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ABSTRACT
Freedom is a social category, has a long history, is considered from many different angles, associated with human activities, and has profound cultural - humanitarian significance. From the approach to value, when freedom is abolished, human dignity is offended, or the need arises for “more freedom”, the movements for freedom take shape and spread. Today, in the open space of globalization and international integration, many variations of liberalism are born and occupy a certain position in all areas of social life. Therefore, the article does not repeat the different notions of freedom and liberalism, but only draws from that one issue that is of concern - the issue of cultural behavior in the spirit of tolerance. The vivid expression of the sense of freedom and respect for cultural diversity in relations between nations and peoples is often interpreted through the lens of cultural tolerance, as determined by the United Nations such as the human aspiration to “transform the culture of war into a culture of peace” with the recognition of freedom and the possibility of dialogue between cultures.
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INTRODUCTION
As a social category, freedom is associated with the history of human development. The realization of freedom in each social community depends on the characteristics of historical standards, culture, customs, habits, and political institutions. This explains why in many European peoples there is a tendency to protect individual rights and freedoms, while in the East community cohesion requires that each individual activity needs to be based on group values, of the collective, ethnicity, nation. Historically, each era has introduced the content of the free category, which prescribes new problems, but all have in common is the expression of the unique human “life is species human”, which is of the historic way of being of man as “the free entity” (Marx & Engels, 2000, p. 134-135).

Up to now in countless conceptions of freedom, we pay attention to two approaches: one that emphasizes the dialectic of freedom and the inevitable or the like, and the approach associated with the feeling of the need to overcome obstacles in the path of perfecting the human I. This second approach is the inspiration for the free movements, the advent of liberalism and its specific forms. However, since liberalism goes through a long process, from classical liberalism to libertarianism, neoliberalism, through its various forms - mod harmony or extremism, different areas of social life, and often associated with the political tendencies of groups, communities, and parties, so the identification and classification of liberalism is a no-brainer stop and relative. Liberalism has many diverse expressions: Some delegate’s emphasized freedom in the economic realm, while others emphasized freedom in the areas of politics, culture, society, and morality. Their differences are also reflected in the way in which individual freedoms are exercised. The problem that we wish to clarify in this article is the interpretation of the basis of liberalism, the sense of freedom, and cultural behavior in the context of globalization today.

LITERATURE REVIEW
In countless movements, philosophical doctrine, contemporary politics, in our opinion, there are 4 main pillars: socialism, democracy movement, liberalism, and ideology opposing it - Conservativism. If the category of libertarian is the generalization of human activity, the
manifestation of human values and nature, then the category of liberalism refers to an intimate need and does not appear to be the endpoint - the need for “more freedom” in all aspects of the activity, that is, the human right to achieve his own personal goal, the right to overcome limitations that they consider unreasonable. The struggle for freedom in human history proves that, where freedom is not met, people are ready to step up to fight for freedom.

The deep roots of liberalism include liberal-oriented thinkers such as the Cynics, Epicurus, and Epicureanism in ancient Greece, the Renaissance humanist ideology with the aspiration of individual liberation from theocracy, free thought of philosophers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such as J. Locke, D. Hume, C.L. Montesquieu, F.M. Voltaire, J.J. Rousseau, D. Diderot, P. Holbach, Enlightenment and Classical German Philosophy (I. Kant, J.W. Goethe, W. Humboldt) nineteenth-century European-American philosophy - politics (I. Bentham, J.S. Mill), the classical political economy of English (A. Smith, D. Ricardo).

In the approach of the relationship between freedom and inevitability, thinkers often point out the direction of human activity, the goal that man should reach. For example, Aristotle considered the problem of freedom of choice, choose as a human blueprint of yourself. In the spirit of free choice, in “Loyalty” theory, Aristotle requires that man “choose the best from the good for personal and community life”, “accompanied by reason and thought” (Aristotle, 1974, p. 94). The principle of fidelity demands this, which is associated with justice by Aristotle (Aristotle, 1974, p. 182). Aristotle gives a series of examples of the ability to choose the best, overcoming extremes, excesses: courage is “neutral” between recklessness and cowardice, generosity is a beautiful choice between wastefulness and stingy, honesty is a virtue, as opposed to boastful and reserved, etc. (Aristotle, 1974, pp. 106, 127 & 158).

Rapid changes in near and modern history have created an explosion of conceptions of freedom, from a somewhat pessimistic approach to the place of man in the universe to the sanctification of sub-nature a person as a free creative subject (Monod, 1973, pp. 172-173). The Renaissance cultural movement is the attempt to overcome the obstacles of the medieval ideology, promote creative activities of “standard deviation” to pave the way for history to move forward, to take the image of the human person to freedom as the center, replacing “dominion of God” (Regnum Dei) with human domination (Regnum Hominis). “Standard deviation” The story of Alighieri Dante in Divina Commedia (Divina Commedia, 1308) is a way of borrowing the old form to convey a new message, overcoming the barrier of Christian theology. “Standard deviation” in such an expression is often associated with the process of “re-realizing”, creating a new value system, promoting freedom of thought.

In the Middle Ages, acts contrary to “normative thinking”, that is, thought which is dominated by theology, is often attributed to the deviation. However, such “standard deviations” behavior, especially in cultural creation, heralds the new and the progressive. Renaissance culture in Western Europe is a testament to this spirit, it both expresses the desire to return to ancient values (because the present, the feudal ideology which is considered the “standard thinking” turns out. it is the stagnation, the restraining factor), considering the values created from the ancient Greek-Roman culture really the “norm” (classics), just setting the foundation for development next.

The signs of “standard deviation” take place in almost every field of perception and practice: literature, art, science, philosophy, politics, and religion. In literary and artistic creation, secular and non-religious nature is associated with the breaking of outdated norms, paving the way for the movement of freedom of thought and culture to free people from belief. Goodness and beauty are perceived again on the basis of promoting realism and natural values. In Copernicus’ heliocentric science shakes the spiritual orthodoxy of the church, bringing people closer to the universe. Even a field with little change like religion has undergone major changes, which is the Religious Reform movement initiated by M. Luther, creating a new polarization in European religious and political forces., though viewed by the Vatican as a deviation, as a destructive factor for the unity of Christianity. The individual’s “rebellion” does not transcend the framework of the contemporary social order, but heralds its inevitable crisis (Ferguson, 1948, pp. 305-332). The
Renaissance humanists, from Petrarch onwards, were interested in Plato and Aristotle not only in speculation and logic, but also in matters of ethics, aesthetics, culture, politics, and society, and at the same time adapting these issues to the demands of the coming new age, the era of human liberation - the individual from the oppression of theocracy (Constance Blackwell & Sachiko Kusukawa, 1999, pp. 1-15).

After Aristotle, in modern times, T. Hobbes discussed “civic freedom” as freedom within the framework of the law, not freedom to do whatever you want, not physical freedom (Edwin, 1957, p. 197). “Freedom and inevitably agree with each other,” he affirmed. For example, the river’s water is not only free but also inevitable to flow along. We also see this unity in action voluntarily taken by everyone. Indeed, because voluntary actions take place out of the human will, they take place out of freedom” (Edwin, 1957, pp. 196-197). But the political model that Hobbes pursues as a realization of his idea of inevitability-freedom is a historic regression, pulling Britain back into the authoritarian state in the image of Leviathan. In other words, the model is no different from an insult to human dignity. Thus, J. Locke “adapted” Hobbes to suit the historical conditions of England after the Glorious Revolution (1688).

For Locke, in nature before and outside man the concept of freedom and not freedom cannot be reconciled. They only mean where human relationships exist, mutual demands, arrangements, and disagreements, etc. Locke promotes basic human rights, including the right to life, freedom Ownership, in which the right is associated with human nature is the impetus that motivates people to act and create r values, in order to maintain life, to create essential values. Rights, freedoms, and ownership in Locke’s understanding are not arranged, externally distributed, unrelated, but a system of fundamental rights, interconnected. Freedom in a narrow sense such as freedom to vote, freedom to design and pursue purposes, freedom of belief, etc. will be more or less vulnerable if it is not given the freedom to use one’s personal life energy and freely use the products they make, which contain both the desires and the subjective goals that we pursue. Freedom of possession is compromised and limited if it is pervasive for things and only stops there.

Thus, in Locke, private ownership is particularly focused on the natural right system. It contains within itself the right to life and freedom - fighting to protect the property we have created as a privilege God gives is to protect the right to life, the right to use the fruits of our labor freely (in the system of social relations). Locke presented ownership sometimes as the most common political institution - the rule of law. Once freedom is taken away, the remaining rights - the right to life and possession - are also lost. It is no coincidence K. Marx sees Locke as “the father of freedom of thought” and that spirit “was brought from England to France” (Marx & Engels, 2005, p. 293).

Thus, the polarity of freedom is not necessarily something unnatural, but coercion, violence, imposition, domination, or something similar. Freedom, on the contrary, always shows harmonious relationships with each other in the spirit of mutual recognition and understanding between people. The state and society need to recognize each individual in the event that these individuals recognize each other and join the system of social relations. Locke’s natural rights shaped the political ideal - the rule of law, in which each human being is an active subject of labor - possession - freedom. Liberal thought that began with Locke continued to receive new ideas, gathered in human and civil rights, as an affirmation of the inviolable nature of the right granted from God. He emphasized: “Even if it is possible to make a mistake, the purpose of the law is not to destroy or suppress freedom, but to preserve and expand it, etc. where there is no law, there is no self-do” (Locke, 2007, p. 93). And the rule of law, with the protection and institutionalization of human rights, including freedom, has itself a divine meaning.

Looking at the state of France in the 60s of the eighteenth century, J.J. Rousseau pondered: “Man is born free, but everywhere lives in chains” (Jean Jacques Rousseau, 1963, p. 9). Point out the social basis of slavery, that the history of man is the history of the struggle for freedom, the struggle to “break that oppressive yoke”. Freedom is “from human nature,” so “renouncing one’s freedom
means renouncing human dignity, renouncing the right to be human and the obligation to be human” (Rousseau, 1963, pp. 10 & 13).

Inheriting L. Feuerbach’s understanding of the meaning of human “species life”, K. Marx criticizes the present society which shuffles human dignity: man is only free when he does the function of animal life (instinct), but when performing the functions of human (society), it is no longer a free entity. He writes: “Human (worker) only feels he is acting freely while performing his animal functions - eating, drinking, giving birth, mostly in housing, in jewelry, etc. but in his human functions he feels that he is only an animal. What is inherent in animals becomes a human function, and what is human becomes what is inherent to animals” (Marx & Engels, 2000, p. 133). To overcome corruption, man, instead of dreaming of a Feuerbach-style “religion of love”, where each can become God (Feuerbach, 1989, p. 271), needs to do historical manipulation “reverses” existing relations, “returns to oneself as a social man”, this return “agrees with humanism” (Marx and Engels, 2000, p. 167).

At the same time as K. Marx, J.S. Mill is seen as the eminent figure of liberalism. According to Mill, man - the individual is lord to oneself, “his body and his soul” (Edwin, 1957, p. 956), so “when humanity attains its power,” according to Mill. Self-fulfilling, etc. coercion, whether in the direct form or through the threat of punishment, etc. is unacceptable” (Edwin, 1957, p. 957). The reason for the emergence of freedom movements in the UK is clarified in his work - On Liberty. The paradox of freedom is mentioned by many near and modern thinkers, from B. Pascal, F. Voltaire, L. Feuerbach, M. Stirner, A. Schopenhauer, F. Nietzsche, N. Berdyaev, P. Tillich, E Fromm, J.P. Sartre, A. Camus, etc. Paul Tillich expressed pessimism at the secrets of human nature, expressed through expressions that seem chaotic, irrational, difficult to measure determined by physical measures and “programmed” inferences. In a bitter mood, he thinks that this secularized world makes us look at evil more deeply than previous generations, the desire for freedom becomes the illusion of freedom (Tillich, 1961, pp. 382-384).

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The liberal tendencies

After the crisis of 1929 - 1930, in ideological activities, people mentioned a number of names following the liberal tendency from the late nineteenth century to that time such as Th. Green, L. Brentano, L. Hobhouse, J. Keynes, B. Ohlin. A pragmatic philosopher inclined to uphold freedom and democracy in society and education - J. Dewey (1859-1952) - also became famous for his serious evocations of liberalism. great. The number of thinkers of liberalism in various forms continues to extend: J. Kenneth Galbraith, J. Rawls, R.Dahrendorf, M. Friedman, K. Brunner, F. Hayek, L. Erhard, Jacques L. Rueff, David Fraser Nolan, V.S. Nersesians, Avram Noam Chomsky, Henry George, J.Rawls, etc.

Liberalism has many forms of expression in all areas of social life, such as political liberalism (requiring the overthrow of an anti-humanist regime, instead of a “rational”, humanist regime. cultural, promoting the individual as the foundation of law and society, recognizing the basic rights of citizens), cultural liberalism (liberating the individual’s creativity from barriers, gender unreasonable, critical of government interference in personal life, emphasizing the individual’s right to self-defense against inhumane forces, etc.), economic liberalism (requires removing barriers trade, accept the natural results of the competition, support private property rights, freedom of union, agreement, the anti-state monopoly in some traditional fields in a market economy, etc.), capitalism Due to society (each individual has the right to access and satisfy basic social needs such as education, medical care, employment opportunities, and to prevent harmful effects beyond control. in favor of a major easing tax books for activities with the meaning of social welfare; antitrust and price controls for the best interests of citizens.

In Western countries, social liberalism tolerates a number of elements of Marxism, including the critique of the situation of exploiters, requiring each individual to have access to achievements. of economy, culture, and education, enjoying those achievements, requiring price control, antitrust, ensuring social welfare, towards community benefits. Social liberals demand the state to have a
greater role in creating a free environment for human activity, for the ubiquity of social policies (pensions support), health care, welfare, scientific and art support, etc.), responsible coordination between the state and private organizations.

In short, the name liberalism, seen as a movement for freedom, proves that freedom has been questioned, that is, the need for freedom is not met, or is not fulfilled. Liberalism, in that sense, is a doctrine that calls on man to transcend the limits and prohibitions imposed on him by the society under certain historical conditions. In Western countries, liberalism is associated with the tendency of ideological pluralism, promoting individualism in the ontological aspect, that is to define each individual as an autonomous, self-regulated entity, has unique, non-repetitive qualities. The struggle for individual autonomy and self-regulation against universalism, the mechanical “dissolution” of the individual into the community, is also a struggle for individual freedom. Multiply. For example, existentialism (existentialism) is the ontology of the person - the individual, attempting to determine the specific mode of human existence. From the “being is what it is” approach (L'être est ce qu'il est), J.P. Sartre speaks of the person - the individual as a “project” and “futuristic subject” (Sartre, 1948, p. 33). He emphasized the uniqueness of the human subject; uniqueness is not understood in the sense that there is nothing else other than man, but in the sense that everything else, when compared with “human”, appears to be small, insignificant. In addition, accepting and promoting individual autonomy also requires personal responsibility to the community (Jan & Tariq, 2011, p. 28).

Liberalism was born with the message of fighting against harsh political, social, religious, cultural, and scientific control. The fight for freedom is a struggle to eliminate the limits of man’s political, physical, and spiritual freedom. The repression, the unsatisfying mood of the human need, the desire to protest, and the desire to overcome the obstacles to achieve his goal are the thriller of liberalism; it is expressed in the discourse “free before B, let P”, in which P is used to indicate an action (select appropriate action), and B is an obstruction (individual, social).

However, liberal movements are sometimes abused for purposes of counteracting historical movements. The phenomenon of “identity corruption” and “identity stubbornness” is one of the examples of differences in the concept of freedom, of the relationship between the common and the particular, between the interests of humanity, and national interests.

After the collapse of the socialist paradigm in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, “liberalism” movements mushroomed. In Russia, for example, no fewer than ten movements called “freedom” were formed, some of which approached extremist nationalism, neo-fascism, and royalism. That is not to mention the term “free” is distorted into political games Identifying liberalism, classifying its variables is not a simple job. Socio-political practice can only be used as the most effective measure of an idea once it enters that environment.

Liberalism and cultural behavior in the spirit of tolerance

According to the above-mentioned approach, liberalism often takes shape in a pluralistic political space and contains elements of tolerance. Besides, in classical and modern liberalism, there is always a process of self-criticism, adjustment, against adventurism, willpower, insatiable order and at all costs, order- anti-freedom, that is, the order of selfishness, regardless of the loss of freedom of other people, communities or countries.

Sometimes, a country proclaims itself a symbol of freedom but imposes a political model on another in a non-democratic, even anti-human way, whose victims are innocent civilians. The political changes in the late twentieth century and now show this. Therefore, cultural behavior in relations between nations and peoples has become an urgent need in the age of globalization, the era when the world is “flattened”, but there are also many places that “have not yet reached flatten”. The “not flattened” world can be found in the book of Friedman “The World is flat” (Friedman, 2006, pp. 656, 663, 665 & 671).

Globalization has a significant impact on the movement trend of society. The “collision” of civilizations, multi-dimensional notions of standards and values can lead to the stress in handling arising situations, anxiety about conflicting changes in life of economic, political and cultural life.
In that complex context, the search for the ability to narrow differences, resolve contradictions, is associated with the responsibility not only of a nation, but also of the region and the world, in which respect the choice of each nation and nation on its path of development, respect for individual freedom in vital relationship with the community’s interests, the principle of “patience” in behavior between nation, ie the popular culture of tolerance, is the condition for the formation of a human value system, ensuring a “eternal peace”, as the message that I. Kant once pointed out more 250 years (Kant, 1977, p. 72). To do so, the return to the roots of “species life” (an expression by K. Marx in “Manuscript of economics - philosophy in 1844”) of man - natural human needs and the capacity for such satisfaction - becomes necessary. In other words, returning to the concept of freedom, in order to interpret the essential problems of human life, has always been a topical concern.

Recognizing peoples’ free choice for the path of development, recognizing cultural diversity, the capacity for dialogue, sharing, interest and mutual learning between countries synonymous with multiculturalism - an ideology that focuses much on the issue of “cultural autonomy”. Tolerant behavior in culture on the basis of respecting the freedom of the peoples is linked with the anti-unipolarism process, assimilation and cultural isolationism. Anti-monopole, that is, against cultural imposition. Anti-assimilation means to fight against all cultural oppression, imposition and “dissolve”, and eliminate the I-culture of all ethnic groups, ethnic groups and communities. Against isolationism, that is against “identity stubbornness”, persevering in cultural endogenous factors, not accepting the new to develop in “openness” to nations and nations other family.

At the global level, respect for cultural diversity in line with the philosophy of tolerance, popularized by the United Nations as the principle of global conduct, replacing “culture of war” with “culture of peace”. In the Declaration on the Principles of Tolerance published by UNESCO in the United Nations (1995), the term “tolerance” refers to “the respect, reception and correct understanding of the rich diversity of platforms the culture of our world, our forms of self-expression and the way of expressing our individuality”. In the concept of tolerance contains “knowledge, openness, conscience and righteous thoughts”. Tolerance shows harmony in diversity. It is not only a moral obligation, but also a political and legal need. “Tolerance - it is a quality capable of achieving peace and allows the culture of war to be replaced by the culture of peace. Tolerance is first and foremost a positive relationship, established on the basis of the recognition of universal human rights and fundamental freedoms. It is not concessions, condescension or indulgence. Tolerance - it is the responsibility that facilitates the assertion of human rights, pluralism (including cultural pluralism), democracy and the legal order. Tolerance - it is a concept of rupture with dogmaticism, with the absoluteization of truth and the affirmation of established norms in international legal life in the realm of human rights.

The expression of tolerance means respect for human rights, does not mean tolerance towards inequality, renouncing one’s rights, or giving in to unfamiliar views. That means each person is free to pursue his or her own opinion and acknowledge the rights of others, etc. Do not impose one’s opinion on others. At the state level, the Declaration clearly states: “Tolerance requires fair and impartial legality, compliance with legal order and judicial standards - procedural and administrative, etc. To make society become should be tolerant, etc. each individual person, community, and nation should recognize and respect the cultural pluralism of human society.

Peace is difficult to achieve without tolerance, and development and democracy will be difficult to achieve without peace” (UNESCO, 1995). The Declaration also criticizes the intolerance of the treatment of unprotected communities, as well as violence and discrimination. This behavior has a positive meaning in identifying the picture of today’s complex and complex ideological and cultural activities in the world. In response to the United Nations Declaration of Tolerance, many countries around the world see cultural tolerance as a fundamental principle in domestic and foreign policies (MaykelVerkuyten, 2019, p.17-18).
In the book “The World is Flat”, Friedman emphasizes, the culture of tolerance “is the expression of open culture” (Friedman, 2006 p. 594); It always puts people in the position to expand cooperation, no matter what race, ethnic group, country, the important thing is talent and ability to communicate, cooperate, “many people who cooperate with many people do not know and have never met” (Friedman, 2006 p. 595).

“Identity stubbornness” and “identity corruption” are extreme expressions of the concept of freedom in the age of globalization. “Stubborn identity” is the freedom to choose a particular path of development, but standing on the sidelines of human concerns, not accepting to expand relations with the world in order to maintain identity. However, it is a manifestation of isolationism in international relations, low self-esteem, and conservativism. “Identity corruption” is a consequence of the dissolution of identity, the loss of the national self, and the departure from tradition. Identity corruption, seen from a global approach, is a contagious loss of national characteristics when participating in international rules of the game that have not been actively prepared. Due to the imposition of foreign motifs or norms, the “deviation” of value from the “archetype” is increasing. J. Derrida, the French futurist, one of the proponents of the spirit of “decoding” in culture, once addressed the risk of breaking or distorting a cultural tradition in the face of the diffusion of rules of the game equity (Jacques Derrida, 2004; Marx, 1994, p. 172 - 177).

Overcoming the situation of “identity stubbornness” and “identity corruption” requires cultural behavior in accordance with global trends, while maintaining and promoting national cultural features, which are preserved in the depths of the history of each nation. That is the dialectic of the common (human factors) - the specifics (national factors). Besides, it is impossible not to encourage the new, the creative, to overcome the path, opening up new horizons for development in the “flat world” - the globalized world. Today the creative disruption, or “breaking the pattern” is attracting the attention of society. Postmodernism, the process of going from structuralism and the structural method to deconstruction, individual fragmentation, and non-central transformation - are all posing new needs, the need for adaptation and “self-design” to be more proactive in the face of rapid changes in reality, or say as A. Toffler, when the future comes too fast, forcing us to be proactive in formulating appropriate scenarios for a life of mankind.

CONCLUSION

The world today appears like a multicolored and complex picture, with the intertwining of different lines and tendencies, including both opportunities and challenges, advantages and disadvantages in human relations, and nature, between people and people, between nations, peoples, religions in the process of globalization, “flattening the world” and its consequences, both positive and negative. Identifying, analyzing, and evaluating the global picture, thereby identifying key trends, overcoming challenges and difficulties, towards an open world, a “world-wide state” as the wish of Generations have become the needs and responsibilities of nations, peoples, each individual. If freedom is understood as the dignity and nature of the human person, the respect for the choice of the development path of each nation and people in accordance with its traditions and identity is the basis for a culture of tolerance and eternal peace, as the United Nations Declaration of Tolerance started more than 25 years ago.
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