

FREEDOM OF CHOICE AND TOLERANCE: SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF UNITY AND HARMONY IN THE CONTEMPORARY MULTIETHNIC SOCIETY

A.A. Akhatova, A.O. Tursynbaeva

ABSTRACT

This article examines the dialectical interrelationship between freedom of choice and tolerance as the fundamental pillars of social unity within a modern multiethnic society. Freedom of choice is analyzed as a key attribute of human agency and subjectivity, exploring its correlation with moral responsibility and social conditions. Within the framework of philosophical analysis, the dialectical link between tolerance and individual autonomy is studied, alongside their roles in ensuring a sustainable social order.

The article analyzes the historical and cultural features of tolerance in Kazakh society, comparing them with Western philosophical frameworks, particularly Michael Walzer's theory of levels of tolerance. The research reveals a qualitative transition from passive "patience" (tozimdilik) to active, value-oriented tolerance. Special attention is paid to the challenges of the globalization and digitalization era: the risks of "digital intolerance," the impact of algorithmic determinism on personal autonomy, and the role of "digital resilience" in maintaining social harmony.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in justifying the necessity of transforming pedagogical strategies in higher education. The author argues that integrating traditional Kazakh ethical concepts, such as Abai's concept of "Tolyq Adam" (The Whole Man), into the modern educational process facilitates the decolonization of social values and the formation of "proactive solidarity." Using Kazakhstan as a case study, the article analyzes interethnic policy strategies and the activities of the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan as mechanisms for ensuring national unity. The study concludes that the synthesis of individual freedom and collective responsibility is a vital condition for stable development in a turbulent digital world.

Keywords: Freedom of Choice, Tolerance, Moral Responsibility, Social Stability, Digital Citizenship, Algorithmic Determinism, National Unity, Tolyq Adam.

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

Corresponding author:
A.A. Akhatova, aigul-479@mail.ru

Citation:
Akhatova A.A., Tursynbaeva A.O. Freedom of Choice and Tolerance: Socio-Philosophical Foundations of Unity and Harmony in the Contemporary Multiethnic Society // Adam Alemi. – 2026. – Vol. 28. – No. 2 (108). – P. 69–77. – DOI: 10.48010/7dhqd991

Open Access
© The Author(s), 2026
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Received: 21/01/2026
Accepted: 24/04/2026
Published online: 30/06/2026

Таңдау еркіндігі және толеранттылық: қазіргі көпұлтты қоғамдағы бірлік пен келісімнің әлеуметтік-философиялық негіздері

Аңдатпа. Мақалада қазіргі көпэтникалық қоғам жағдайындағы әлеуметтік бірліктің іргелі негіздері ретінде таңдау еркіндігі мен толеранттылықтың диалектикалық өзара байланысы қарастырылады. Таңдау еркіндігі адам субъективтілігі мен агенттілігінің (агенсу) негізгі қасиеті ретінде талданып, оның моральдық жауапкершілікпен және әлеуметтік жағдайлармен арақатынасы зерттеледі. Философиялық талдау тұрғысынан толеранттылық пен тұлға автономиясы арасындағы байланыс, сондай-ақ олардың тұрақты қоғамдық құрылымды қамтамасыз етудегі рөлі зерделенеді.

Мақалада қазақ қоғамындағы толеранттылықтың тарихи-мәдени ерекшеліктері талданып, олар батыстық философиялық тұжырымдамалармен, атап айтқанда, Майкл Уолцердің толеранттылық деңгейлері теориясымен салыстырылады. Зерттеу барысында пассивті «төзімділіктен» белсенді, құндылыққа бағдарланған толеранттылыққа сапалы көшу процесі ашып көрсетіледі. Жаһандану және цифрландыру дәуірінің сын-қатерлеріне ерекше назар аударылады: «цифрлық төзімсіздік» тәуекелдері, алгоритмдік детерминизмнің тұлға автономиясына әсері және әлеуметтік үйлесімділікті сақтаудағы «цифрлық тұрақтылықтың» (digital resilience) рөлі қарастырылады.

Зерттеудің ғылыми жаңалығы жоғары білім беру жүйесіндегі педагогикалық стратегияларды трансформациялау қажеттілігін негіздеуден көрінеді. Авторлар Абайдың «Толық адам» тұжырымдамасы сияқты дәстүрлі қазақ этикалық концептілерін заманауи білім беру процесіне интеграциялау әлеуметтік құндылықтарды деколонизациялауға және «проактивті ынтымақтастықты» қалыптастыруға ықпал ететінін алға тартады. Қазақстан мысалында ұлттық бірлікті қамтамасыз ету тетіктері ретінде этносаралық саясат

стратегиясы мен Қазақстан халқы Ассамблеясының қызметі талданады. Қорытынды бөлімде жеке бас еркіндігі мен ұжымдық жауапкершілік синтезі құбылмалы цифрлық әлемдегі тұрақты дамудың маңызды шарты екені негізделеді.

Түйін сөздер: тандау еркіндігі, толеранттылық, моральдық жауапкершілік, қоғамдық тұрақтылық, цифрлық тұрақтылық, цифрлық азаматтық, алгоритмдік детерминизм, ұлттық бірлік, Толық адам.

Свобода выбора и толерантность: социально-философские основы единства и согласия в современном многонациональном обществе

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается диалектическая взаимосвязь свободы выбора и толерантности как фундаментальных основ социального единства в условиях современного многоэтнического общества. Свобода выбора анализируется как ключевое свойство субъективности и агентности (agency) человека, исследуется ее соотношение с моральной ответственностью и социальными условиями. В контексте философского анализа изучается связь между толерантностью и автономией личности, а также их роль в обеспечении устойчивого общественного устройства.

В статье анализируются историко-культурные особенности толерантности в казахском обществе, которые сопоставляются с западными философскими концепциями, в частности с теорией уровней толерантности Майкла Уолцера. Исследование раскрывает качественный переход от пассивного «терпения» (төзімділік) к активной, ценностно-ориентированной толерантности. Особое внимание уделяется вызовам эпохи глобализации и цифровизации: рассматриваются риски «цифровой нетерпимости», влияние алгоритмического детерминизма на автономию личности и роль «цифровой устойчивости» (digital resilience) в сохранении социальной гармонии.

Научная новизна исследования заключается в обосновании необходимости трансформации педагогических стратегий в системе высшего образования. Авторы утверждают, что интеграция традиционных казахских этических концептов, таких как концепция Абая «Толық адам» (Целостный человек), в современный образовательный процесс способствует деколонизации социальных ценностей и формированию «проактивной солидарности». На примере Казахстана анализируется стратегия межэтнической политики и деятельность Ассамблеи народа Казахстана как механизмов обеспечения национального единства. В заключении обосновывается, что синтез индивидуальной свободы и коллективной ответственности является необходимым условием стабильного развития в турбулентном цифровом мире.

Ключевые слова: свобода выбора, толерантность, моральная ответственность, общественная стабильность, цифровая устойчивость, цифровое гражданство, алгоритмический детерминизм, национальное единство, Толық адам (целостный человек).

Introduction

In philosophy, freedom of choice and tolerance are considered closely interconnected concepts. Freedom of choice represents a person's ability to realize themselves as an autonomous subject, while tolerance serves as the ethical and social form of recognizing this autonomy in other people as well. From this perspective, tolerance appears not merely as a consequence of freedom, but as its necessary condition. Tolerance is the foundation for recognizing the rights and respecting the human dignity of individuals who hold different views, opinions, and religious or cultural distinctions. This concept signifies a person's capacity to understand one and others and to accept another individual as they are. Hannah Arendt links the fundamental basis of tolerance to the pluralism among human beings. In her view, the dissimilarity (or difference) between people – the fact that humans are not alike – constitutes the primary condition for public (or political) freedom in society [1]. Tolerance is closely associated with the idea of pluralism, as pluralism acknowledges the coexistence of diverse perspectives

and opinions and provides the legal framework for their expression. In turn, this creates conditions conducive to spiritual development, since interactions among various cultures and beliefs enrich human consciousness.

In the Kazakh worldview, the concept of tolerance is often interpreted as restraint, patience, and composure. In other words, accepting and acknowledging another person's opinion, even when one disagrees with it, is regarded in Kazakh society as a profound spiritual and ethical value. Philosophically, this is understood as an expression of respect and reverence, since the ability to accept what one dislikes reflects a person's inner culture, generosity, and spiritual maturity. This ethical stance resonates with the traditional Kazakh concept of "sabyrlylyq" (rational patience), which implies not a suppression of the self, but a balanced state of mind that preserves social harmony through dignity and wisdom. From the perspective of Immanuel Kant's moral philosophy, this principle aligns with the categorical imperative that one must treat other people never merely as a means, but always at the same time as an end in themselves. In other words, recog-

nizing another's freedom of choice is equivalent to acknowledging their autonomy [2].

However, in recent years, there has been a tendency to translate tolerance as patience ("tozimdilik") in Kazakh. Yet this translation does not fully convey the depth and breadth of the term tolerance, whose semantic and conceptual scope is much broader. The word "tozimdilik" literally refers to "endurance", "perseverance", or "forbearance," that is a collective term encompassing such virtues as patience, restraint, and calmness. It functions as a synonym for patience, forbearance, and tolerance in the narrow sense. This notion, borrowed in accordance with Western linguistic conventions, generally implies enduring or tolerating other beliefs and practices for the sake of social peace. Endurance thus emphasizes resistance to external forces and the ability to withstand discomfort, whereas tolerance in its philosophical sense involves voluntary acceptance, understanding, and mutual respect. While "tozimdilik" is often a passive reaction to external constraints, true tolerance is an active virtue of judgment - a "dialogic openness" that seeks to understand the "Other" without losing one's own identity. In Jean-Paul Sartre's existentialist philosophy, freedom is realized through conscious human choice, while responsibility toward others appears as the moral consequence of this freedom [3]. Its meaning goes beyond mere external endurance, and it is realized through inner spiritual development and the expansion of personal consciousness. Therefore, the philosophical essence of tolerance is much deeper than that of patience. It represents not only the acceptance of differing opinions but also a comprehensive worldview aimed at understanding and respecting diversity in cultural, religious, and social dimensions.

The connection between the profound meaning of tolerance and freedom of choice is grounded in mutual respect and understanding, which emerge from the foundations of individual liberty and social harmony. These concepts complement each other, forming the philosophical basis for preserving peace and coherence within society. As Karl Popper has shown, while tolerance is a fundamental condition of a free society, it cannot be extended indefinitely to attitudes aimed at destroying freedom itself. Thus, tolerance signifies not only external endurance and patience but also encompasses inner freedom and respect for the choices of others. This equilibrium is particularly vital in the era of "algorithmic determinism,"

where digital platforms can limit the horizon of choice and foster "echo chambers" of intolerance.

Despite the extensive philosophical discourse on these concepts, the specific mechanism by which freedom of choice interacts with tolerance in the context of a rapidly digitalizing multiethnic society remains insufficiently explored. This article aims to address this gap by investigating the dialectical relationship between individual autonomy and social cohesion. The central research question focuses on how the transition from passive endurance to active, value-based tolerance can serve as a foundational element for national unity in modern Kazakhstan. A key focus is placed on the integration of Abai's concept of "Tolyq Adam" (The Whole Man) as an ethical framework that harmonizes individual choice with moral responsibility, providing a unique "internal filter" against digital radicalization. The scientific contribution of this study lies in its synthesis of Western existential-political theories with traditional Kazakh ethical concepts, offering a conceptual framework for maintaining social stability amidst the challenges of global digital transformations.

Methodology

This study employs a comprehensive socio-philosophical framework to investigate the dynamics of freedom and tolerance. To provide a structured response to the research questions, the following methodological approaches are applied:

Historical-philosophical method: Used to trace the evolution of freedom and tolerance from classical Western thought (Kant, Popper) to modern existentialist perspectives, providing a theoretical foundation for the study.

Comparative approach: This is central to the research as it allows for a rigorous contrast between Western liberal concepts of tolerance and traditional Kazakh ethical values such as "tözimdilik." This comparison reveals the unique cultural synthesis required for social harmony in Kazakhstan.

Dialectical method: Applied to analyze the complex relationship between individual autonomy and social responsibility, demonstrating how they function as mutually reinforcing rather than contradictory forces.

Axiological analysis: Employed to examine tolerance not merely as a political strategy but as a core moral value. This method helps identify the ethical motivations behind tolerant behavior in a multiethnic society.

Phenomenological approach: Used to explore tolerance as a lived experience and a specific life stance, focusing on how individuals navigate choice and responsibility in the digital age.

By integrating these methods, the study ensures a transition from abstract theoretical modeling to a practical analysis of social stability in modern multiethnic contexts.

Main part

Theoretical Foundations: Dialectical Relationship between Tolerance and Freedom of Choice

The relationship between tolerance and freedom of choice is a foundational synthesis of individual autonomy and social harmony. Freedom of choice grants a person the ability to make decisions about their life path, values, and way of living, serving as an essential component of individual liberty. According to Immanuel Kant, it is precisely this autonomy that transforms a human being into a moral subject, where free choice constitutes an activity of reason bounded by responsibility. This concept is grounded in "inner freedom" - the capacity to make independent choices free from external pressures - while tolerance acts as the external respect for the inherent dignity and worth of the Other. In this sense, freedom of choice and tolerance are not two separate entities but two sides of the same coin: freedom is the internal right to be different, while tolerance is the social guarantee that this difference will be respected.

However, from a socio-philosophical perspective, tolerance is not a universal category; its content and boundaries vary historically depending on cultural traditions and social conditions [4, pp. 543–566]. To analyze the structural transition from individual ethics to social mechanisms, we must refer to Michael Walzer's framework of levels of tolerance [5]. He distinguishes four main levels, each describing specific forms of interpersonal relations and moral responsibility:

1) Resigned Acceptance: The first level is endurance for the sake of avoiding conflict. At this level, groups agree to coexist peacefully solely to prevent war. Relationships are based on external agreements rather than mutual respect. The primary limitation here is that social stability remains fragile, as it depends entirely on external circumstances. In the context of multiethnic so-

cieties, this level represents a "precarious peace" where differences are merely ignored rather than understood.

2) Stoic Recognition of Rights: This level transitions from pragmatic endurance to a moral stance. Grounded in the foundations of Stoicism, it emphasizes personal responsibility and respect for the legal rights of others. Social peace depends not just on order, but on the moral accountability of each individual.

3) Axiological Respect: At this level, tolerance represents complete respect for the opinions and lifestyles of others. It goes beyond intellectual understanding, incorporating an emotional recognition of the value of diversity. This signifies a higher stage of social harmony based on mutual responsibility.

4) Openness to Transformation: The highest stage is characterized by the willingness to listen to and engage with different perspectives. Here, dialogue is essential, and individuals are prepared to embrace both internal and external change. This level represents the peak of democratic pluralism.

Walzer's hierarchy demonstrates that social unity evolves from a state of "passive indifference" to "active engagement." Critically, if a society limits itself to only the first level, tolerance remains confined to passive patience. Byung-Chul Han highlights that in contemporary society, a "formal tolerance" often predominates, rendering it incapable of genuine dialogue [6]. Han argues that modern society often replaces deep, painful encounters with the "Other" with a sterilized, hyper-connected digital proximity that avoids real confrontation. To ensure sustainable justice, tolerance must move beyond mere endurance toward a proactive willingness to reconsider one's views and show mutual respect. This active form of tolerance enables people to strengthen cooperation while ensuring social justice and peace. Therefore, the dialectical synthesis of choice and tolerance serves as a safeguard against "the violence of the same," allowing for a society where plurality is not just tolerated, but celebrated as a source of collective strength.

Cultural Formation and Specifics of Freedom of Choice and Tolerance: Western and Kazakh Perspectives

In the Western tradition, the institutionalization of tolerance is closely linked to John Rawls's

theory of justice, which advocates for a society providing equal opportunities regardless of initial social status. This is practically manifested in "blind" recruitment processes, such as résumés that exclude photographs, birth dates, or places of origin. These structural measures are designed to mitigate systemic biases - including racism and ageism - ensuring that professional merit remains the primary criteria for evaluation, independent of an individual's personal or ethnic background. This model prioritizes "procedural neutrality," where the individual is viewed primarily as a citizen or a professional, detached from their communal identity.

In contrast, within the Kazakh context, social and cultural interactions are often influenced by attributes such as ethnicity, kinship, or marital status. From Pierre Bourdieu's perspective, these factors act as forms of social capital that can, at times, overshadow individual professional competencies. Such cultural specifics create a unique social fabric where personal identity and group affiliation play a significant role in mutual interactions, necessitating a culturally specific model of tolerance that balances tradition with modern meritocratic ideals. Unlike the Western "blind" approach, the Kazakhstani model is often characterized by "relational recognition," where tolerance is achieved not by ignoring differences, but by integrating them into a shared social network based on the principles of hospitality and mutual support.

Furthermore, tolerance has evolved from a moral virtue into a strategic socio-economic asset. As Byung-Chul Han points out, the capacity to accept "otherness" has become a new form of global competitiveness [6]. In the corporate world, multinational companies and airlines that accommodate diverse religious and cultural traditions do not merely perform an ethical duty but optimize their market reach. This demonstrates that societies and states adhering to the principles of tolerance gain a distinct advantage in fostering innovation and economic prosperity. In this light, tolerance becomes a "soft power" tool, enabling a nation to navigate the complexities of the global market by leveraging its internal diversity.

The formation of this tolerant worldview is a developmental process. From birth, an individual's perspective is shaped by their immediate ethnic and religious environment. However, personal growth requires what Søren Kierkegaard describes as the "responsibility in the face

of choice" [7]. An individual must decide whether to remain within a closed, exclusionary worldview or to expand their boundaries by accepting the "Other." Choosing the latter prevents intellectual stagnation and allows for the expansion of personal consciousness. This Kierkegaardian "leap" is essential for decolonizing social values; it allows the individual to move from a dictated collective identity to a consciously chosen one that respects the pluralism of the modern world.

Ultimately, from a socio-philosophical standpoint, tolerance is the ability to maintain one's own cultural and religious convictions while simultaneously respecting global diversity. This process of "voluntary openness" serves as the foundation for both individual development and sustainable social stability in a globalized era. This synthesis suggests that freedom of choice is not the freedom to be isolated, but the freedom to belong to a global community while remaining rooted in one's own heritage.

Historical Expressions of Freedom of Choice and Tolerance in Kazakh and Turkic Cultures

Tolerance has long held a place in the culture and history of the Kazakh people and the Turkic world as a whole. In general, Turkic philosophy is not a concept that unites us solely on a religious basis, since the nearly thirty modern Turkic peoples differ in both their religious affiliation and anthropological features. However, they are bound by deep linguistic, cultural, and genealogical ties. Lev Gumilyov explains this unity through the concept of a "passionary field" and a cultural code [8]. The formation of Turkic philosophy rests on several foundations such as modes of life, political and social structure, and everyday ethics and etiquette. Above all, the primary basis of Turkic philosophy is linguistic kinship. Language, in turn, is a spiritual phenomenon that connects thought, culture, and worldview. Even in mythology, we can still observe common patterns, themes, and motifs shared among Turkic peoples. In nomadic Turkic societies, various mechanisms and traditions were established to preserve mutual understanding and peace among different religions and ethnic groups. Throughout their history, the Turks were influenced by multiple faiths like shamanism, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, Christianity, Islam, and others. Karl Jaspers regards such cultural multilayeredness as the historical legacy of the "Axial Age", in which diverse spiritual traditions develop in par-

allel [9]. The coexistence of these religions and respect for faith and belief formed the foundation of tolerance. This historical "pluralism of the steppe" suggests that freedom of choice was an inherent part of nomadic life, where the vast geography required a flexible and inclusive social structure. The spread of Islam in Kazakh society also contributed to the development of the idea of tolerance, as Islamic culture and religion place great emphasis on human rights, justice, and mutual respect. The nomadic lifestyle required constant interaction with various ethnic, religious, and cultural groups. In Emmanuel Levinas's philosophy, the face-to-face encounter with the Other is interpreted as the very origin of ethics, while nomadic culture is precisely open to this "encounter with the Other" [10]. In the Great Steppe, the stranger was not an enemy but a guest, and the law of hospitality (Qonaqjalylyq) served as a practical manifestation of ethical tolerance. Most Turkic peoples developed and strengthened mutual understanding and tolerance through trade and political alliances. This process prioritized peace and harmony in social relations. The values and norms formed within nomadic culture placed mutual respect and tolerance at the forefront. In this regard, the works of poets, sages, and orators, as well as the intellectual movement of the later enlightenment period, vividly reflected these values, leaving a deep mark on the history and culture of the Kazakh people. Abai's principle "Love all of humanity" is regarded as the Kazakh form of universal humanism. These elements of steppe culture played a significant role in the national identity and everyday life of Kazakh society. The spirit of kindness and compassion is the readiness to support others in times of hardship, to offer shelter and share the last piece of bread that has been deeply embedded in the nation's consciousness through its traditions and customs, passed down as a moral legacy from generation to generation. As the great thinker Abai emphasized in his poetry: «Love all humankind as your brothers...». Abai's philosophy of "Tolyq Adam" (The Whole Man) provides the ultimate synthesis: true freedom is achieved only when the "nurlı aqyl" (luminous reason) and "joly jurek" (warm heart) guide an individual to recognize the dignity of all human beings [11].

In our country, the nations and ethnic groups living together are provided with conditions to learn their native languages, develop their cultures and traditions, and practice their religions, thereby preserving an atmosphere of tolerance. In Islam as

well, it is stated: «...Be brothers to one another...», commanding that division is wrong and that humankind should live in unity and harmony.

During the Soviet period, many ethnic groups were subjected to repression and were deported from their homelands to the territory of Kazakhstan. The Kazakh people at that time demonstrated their hospitality and fraternity, providing them with shelter and assistance. The Kazakhs accepted these peoples during difficult times, helped them, and lived together in friendship and mutual understanding. This "unity of the oppressed" transformed a tragic historical event into a foundation for proactive solidarity. Thus, the Kazakh people, together with many ethnic groups, went through various trials, shared a common history, and were together in both sorrow and joy. Such cooperation and unity clearly demonstrate the tolerance and humanism of the Kazakh people. Therefore, choosing peace, as well as showing patience toward ethnic, religious, political, confessional, and interpersonal disagreements, including age and gender differences, and recognizing that «other people» have an equal right to live, represents tolerance. Tolerance is human compassion, the art of living in a world of diverse people and ideas, and while possessing rights and freedoms, not violating the rights and freedoms of others. However, tolerance is not submission, indulgence, or approval; it is an active life position based on the recognition of others. It is a "freedom for" rather than a "freedom from" - a conscious choice to build a shared future.

This shared experience of suffering and mutual support formed a unique historical consciousness, reinforcing the modern Kazakhstani model of "unity in diversity". Contemporary discourse on decolonizing national identity in Kazakhstan further emphasizes the need for an inclusive policy that balances this historical legacy with modern civic values. Ultimately, tolerance in the Kazakh worldview is far more than passive patience (тәзімділік); it is an active, existential commitment to peace that bridges the gap between traditional wisdom and the requirements of a modern democratic state.

Challenges in Globalization Era: Kazakhstan's Experience and Future of Social Harmony

In the contemporary era, globalization and the rapid proliferation of digital technologies

have fundamentally reshaped the landscape of individual decision-making. The expansion of the digital information space, while providing unprecedented access to knowledge, has also introduced significant risks to social cohesion. Social media platforms, often driven by algorithmic determinism, can create "echo chambers" that amplify extremist views and spread misinformation. In this context, the "digitalization of intolerance" has become a global challenge, where the speed of information often outpaces the ethical responsibility of its creators. Recent studies highlight that digital spaces often foster a specific form of racialization and exclusion, requiring a more nuanced understanding of tolerance in the era of social media [12]. This digital environment demands a transition from traditional media literacy to a more profound "digital ethics," where freedom of expression is balanced by the preservation of social peace.

From a socio-philosophical perspective, this digital radicalization poses a threat to the traditional Social Contract Theory. If, according to Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Thomas Hobbes, the social contract was designed to ensure peace and equality, modern digital spaces often test these foundations by allowing the marginalization of minorities through anonymity and hate speech. In a multiethnic society like Kazakhstan, the spread of "titular nation" narratives or exclusionary rhetoric through digital channels contradicts the inclusive principles of a modern state. As contemporary researchers on social cohesion (such as Manuel Castells or digital ethicists) suggest, the stability of a multicultural society today depends on the "digital citizenship" of its members - their ability to exercise freedom of choice with moral responsibility.

The President of Kazakhstan, Kassym-Jomart Tokayev, has emphasized that national unity must be based on equal rights for all citizens, moving beyond ethnic or social silos. This policy aligns with Amartya Sen's "capability approach", which argues that justice is not merely an abstract ideal but a practical necessity to ensure that every individual has the freedom to realize their potential [13]. In Kazakhstan's multiethnic landscape, this approach ensures that "freedom of choice" is not just a legal right, but a tangible opportunity for every citizen to participate in the nation's cultural and political life.

Furthermore, the psychological dimension of tolerance in a multiethnic environment deserves

closer examination. Recent sociological research suggests that tolerance is not a static trait but a dynamic process influenced by "intergroup contact theory". In Kazakhstan's context, this means that the mere coexistence of different ethnic groups is insufficient for long-term stability; instead, it requires meaningful, goal-oriented interaction that reduces prejudice. When citizens exercise their freedom of choice to engage in cross-cultural dialogue, they move from "passive recognition" to "active empathy", which strengthens the social fabric against external ideological shocks.

Parallel to this, the transition to a model of active tolerance requires a fundamental reimagining of pedagogical strategies in higher education. It is not enough to teach tolerance as a set of static rules; it must be cultivated as a "virtue of judgment". In this regard, the integration of Abai Qunanbaiuly's concept of "Tolyq Adam" (The Whole Man) - which emphasizes the harmony of reason, heart, and will - into the modern curriculum offers a unique pathway for decolonizing social values. By applying the "Tolyq Adam" framework, students can learn to align their "luminous reason" (nurly aqyl) with "warm hearts" (joly jurek), transforming digital interaction into a space of mutual growth rather than conflict. By synthesizing this indigenous ethical wisdom with global civic standards, Kazakhstan can foster a generation of citizens who view freedom of choice not as a license for self-interest, but as a moral commitment to the common good.

Moreover, the rise of Artificial Intelligence and algorithmic governance introduces new paradoxes to the concept of personal autonomy. As algorithms increasingly curate the information we consume, the "freedom of choice" becomes increasingly illusory, often confined within digital "filter bubbles." To counteract this technological determinism, a modern model of tolerance must include "digital resilience" - the ability of citizens to critically evaluate information and consciously choose to engage with viewpoints that differ from their own [14]. Digital resilience acts as a "technological immunity", protecting the multiethnic social fabric from the infectious spread of radical ideologies.

Finally, the integration of traditional values with global civic standards remains a cornerstone of Kazakhstan's path to social harmony. While Western models of tolerance often focus on

individual rights, the Kazakhstani experience emphasizes "collective responsibility" and mutual aid, values historically rooted in the nomadic code of honor. This synthesis creates a unique form of "communitarian tolerance", ensuring that diversity remains a source of national strength.

Since independence in 1991, Kazakhstan's unique strategy - embodied by the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan - has functioned as a "social laboratory" for interethnic harmony. The program "One Nation, One Country, One Destiny" serves as the structural framework for this harmony [15]. However, as Karl Popper warned in his "paradox of tolerance", a society must be vigilant. Unlimited tolerance can lead to its own destruction if it allows the spread of intolerant forces that aim to abolish freedom [16]. This vigilance requires a proactive defense of the "Common Home" (Shaňyraq), where the freedom of one is protected by the tolerance of all. Therefore, tolerance in the digital age must be "active" - it must be a choice to defend diversity while resisting the violent imposition of singular worldviews

Conclusion

In conclusion, the dialectical relationship between freedom of choice and tolerance constitutes the bedrock of a just and democratic society. This study demonstrates that freedom of choice is not an absolute individual license but a moral capacity that finds its fulfillment through the recognition of the "Other". In a tolerant society, every individual is free to express their views and embrace various cultures, yet this freedom must not infringe upon the rights of others or lead to systemic discrimination. Tolerance, in its highest philosophical form, acts as the necessary boundary that harmonizes individual autonomy with social cohesion, preventing the descent into discrimination and social fragmentation. By aligning personal agency with ethical boundaries, society can transition from a state of mere coexistence to one of genuine integration based on the protection of fundamental human rights.

The transition from the 20th-century model of "passive endurance" to a 21st-century paradigm of "active, reflective tolerance" is essential, particularly in the face of globalization and digital radicalization. As digital technologies increase the risk of ideological silos and algorithmic polarization, the stability of a multicultural

society increasingly depends on a "Digital Social Contract" rooted in mutual respect and ethical responsibility. This new contract must prioritize the human subject over the algorithm, ensuring that digital connectivity enhances rather than erodes human dignity. Therefore, maintaining this balance is not merely a moral duty but a political and legal necessity that allows a "culture of war" to be replaced by a "culture of peace".

Kazakhstan's historical experience - from the traditional humanism of the Great Steppe to the modern institutional framework of the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan - offers a valuable model for this global necessity. The synthesis of the "Tolyq Adam" ideal with modern democratic principles provides a robust philosophical foundation for navigating the complexities of a multiethnic state. The Kazakhstani strategy of "Unity in Diversity" proves that a multiethnic structure is not a challenge to be managed, but a strategic asset for sustainable development. However, as the "paradox of tolerance" suggests, this harmony requires constant vigilance and an inclusive legal framework that protects human rights while resisting the imposition of intolerant ideologies.

Ultimately, tolerance must be integrated not merely as an abstract principle, but as a lived experience and a civic virtue. It requires a transformation of the educational landscape, where traditional ethical concepts serve as a compass for modern digital citizens. Fostering a global order based on the supreme value of human life and dignity is the foremost task of the modern era. In this regard, the synthesis of individual freedom and social harmony remains the only viable path toward a stable, just, and progressive future in an increasingly turbulent world

References

- 1 Arendt H. *The Human Condition*. – Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998. – 372 p.
- 2 Кант И. *Основы метафизики и нравственности*. – М.: Издательство АСТ, 2023. – С. 151–310.
- 3 Сартр Ж.-П. *Экзистенциализм – это гуманизм*. – М.: Издательство АСТ, 2025. – 160 с.
- 4 Turgunov Y., Abdimomunov Y., Smanov B., Shakhanova R., Najmanbaev A., Kenan K. *The Problem of Elimination of Illiteracy by writing textbooks in the steppe // Opción*. – 2019. – № 35(88). – Pp. 543–566
- 5 Walzer M. *On Toleration*. – USA: Yale University Press, 1997. – 160 p.
- 6 Хан Б.-Ч. *Общество усталости*. – М.: Издательство АСТ, 2024. – 160 с.
- 7 Kierkegaard S. *Fear and Trembling*. – London: Penguin, 2003. – 178 p.

8 Гумилев Л.Н. Этногенез и биосфера Земли. – М.: Айрис-пресс, 2004. – 560 с.

9 Ясперс К. Смысл и назначение истории. – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – 527 с.

10 Левинас Э. Время и Другой. – СПб.: Высшая религиозно-философская школа, 1998. – С. 123–156.

11 Құнанбайұлы А. Қара сөздер. – Алматы: Аруна, 2022. – 128 б.

12 Floridi L. The Fourth Revolution: How the Info-sphere is Reshaping Human Reality. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. – 272 p.

13 Sen A. The Idea of Justice. – Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press Cambridge, 2009. – 92 p.

14 Pariser E. The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You. – London: Penguin Books, 2011. – 304 p.

15 Бір халық – бір ел – бір тағдыр // [Electronic resource] URL: https://el.kz/bir_khaly_-_-bir_el_-_-bir_tadyr_21882/ (accessed: 15.09.2025).

16 Поппер К. Открытое общество и его враги: в 2 т. – М.: Международный фонд «Культурная инициатива», 1992. – Т. 1. – 448 с.

Transliteration

1 Arendt H. The Human Condition. – Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998. – 372 p.

2 Kant I. Osnovy metafiziki i нравственности [Foundations of Metaphysics and Morality]. – М.: Izdatel'stvo AST, 2023. – Pp. 151–310. (in Russ)

3 Sartre Zh.-P. Ekzistentsializm – eto gumanizm [Existentialism is a Humanism]. – М.: Izdatel'stvo AST, 2025. – 160 p. (in Russ)

4 Turgunov Y., Abdimomynov Y., Smanov B., Shakhanova R., Najmanbaev A., Kenan K. The Problem of Elimination of Illiteracy by writing textbooks in the steppe // Opción. – 2019. – № 35(88). – Pp. 543–566

5 Walzer M. On Tolerance. – USA: Yale University Press, 1997. – 160 p.

6 Khan B.-Ch. Obshchestvo ustalosti [The Society of Fatigue]. – М.: Izdatel'stvo AST, 2024. – 160 p. (in Russ)

7 Kierkegaard S. Fear and Trembling. – London: Penguin, 2003. – 178 p.

8 Gumilev L.N. Etnogenez i biosfera Zemli [Ethno-genesis and the Biosphere of the Earth]. – М.: Iris-press, 2004. – 560 p. (in Russ)

9 Yaspers K. Smysl i naznachenie istorii [Meaning and Purpose of History]. – М.: Politizdat, 1991. – 527 p. (in Russ)

10 Levinas E. Vremya i Drugoy [Time and the Other]. – SPb.: Vysshaya religiozno-filosofskaya shkola, 1998. – Pp. 123–156. (in Russ)

11 Qunanbaiuly A. Qara sozder [The Book of Words]. – Almaty: Aruna, 2022. – 128 b. (in Kazakh)

12 Floridi L. The Fourth Revolution: How the Info-sphere is Reshaping Human Reality. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. – 272 p.

13 Sen A. The Idea of Justice. – Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press Cambridge, 2009. – 92 p.

14 Pariser E. The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You. – London: Penguin Books, 2011. – 304 p.

15 Bir khalyk – bir el – bir tagdyr // [Electronic resource] URL: https://el.kz/bir_khaly_-_-bir_el_-_-bir_tadyr_21882/ (accessed: 15.09.2025). (in Kaz)

16 Popper K. Otkrytoye obshchestvo i yego vragi: v 2 t. [The Open Society and Its Enemies: in 2 Volumes]. – М.: Mezhdunarodnyy fond «Kul'turnaya initsiativa», 1992. – Т. 1. – 448 s. (in Russ)

Author Contributions. Akhatova A. - selected the research topic and substantiated its relevance, conducted a review of the scientific literature, developed the theoretical and methodological framework of the study, collected and analyzed the research materials, wrote the main text of the article, and interpreted the research findings. Tursynbayeva A. - supervised the development of the scientific concept of the study, refined the research methodology, provided scientific guidance, conducted an expert review of the academic content of the article, improved the conclusions, and approved the final version of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to its publication.

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHORS

Aigul Akhatova

PhD student, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, email: aigul-479@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6876-1269

Aigul Tursynbaeva

Professor, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, email: aigul_73kz@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1900-2685

Айгүл Арысланқызы Ахатова

PhD докторант, Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан, email: aigul-479@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6876-1269

Айгүл Өмірбекқызы Тұрсынбаева

профессор, философия ғылымдарының кандидаты, Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан, email: aigul_73kz@mail.ru, ORCID ID:0000-0002-1900-2685

Айгуль Арыслановна Ахатова

PhD докторант, Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан, email: aigul-479@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6876-1269

Айгуль Омйрбекқызы Тұрсынбаева

профессор, кандидат философских наук, Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан, email: aigul_73kz@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1900-2685