there are sharp turns. In the following years, dramatic geopolitical changes took place on Earth, which disrupted the system of security and stability on an international scale. The rapid movement of global processes not only fuels the capabilities of humanity, but also exacerbates conflicts, leading to a widening gap between developed and backward countries. As a result, there are various actions that undermine peace and stability, having a transnational nature in essence and scale [8, p. 33].

The problem of conflicts of modern international relations covers almost all processes. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the most powerful power in the Western world had to openly resolve the conflict with elusive phantoms of another culture, which are even difficult to interpret adequately [1, p. 27].

The formal definition of "terrorism" expresses, at best, only one odious aspect of the implementation of conflict actions. The semantic and substantive part of the problem escapes the attention of researchers and politicians: we do not know what such a sharp reaction of many organizations and people is; we do not know what, what challenge these people, who are called terrorists, are so terribly

responding to. And if the world community is not clear about the content of the phenomenon, the fight against its negative consequences is unlikely to be successful, political institutions will not be able to control the process, and the consequences of such conflicts may be the most unexpected. The first problem, without solving which it is difficult to talk about the conflicts of the modern world in a theoretical form, relates to the interpretation of the conflict space. This problem is incredibly complicated: we can distinguish at least three levels of substantial sources of conflictogenicity, which, moreover, are intertwined in the most bizarre way. By the three substantial foundations we mean in this case the contradictions of the pre-industrial, industrial, and post-industrial cultures. The substantiality of the good-industrial society was modified in the industrial society, which gave rise to its contradictions. In the modern post-industrial society, these two substantial sources of conflict are moving to a new level, driving almost to a dead end all attempts to resolve conflicts of a significant nature. For example, the conflict-prone nature of relations between the East and the West is both industrial and post-industrial. Within Uzbekistan, we can also distinguish the conflict spaces of quasi-industrial, post-quasi-industrial, and post-industrial types [5, p. 66].



The resolution of conflicts with different substantive bases is possible by changing the configuration of the corresponding spaces, which must be taken into account in each specific case. Otherwise, complex conflicts turn into a cultural black hole, in which resources, representatives of different elites, a significant part of the population of those regions that are involved in conflicts, and much more disappear. The modern conflict space has received a very complex configuration, which expresses the content of many very different processes of a global, regional and sub-regional nature.

The author's rooted position is that the interpretation of the conflict spaces of the modern world will be adequate only if we proceed from an understanding of the trends of post-industrial development. The main trends of this nature include: the globalization of culture with all subcultural processes; the dominance of Western centrism in the modern political and cultural mentality; the lack of a satisfactory ideology of the formation of the information society, and a number of others. The situation of modern Uzbekistan allows us to conclude that the inability to align the configuration of the economic space in the market meta-space leads to a natural unfolding of the political orientation of the cultural space. For example, at present, the policy of the world is aimed at turning it into a sub subject of the political space shared with the United States: confrontation and quasi-partnership can turn into a conglomerate integrity. Such integrity, with visible positivity, cannot but lead to an escalation of conflict in Uzbekistan due to an increase in political resources, which will allow us to preserve the negative state of our life, for example, a low standard of living, the separation of the elite from the population, etc. [2, p. 751].

This contradiction can be resolved only if the situation of the post-industrial crisis is understood, from which the information culture of a global nature is still spontaneously developing, and the corresponding ideology of an integrative nature begins to develop. For Uzbekistan, this contradiction can be resolved through an adequate understanding of our real situation, and not by attempts to implement a liberal transit or post-communist modification of consciousness. The current state of consciousness is such that it is almost impossible to distinguish between heroes and terrorists: passionarity gets a spontaneous embodiment and, with the difficulty of subjectification, falls into the category of deviance of an anti-legal nature. In the practical sphere of activity, in this state of understanding conflict, the question of compliance with the proportionality or, if you want, the adequacy and correctness of relations between actors of different orientations in the formation of the communicative space becomes fundamental. The set of these

problems includes the problem of tolerance of consciousness. Tolerance as such is a characteristic of the way of communication or the conflict culture of subjects who occupy different ideological positions. The opposite of tolerance in this sense will be antagonism or ideological intolerance. The nature of relations in the space of tolerance goes back to the dialogic mode of communication in ancient philosophy and rhetoric. As you know, the thesis and the antithesis in the process of dialogue communication are modified in such a way that it becomes possible to find a convention - a common position of the participants in the dialogue or to achieve the truth, meaning the coincidence of thought with the subject. Eristic communication is not aimed at creating a common intellectual product, but at winning the polemic of one of the parties by proving one's own truth or suppressing the opponent by normative or non-normative means of communication. Depending on the properties of the culture in which communication is carried out, the latter may correspond to the norms of antagonism or tolerance. For example, the ideological antagonism of inter-confessional, inter-racial, ethno-national, political, party and other forms of communication is well known. The development of democracy, liberalism, pluralism, equality and other forms of relations in a post-verbal society has led to the formation of a "tolerant" way of communication in Western culture, which allows at least to listen to each other to the parties to the discussion. At the same time, tolerance is difficult to interpret in a rigid way, so the form of this category is used mainly in psychology. We can say that tolerance can only exist in the space of trust or legitimacy. Outside of confidential communication, tolerance can turn into anything, up to criminal ideological treason. We can distinguish two forms of communication in the space of tolerance: equal-subject and different-subject [6. p. 20].

Equal-subject tolerance is natural and transparent: its implementation requires a convention that defines the common goals and form of interaction, as well as a synthesis of theses or resources that is adequate to achieve the goal set by the participants in the interaction. In the case of multi-subject communication, tolerance takes on a complex, contradictory character: the different status of subjectivity of communication participants and, in particular, the inequality in terms of resources make the communication system unbalanced. Traditionally, the dominant subject tends to form a goal-motivational space and extend its own interests to the space of the sub-subject. Even when the communication is of a proportionate nature, it psychologically and statusy threatens the sub-subject with a reduction in his space, which is usually perceived painfully and sharply reduces the tolerance of the sub-subject. Based on our position, the



condition for tolerant interaction in multi-subject conditions will be a legitimate understanding of the processivity in a common space for communication participants with a conventional definition of all the parameters of the latter. Moreover, an adequate approach to the interpretation of the communicative space is very important, which can be considered a culture of tolerance. Post-industrial or information culture, which is presented to us in a crisis, emerging form, significantly increases the number of conflict-related aspects and limits the space of tolerance. We see a standard situation for people: everyone expects tolerance from a partner, but treats their position with incredible "trepidation", at the first opportunity turning to anger or "offended" restoration of violated rights [7, p. 32].

This situation is associated with many circumstances, first of all, with the entrenchment of liberal stereotypes in the mentality, in particular, the stereotype of equality, on the one hand, and the blatant real inequality of cultures, societies, countries, and people, on the other. The experience of global culture and the unconscious push people to understand the fact that the space of public resources is growing at breakneck speed, but because of the continuing diversity of subjects, this growth for most people on the planet means not the acquisition, but the loss of resources. Where is the guarantee that the wave of terrorism is not caused by a sense of destruction of the usual way of life due to the unrestrained and unilateral pressure of man-made, inhumane Western aggression? If we look at the situation in Uzbekistan, we will see the mentality of the people, whom the authorities over the past century have involved in a series of wars and revolutions that have brought death, grief and suffering to the population of several generations. At the same time, each new government, with the "naivety" of virgins, promises the population to create conditions for a decent life in exchange for the right to turn the population of Uzbekistan into a resource of the state. In this situation, tolerance can only be speculative and ideologized, representing another way of deceiving people. Tolerance in Uzbekistan can only be discussed if there is a conventional understanding of the communicative situation. If we take the traditional basis of "survival" for Uzbekistan as the basis of tolerance, then this should be done together, and not by concentrating resources in the elite sphere due to the total deprivation of the main part of the population. For this reason, killed the tsarist government and socialism. Such a scenario, except for the tolerance of hard labor, cannot give any tolerance. Thus, at the theoretical level, an adequate understanding of the communicative space and equality in the distribution of subjectivity and resources can serve as a condition for the development of tolerance. Ideologically, tolerance can take root on the basis of legitimacy.

Pseudo-tolerance can arise and disappear, acting as one of the ideologies that change each other in time. Manipulations of the population's consciousness led to antagonism and aggressiveness. One of the causes of terrorism in the modern world is manipulation in the cultural space of resource - bearing entities pursuing corporate goals. A fundamental solution to the problem of the conflict of the modern world is possible due to an adequate understanding of the formation of the information society and the corresponding reform of the space of subjectivity and resourcefulness on a global scale.

REFERENCES

1. Musienko T. V. *Demokratische i religioznye sennosti: problemi konfliktnosti i netolerantnosti [Democratic and religious values: problems of conflict and intolerance] // Materials of the Round Table (November 16, 2002). St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Philosophical Society, 2003. pp. 27-36.*
2. Layman G. C., and Carmine E. G. *Cultural Conflict in American Politics: Religions Traditionalism Postmaterialism and U.S. Political Behavior // The Journal of Politics. 1977. Vol. 59. № 3. p. 751-777.*
3. Shamir M., and Shamir J. *Comparing Value in Public Opinion: A ConJoint Analysis // Political Behavior. 1995. Vol. 17. № 1. P. 110.*
4. Huntington S. *Will More Countries Become Democratic? // Political Science Quarterly. 1984. Vol. 99. No. 2. p. 208-209.*
5. Shalin V. V., Albov A. P. *Pravo i tolerantnost: liberalnaya traditsiya v epoxu globalizatsii [Law and tolerance: the Liberal tradition in the era of globalization]. - 2nd ed., reprint. and an additional one-Krasnodar. Krasnodar Academy of the MIA of Russia, 2005. - p. 66*
6. Fedorova T. N. *Tolerantnost i formirovanie demokraticeskoy politicheskoy kulturi v tranzitix obshestvax [Tolerance and democratic political culture in transition societies] // Materials of the Round table (16 November 2002). SPb.: St. Petersburg philosophical society, 2003. p. 20-26.*
7. Waldron-Moore P. *Eastern Europe at the Crossroads of Democratic Transition: Evaluating Support for Democratic Institutions, Satisfaction with Democratic Government, and Consolidation of Democratic Regimes // Comparative Political Studies. 1999. Vol. 32. № 1. p. 32-62*
8. Mirziyoev sh. M. *Milliy taraqqiyot yo'limizni qat'iyat bilan davom ettirib, yangi bosqichga ko'taramiz [Continue our path of national development with determination, we will raise it to a new level]. - T.: Uzbekistan: NMIU, 2017. - p. 33.*