

---

## TOLERANCE AS A SOCIAL VALUE IN CONTEMPORARY KAZAKHSTANI SOCIETY

**Ablay-khan Ibraimuly Akbergen<sup>\*</sup>, Aliya Gairatovna Karabayeva and  
Zukhra Nurlanovna Ismagambetova**

*Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, al-Farabi Avenue 71, Almaty, 050040, Kazakhstan*

(Received 11 March 2016, revised 27 April 2016)

---

### **Abstract**

The present article addresses the state of tolerance as a social value in contemporary Kazakhstani society. The article shows the significance of this value for the society, its types and the history of its development in Kazakhstani society. The main directions of scientific studies in Kazakhstan are defined. Authors emphasize that there is no inter-ethnic or inter-religious tension in Kazakhstani society. However, the questions of religious education should be addressed properly. The situations of intolerance are often based on the reasons, coming from cultural or material inequality. It is necessary to point out, that the area of problems, addressed in tolerance studies in Kazakhstani science, is still relatively narrow and needs to be expanded. One of the main conclusions of present article shows that there is no single general tool, which could allow creating a unified theory of tolerance.

*Keywords:* intolerance, religious tolerance, inter-ethnic tolerance, culture, religion

---

### **1. Introduction**

Tolerance is the social value necessary for organizing a dialogue between different cultures and religions in any contemporary society. Tolerance is especially important for the contemporary Kazakhstani society, which is currently undergoing the transformation and has not fully changed the development paradigm after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Among the unifying values, which we got from the past, the values of intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic compliance and stability are especially significant. They present the axiological basis of multi-ethnic Kazakhstani society, which is required for the further settlement of democratic values in Kazakhstan. They should become the basis of civil society development, as well as the development of the corresponding conscience. Religious tolerance, absence of religious fanaticism and aggression in historic tradition of Kazakhstani people, respectful attitude towards older generations and mental freedom of other nations are the main values, which should be taken into account for the development of productive

---

<sup>\*</sup>E-mail: 87\_ablai\_87@mail.ru

and tolerant dialogue between the confessions and their acceptance as an element of civil society [1].

The main subject of the inter-cultural dialogue, which creates the contemporary tolerant social conscience, is the proportion between the Eastern traditional ways of being and axiological orientations and the Western liberal principles of life organization. Traditional types of mentality, which include the Kazakh culture, are based on the holistic attitude towards nature, which is viewed as a live heavenly environment. A race, being a biosocial entity, can be compared to the Space and the human is kindred to the nature. An individual is considered an organic particle of a family clan; he does not make separate decisions and follows the collective will. To find oneself outside a clan means to lose everything – a home, a family, happiness. The main values of such society are traditionalism and collectivism.

Liberal principles are based on different priorities. Individualism, personal freedom and responsibility, individuals will statement, his initiative and proactiveness provide the conditions of democratic and plural social being. Does archaic mythopoetic conscience stand in the way of the creation of democratic country and civil society, which imply the initial personal activity? It is therefore important to study the processes of how Kazakhstani mass conscience explores Western institutions and values [1, p. 135].

Strategically significant factor for the emergence and development of a true democracy is the new tolerant social conscience and the appearance of people, who are able to perform social and economic transformations. Middle class, who got an opportunity to actualize their economic and creative freedom, develops in Kazakhstan [1, p. 120].

In the XX century tolerance became the main ‘basis’ of the axiological attitudes, a part of personal and social connections ‘system’, interactions and interdependencies in the society. Tolerance and tolerant, or, on contrary, intolerant behaviour appeared to be the significant factors, which determine an imperative need to create working mechanisms of actualizing human rights and freedom. During 20 years of independent development our country experienced a severe emotional and psychological stress, which affected all areas of social functioning [2].

Tolerance may contain various attitudes, such as integrity, arrogance, indifference, pointless malice, aspiration to cooperation, temporarily delayed revenge, etc. Because of this, in order to clarify the concept of tolerance it is necessary to decode its separate historic and applied contexts [1, p. 64].

## **2. Tolerance - definition and types**

It is obviously impossible to provide a strict definition of the concept of tolerance. If we analyse tolerance as a social value, it should include such characteristics, as respect and acceptance of equality of community partners’ rights, rejection of dominance and violence in interpersonal communications, acceptance of each culture’s right for distinctive character and self-presentation,

readiness to accept the 'other's' culture the way it is, the ability to find a constructive solution in conflict situations, readiness to interact on the basis of consent but without limiting one's own interests [1, p. 241].

Tolerance cannot be limited to the system of general principles and to a single life situation, because tolerance is revealed in various social life forms and personal activity, on different levels of personality organization and its conscience [2].

As Khamidov states, tolerance is a principle, a maxim and an imperative of an externally non-aggressive, non-intolerant attitude of the individual, group, ethnicity, nation, confession, etc. towards anything different – towards different beliefs, values, traditions, religions, etc. – regardless of how incompatible it is with their own values, points, etc., which are considered as right and correct. However, principles, maxims and imperatives are consistent with one's own concepts only when being implied in real actions, behaviour and attitudes [3].

Tolerance is not only a philosophic, but also a political, religious and psychological phenomenon. Scientist Tsepkova emphasizes that tolerance is not an innate group or individual quality, but rather is a constant and direct effort of constructing and actualizing certain personal and social values and behavioural regulations [4]. She separates a wide range of tolerance types. She puts individual (internal) tolerance in the first group; it includes self-tolerance, robustness towards external factors of influence (fear, stress, risk and anxiety). The second group is social (external) tolerance, which contains a number of tolerance types: gender, international, political, interclass, social, religious, age, educational, geographic (city vs. village), sexual-orientation, personality (consideration of one's own and others' values) tolerance [4].

We suppose that tolerance types, described above, are the objects of studies in different sciences and not only in Philosophy. Moreover, national philosophic school usually addresses only the problems of tolerance in inter-religious and inter-ethnic relations.

### **3. Historic aspects of tolerance in Kazakhstani society**

It is necessary to point out that Kazakhstan has a rich historic experience of tolerance culture. Tolerance as a value had an important place in ancient Kazakhstan, allowing different ethnicities, cultures and religions to co-exist. Historical data confirm this. As stated in the book of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University Professor Abazov, long before Islamic religion people of Kazakhstan were familiar with practicing Zoroastrianism and Buddhism [5]. Scientists state that the independent history of religion of ancient Turcomen and proto-Kazakhs begins from the end of II millennium B.C. from the animistic views upon reality. Later, the Arabs, who came to Middle Asia with a new religion, noted, that the local villages often had a 'house of fire' and 'house of gods', which allows suggesting that one village had both Zoroastrian and Buddhist churches [1, p. 144]. The data on wide spread of Buddhism in the area of modern south of Kazakhstan were confirmed during archaeological studies of this region in

1920s, which helped finding Buddhist churches, temples, mortuaries and other buildings, dating back to II-X centuries A.C. [6]. Comans, the ancestors of Kazakhs, confessed the Western branch of Christian religion – Catholicism – in the late XIII century. It is confirmed by the Codex Cumanicus (1298), the most ancient written artefact of Kipchaks, which were called Cumans (Comans) in the West and Polovtsy in Russia. It contains the Catholic prayer ‘Ave Maria’ in Turcomen language, texts and music of religious anthems in the ancient manuscript; it also mentions Pontius Pilatus, Christ, Joseph, David. Ancient Christian texts, translated into Turcomen, confirm, that the missionaries treated the Turcomen nations with all due respect [6]. Despite the fact that Islam was officially adopted in Kazakhstan approximately in 1043, the Kazakhs and their ancestors believed in the spirits of nature and ancestors [7].

Tolerance of Turcoman people in the land Kazakhstan initially emerges from the specifics of Turkoman concepts of country and Turcoman government of nations. Turcomen did not neglect asking their liegemen for help when the latter were more civilized than the Turcomen themselves, and often entrusted them with important business. They also borrowed anything that could be useful, whether it was the machinery, or lifestyle, or religion and language [8].

In the conditions of nomadic lifestyle, when the main life source was cattle breeding and when Kazakhs could not contact people from another clan or tribe for months in a row, the tradition of hospitality should be assessed as a display of tolerant conscience and humanism, common for the Kazakh people, who lived in territorially divided, naturally severe and socially hard life conditions [1, p. 157].

Thus, the main factor, which provided the Kazakhs with the opportunity to survive in relatively severe conditions of territorial divide and, at the same time, to maintain friendly relations with the neighbouring nations without major conflicts, is the natural human integrity in the wide sense. This concept includes certain hospitality, mutual help, lack of aggression, as well as kind-heartedness, open-mindedness and friendliness.

#### **4. Tolerance on the contemporary stage in Kazakhstan**

##### ***4.1. Inter-ethnic tolerance in contemporary Kazakhstani society***

Tolerance in inter-ethnic relations in Kazakhstani society is considered to be one of the achievements of contemporary period. Confirming arguments are the absence of major inter-ethnic conflicts or civil war, co-existence of the representatives of over 100 ethnicities in the republic. It is often presented as a picture of overly peaceful existence, while the conflicts of inter-ethnic reasons are viewed as domestic ones. According to study, conducted upon the request of the Institute of Philosophy, Political and Religion sciences of the Ministry of Education and Science of Kazakhstan Republic, 95% of population does not experience regret over their ethnical affiliation [1, p. 245]. Thus, it is possible to conclude that there are no major reasons for the occurrence of thoughts about

‘inferiority’ of one’s ethnic group. However, in spite of this, only 42% of respondents did not come upon displays of humiliation on the basis of ethnic affiliation [1, p. 253]. And only 36% of respondents claimed that they are interested in the culture of other nations [1, p. 248], while only 34% do not consider the ethnic affiliation of their marriage partner [1, p. 249].

Of course, there is no segregation policy in Kazakhstan. There were also no displays of gender genocide. However, there is a certain atomization in the society based on the ethnic characteristics. An invisible border is set between Kazakh-language and other-languages populations, not only Russian-language ones, as it is frequently stated in the media. A reality of Kazakh-language and other-languages world is present in Kazakhstani society. Apart from Kazakh language environment, the prevailing language environment is Russian. Surprisingly, this situation resembles the existence of ethnic ghettos, but the paradox is that Kazakh-language people sometimes atomize in the society, as if it is them who are the migrants. Such process of atomization is thoroughly presented in the work of Meyer on multi-culturalism, where, upon the results of cross-cultural study, the author shows the marginalization of young migrant families in Vienna, Austria. Marginalization occurs as a consequence of lacking necessary language skills, of financial resources for obtaining higher education and of real political representation [9]. Existence of sports grounds – ‘cages’ – is the main and often forced factor of closing in one’s own ethnic community. The world of young migrants revolves around the sports ground of their home and, if they are lucky, of their work. The contact with the rest parts of the city is often limited; this is the so-called phenomenon of the ‘district’. The return to one’s own ‘cage’, to one’s territory is always pleasant, the external world seems hostile. Ideas and beliefs are developed in this narrow and small environment [9, p. 160]. The cage is a very strong mean for developing the identity. It is very hard to leave this cage [9, p. 161]. Many migrants’ children, visiting their homeland, felt alienated, perceived themselves as tourists. They consider their home country boring and the language of their homeland is foreign to them [9, 169]. Young people’s employment is mainly presented in so-called ethnic business and consists of unqualified work in cafes, bakeries and shops in the districts of compact migrants living. Young people, especially from Turkish families, often find work in family business. A certain micro-cosmos is created and it does not imply the need to communicate with German-speaking community [9, p. 166]. But it is not possible to say that a complete adaptation to Austrian society took place.

Relatively similar situation takes place in Kazakhstan as well. In colleges young Turkish, Uighur and Kurdish people create their own micro-world, choosing to speak their native languages even during 5-minute breaks between lectures. In Kazakhstan, college and higher education is available in two languages – Kazakh and Russian. There are a few schools, where the education is presented in other languages (Uighur, Korean, Tadjik). But the fact, that from the young age citizens of one country grow up as being separated by an invisible, or sometimes even visible, cage, is concerning. It even seems like the

educational system itself does not approve of joint socialization of Kazakh- and Russian-speaking students. Earlier, Kazakh and Russian parts of school with combined education language were separated with a wall, which sometimes came through the corridor. Currently Kazakh classes are not separated by metal barriers, but they appear to be isolated from the rest of the school by an invisible wall. Igor Savin, head of the non-government organization 'Dialogue' from Shymkent, who addresses ethnic issues, tells that children from national classes spend their events and celebrations separately and rarely communicate with each other, because their classrooms are in the different parts of school building. Only few of them ever cross this invisible border [10].

The situation in post-Soviet Kazakhstan is vividly described in Nazpary's work 'Post-Soviet Chaos: Violence and Dispossession in Kazakhstan'. This work, based on the author's experience from staying in Kazakhstan, has not lost its significance. It shows the real situation in interethnic relations, which is far from the official statistics. Domestic sketches, describing conflicts between representatives of different ethnic groups, reflect the true state of affairs correctly. Sketches of domestic supremacism and intolerance are fully described by Joma Nazpary, and it is necessary to acknowledge that they do not contradict the truth. Discontent towards the distribution of wealth and resources comes not only from the ordinary citizens, but also from some media people. Nazpary describes the politics of gradual exclusion of other ethnic groups representatives from the government positions and from the boards of national higher education institutions. A reverse process is in motion, as the national-patriotic middle class would state. It is rightly noticed that economic private sector is the least affected by the tendency to 'Kazakh' everything, because the staff is selected mainly on the basis of their skills [11]. This has similarities with the aforementioned situation described by Meyer. Non-Kazakhs move to business, and they do it quite successfully. It certainly is not possible to be marked as intolerance or to create a policy of forced participation in cultural events, but Nazpary was surprised by the low attendance of non-Kazakhs at the celebration of Abay's, Kazakh poet's, jubilee. It can be stated that such cultural segregation is still present nowadays [11, p. 150]. It is known that since the dissolution of the USSR, the names of streets, cities and towns in Kazakhstan are being changed, the names of famous people from the past are being excluded. But there is a certain amount if not truth then poignancy in one of the respondents words about the issue of onomasiology. He reasonably asked why the streets of Kunaev (KazASSR leader) and Zhambyl (famous poet) still remained unnamed. In his opinion, the reason is that they their ethnic affiliation is Kazakh [11, p. 151]. Like children of migrants in Austria are estranged from their native culture and language, such estrangement from Kazakh language can be found in Kazakh youth. Nazpary revealed a language conflict back at that time and it becomes even stronger now. We can blame each other for the lack of desire to support the development of Kazakh language, but one thing can be said for sure – the range of the reasons for the trouble of its popularization has been thoroughly described. It is the lack of methods and textbooks and the very little number of

books and popular films translated into Kazakh language [11, p. 154]. And, as Nazpary rightly stated, there is a mutual process of unacceptance between city and village Kazakhs, which is rooted on different social, cultural and financial status [11, p. 156].

Generally, the situation of interethnic tolerance can be called acceptable. But for Kazakhstani society, which population equals the population of one or two big metropolis of international scale, the level of estrangement of Kazakhs from non-Kazakhs is too high, but it still does not lead to conflicts and aggression. The project of creating a unified 'Kazakhstani community', 'unified Kazakh nation', which was discussed on the highest level, may be considered as failed.

#### ***4.2. Inter-religious tolerance in contemporary Kazakhstani society***

In 2015 in Kazakhstan, according to the data of Committee for the Religious Affairs in the Ministry of Culture and Sport of the Republic of Kazakhstan, there are approximately 3500 religious associations and groups [[http://www.din.gov.kz/rus/religioznye\\_obedineniya/?cid=0&rid=1638](http://www.din.gov.kz/rus/religioznye_obedineniya/?cid=0&rid=1638)].

Kazakhstan defines itself as a secular state, which preaches freedom of conscience and freedom of religion. And, ex facto, as with the issue of interethnic tolerance, there is a beautiful picture.

It is necessary to note two critical and significant moments in the situation of religious tolerance in contemporary Kazakhstani society. The first one, completely philosophic, is set by Kazakh philosopher Khamidov: is true tolerance between the representatives of different religious confessions possible at all? Is the dialogue between confessions or at least between world religions possible or necessary? Yes, it is possible and even necessary. But is it able to provide even a partly radical solution or at least allow getting closer to finding the solution for the problem of overcoming religious oppositions? No. Religion has three levels: doctrinal, ritually-ceremonial and organizational. Obviously, the last one can become the subject of meaningful discussion, which can eventually lead to the improvement of priesthood in every confession. Mutual improvement of confessions on the ceremonial level is harder but is still possible. However, the main level is the doctrinal one, and first of all, its idea of Absolute Superbeginning. In theistical confessions it is understood as Theos and in non-theistical – as something essentially non-definable (Brahman is often referred to as That). But among theistical confessions (for example, between Judaism, Christianity and Islam) there is no unity in the issue of its essence, attributes, etc. If in the process and as a result of dialogical relationship the confessions, speaking with the words of Bakhtin, “do not merge and do not blend”, as Khamidov noticed, then, generally, each confession exits the dialogue without significant changes. The dialogue in this case appears to lack perspective and even turns out to be pointless [3, p. 38]. Khamidov points out that only between personal worlds with all their multiple levels and dimensions full polyphony becomes possible, and during this process the real mutual enrichment of these

worlds occurs [9, p. 40]. Essentially, Khamidov thinks that the means for religions dialogue in Kazakhstan and in the whole world do not solve the deep controversies and do not facilitate the true merge, similarly to how May Day demonstrations in Kazakhstan are meant to present the unity of different nations. Tolerance is no more than a palliative. Principles and imperative and tolerance direct everything – individuals, ethnical groups, nations, confessions, etc. – to remain the same as they are, only with the condition that they will not express their internal intolerance to everything different externally [3]. Similar opinion is expressed by another Kazakh philosopher, Kolchigin, stating that multiple encounters of priesthood representatives from different religions (as, for example, the Meeting of World and Traditional Religions Leaders, which regularly takes place in Astana, capital of Kazakhstan) do not contain anything constructive, but are just formal events [12].

Considering the significant fact that religious texts themselves contain tolerant messages, as well as intolerant ones, for example, monotheistic religions have attacks towards polytheists, idolaters, etc. [13].

The second critical moment in the situation of inter-religious tolerance Kazakhstani scientists relate to the fact that Kazakhstan leads the policy of giving the priority to the two major religions – Sunni Muslim and Orthodox Christianity – and also to the fact that a number of media severely damage the image of other religions with their unprofessional statements. Kolchigin notes that even Sufism was criticized on air on very established Kazakhstani TV-shows, despite the fact that a number of Kazakh relics are related to it [12, p. 54]. Journalists, lawyers and politics, in Kolchigin's opinion, can easily pronounce any religion to be a 'totalitarian cult'. The thing is, these people, upon their own confession, do not know what 'totalitarian' or 'cult' is, what is the essence and content of multiple different world religions, what is the way of their historic development, what are their similarities and differences. Moreover, they disregard the differences between multiple religious movements, there are no efforts to understand their essence and create even a tentative hierarchy in them, according to their historical and cultural roots, meta-historic influences, eschatological ideas, social priorities, ethical and psychological bases, etc. [12, p. 55]. Artemjev, a well-known Kazakhstani religious studies specialist, states that the principle of unbiased attitude towards religions is being violated, because recently some religions began gaining government support, while the other ones are being criticized and are being tagged as untraditional [14]. Tsepkova, Kazakhstani philosopher and tolerance scientist, agrees with him. In her opinion, negative attitude towards the religious movements, 'new' for Kazakhstan, obtains political subtext, which manifests through government's supporting actions only towards so-called 'traditional' confessions. Higher-level government officials, starting with the President, often visit churches and mosques but are rarely, or never, seen in prayer houses of other confessions. In turn, head mufti and Orthodox metropolitan, unlike representatives of other confessions, are invited to attend almost all civil ceremonies. Orthodox Christmas (7<sup>th</sup> of January) and Kurban Bayram (in accordance with Islam

calendar) are pronounced to be state holidays. Some deputies in Mazhilis suggest lawfully confirming Islam and Orthodox Christianity as so-called 'traditional religions'. They also propose supporting Islam and Orthodox priests and building mosques and Orthodox churches by the state budget. In fact, local government representatives actively participate in building mosques, while the two cathedral mosques – in Astana and in Almaty – are maintained with state financial support. These facts, obviously, complicate the relationship between so-called 'traditional' and 'untraditional' dominations in Kazakhstan [15]. In Tsepkova's opinion, 'traditional' religions list Orthodox Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism and Judaism. All other confessions are considered to be 'untraditional' [16]. An agreement cannot be reached even among the religion and philosophy specialists, which sometimes causes major arguments and discussions [16]. This seems to be somewhat unfair, because, despite the fact that religions have differences (Abrahamic religions possess a certain potential for intolerance), the moral imperative that they preach generally states that the religious person should behave the same way he would like to be treated by another person [17]. We can refer to an interesting thought of a well-known philosopher, Scanlon, when he describes an example of inscribing the American cent coins with the words 'We believe in God', which contradicts the tolerance principle, because it disregards the atheists [18]. Would it violate their feelings? The time when religion would have a main role in the issues of social value would be really concerning. This situation would call for the limitations, despite the fact that initially the ideas of tolerance implied religious variety and freedom of conscience [18, p. 191].

The situation with religious tolerance in general can be characterized as acceptable. There are no inter-religious conflicts in Kazakhstani society. It is important to understand, that we cannot allow one of the religions to prevail upon the other, or provide it with a priority in social life, or persecute someone for violating religious feelings. Unprofessional actions of representatives from media, government or science may lead to a with-hunt that can result in tragic consequences.

#### **4.3. What is not being told?**

As we stated above, tolerance is not limited to the acceptance of people of other nation or religion. Situations of tolerance or intolerance are possible in other cases as well. Here we want to stress that, apart from describing tolerance in inter-religious and inter-ethnic communications, national science does not highlight any other areas of tolerance; some of these areas even become a taboo and it is considered appropriate to discuss them. For example, a study, conducted with the support from 'Legal reform' program of the 'Soros-Kazakhstan' Foundation, revealed that 81.2% of respondents stated that the society in general judges and disrespects lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgender people (LGBT) [[http://ru.soros.kz/uploads/user\\_67/2013\\_05\\_04\\_\\_10\\_14\\_09\\_\\_058.pdf](http://ru.soros.kz/uploads/user_67/2013_05_04__10_14_09__058.pdf), p. 95]. In light of recent scandals in Kazakhstani society, related in one way or another to

homosexuality issues, it is possible to say that even of this is not a pressing matter, it causes heated debates. Furthermore, the news on this topic gets high viewing rating, despite obvious society disapproval. We do not give our opinion about recommendations, proposed by the aforementioned scientists. We do not discuss the scandals that rocked Kazakhstani society. But we would like to note that, apart from sensations in the media and the Internet, there are no somewhat serious studies in this topic, even with the negative evaluation. And any non-governmental organizations, supporting LGBT members, or even protecting members of untraditional religions, are easily listed as the agents of enemy influence, whose goal is to ruin the moral principles of Kazakhstani society. The issue of tolerance towards LGBT is a taboo for Kazakhstani society.

Furthermore, even bigger attention in the West is drawn to studying tolerance in Science, especially in Medicine. It concerns the issues of Bioethics, which have been discussed for a long time. This raises important questions, which are directly related on the communication between religion and Science. For example, philosopher Mary Warnock vividly describes the main problem related to studying embryos. This issue causes the discussion between scientists and religious people, because the first ones claim that during the study periods the embryos do not have a nervous system, thus, they cannot feel pain, and the latter firmly believe that the soul comes into existence at the moment of conception [19]. Such studies are offensive for the religious people. Warnock, however, mentions a good reason for the controversy or even capability of violating religious feelings as an abstract concept. This reason states that a religious person might see washed clothes on a religious holiday when washing is prohibited. Will this be considered as offending the religious feelings? [19, p. 134] Recently in Kazakhstan there are debates about changing the law on transplantology; due to this, the issues of tolerant attitude towards Science, and biomedical manipulations in particular, may rise to another level.

## **5. Conclusions**

Describing all of the tolerance aspects in contemporary Kazakhstani society is certainly not a simple task. We can probably agree with the statement of Kok-Chor Tan, which might be the tolerance border, that the most extreme manifestations of aggression, such as genocide, slavery, racial and gender discrimination, will never be approved, even if all of the above would be based on some cultural foundations [20].

Considering everything described above, we can conclude the following:

- tolerance is definitely our ancient value, which has centuries-long history;
- tolerance is one of the core values and it defines the level of acceptance or non-acceptance of other values and phenomenon and their changes;
- scientific literature only refers to the tolerance in inter-ethnic and inter-religious communications;
- tolerance as a value faces the risk of becoming a formality, due to merely formal events for its support;

- while we still remember the cultural multitude of religious beliefs and teachings, that were once preached on the Kazakhstan territory, we are no longer their carriers and we repeat the destiny of lost civilizations.

Tolerance can hardly be over-rated. Andrew Fiala rightfully notes that it is impossible to understand the other without deep internal effort. In his work he describes an example with the ritual of self-immolation of widows in India. Supposedly, by criticizing widows' self-immolation ritual in India, one demonstrates his ethnocentricity or, in other words, culture-centricity. Because of this tolerance requires a certain level of education and self-criticism. In order to understand a wide range of situations with different from one's own religious beliefs and cultural rituals, it is necessary to expand one's horizon. This is the exact reason why people should remain tolerant when our imagination and thinking might not be enough to fully imagine the others' experience; it is hard for us to feel the foreign conscience. And, of course, it does not imply the acceptance of any anti-humanitarian actions, but tolerance is needed for creating a dialogue, even of it is critical, instead of a mere rejection [21]. The role of social knowledge, especially of Philosophy, is major for learning to be tolerant. Tolerance is a result of philosophic education and of exposure to cultural achievements through literature, history and art. Children have excellent capacities for analysis and imagination, and because of this it is important not to miss that moment in their education. With education we lead the children outside ethnocentricity and closed conscience and with education it is possible to present the young generation with another mindset [21, p. 55]. However, it is necessary to set the limits of tolerance. Otherwise, the thought justified the ritual of self-immolation by comparing it to Christian ritual of interment [21, p. 56].

It is also necessary to point out that there is no universal code of tolerance. According to the studies, mentioned by Kazakhstani sociologist Zabirowa, tolerance, as well as intolerance, is currently a result of common domestic practices and not of a direct policy [22]. Each case of a problem with acceptance or rejection is individual and has its own details, as noted by Warnock. It is impossible to let narrow-minded minority and uneducated masses make moral decisions. These complicated moral questions of tolerance cannot be solved with neither quotes from the Bible, nor from the Quran, nor with liberal theories, justifying the Science. Tolerance limits must obviously be defined in every single case with regard to present facts and common sense [19, p. 139].

Studying tolerance seems perspective [23]. It is necessary to explore the state of gender, educational, inter-class and sexual-orientation tolerance. Scientific studies presented above show that tolerance is understood and is being studied only in a narrow sense on Kazakhstani science. It is also necessary to study the mechanism of learning tolerance in Kazakhstani society more thoroughly by finding a balance between authentic Kazakh culture and contemporary education, including the achievements of universal culture.

## References

- [1] A.N. Nysanbayev (ed.), *Formirovanie tolerantного soznaniya v sovremennom kazakhstanskom obschestve*, Institut filosofii i politologii komiteta nauki MON RK, Almaty, 2009, 108.
- [2] A.G. Karabaeva, *Tolerantnost kak lichnostnyy i sotsialnyy fenomen*, Proc. of the international scientific-practical conference 'Social, historical and cognitive creativity problems of personality', A. Dzholdasbekov Academy of economy and law, Taldykorgan, 2013, 106-111.
- [3] A. Khamidov, *Obratnaya storona tolerantnosti*, Dukhovnost i tolerantnost kak osnova stabilnosti obschestva: Mezhdunarodnaya nauchno-prakticheskaya konferentsiya, The Embassy of Peace, Almaty, 2008, 34-41.
- [4] I. Tsepkova, *Poisk. Seriya gumanitnykh nauk*, 4 (2007) 107-112.
- [5] R. Abazov, *Culture and Customs of the Central Asian Republics*, Greenwood Press, Westport, 2007, 64.
- [6] I. Tsepkova, *Religioznaya tolerantnost kak fenomen kultury Kazakhstana*, Proc. of Traditsionnaya kultura kazahov: Sbornik nauchnykh statey, Ziyat press, Almaty, 2004, 17-25.
- [7] O.M. Brill, *The Kazakhs*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., Hoover Institution Press. Stanford University, Stanford, 1995, 20.
- [8] S.K. Bulekbaev, *Mysl*, 1 (2014) 24-27.
- [9] G.B. Prato, *Beyond multiculturalism: views from anthropology*, Ashgate, Farnham, 2009, 154.
- [10] I. Chuprynina, *Tolerantnost v molodezhnoy srede Almaty: 'svoi' i 'chuzhie'*, Materialy sotsiologicheskogo issledovaniya i prilozheniya, Konfliktologicheskii tsentr, Almaty, 2001, 34.
- [11] J. Nazpary, *Post-Soviet Chaos: Violence and Dispossession in Kazakhstan*, Pluto Press, London, 2002, 149.
- [12] S.K. Kolchigin, *K sootnosheniju istiny i tolerantnosti*, Tolerantnost, veroterpimost, svobodomyслиe – osnova kultury mira: mezhdunarodnaya nauchno-prakticheskaya konferentsiya, The Embassy of Peace, Almaty, 2006, 53-60.
- [13] I. Tsepkova, *Tolerantnost: istoriya i suschnost*, Duhovnost i tolerantnost kak osnova stabilnosti obschestva: Mezhdunarodnaya nauchno-teoreticheskaya konferentsiya, The Embassy of Peace, Almaty, 2008, 14-31.
- [14] A. Artemyev, *SMI i ih rol v formirovanii tolerantnosti, veroterpimosti i svobodomyслиya*, Rol SMI v formirovanii kultury mira: mezhdunarodnaya nauchno-prakticheskaya konferentsiya, The Embassy of Peace, Almaty, 2005, 37-42.
- [15] I. Tsepkova, *Sayasat*, 10 (2008) 9-13.
- [16] I. Tsepkova, *Evraziyskoe obschestvo*, 4 (2000) 149-154.
- [17] I. Tsepkova, *Vestnik KazNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya sotsiologii i politicheskoy nauki*, 4 (2007) 23-39.
- [18] T.M. Scanlon, *The difficulty of tolerance. Essays in Political Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2003, 196.
- [19] S. Mendus and D. Edwards, *On Toleration*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987, 130.
- [20] K.-C. Tan, *Toleration, Diversity, and Global Justice*, The Pennsylvania State University, Pennsylvania, 2000, 130.
- [21] A. Fiala, *Tolerance and the ethical life*, Continuum, London, 2005, 52.
- [22] A.T. Zabirowa, *Vestnik Evraziyskogo Natsionalnogo universiteta imeni L.N. Gumileva. Seriya gumanitarnykh nauk*, 1 (2010) 209-213.

- [23] S.S. Aubakirova, Z.N. Ismagambetova, A.G. Karabayeva and G.G. Akhmetova, Eur. J. Sci. Theol., **10(6)** (201) 89-98.