

N.Sh. Ybyray\*

*Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan  
(E-mail: [nurlan18631@gmail.com](mailto:nurlan18631@gmail.com))*

## Mutual influence of morality and religion

The article was written in the scope of the topic of the dissertation research “The problem of relationship of morality and religion in Kazakh philosophy”. The article examines the intricate relationship between morality and religion, exploring their historical, philosophical, and cultural intersections. It highlights the evolution of moral norms as both independent of and intertwined with religious ideologies. These secular approaches frequently prioritize practical outcomes, emphasizing efficiency and overall benefits. However, individualistic and utilitarian perspectives can sometimes conflict with deeper, more intrinsic moral values associated with religion. As a result, whereas secular morality can foster social cohesion and progress, it does not always align with deeper moral principles that surpass purely practical considerations. This perspective suggests that morality is a product of social and historical evolution rather than being dictated by practical reasons. Although moral standards have traditionally been tied to religious consciousness, their modern humanistic reinterpretation places greater emphasis on their genetical connection with sources and process of emancipation of moral norms from religion, becoming secular morality as independent construction. The article ultimately discusses the question of the dependance and contextual nature of religion on morality and at the same time autonomous nature of moral obligations, underscoring the importance of situational ethics and human decision-making over rigid absolutes. In conclusion, it advocates viewing morality as an autonomous form of social awareness, fully capable of guiding humanity independent of religious influence.

*Keywords:* ethics, God, humanism, culture, secularization, moral values, emancipation, happiness, virtue.

### *Introduction*

Morality, rooted in the Latin term “moralis” and frequently contrasted with the Greek “ethos”, which translates to habit or custom, represents one of the most complex and layered constructs within human social consciousness. It extends beyond a mere system of behavioral guidelines to form a dynamic structure of principles, values, and norms that both influence and are influenced by the interactions among individuals, groups, and the larger societal frameworks they inhabit. The relevance of the construct of morality lies in its fundamental role in shaping human interactions and societal relationships. At its core, exploring morality is akin to delving into the essence of our shared human existence. It compels us to reflect on the delicate balance between individual aspirations and the collective good, urging us to consider how our personal desires align with the needs and values of the community.

In a world increasingly characterized by diversity and complexity, the quest for a moral framework becomes ever more critical. Morality serves as a guiding compass, helping individuals navigate ethical dilemmas and societal challenges. It fosters a sense of responsibility, encouraging people to act not only in their own interest but also in ways that promote the welfare of others. This interplay between self-interest and common good is essential for the cohesion and sustainability of any society.

Moreover, the exploration of morality invites us to engage in meaningful dialogues about our values and beliefs. It challenges us to question established norms and to seek a deeper understanding of what it means to live a good life. In doing so, we can cultivate a more empathetic and just society, where individuals are motivated to contribute positively to the world around them.

At its core, morality operates within the realm of ethical values, functioning as a guiding compass for human behavior. It includes a broad range of components, such as guidelines, standards, customs, and expectations that govern interactions between individuals, influence the relationship between individuals and groups, and even shape the interactions between countries and nations. These guidelines extend into every aspect of life, influencing attitudes toward family, labor, and communal responsibilities. However, morality is not a static or universal entity; it is deeply embedded within the historical, cultural, and socio-economic contexts of a given society.

\* Corresponding author's e-mail: [nurlan18631@gmail.com](mailto:nurlan18631@gmail.com)

One of the most significant dimensions of morality is its capacity to define and reflect ethical concepts such as justice, injustice, virtue, vice, honor, dishonor, happiness, and distress. These defined and reflected constructs serve as lenses through which individuals evaluate behaviors, intentions, and their outcomes. For instance, justice as the concept of what is wrong and what is right is often associated with principles of fairness and equality in every context; however, its interpretation can vary greatly depending on cultural, religious and ideological contexts, historical circumstances, and social dynamics. Meanwhile the notions of good and evil in morality are static and independent from culture, but their accommodations are continually reinterpreted and renegotiated as societies evolve over time.

As for religion, every religion is “a cause, principle or system of beliefs held to with ardor and faith, a personal set of institutionalized system of religious attitudes, beliefs, and practices” [1]. Etymologically the meaning of the word “religion” varies from Cicero’s definition of religion as “again” and “consider carefully”, i.e., consider carefully again and again, and definition of other scholars who have associated religion to reconnecting, binding with God [2].

As cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz argues in “The Interpretation of Cultures” that “... the notion that the essence of what it means to be a human is most clearly revealed in those features of human culture that are universal rather than in those that are distinctive to this people...” [3, 43]. With these words Geertz highlights not only the importance of cultural context in shaping moral understanding, but also explains the difference of religions, which arise from the differing cultures that elaborate each religion. That is why the number of religions that currently exist and function is estimated to be around 10,000 worldwide [4].

Religious scholars and theologians of the most popular religions — Christianity and Islam, such as Thomas Aquinas and Al-Ghazali, often posit that morality originates from a divine source, with religion serving as its custodian. Aquinas argued in his “Summa Theologica” that moral laws reflect eternal laws established by God [5], while Al-Ghazali emphasized in works like “The Revival of the Religious Sciences” the harmonious relationship between divine commandments and ethical human behavior [6]. From their perspective, morality, like religion, is a divine ordinance bestowed upon humanity by God and is intrinsically linked to religious belief. Without religion, they argue, true morality is unattainable, and humanity risks succumbing to spiritual decay and moral void. In this view, the moral guidelines that govern human behavior are eternal, unchanging commandments dictated by a higher power and recorded in sacred texts.

Theologians assert that morality’s divine origin ensures its sanctity and universality. For believers, moral values and norms are seen as immutable truths that transcend temporal and cultural boundaries. This perspective is deeply rooted in the belief that a higher power — God, Allah, or another divine entity — is the ultimate arbiter of justice and the source of moral authority. This connection to the divine fosters a sense of accountability and responsibility among believers, as they view their actions as being judged by an omniscient and omnipotent creator.

The variability of religious concepts across different cultural formations highlights the complexity of religion that these cultures elaborate. Moreover, religions’ multifaceted nature become evident when considering their interplay with morality and forms of social consciousness, such as law, art and ideology. Due to intersection of these domains, each of them brings unique perspectives and contributions to each other and in creation of moral landscape as such. Nevertheless, moral values codify themselves into enforceable rules of religion, art, law, ideology, or other areas, but not the other way around.

In contemporary discourse, morality faces new challenges and opportunities, shaped by globalization, technological advancement, and the increasing complexity of societal structures. Issues such as climate change, digital ethics, and cultural pluralism demand a reexamination of traditional moral frameworks and the development of new paradigms that can address these pressing concerns. This ongoing evolution underscores the importance of understanding morality not as a fixed set of dictates but as a dynamic, dialectical process that requires continuous engagement and reflection.

### *Methodology*

The scope and essence of morality as a construct of different concepts and moral constants are undeniably complex and multifaceted, revealing its profound connection to other spheres of human consciousness, particularly the religious worldview. To explore this intricate relationship, we will compare and focus on the interplay between moral consciousness and religion, considering their historical, philosophical, and cultural dimensions. This approach allows us to examine the interconnection and mutual influence between morality and religion, both fundamental aspects of human existence. Through this lens, we can better understand the dynamic interactions between these two domains. Take as an example such notion like happiness: in reli-

gious frameworks, happiness is often seen as a divine reward for righteous life and a goal wherefore people have to fulfill spiritual obligations, whereas non-religious moral systems, like utilitarianism, tend to view virtuous actions that maximize happiness for the acting individuals as a practical approach to improve overall well-being. This contrast illustrates how similar ethical actions can stem from fundamentally different motivations, offering a concrete example of the interplay between religious and non-religious moralities.

### *Results*

Contemporary societies are marked by diverse attitudes toward religion and morality. Many people consider themselves to be believers, following religions like Islam, Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism etc. Others, though not aligned with organized religions, recognize the presence of a higher power or universal intelligence. At the same time, a large segment of the global population identifies as non-religious, including atheists, agnostics, secular humanists, and freethinkers.

The distinction between religious and non-religious perspectives on morality is not merely one of practices, but fueling motivation and acting collectively. For a believer, the world is perceived as “God’s creation”, for all and life’s purpose is framed within the context of divine will. This belief fosters a worldview in which moral actions are expressions of obedience to a higher power. However, this does not negate the importance of human agency; many religious doctrines emphasize that individuals bear responsibility for their actions and contribute to the divine plan through their choices.

Non-religious perspectives on morality, by contrast, emphasize human autonomy and rationality. For instance, Immanuel Kant’s deontological framework underscores the role of reason and the categorical imperative, which asserts that individuals should act according to principles that could be universally applied. Similarly, utilitarian philosophers like Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill advocate for a morality grounded in the maximization of happiness for more people focusing on outcomes rather than divine mandates. These frameworks illustrate how ethical behavior can be derived from any rational analysis and the consideration of human well-being, independent of religious influence. From this viewpoint, actions that are counted as moral are seen as products of social evolution, emerging from the collective experiences and interactions of humanity. Moral behavior, in this context, is guided not by adherence to divine commandments but by principles of empathy, reason, and mutual respect. This secular approach challenges individuals to find within themselves the strength to act ethically, raising profound questions about the sources of moral obligation and the motivations in depth.

Religious morality is characterized by several distinctive features. First, it often involves a dual orientation toward earthly and heavenly values, with earthly concerns subordinated to spiritual goals. Second, it provides a firm criterion for moral behavior, rooted in compliance with religious doctrines and imperatives. These qualities may lend religious morality a sense of clarity and stability, offering believers straightforward answers to complex ethical dilemmas.

However, the simplicity and rigidity of religious moral frameworks can also have limitations. The emphasis on adherence to divine commandments can lead to dogmatism, moral literalism, and an aversion to critical reflection. Moreover, the prioritization of heavenly values over earthly concerns can sometimes result in passivity, intolerance and the lack of to act morally beyond of religious framework.

As the results of this study, it can reveal that non-religious morality represents ethical systems based on human reason and social experience. While it lacks the metaphysical foundation of religious dogmata, it offers a dynamic and adaptable approach to ethical questions, emphasizing the importance of individual conscience and societal well-being. This perspective highlights the role of human agencies in shaping moral values and underscores the interconnectedness of ethical behavior and social practice.

Nevertheless, the interplay between religious and non-religious morality is evident in their shared concern for human dignity and ethical responsibility. Despite their differences, both approaches recognize the importance of moral ideals and the need for accountability in human actions. For instance, while religious morality often derives its authority from sacred texts and divine revelation, non-religious morality finds its basis in humanistic principles and the collective pursuit of justice and equality.

### *Discussion*

Religious moral consciousness is inherently complex and often contradictory. Whereas the divine origin of moral commandments demands unquestioning obedience for framing good and evil as determined solely by God’s will, a number of moral actions is often viewed as requiring free will and personal understanding, creating a tension between submission and autonomy. This duality is particularly evident in theological dis-

cussions, where obedience is framed not merely as fear-based compliance but as an expression of love and faith.

In Islam, for example, theologians emphasize that true obedience stems from a heartfelt understanding of Allah's will and a genuine commitment to living under divine principles. This perspective is supported by Islamic texts such as the Quran and the Hadiths, where obedience is framed as an act of love and understanding. For instance, the Quran states in Surah Al-Baqarah (2:2): "This is the Book about which there is no doubt, a guidance for those conscious of Allah" [7]. Furthermore, Islamic scholars like Al-Ghazali have explored the deeper meanings of obedience and its implications for moral conduct, emphasizing the integration of divine guidance with personal conscience. This perspective underscores the transformative potential of religious morality, encouraging believers to internalize moral values and integrate them into their daily lives.

Ultimately, the relationship between morality and religion reflects broader philosophical questions about the nature of human existence and the sources of ethical responsibility. While religious frameworks offer a sense of cosmic order and purpose, secular approaches emphasize the potential for human beings to create and sustain moral systems independently of divine authority. Both perspectives contribute to the rich and evolving discourse on morality, challenging us to consider the diverse ways in which individuals and societies navigate the complexities of ethical life.

In Christianity, it is evident that the evolution of religion has moved from external coercion and fear toward voluntary adherence to the moral law's essence. The fundamental tension between the unquestionable authority of God's commands and the exercise of free will — rooted in rational and independent choice — remains unresolved. The path is preordained, leaving individuals no option but compliance. Yet, this contradiction is not resolved but instead becomes internalized.

In earlier understanding, this conflict was viewed as an external clash between human desires and divine laws. In contrast, it now appears as an inner struggle within the individual. The voice of God is expressed through the human conscience, standing in opposition to sinful inclinations.

Achieving goodness requires self-discipline and inner conflict, as expressed in the scriptural assertion: "For all are under sin, as it is written: There is none righteous, not even one" [8, 9-10].

The Apostle Paul candidly articulates this inner turmoil, stating: "For the good that I want, I do not do, but the evil that I do not want, that I do" [8, 19]. This vivid description underscores the enduring and deeply personal nature of the moral struggle in Christian teachings.

Immanuel Kant, in his philosophical system, provided a thorough and systematic analysis of morality that revealed its internal logic with remarkable clarity. He expressed a critical view of morality derived from religion, often referred to as theological morality. Kant argued that moral law is not a construction imposed by external forces but is embedded within the human mind itself. For Kant, the existence of this innate moral law serves as evidence of the existence of God. His philosophy emphasizes that morality entails adhering to one's duty and suppressing inclinations that conflict with this duty.

If an individual acts in alignment with the moral law without overcoming personal inclinations — acting instead according to natural attraction — their actions may comply with legal requirements but lack genuine moral dignity. This perspective challenges the centrality of love as a moral driving force, which is profoundly emphasized in religious contexts, such as Christianity. In the Gospels, the commandment to "love thy neighbor" holds paramount importance. However, Kant's framework creates a dichotomy between duty and love: one cannot love out of obligation. The question "Can one compel oneself to love?" highlights the tension between the notion of duty, backed by divine authority, and the independence of human free will.

This apparent contradiction between the absoluteness of divine commands and human autonomy is not solely the product of religious morality. Instead, it reflects a broader issue rooted in the complexities of human existence. Religion, in this context, provides a conceptual framework for interpreting the historically evolved tensions inherent in moral life. These tensions include the dichotomy between moral duty and inclinations toward virtue and happiness, the conflict between the absolute imperatives of morality and individual self-interest, and the exercise of free will. Religious ethical systems often frame these conflicts as manifestations of the alienation of morality within sociohistorical structures characterized by systemic inequality. This alienation not only perpetuates the relevance of religious constructs but also underscores the deep entanglement of morality with the socio-economic realities of its time. Importantly, the mere negation of religious ideology does not inherently resolve these estranged or reified forms of moral consciousness, as their roots lie in broader societal contradictions that transcend religious belief. Such a resolution, Kant and others might argue, requires profound social transformation and the achievement of greater equality.

The study also uncovers tensions between the absoluteness and autonomy of those laws which are imposed with morality and the relativity of these moral norms, which are often influenced by practical considerations. These contradictions are not merely logical inconsistencies or errors in reasoning; rather, they are intrinsic to the nature of moral consciousness as it evolves through different stages of historical and social development. Their resolution is intricately tied to the trajectory of societal progress, suggesting that the development of moral consciousness is not an isolated phenomenon but one deeply rooted in broader socio-historical contexts.

The exploration of religious moral consciousness reveals a complex interplay between divine authority and human autonomy, highlighting inherent contradictions that shape ethical behavior. The study has outlined how morality, particularly within religious frameworks, grapples with the duality of obedience to divine commandments and the necessity of free will; reveals that its tension manifests in various theological discussions, where obedience is not merely about fear, but is seen as an expression of love and faith as well.

In Islam, the emphasis on heartfelt understanding and commitment to Allah's will illustrates this duality. The Quran and Hadiths frame obedience as an act of love, suggesting that true moral action integrates divine guidance with personal conscience. Scholars like Al-Ghazali further explore how this integration can lead to transformative moral behavior, encouraging believers to internalize ethical principles in their daily lives.

The study also has examined Christianity, where the evolution of religious thought reflects a shift from coercion to voluntary adherence to moral laws. The struggle between God and humans reveals the deeply personal nature of moral conflict, emphasizing that achieving goodness requires self-discipline and an understanding of one's sinful inclinations.

Philosopher Immanuel Kant's perspective adds another layer to this discussion. He critiques the notion of morality derived from religion, proposing that moral law is inherent within human reason rather than externally imposed. Kant's analysis emphasizes duty over inclination, arguing that true morality arises from acting in accordance with one's duty, regardless of personal desires. This framework challenges the centrality of love in moral actions, creating a dichotomy between duty and genuine affection.

The contradictions between divine commands and human autonomy reflect broader philosophical questions about the nature of morality. These tensions are not merely theological; they are deeply embedded in the socio-historical context. The study suggests that religious ethical systems often frame moral conflicts as manifestations of societal inequalities, emphasizing the need for social transformation to resolve these tensions.

In assessing the results, it becomes clear that the relationship between morality and religion is multifaceted. The study highlights that while religious frameworks provide a sense of order and purpose, they also present challenges regarding individual autonomy and ethical responsibility. The ongoing discussion between divine authority and human freewill illustrates the richness of moral discourse, prompting individuals and societies to navigate the complexities of ethical life. The interconnection of morality and religion is only one directed. Morality gives to religions all the corpus of notions that operate religion, but religion contributes nothing to morality. Religion has not contributed anything new to the domain of morality. It did not invent new notions of morality or ethical system in framework of philosophy. Nevertheless, religions have created new aesthetics, whose contributions are enormous to the cultural heritage of the world.

Ultimately, the exploration of religious moral consciousness underscores the need for a nuanced understanding of morality that considers only human dimensions. By recognizing the interplay between obedience and autonomy, scholars and practitioners can better appreciate the transformative potential of moral frameworks in shaping ethical behavior. This understanding can lead to a more inclusive dialogue about morality that embraces diverse perspectives and promotes social justice and equality.

### *Conclusion*

Moral philosophy reveals two distinct and often conflicting tendencies in addressing the contradictions between the absoluteness and autonomy of morality and the relativity of moral norms. On the one hand, some authors argue for the existence of moral absolutes — timeless, universal principles that transcend cultural and historical variability — morality as such. On the other hand, there is a contrasting perspective that highlights the relativity of moral norms, often veering into moral relativism, which posits that ethical norms are contingent on specific cultural, historical, or personal context [9].

In non-religious moral frameworks, attempts to justify ethical principles frequently draw upon philosophical reasoning and scientific methodologies. These justifications often aim to establish norms and prin-

ciples oriented toward overarching goals such as the common good, social progress, human happiness, and a harmonious balance between individual interests and collective welfare [10, 224]. For instance, utilitarianism — one of an ethical theory — equates “good” with “benefit” or utility. It shifts the focus of moral behavior away from an intrinsic commitment to goodness and toward the pursuit of outcomes that maximize utility or overall well-being.

By examining these tensions, it becomes evident that both absolutist and relativist perspectives, as well as utilitarian frameworks, offer valuable insights but also face limitations in their ability to fully resolve the inherent contradictions of moral consciousness.

Science, while capable of offering effective recommendations for human behavior, often faces challenges aligning its rational prescriptions with deeply ingrained moral sensibilities. Moral values, unlike scientific directives, emerge spontaneously from the fundamental conditions of human life. Although some norms may gradually integrate into moral consciousness, the historical formation of moral ideas typically follows a different path. These ideas arise organically through the interplay of emotional, rational, conscious, and unconscious elements within societal contexts, reflecting the dynamic and dialectical nature of human psychology.

Morality, as articulated through the voice of conscience, provides insights into what a person ought to be and what they should strive to avoid. Its primary function aligns with the historical process of fostering and affirming humanity’s essential qualities. Research reveals that these qualities are not innate but are cultivated and affirmed through historical processes. Humanity’s essence, therefore, is not a static ideal but a dynamic construct shaped by collective experiences and choices.

Religious moral requirements are inherently relative, shaped by specific historical circumstances and, in class-based societies, by class interests. Even universal religious moral norms contain elements of relativity and conventionality. Ignoring this conditionality risks leading to immorality in practice. For instance, norms like “Do not kill” or “Do not lie” may appear absolute, yet situations can arise where their violation becomes morally justifiable [11]. Conversely, treating moral rules as absolutes can stifle the adaptive, living spirit of morality, which demands context-sensitive solutions.

The absolute and unconditional dimensions of morality manifest through the relative and conditional aspects of everyday life. The ordinary tasks and responsibilities of daily existence, enriched with profound significance, coexist alongside transcendent goals and ideals. Genuine moral commitment entails integrating both the practical realities of life and the pursuit of higher aspirations, working to enhance the quality of life while striving toward loftier objectives.

Religious traditions, such as Christianity and Islam, emphasize moral rebirth and righteous living, albeit with differing conceptions of humanity’s ultimate destiny. While religious moral ideas are often dismissed as mere illusions, philosophers like Ludwig von Feuerbach offer a nuanced critique. Feuerbach, for example, refrained from dismissing religious concepts outright, instead reinterpreting them as expressions of human aspirations. As he wrote: “I do not say: God is nothing, the Trinity is nothing, the word of God is nothing... I only show that they are not what theological illusions represent them to be, but rather are mysteries of humans” [12, 38].

This exploration underscores the complexity of moral philosophy, revealing its roots in both religious and secular frameworks while highlighting its enduring relevance in addressing the challenges of human existence.

The research into the gradual emancipation of moral standards from religious influence holds significant practical and scientific value. Practically, this evolution allows societies to acknowledge the importance of humanistic values that transcend religious frameworks, fostering ethical autonomy among individuals. This shift empowers communities to cultivate moral principles that are more inclusive and reflective of diverse cultural and social realities, ultimately promoting social cohesion and mutual respect.

This research emphasizes the significance of community moral ideals, even when rooted in religious beliefs, and underscores their relevance in contemporary society. By recognizing genetical connection of morality and religion, scholars and practitioners can foster dialogues that integrate traditional moral values with modern ethical considerations, enriching the overall moral landscape.

This study underscores a troubling phenomenon: the deliberate framing of detrimental religious biases and antiquated traditions as integral components of the authentic national identity of Kazakh culture. Such misrepresentations perpetuate regressive narratives and pose a significant challenge to cultural and intellectual progress. Addressing these issues requires a rigorous application of constructive critique to deconstruct and counter these harmful ideologies.

While some positive aspects of early Kazakh morality and aesthetics were deeply rooted in past living conditions and ways of life, these are now irrevocably gone. Creating a new culture necessitates a robust foundation rooted in the finest accomplishments of humanity. Among the vast legacies of history, the most precious are humanity itself and its spiritual evolution. The individual stands as the ultimate objective of the entire historical journey. Over centuries, national character and moral traditions have been carefully shaped. Their importance lies not in fostering uncritical sentimentality or nationalistic pride but in their role as potent instruments for nurturing personal growth and development.

Recognizing the autonomy of morality doesn't simply mean a lack of belief in God. It is a situation where individuals disregard external moral authorities relying solely on their judgment of what is right, what is wrong according to what suggested in their Holy teaching. Consequently, religious logic leads individuals to see themselves as moral beings, as it described in their Holy books.

By highlighting the significance of society's moral ideals that do not rooted from religious beliefs, scholars and practitioners can facilitate dialogues that connect traditional values with contemporary ethics, enriching the moral landscape. On the other hand, the study calls for a critical examination of harmful religious biases about interdependence of morality and religion.

Practically, these insights can guide educational programs and community initiatives aimed at fostering personal growth and moral development. By recognizing the historical significance of moral traditions while promoting a forward-looking approach, communities can cultivate a new culture that honors humanity's spiritual evolution and supports individual autonomy within a collective context.

The 17th-century philosopher Pierre Bayle posited the potential for a society devoid of religious beliefs, where ethical questions are resolved exclusively through the application of reason. Numerous prominent thinkers, including Ludwig Feuerbach [13], Immanuel Kant [14], Baruch Spinoza [15] have similarly argued that by removing from religion its central tenets such as faith-based symbols, rituals, church-centered doctrines, and scientifically contentious claims (e.g., the six-day creation narrative or the doctrine of the immaculate conception) that remains as a distinct moral framework rooted in human reason. This perspective aligns with the broader critique of religious influence on morality, as discussed by Feuerbach [13] and Kant [14], who emphasized the autonomy of morality independent of religious doctrines. Spinoza [15] highlighted the primacy of reason in moral inquiry, asserting that ethical principles derive from human nature and rational understanding rather than divine revelation. Similarly, Shakarim [16] emphasized the capacity of humanity to develop moral standards based on reason and social experience, free from the constraints of religious authority. These foundational ideas support the notion that morality can be understood as a distinct and autonomous sphere, grounded in reason and humanistic principles, rather than solely dependent on religious frameworks. Therefore, this study recommends understanding morality as an independent form of social consciousness, which can and should be studied without relying on religion. If a connection exists, it should be explored through the study of morality itself, examining the limitations and challenges within moral experience that might lead individuals to seek answers in religion.

## References

- 1 Merriam-webster dictionary "religion". — [Electronic resource] — Access mode: <http://merriam-webster.com/dictionary/religion>
- 2 Harpur T. In the pagan Christ: Recovering the lost light / T. Harpur. — Thomas Allen, 2004.
- 3 Geertz C. The Interpretation of Cultures: selected essays / C. Geertz. — Basic Books, 1973.
- 4 African Studies Association. University of Michigan. History in Africa. — 2009. — Vol. 32. — P. 119.
- 5 Aquinas T. Summa Theologica. Vol. 1 / T. Aquinas. — William Benton Publisher, 1923.
- 6 Al-Ghazali A.H. The Revival of the Religious Sciences / A.H. Al-Ghazali. — Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyah, 2011.
- 7 The Qur'an (M.A.S. Abdel Haleem, Trans.). — Oxford University Press, 2008.
- 8 Священные Писания. Новый Завет: с комментариями и объяснениями, послание Павла. Римлянам. Глава 3. — Москва: Издательство АСТ, 2024.
- 9 Медведев Н.В. В поисках основания морали / Н.В. Медведев // Вестник Томского университета. Гуманитарная серия. — № 6(50). — С. 82–86.
- 10 Кант И. Сочинение [в 6-ти т.] / И. Кант. — Т. 4. Ч. 1. Основы метафизики нравственности. — Москва: Мысль, 1965.
- 11 Коран. Перевод смыслов / пер. Э.Р. Кулиев. — Москва: Издательство «Умма», 2007.
- 12 Фейрбах. Л.А. Сочинения [в 2-х т.] / Л.А. Фейрбах. — 2 т. — Москва: Наука, 1995.

13 Feuerbach L. The Essence of Christianity / L. Feuerbach. — Asa.K. Butts & Company, 1873.

14 Kant I. Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals / I. Kant. — Vail-Ballou Press, 2000.

15 Spinoza B. Ethics [Electronic resource] / B. Spinoza. — 1677. — Access mode: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3800/3800-h/3800-h.htm>

16 Құдайбердіұлы Ш. Үш анық [Электрондық ресурсы] / Ш. Құдайбердіұлы. — Қолжетімділігі: [https://vk.com/doc551192032\\_524473138?hash=pOWR8navyhmlwL1OytN7g98ql7Dovvy6ZMPBSAuJGuXn](https://vk.com/doc551192032_524473138?hash=pOWR8navyhmlwL1OytN7g98ql7Dovvy6ZMPBSAuJGuXn)

Н.Ш. Ыбырай

### Мораль мен діннің өзара ішкі байланысы

Мақала «Қазақ философиясындағы мораль пен діннің арақатынасы мәселесі» атты диссертациялық зерттеу тақырыбы аясында жазылған. Сонымен қатар мораль мен діннің күрделі байланысы қарастырылған, олардың тарихи, философиялық және мәдени тоғысуы зерттелген. Ол діни идеологиялардан тәуелсіз және олармен астасып жатқан моральдық нормалардың эволюциясын көрсетеді. Бұл зайырлы тәсілдер көбінесе тиімділік пен жалпы артықшылықтарға баса назар аударатырып, практикалық нәтижелерге басымдық береді. Дегенмен, сондай индивидуалистік және утилитарлық көзқарастар ішкі моральдық құндылықтарға қайшы келуі мүмкін. Нәтижесінде, зайырлы мораль әлеуметтік бірлік пен прогреске ықпал ете алатынымен, ол әрқашан таза практикалық ойлардан асып түсетін тереңірек моральдық принциптерге сәйкес келе бермейді. Бұл көзқарас мораль практикалық себептерге байланысты емес, әлеуметтік және тарихи эволюцияның жемісі екенін көрсетеді. Моральдық нормалар дәстүрлі түрде діни санамен байланысты болғанымен, олардың қазіргі гуманистік жаңадан интерпретациясында олардың генетикалық байланысы мен моральдық нормалардың діннен эмансипациялану үрдісіне, тәуелсіз құрылыс ретінде моральға айналуына көбірек көңіл бөлінеді. Мақалада, сайып келгенде, діннің моральға тәуелділігі мен контекстік табиғаты және моральдық міндеттемелердің автономды табиғаты туралы мәселе талқыланған, қатаң абсолюттерден гөрі ситуациялық этика мен адамның шешім қабылдауының маңыздылығы атап өтілген. Қорытындылай келе, ол моральды әлеуметтік сананың автономды нысаны ретінде қарастыруды жақтайды, ол адамзатты діни әсерден тәуелсіз басқаруға толық қабілетті.

*Кілт сөздер:* этика, Құдай, гуманизм, мәдениет, моральдық құндылықтар, эмансипация, бақыт, ізгілік.

Н.Ш. Ыбырай

### Внутренняя взаимосвязь морали и религии

Статья написана в рамках диссертационного исследования «Проблема соотношения морали и религии в казахской философии». В ней рассматривается взаимосвязь морали и религии, изучается их исторические, философские и культурные пересечения, а также показывается независимое от религиозной идеологии и конкурирующее с ней развитие моральных норм. Такой светский подход акцентирует внимание на практической ценности и общественном благе, отдавая приоритет практическим результатам. Однако в некоторых случаях индивидуалистические и утилитарные установки вступают в противоречие с моральными ценностями, ассоциируемыми с религией. Как результат показано, что, хотя светская мораль может способствовать социальной сплоченности и прогрессу, она не всегда соответствует более глубоким моральным принципам, выходящим за рамки чисто практических соображений. Эта точка зрения предполагает, что мораль является результатом социальной и исторической эволюции, а не просто следствием практических нужд. Хотя моральные нормы традиционно связаны с религиозным сознанием, больше внимания уделяется их современному гуманистическому пониманию, их происхождению, а также трансформации моральных норм в мораль как самостоятельный конструкт после эмансипации от религии и последующей секуляризации. В статье обсуждается зависимость религии от морали в контексте ее развития, а также автономный характер моральных обязательств, подчеркивающей важность ситуационной этики и человеческого принятия решений, а не жестких абсолютов. Автор выступает за рассмотрение морали как независимой формы общественного сознания, способной управлять человеческим поведением независимо от религиозного влияния.

*Ключевые слова:* этика, Бог, гуманизм, культура, секуляризация, моральные ценности, эмансипация, счастье, добродетель.

### References

- 1 Merriam-webster dictionary “religion”. *merriam-webster.com*. Retrieved form <http://merriam-webster.com/dictionary/religion>
- 2 Harpur, T. (2004). *In the pagan Christ: Recovering the lost light*. Thomas Allen.
- 3 Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: selected essays*. Basic Books.

- 4 (2005). African Studies Association. University of Michigan History in Africa, 32, 119.
- 5 Aquinas, T. (1923). *Summa Theologica*. (Vol. 1). William Benton Publisher.
- 6 Al-Ghazali, A.H. (2011). *The Revival of the Religious Sciences*. Dar Al-Kotob Al-Ilmiyah.
- 7 (2008). The Qur'an (M.A.S. Abdel Haleem, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- 8 (2024). *Sviashchemye Pisaniia. Novyi Zavet: s kommentariami i obiasneniami, poslanie Pavla. Rimlianam. Glava 3 [The Holy Scriptures. The New Testament: with commentary and explanation, the epistle of Paul. The Romans. Chapter 3]*. Moscow: «Izdatelstvo» Azbuka-Atticus [in Russian].
- 9 Medvedev, N.V. V poiskakh osnovaniia morali [In search of the foundation of morality]. *Vestnik Tomskogo Universiteta. Gumanitarnaia seriia — Bulletin of Tomsk University. Humanitarian series*, 6(50), 82–86 [in Russian].
- 10 Kant, I. (1965). *Sochinenie. Osnovy metafiziki nrvstvennosti [Fundamentals of the Metaphysics of Morality]*. (Vols. 1–6; Vol. 4, P. 10). Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].
- 11 (2007). *Koran. Perevod smyslov [Koran. Translation of meanings]*. (E.R. Kuliev, Trans). Moscow: izdatelstvo «Umma» [in Russian].
- 12 Feuerbach, L.A. (1995). *Sochineniia [Works]*. (Vol. 1-2; Vol. 2). Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 13 Feuerbach, L. (1873). *The Essence of Christianity*. Asa.K. Butts & Company.
- 14 Kant, I. (2000). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Vail-Ballou Press.
- 15 Spinoza, B. (1677). Ethics. *gutenberg.org*. Retrieved from <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3800/3800-h/3800-h.htm>
- 16 Qudaiberdiuly, Sh. Ush anyq [Three Truths]. *vk.com*. Retrieved from [https://vk.com/doc551192032\\_524473138?hash=pOWR8navyhmLwL1OytN7g98ql7Dovvy6ZMPBSAuJGuXn](https://vk.com/doc551192032_524473138?hash=pOWR8navyhmLwL1OytN7g98ql7Dovvy6ZMPBSAuJGuXn) [in Kazakh].

#### Information about the author

**Ybyray Nurlan** — PhD Student, Faculty of Philosophy and Psychology, Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0693-9481>