

Tolerance in vertical, or patrimonial societies: perspectives from a vertical society

Sheikha Al-Shamsi

PhD candidate, Mohamed Bin Zayed University for Humanities

Abstract

This paper provides an analysis of tolerance in vertical, or patrimonial societies from the perspective of someone in a vertical society. It discusses how the structure of a vertical society can either enable or hinder the development of different types of values related to tolerance and uses examples from efforts of the United Arab Emirates to enable tolerance as a social value. It does this using a social structure framework called vertical relationships and discusses how vertical and patrimonial societies in modernity and the era of globalization pose a number of moral and ethical challenges in the face of pervasive voices of freedom and rights of all kinds at the hands of multiple governments and social action groups. It concludes with a discussion of the types of values that can be nourished in vertical societies to enable positive tolerance and peaceful co-existence.

Introduction

Many traditional societies have cultures based on vertical, or patrimonial social relations,¹ meaning that the will of one party prevails over another in the relationship, and is represented in dual forms such as the ruler and the ruled, the project owner and the workers, the father and the son, the professor and the student, etc. It is centered on receiving orders from an authority. A dominant party enjoys asymmetric influence over the submissive party, not necessarily due to inherently poor vertical relations, but rather due to a poor understanding of the vertical social system and how to navigate the system. Such traditional societies are often accused of abusing human rights because of a lack of tolerance for individual rights on a more horizontal, or civil society plane.

Modern societies tend to adopt the culture of horizontal relations alongside that of the vertical, which shapes social action in a regular network of relationships between vertical and horizontal, so that it enables partnership in decision making and achieving goals, and manifests itself in dialogue, criticism, negotiation, and deliberation. This is where the social value of tolerance is critical for effective dialogue and engagement, as it is the means by which patterns of social relations are organized to achieve the values of justice, freedom, respect and equality.

The Problem

It is hardly possible for a society to be devoid of religious pluralism and cultural diversity in a globalized world and in an era of cosmopolitanism, which is characterized by the era of freedoms and rights of all sorts. Societies with patrimonial cultures are often seen as obstacles for the rights of minorities living in their areas. The difficulty of activating tolerance in patrimonial cultures can be particularly seen in efforts to maintain public order, where the ruling party, tribe, family or class limits the freedoms of minorities in the name of national security. So the concept of tolerance loses its meaning in such societies because it's seen as a political tool, rather than a universal value. This creates a sort of dilemma for the concept of tolerance, with its ideal of love and harmony clashing with political realities. So how is the value of tolerance manifested in pragmatic relationships? What are the stereotypes that restrict the value of tolerance in patrimonial societies? What are the values that support tolerance so that minorities might accept majority authority? What type of tolerance in patrimonial societies maintains acceptable standards for any cultural or religious group?

Research question

This paper analyses variations of tolerance that prevail in patrimonial societies and proposes ways to address intolerance and nurture the value of tolerance in these types of societies.

Overarching research question:

- How is tolerance manifested in the system of vertical relations?
- What values are needed in vertical societies to enable tolerance?

Methods

The study follows the descriptive analytical approach, by using the literature on social structure and the psychology of tolerance in human understanding, and then describes the nature of the vertical relationships in patrimonial societies, in order to analyze how tolerance is experienced in vertical societies. The paper starts with discussing the concept of vertical relationships (or patrimonial societies) and tolerance. It then discusses obstacles to tolerance in vertical relationships including inherent stereotypes. The paper then discusses how tolerance can be nurtured in vertical or patrimonial societies.

Vertical relationships

Within the theories of sociology is a framework of social structure called vertical and horizontal relationships.² Additionally, Max Weber provides a framework for understanding how patrimonialism operates in kin-based societies, which is relevant to societies in the Arab world.³ Vertical relations are a form of social relations that appear at several levels in societies systems in addition to horizontal relations. Patrimonialism is a type of society where all power flows directly from a ruler or a ruling family or class. In this study, the focus is on vertical relationships, in which a higher authority is determined. Vertical and patrimonial societies in modernity and the era of globalization pose a number of moral and ethical challenges in the face of pervasive voices of freedom and rights of all kinds at the hands of multiple governments and social action groups. This is a prelude to determining the place of tolerance in the pattern of this relationship and dismantling its obstructing and intolerant aspects. To answer the research questions we will begin by analyzing the nature of the pattern of vertical relationships and its data, in order to clarify its boundaries and determine the centrality of its circulation.

The topic of vertical relations is used in more than one field when studying social relations. This study uses the framework of Daniel Lerner in studying social development.⁴ In order to determine the level of media influence on society, he divides social relations into two parts, which are:

- Vertical:** in which the differentiation is dependent on the inherited identity of tribal, sectarian, religious or gender.
- Horizontal:** in which differentiation is according to the individual's choice of a profession, religious or cultural party, or even belonging to the borders of a land and belonging to a people.

Traditional societies often follow the vertical structure and submit to the source of dependency. This implies that it is a challenge for traditional societies to accept new social patterns and accommodate the new groups. On the other hand, economic-based societies tend to follow the horizontal structure in establishing their relationships on a horizontal pattern that follows public norms in order to establish a public interest. The dynamics of modernization and renewal is faster and easier in a horizontal society. It is worth noting that vertical and horizontal structures are not mutually exclusive in terms of presence in society, as both are required to organize and stabilize the network of relationships in the public interest. However, the paradox in the feasibility of serving the stability and development of society remains the extent to which the both vertical and horizontal structures are needed to different degrees of development.

From this, it can be noted that the pattern of vertical relationships in which the parties concerned have a fixed relationship with them, meaning that the less powerful party acknowledges the dominance of the other more powerful party, abides by its orders, and submits to its influence, and it cannot be handed over to anyone else from the perspective of the relationship. It is clear from this that the less powerful party in the relationship is dependent upon the more powerful one, and in an Hobbesian way, must give the more powerful party a measure of its will and voice to maintain security in society. This will is required because without it, the power to protect and care for the other party would not have been granted.

To clarify the matter, we can represent the relationship of the state with the inhabitants of its land. The will of the authority imposes hegemony over the borders of the state for everyone within these borders and ensuring a good life for them and defending their rights. In return, everyone who enters these borders accepts the authority of the state by adhering to its laws in order to achieve their interests in living, and from here the pattern of the vertical relationship is evident with a fruitful balance, such as the Hindu's acceptance of the authority of the law of the UAE when he resides there by respecting the procedures of the authority on its land, in exchange for the state guaranteeing the requirements of his decent living that give him a right to worship according to his religion, including his need for a place of worship. This vertical relationship can explain how the UAE government gave permission to build a Hindu temple in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi to meet the needs of the Hindu minority within the borders of its land and opened to the public in February 2024.

It can be said that vertical relationships are those in which the entities concerned have a fixed relationship between them. The relationship proceeds in a certain way, in that certain entities enjoy greater authority over other entities, in exchange for less authority in the same relationship. To be sure, the most important thing that distinguishes the nature of vertical relationships is influence. It has the power of influence in exchange for acceptance from the other party, which is a feature that assigns it the responsibility of caring for and protecting the less powerful party. Therefore, this power is necessary in the pattern of vertical relationships in society, with the values of empathy, compassion, and kindness that transform into influence. Because of the possibility of harmonious acceptance of the relationship, vertical integration occurs that enables each party to decide its presence in the pattern, such as the Emirates Council issuing a legal fatwa, representing the state's responsibility towards members of society, permissible to congratulate non-Muslims on their religious holidays, which is a step taken by the institution as a deterrent to extremist movements that spread hatred between religions. Its image was distorted, so the role of the authority, based on its vertical relationship, was to protect those who accepted its authority, to defend them, and to confirm their right to friendly coexistence and peaceful residency in society.

This explains the need to link the attributes of wisdom, knowledge, and honesty with governance found in the sacred writings of world religions. For example, the prophet of God, Joseph, spoke these words, asked for authority, he said: "Put me in charge of the treasures of the earth. Indeed, I am a guardian and all-knowing." Surat Yusuf, verse 55. Preservation is related to fulfilling the trust and taking care of the right of responsibility. As for knowledge, it is a source of wisdom and insight in managing matters and determining the fates of events and people according to the scale of justice and truth. When someone misses authority in vertical relationships, such as a ruler, for example, there is no doubt that the result will be the anger and frustration of the governed. The loss of insight in making decisions or lack of cooperation in dealing with others or the lack of mercy illustrate some of the disadvantages of an authoritative power in the pattern of vertical relations. With a pluralistic society, it is of utmost importance for a diverse society like the UAE for there to be cooperation with the public and trust in the government. Over 80% of its population is foreign workers who come from diverse religious and cultural backgrounds. Many of the countries of those foreign works have internal religious tensions or are involved in religious conflicts. Importing politically charged religious sensitivities to the UAE would be a great security concern if those foreign workers felt grievances in a vertical society such as the UAE. In an effort to make foreign workers feel at home and to encourage religious harmony in society, the UAE grants worshiping privileges for non-Muslims who respect the law, which in turn guarantees freedoms for all individuals. This is a reason for enacting the Anti-Discrimination and Hatred Law in July 2015, which is a law that criminalizes actions related to contempt of religions and their sanctities, and combating all forms of discrimination and hatred through various means and methods of expression.

The position of the dominant power in a vertical society is both sensitive and precise, requiring comprehensiveness and understanding. As for comprehensiveness, it is taking into account all the individuals of the other party, regardless of their differences, diversity, and multiplicity, and their leadership in what achieves safety for all of them, and not satisfaction, because it will often be impossible to satisfy every individual and every difference due to the presence of contradictory oppositions. In fact, it is not the mission of the dominant authority to satisfy all entities religious interests, but rather its mission is to enable an environment of safe coexistence and harmony. As for harmony, it is understanding the specific differences of individuals and searching for what brings them together organically in one environment, which creates aspects of common ground based on the values of unity of a common destiny. Emphasizing harmony enables belonging and unity for all. The UAE government has sought to take into account the common ground among social and religious groups. Its vision of religious harmony is illustrated by the signing of the Document on Human Fraternity on February 4, 2019, between Pope Francis and the Grand Imam, Sheikh of Al-Azhar Al-Shari in Abu Dhabi. Hence, the role of the dominant authority in the structure of vertical relations, if not performed faithfully, can lead to an intrusive misuse of power with coercion and submission, which fosters persecution, hatred, anger and contempt.

To better understand vertical relations, we must compare them with their horizontal counterpart, and it can be summarized in several points, namely:

- Vertical relations are between forces of varying authority, while horizontal relations are between forces of equal power level.
- Vertical relations are balanced by the means of understanding between its parties, and horizontal relations are balanced by the means of appropriate cooperation between its parties.
- Vertical and horizontal relationships are integrated in organizing the network of community relationships. For example: coworkers share a horizontal relationship, while they have a vertical relationship with the team leader.
- The most prominent problem that may arise from vertical relationships if they are not invested well is: oppression, while the most prominent problem that may arise from horizontal relationships if they are not invested well is competition.

Therefore, the existence of vertical relations is based on the will of authority. It imposes its hegemony with the powers it possesses that the other party accepts to harness to it in order to enable its existence with care and protection, on the condition that it accepts the centrality of the will of authority, which provides the opportunity to manage coexistence between all differences. So how can a higher authority tolerate the religious and cultural preferences of different individuals in order to achieve the interest of peaceful coexistence, and how does one accept a lesser authority that sees itself as a minority in exchange for submission to the higher authority?

In the next section, we discuss the concept of tolerance as a perception present in types of social relationships.

Tolerance

The concept of tolerance has been associated in historical memory with a general definition: (acceptance of difference), especially after the famous book by Voltaire in 1763, *Traite on Tolerance*, which came as a result of a prolonged conflict between the Catholic Church and Protestantism.⁵ However, further consideration of this general definition leads us to the extent of voluntary action? The moral meaning is conditional on freedom of conviction, not indifference. Does tolerance include involuntary acceptance? Or acceptance with indifference, or acceptance with complete conviction and feeling? All of this directs us to the definition of tolerance. Michael Walzer believes that indifference towards accepting difference is a means and introduction to the marginalization of tolerance, while other thinkers refuse to consider indifference as part of tolerance.⁶ Simply put, when we are not indifferent to something, we have not accepted it in the first place, as it is very far from the true concept of tolerance in embodying acceptance of difference. Because acceptance is a voluntary act governed by a perception based on the presence of an incentive to reject or accept, the embodiment of tolerance is through an attitude, while indifference is the absence of an attitude.

The concept of tolerance is considered one of the concepts of a synthetic nature in itself. In it, descriptive and normative moral relationships intervene, and the components of its meanings overlap the basis of which Sheikh Abdullah Bin Bayah distinguished according to the extrapolation of the Holy Qur'an, from which we consider a source of moral significance, and its discourse determines the significance due to the reciprocal relationship between the tolerant and the tolerated with the word *tasammuh* in Arabic comes from:

- Tesdon
- Forgiveness
- Forgive
- Isaan

The values of tolerance are only positioned as a means of manifesting other values, the most important of which are justice, freedom, respect, and equality, which confirm the existence of conditional restrictions that distinguish the recognition of tolerance at the level of principle from the level of implementation, in addition to the difference in the use of the concept in relationships at the level of the horizon than at the level.

Given the intertwining of relationships and the overlapping levels of use of value, thinkers raise a problem regarding the moral standard for the concept of tolerance: Is it a virtue or a vice? Friedrich Nietzsche believes that tolerance is a vice because it contains in its essence an explicit acknowledgment of giving up what is right,⁷ that is, it is self-denial. While Rainer Forst refuses to evaluate the concept of tolerance on the basis of virtue and morals,⁸ considering that its value is only upright if it is harmonized in the context of other supporting concepts such as justice, equality and respect. That is, a partial view of the reality of tolerance in isolation from its social context appears as an abandonment of the position of the self, while its positive originality appears in the place of its connection to the social context in interacting with concepts of other moral values and determining their positive meanings.

From this we are assured that the conceptual analysis of tolerance requires that it be initially based on subjective elements that establish the components of the concept. For this reason, Peter Nicholson presents to us in his research entitled (Tolerance as a Moral Example) six components in order to define tolerance, which are:

- Deviation
- The importance
- Not agreeing
- Power
- Not to refuse
- Righteousness

The details of the statement will come in the discussion of the truth of the approved in light of the vertical relationship, and what we want to emphasize here is that these components represent the minimum definition, meaning that it represents the starting point in the manifestation of tolerance, as it contains a number of sub-conceptions in which the nature of the relationship between the tolerant and the tolerated is distinguished. In addition to the quality of the relationship, is it equal or equal relative to the level of the horizon or the vertical?

Hence, we must acknowledge basic points regarding dealing with the concept of tolerance before revealing it from the perspective of vertical relations, which are:

- Tolerance is a conceptual word with two aspects, descriptive and normative, that leads to different subtypes and degrees depending on its connection to other concepts such as freedom, recognition, justice, respect, equality, and others.
- The concept of tolerance is not determined on the basis of a moral virtue or a vice except by its harmony with other moral concepts and its consistency with their components. It is a dependent concept, not independent in itself, and it is governed by moral values.
- Tolerance is a dense concept that is based on components in terms of itself, such as deviation, importance, disagreement, authority, non-rejection, and righteousness, or in terms of its relationships, such as pardon, forgiveness, forgiveness, and benevolence. Therefore, it is based on a minimum definition that translates the meaning of accepting difference in its broad meaning, which in turn constitutes a starting point in the definition.⁹ Manifestations of its types and degrees.

On the basis of this, we will discuss in the next chapter the most prominent stereotypical perceptions that hinder the manifestation of the reality of tolerance at the level of vertical relations.

Obstacles to tolerance in vertical relationships

To clarify the position of tolerance in the nature of vertical relationships, we must first acknowledge the level of need for this type of pattern, on the basis of which we can determine the importance of the tool of tolerance in it, and through that the aspects hindering its manifestation will emerge.

Regarding the formation of intolerant stereotypes within vertical relationships, one can be guided by what behavioral psychologist Aladdin Kafaf described as the nature of the relationships that surround the child as he grows up and is raised. He emphasizes that, in the course of early childhood social development, children need to develop two different types of relationships, namely: both vertical and horizontal relationships.¹⁰ Neither of them can be dispensed with the other. The verticality that is the subject of our research involves the child being linked to a person who has power and social influence. That is, he has a higher authority over him, and possesses additional ability and knowledge over him, such as a father, a teacher, and an older brother. Kafaf confirms that these are relationships that can be described as complementary, but they are not reciprocal. As a complementary relationship, that is, it adds to both parties in the relationship, it establishes care and protection through the elements of authority, will, and power possessed by the higher party, and adds empowerment to the needs required by the other party.

It should also be noted that the complementary nature of the quality of vertical relationships does not mean that it is an addition that can be dispensed with; rather, it means that it complements an aspect of each party whose components are owned by the other party, and they are not equal in it. The ruler does not have the authority to rule except with the presence of a people and a land that he rules, and the father and mother do not have the authority of parenting except with the presence of children to raise. On the other hand, a group of people on a land is obligated to them. A legal and constitutional symbolism that determines their rights and enables their livelihood to be linked to their interests. This is only a right with the existence of a vertical relationship that directs the functioning of the regime. This is also the case with the child whose inquisitive instinct yearns for the presence of someone to guide him and guide him in his behavior and knowledge.

It can be said that the nature of the stereotypes in vertical relations is that it is based on the centralization of power to one party stronger than the other, and the existence of this power out of protection and care, which is created starting from the recognition of the existence of a party demanding the benefits of the power, and this recognition entails knowledge of the type of needs through which the goal of care and protection is achieved.

Therefore, the position of tolerance is manifested in enabling the power of authority to achieve the desire for protection and care in vertical relationships, and it appears in several forms, for example such as discursive and parliamentary sessions regarding the government's relationship with the people, through which the concepts of tolerance are implemented through dialogues and negotiations.

While the absence of tolerance in vertical relationships enables violence and persecution, power is exercised in a state of taking away the will to accept the less powerful party, so he accepts the force imposed on him because he is forced to accept it, not because he wants to accept it in order to achieve the goal of care and protection for him, and thus the force is exploited for his own benefit. One party without the other, while the presence of tolerance, which means recognition on the part of the higher authority and acceptance on the part of the lower authority, opens a space for understanding in building a harmonious system of achieving interests.

Therefore, it can be emphasized that the existence of vertical relations does not mean backward and traditional societies. Indeed, abuse of its nature leads to backwardness, while investing the value of tolerance makes its development within a network of vertical and horizontal relationships an important and necessary matter in sustaining the security and safety of all parties. We will now discuss the most important stereotypes about the concept of tolerance that hinder its manifestation in vertical relationships to achieve its societal goal.

Based on the above, it should be noted that the correct investment of tolerance in vertical societies engenders understanding between the concerned parties. This is not for exchange between their positions, meaning that the parties to the relationship are fixed in their party, so the lower authority does not have the illusion that it is exchanging the position with the higher party in approving its opinion or the like. This disrupts the pattern of the relationship and harms it, and this explains many of the complaints of some minorities in pluralistic societies, which want to establish proven and make it a general law. For example, demands to remove the high in government institutions actually harm other parties and lead to a disruption of peace. In general, therefore, tolerance allows for deliberation and understanding, but does not change roles, so decision-making authority remains with the stronger, according to which a comprehensive view of caring for the interests of all is taken into account.

In order to understand some of the perceptions that hinder the embodiment of tolerance in its proper form, we can follow what Karl Peter Fritzsche described about concepts of tolerance, which he monitored through his careful examination of the process of its historical progress, through his text entitled Unable to Be Tolerant.¹¹ It is worth noting that he derived it from the progressive stages in the history of the concept's use, and it could be that the concept can be used to varying degrees depending on the specific situation of its application, which are:

1- The pragmatic calculating tolerance:

It is tolerance that must exist and be practiced. Because failure to do so leads to worse results, as it appears to be a waiver of a party's right, but it is a concession in a situation where more harm will be caused, so it is subject to the necessary preliminary measure.

2- The endured passive tolerance

It is tolerance that stops at the limits of accepting and tolerating difference at the level of obligatory acceptance, without making any attempts to support those who are different, in any aspect of their existence, or to intervene positively with regard to them, as it includes them but does not surround them with acknowledgment and recognition.

3- The active interfering tolerance

It is tolerance that goes beyond the issue of accepting difference to the necessity of owing it with a positive attitude towards those who differ, in order to provide the appropriate environment for tolerance to exist and continue.

In all of these degrees, it can be noted that tolerance has a negative and positive characteristics. Anna Elisabetta Galeotti distinguished, through her book entitled Tolerance as Recognition, between three types of perceptions of tolerance,¹² in which the distinguished between the negative and positive qualities, which are:

1- The standard notion

It is a traditional perception that arose with the era of the state, which includes rebellious religious minorities on its territory, and has the authority to suppress them, but due to some reason in governance and administration of power, it chooses to tolerate them and not interfere in their affairs. Thus, it is kind to these religious minorities by granting them permission to exist and the possibility of practicing their religious activities. The type of permission contains a superficial vision expressed by Galeotti (that it takes respect) because it considers the granting of permission by the authority to be based on a voluntary force similar to granting credit and good deeds, and not as a right to the other party. Galeotti confirms the existence of this type of tolerance in vertical societies. Combining the state with its people is contrary to liberalism, as it does not recognize the right to difference, but rather is based on an implicit meaning of tolerance by being lenient with the contents of difference, and thus it does not enhance the presence of tolerance and the growth of an environment of difference.

2- The political conception

It is a form of state authority towards its citizens, based on the principle of neutrality towards all of them, in order to establish universal rights and freedoms in all their forms and types. However, this method of tolerance in relation to vertical relations presents a class gap, due to the dominance of some groups that constitute a majority, and thus the dominance of their standards. Its own cultural and moral nature, and because of the vertical relationship, this hegemony creates a disparity in the balance of power and status, which opens the way for the conflict of the minority and the majority, because it leads to the marginalization and exclusion of some minorities, whether we like it or not, according to the pattern of style in dominating the moral standards of the greater hegemony, which may imply the dominance of the majority force as a justification for demanding that the state not tolerate the practices and beliefs of the minority as a result of the habit of marginalizing them. Thus, the minority's reactions come with demands for freedom of belief and practice despite the existence of the principle of neutrality that the state exercises absolutely towards everyone. However, this principle raises the issue of the minority's majority as a challenge to the limits of tolerance and the possibility of its positive presence.

3- Tolerance as recognition

Tolerance as a recognition is based on the recognition that differences in beliefs and practices between the minority and the majority establish legitimate choices with equal rights according to a pluralistic liberal democracy, which is not based on any pragmatic vision, nor on the negative attitude of institutions of indifference towards differences between individuals and groups. Accordingly, tolerance can be negative, as is the case with the standard, and not purely positive acceptance based on the principle of neutrality, as is the case with the political; rather, it is a public legitimization of a certain difference, and the preservation of its rights in public existence on the condition that no human right is violated.

To distinguish the presence of tolerance, especially at the level of vertical relationships, we will focus next on the foundations that establish the manifestation of the concept and the most prominent values supporting it at the level of practice.

Prominent values of tolerance

Above we discussed the intrinsic meanings of tolerance and its components, the meanings in forming the concept, all at the level of conceptual analysis. If we make up the level of practice, we will find that there must be elements that represent foundations in managing the meanings that make up the concept, and this is what we will clarify now.

Anna Elisabetta Galeotti, through her book Tolerance as Recognition, establishes the conceptual components that make tolerance present, and emphasizes that it is based on non-interference in the freedom of others. This is the criterion that evaluates all components and degrees of tolerance, whether tolerance is negative, based on accepting the existence of difference only, or positive, based on supporting the environment of difference and those who are different, as it cannot be achieved without first acknowledging the origin of freedom for the party tolerating it.

It is worth mentioning that the meaning of non-interference in the freedom of others negates indifference. Tolerance is a positive attitude – as we previously discussed – that calls for the necessity of the existence of an important disputed matter, the right of which is implicitly recognized. First, we see the necessity of paying attention to the components of respect and appreciation, which represent major components in supporting the origin of recognition in relation to tolerance.

As for tolerance and in connection to the principle of respect, it is based on acceptable standards directed by everyone. Recognition is based on the exchange of legal equality between all parties, regardless of differences, whether in cultural practices or moral beliefs. Social life is not based on favoring a group or favoring a particular culture. Another account, and on this basis Forst distinguishes between two types of equality:

- Formal equality**
In which all individuals are treated equally, regardless of their differences, which belong to a private sphere and are not taken at the level of consideration in the public sphere.
- And qualitative equality**
In which moral/religious or cultural differences are taken into account; because failure to adhere to it causes injustice to some groups, and may lead to marginalization or exclusion.

As for tolerance in its connection with the component of appreciation, it rises to a degree above considering the presence of those who differ in a corresponding part. There must be a way to deal with them as if they were equal. Rather, he reaches tolerance to the point that the existence of difference and those who differ is only an opportunity to appreciate this difference. He considers the existence of some moral difference in terms of practice, values, and belief acceptable, reasonable, and attractive despite the originality of the difference in belief of the one who carries out the tolerance. Hence, appreciation is related to the basic component of the reality of the existence of tolerance, and it is an ingredient of love.

The fact that love is based on the possibility of appreciation makes tolerance an opportunity to develop positive diversity in society, which embodies the universal truth of diversity and integration. It does not stop with tolerance as an appreciation for accepting difference; rather, it leads him to consider what is worthy of appreciation, and this is what is demonstrated by the motive of love.

The love that produced tolerance by the power of the factor of appreciation does not ignore that tolerance is created as a result of the existence of something whose existence we implicitly object to or reject, but by the power of respect and appreciation that we see tolerance as a positive necessity through which societal moral values are achieved, and this is what will be addressed next.

Values supporting the concept of tolerance in vertical relationships

The hypothetical question that can be asked in this regard is what makes us accept something that is rejected and to which there is objection? Certainly there are some moral values that support its acceptance, the most important of which are:

1- Freedom

We must acknowledge that differences between people are inevitable, whether in their cultures, concepts of values, viewpoints, and methods of beliefs and rituals, and this calls for the truth of recognizing tolerance, as we previously referred to Galeotti's concept of determining freedom, which grants the possibility of free existence, which establishes freedom towards society. Recognizing the value of freedom makes the concept of tolerance obligatory in determining value as a prelude to recognition of the other party. For freedom, it is a means by which all parties are taken into account and social peace is achieved for them.

2- Social justice

Al-Jabri distinguished between equality and justice in their presence in tolerance, when he explained that tolerance does not only require equality,¹³ rather, priority must be given to others within this equality, meaning that activating tolerance obliges one party to make a concession to another on the assumption that it tolerates what it rejects in principle, and this concession is not leniency, but rather an embodiment of the standards agreed upon by all parties, and at the same time it does not deny the existence of a specific hierarchy, or disparity in status, but it should be noted that this disparity is something that human society necessarily calls for. For example, the disparity in status between the ruler and the ruled, the professor and the student, the parents and the son, gives the higher party in the vertical relationship the authority to practice tolerance and make it socially praiseworthy in many contexts.

3- Coexistence

Although a number of thinkers have considered tolerance as a negative characteristic, such as Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, for example, who saw it as an insult, he emphasizes its necessity in the stability of society, by considering it as an introduction to dialogue.¹⁴ It is an initial stage that leads to the embodiment of societal relations. Tolerance has many forms and degrees. It is nothing more than an expressive means of bringing social relations closer by finding possible commonalities in living. The appropriate formula for tolerance must be chosen according to each situation and event.

Therefore, the elements on which tolerance is based are considered the foundation for achieving societal values without which a happy life cannot be achieved among its members. Tolerance frames the necessity of freedom and activates its responsibility within the framework of the individual's right and the duty of the group. Likewise, tolerance makes it clear that a priority in the social exchange system in caring for public interests. In order to establish legal equality in a manner consistent with the nature of individuals and their societal structures.

Conclusion

Several points can be concluded from research into the forms of mental patterns that hinder the manifestation of the concept of tolerance at the level of vertical relationships, which are:

1. Activating tolerance in the system of social relations, especially the vertical type, directly contributes to facilitating the development process and the openness of societies to modernity and renewal.

2. Tolerance is based on a free, voluntary act of accepting difference that does not include a sense of indifference, tolerance, or a feeling of insult. It seeks, with the basis of love, to enable an environment of coexistence for all parties in a way that achieves everyone's interest.

3. The type of tolerance in vertical relationships establishes an understanding that makes the will of power to be addressed next. The relationship type means to achieve peaceful coexistence of all differences and diversities, which reduces the possibility of injustice, oppression, exclusion and marginalization.

4. There is no single image of tolerance at the level of practice. Rather, there are moral values that are approved in society through the means of tolerance according to the possibility of balancing the peculiarities of difference and the agreed-upon standards of acceptance.

5. Tolerance manifests itself in vertical relations when the parties realize their responsibility towards the other. The higher authority must achieve the interest of coexistence, so it comes to an understanding with the less powerful party within the limits of freedom and the manner of justice, which will require conscious acceptance of the necessity of relying on tolerance in strengthening societal cohesion and achieving the common good in every situation and event.