

RELIGION-MORAL RELATIONSHIP IN THE CONTEXT OF RELIGIOUS MORALITY AND SECULAR MORALITY

¹*Zhanykulov Nurlybek*, ²*Dossaliyev Timur*, ³*Saifunov Bauyrzhan*

^{1,2,3}*Khoja Ahmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University
(Turkestan, Kazakhstan)*

¹*nurlybek.zhanykulov@gmail.com*, ²*timur.dossaliyev@ayu.edu.kz*, ³*bauyrzhan.saifunov@ayu.edu.kz*

¹*Жаныкулов Нурлыбек*, ²*Досалиев Тимур*, ³*Сайфунов Бауыржан*,

^{1,2,3}*Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті
(Түркістан, Қазақстан)*

¹*nurlybek.zhanykulov@gmail.com*, ²*timur.dossaliyev@ayu.edu.kz*,
³*bauyrzhan.saifunov@ayu.edu.kz*

Abstract. One of the most important systems developed for people to lead a happy life is morality. In general terms, morality is the whole of tradition, custom, command, law, thought and belief systems adopted by society. Therefore, it is impossible to conceive the person who has faith and reason without moral principles and values. Moral principles not only ensure the social order, but also offer the society the best way of life. But an important point to be noted here is that moral principles differ according to philosophical currents. While some moralist philosophers claim that religion is significantly necessary in terms of grounding morality and determining moral principles, other part has adopted that religion should be kept away from the field of morality. Such different views and approaches have led to significant debates in the history of philosophy. In this article, which we discuss, we will focus on the basic characteristics of secular morality and religious morality, which are the subject of many discussions, and the main points where they are separated. At the same time, we will try to address the problems posed in both moral systems in a holistic and critical way.

Keywords. Morality, religious morality, secular morality, the relationship between religion and morality, evil and virtue.

Introduction

From the point of view of the history of thought, the relationship between religion and morality seems to progress in two different lines, usually from religion to morality or from morality to religion. The first of these ways opens the door to an understanding of morality that outweighs the religious aspect – a

theological morality – the other opens the door to a theology – a moral theology – which outweighs the moral character based on human experience [1, 318 p.]. In this type of relationship, the question in Plato's Euthyphro dialogue has been the subject of important discussion [1, 319 p.]. Regarding this discussion, Euthyphro himself expressed that «holiness is what the Gods are satisfied with; religiosity is what they are satisfied with, and irreligiosity is what they hate» [2, 157 p.].

One of the most fundamental problems that stands out when it comes to the discussion of religion and morality is where morality comes from, that is, the source of morality. While the history of thought was based on morality, they treated it in a different way from each other. Epicurean and Cyrenes, one of the thinkers who analyzed the problem of «The Foundation of Morality», are the pleasure of the source of morality [3, 53 p.], Aristotle mind [4.], J. S. Mill also argued that benefit [5, 72 p.], Moore and Bergson was intuition [6, 299 p; 7.], and Hume was passion/human nature/emotion [8, 92-97 pp.]. Philosophers such as Newman, Rashdall, Sorley and Taylor, who belong to the Kant and Kantian tradition in the Western world, J. Theologians such as Calvin, Paul Tillich and Gordon Clark and theologian philosophers such as Ghazali and Ash'ari, who belong to the Islamic tradition of philosophy and theology in the Islamic world, have tried to base religion and morality on the thought of God [9, 36 p.].

These different comments and approaches have led to an important discussion. On the one hand, when believers say that all the commandments of God are moral, they accept that everything – even the torture or rape in the world – is morally permissible, as long as it is commanded by God. Therefore, this thought seems to be a stranger to our concession. On the other hand, when those who do not believe say that God does not determine the basic moral rules, they argue that the moral rules are independent of God and outside his authority [10, 807 p.].

Now, if we are to focus on our main topic, religious morality and secular morality, religious morality is the system of rules and beliefs consisting of religious references, revelations and cultural heritages that aim to protect people from worldly evil. Religious morality can be treated in different ways, such as «Muslim morality», «Christian morality», «Jewish morality» or 'Buddhist morality'. Not only the sacred texts, but also the geography, socio-cultural heritage, have an important impact on the formation of religious morality. For example, the social and ethical climate of Arabia has also played an important role in the shaping of Islamic morality, along with the principle of tawhid put forward by the Qur'an [11, 63 p.]. One of the driving forces that will inspire in this moral system is faith, and the other is righteous deeds. The combination of both elements shows clear that theory cannot be separate from practice. An important feature of religious morality is that it resorts to God in determining

moral laws and thus encourages people to spiritual salvation. Since God is the legislator here, the basis of the moral act is divine. In this respect, the way religious morality exists is vertical and its motivation is punishment and reward. The point to be considered here is that the punishment is frightening and the reward is attractive.

Another of the moral systems that we encounter when it comes to religious morality is secular morality. Secular morality attaches importance to the socialization of the individual in society and ensuring his personal safety. In this context, secular morality tries to turn its direction into this world by excluding the religious and metaphysical controls of man [12, 43 p.]. It is possible to take the basis of secular views back to Stoicism. According to them, Logos, the principle of universal logic and cosmic reason, exists in the essence of man. Thanks to this quality inherent in man, he will be able to establish a universal and ideal world order without the need for any religion. Logos is the source of all moral principles and values. Therefore, despite their physical and cultural differences, people can live in a moral union isolated from religious phenomena, and this moral union can only be possible on the basis of secularization [13, 4 p.].

Methodology

In the course of the research work, many methods were used, including comparative analysis, analogy, observation, generalization, grouping, description, theological and philosophical analysis, etc.

«Religious Moral and Moral Religion» Concepts

The «Euthyphro debate», known as the main problem of the religion-moral relationship, has indeed been one of the main reasons for the division of views on the religion-moral relationship into two. In this critical question, when we say that something is true because God commands, when we say «theological moralit», when we say that God commands it because something is true, we adopt «moral theology». The first version bases morality on religion, and the second bases it on religious morality [14, 319 p.]. According to the first version, it is morally imperative that an action takes place just because it is God's command. That is, it is morally correct to do whatever God commands. According to the second version, God always commands the morally right things. But God's command alone does not result in the fact that any action is morally necessary [15, 210 p.]. Now, without further ado, let's focus on the two main views - religious moral and moral religion - that emerged about the religion-moral relationship.

Religious Morality/Basing Morality on Religion.

According to this approach, morality can be derived from religion, but in no way can religion be derived from morality. Thus, by reducing morality to religion, morality has become a part of religion. The effort to reduce morality to religion is very common in the opinions of thinkers who were trained in cultures dominated by the religion of Islam, Judaism and Christianity. The thinkers who adopted this approach tried to connect the moral good to God's will. That is, according to the basic claim of this approach, all moral principles and ideals are determined according to God's command and laws. This approach establishes a relationship between the will of God and the moral principles, thus claiming that morality should derive from religion. He calls this the «Theory of divine commandment» in the history of thought. According to those who defend this theory, if an action is ordered by God, it is morally correct; if it is forbidden, it is morally wrong. If neither commanded nor forbidden by God, it is optional [16, 131 p.].

Especially in the Jewish-Christian tradition of thought, the association of religion and morality was made through «Divine commandments». It is possible to find the first traces of this religious tradition in Ancient Greek philosophy. According to the ancient Greek tradition of thought, God almost made a contract with people and guaranteed that people who live in accordance with the points in this contract can achieve happiness. But we should also note that there are significant differences between Ancient Greek thought and Jewish-Christian thought in terms of God's conception. It is even possible to say that there is contrast between thoughts. For example, at the center of the ancient Greek tradition is a conception of God that attracts people to desire to resemble him, while at the center of the Jewish and Christian thought tradition is a self-concession of greatness that gives commands/commands more people. In Greek moral philosophy, the religion-moral relationship is considered with the concept of «good», while the Jewish-Christian tradition is based on the concepts of «obligation/responsibility» and «right» in the religion-moral relationship [17, 347 p.].

There are many theologians and philosophers who deal with the issues related to moral good and the will of God from the past to the present with different versions and with different forms of grounding. For the first time in the history of philosophy, one of the thinkers who systematically discussed such problems is Plato. The concept of God is central to his moral philosophy. What he expressed in his *Laws* said, «For us, the measure of everything is God, not man. Therefore, the person who wants to be friends with him has to be as similar to him as possible» [17, 344 p.] is a proof of this.

In the Christian world, William of Ockham and most of the Protestant thinkers have argued that morality derives from religion by adopting the option

of 'something is good because God wants it'. Because, according to them, moral values such as good and bad, right and wrong are known only by revelation [17, 356 p.]. For example, John Calvin, the founder of Protestant theology, attributed the basis of moral values to God by saying, 'What God commands is good, just because He commands it'. Similarly, Gordon Clark argues that God is not bound by any measure. According to him, God does what He wants and these actions should be seen as morally correct just because He wants it [9, 39 p.]. That is, in short, William of Ockham and Protestant thinkers attached more importance to the concept of sin and suggested that salvation would only be achieved through Jesus (by revelation). Thus, he opposed the philosophical theology of the Catholic church. According to them, the philosophical theology put forward by the Catholic church distorts the pure teachings of Jesus. In particular, Ockham's views are very common among Karl Barthian Protestant thinkers. For example, Karl Barth himself claimed that reason alone would not comprehend moral principles, regardless of revelation. On the other hand, Thomas Aquinas and the Christian thinkers who follow in his footsteps claimed that although God sees the source of moral principles, man can know these principles with his own mind, regardless of revelation. It can be easily said that this view is the most approved today, wanted to be developed and defended by many thinkers [18, 10-11 pp.].

Thinkers such as Rashdall, Taylor, Sorley and Newman, who are followers of Kant in contemporary English philosophy, have cited the divine will as the source of morality, claiming that moral principles are in God's mind. To them, without God, no moral ideals will be fully valid [19, 139 p.]. Similar thought exists in the views of contemporary philosophers and theologians, Paul Tillich. When we look at Tillich's views, although it seems to defend a non-religious understanding of morality by linking the source of moral values to the human conscience, it seems to adopt a religious-based understanding of morality by describing the human conscience as the voice of God [20, 31 p.].

In the Islamic world, it is possible to find the opinions of the thinkers belonging to the Gazzali and Ash'ari school in the effort to reduce morality to religion. They say, «what is the ontological status of moral values such as justice, good and evil, and their knowledge? «They focused on the question. According to them, moral values such as good and evil have no meaning other than what God intends. Accordingly, what Allah commands is morally good, and what He forbids is morally bad. Therefore, all our actions will only be valued by Divine will [17, 381 p.]. Eş'ari on the subject says the following words: «Lie, but it is bad because Allah makes it bad. If Allah had made the lie good, it would undoubtedly have been good; If Allah had ordered us to lie, there would have been no objection to Him.» As can be understood from here, according to Ash'ari, it is God himself who puts all moral values, protects and

informs people of them. Moral values have no objective and objective realities independent of God. Likewise, it is not possible for a person to be aware of these values without the revelation of God [9, 39 p.].

Although religion and morality are associated through “divine commandments” in the Islamic thought, the approaches vary according to the meaning and function attributed to the divine commands. For example, the theologian thinkers from the Maturidi and Mutezile school have accepted that using the human mind can have general knowledge of good and evil, regardless of revelation. As a matter of fact, Allah created existence loaded with qualities such as good and bad. The most important of Mutezile’s five main principles is ‘justice’. In order for Allah to realize justice, he must decide on human behavior without any pressure. Otherwise, there will be no point in talking about justice or responsibility [17, 348 p.]. According to Mutezile, the characterization of a behavior as morally good or bad is not because Allah commands or prohibits it, but because that behavior is beneficial or harmful. As can be seen from this, the difference between the theories put forward by Eş’ari and Mutezile is the adjective of justice of Mutezile Allah; Eş’ari, on the other hand, focused on the adjective of power. Although both centered on the Qur’an, the emergence of differences between them stems from different interpretations of the verses [21, 37 p.]. According to Maturidi, another Islamic school, the human mind can grasp moral values such as justice, truth, lies and cruelty, regardless of the commands of Allah. It is a facilitary for reason for Allah to send prophets and inform information about good and evil with revelation [17, 349 p.].

Some thinkers who work on the relationship between religion and morality in Islamic thought have discussed the subject in terms of historical and religious experience. Because from a religious point of view, each of the religions seems to have a largely moral structure and come to regulate relationships between people. The main purpose of sending the prophets is to show people a moral lifestyle and to fulfill their moral missions. Generally, from the point of view of religions, the sending of the prophets has always coincided with the periods when the social order, beliefs and morals were disturbed. Therefore, İhvan-ı Safa expresses “heart doctors” against the prophets. According to İhvan-ı Safa, just as physicians were sent to treat bodily disorders that occurred in different geographies in each period, the same way the prophets were sent to solve the moral problems that arised in different geographies and in different periods [22, 44 p.]. One of the thinkers who adopted this view is undoubtedly Babanzade Ahmet Naim. The thinker expressed the following statements about the relationship between religion and morality. «When we look at every page in human history, auspicious works and virtues have been very common in our society during the periods when the faith and belief system were most rooted. On the contrary, in the periods when the belief systems deteriorated, wars,

moral disgrace and evil prevailed in the life of society [17, 355 p.]. Thus, the thinker provided great support to the thesis that if the religious belief decreases or disappears, serious problems such as moral chaos, crisis, depression and alienation will arise in his society.

Although the effort to reduce morality to religion was adopted by many thinkers, it has been exposed to many criticisms in the history of religious philosophy. The main strands of this view are stated as follows.

Religious morality creates a contradiction and difference between the norms of action of other religions and even anti-faith and non-belief people in today's multicultural societies. Thus, a tendency to marginalize against different believers and non-believers arises and creates a discrimination between people. The fact that every believer has a moral value here means that all other members of religion have a morality. In this case, all non-believers and atheists will be deprived of all moral principles.

The effort to reduce morality to religion eliminates the autonomous existence of morality. Because in order for an action to be moral, it must be revealed with the individual's own will preference. Responsibility cannot be mentioned unless a person prefers an action with his free will. In other words, if the person does not have the opportunity to choose freely in the face of command and event, there is no point in talking about morality.

With the basis of morality on religion, the aspects that have the legal dimension of religion can be perceived as moral. In this case, the orders related to faith and practice in the religion of Islam, such as fasting, going on pilgrimage or believing in the hereafter, turn into completely moral principles. Thus, people or atheists who do not comply with the doctrines related to faith become «immoral».

The spiritual dimension of religion can cause responsibilities to be postponed in the moral sphere. That is, religious beliefs and practices in various religions such as forgiveness of sin and error through repentance, purification of sin, and grounding moral values on reward and sin can reduce the value of morality [23, 715-716 pp.].

In fact, religious morality is not the subject to be discussed in terms of Theism. Because for a theist, since God is the cause of everything in the cosmological and ontological sense, it is also the reason for morality. Without God, there would be no mention of the existence of anything, including morality. Especially the issue of what God commands is good is not a problem for people who believe. Because it is a contradiction in terms of theism that a person believes in God, the Almighty, the absolute good, and questions his will. For a theist, Divine commandments are not an ordinary commandment, and it is unthinkable that there may be an arbitrariness in these commandments. A person can never think of «God can encourage adultery» or «approve of the

lie». Thinking of divine commands like this means not understanding the moral character of the Divine Person [1, 321 p.]. As a result, there may be those who respond in two ways to the question of whether morality is derived from religion or religion from morality in the historical process. Because interpretations and approaches to the relationship between religion and morality may change according to the meaning. But despite these differences, morality and religion have been living side by side and intertwined throughout the ages. Therefore, it can be said that the relationship of morality with religion is together both in theory and in practice.

Moral religion/Base of Religion on Morality.

According to this approach, religion can be derived from morality, but in no way can morality be derived from religion. Thus, by reducing religion to morality, religion became a part of morality. This approach, represented by Protestant liberalism in the Christian world, although it was accepted for a long time in the XIX century, began to be criticized and weakened from the first quarter of the XX century [17, 358 p.]. Therefore, it is difficult to say that the effort of Protestant liberalism to base religion on morality is very successful.

Thinkers who adopted this type of relationship accepted the second option in the Euthyphro discussion. To them, God commands the good things and forbids the bad things. That is, the thinkers who support this thought claim that the realization of morally correct action is an action desired by God. Now let's include examples of Brian Davies about the relationship between morality and religion so that our topic can be understood even better. The thinker states that this approach is divided into two different parts in itself – God wants me to do it, I have to do it morally. If we explain the difference between these two parts with the example of the thinker, a president gives orders to the workers. The president's order is supported by everyone. But a worker says, «Yes, I should, but I should do it not because the president commands, but because it is true» [15, 209 p.]. So it's not because God commanded a good action to happen here, but because that action is inherently good. He confirms this action in God.

When we look at religions in general, we see that Far Eastern religions such as Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism have a predominantly moral basis on their belief systems. For example, Buddha's five commandments such as lying, stealing, killing, committing adultery, drinking have a completely moral structure and these orders coincide with the last articles of the Ten Commandments descending to the Prophet Moses. When we look at the divine religions, it is possible to see that the main sources of Christianity and Judaism, especially the religion of Islam, have a moral structure and essence when the dimensions of faith and law are excluded [23, 717 p.].

When it comes to the relationship between God and morality in Western thought, first of all, we think of Kant's moral proof. According to the German

philosopher Kant, morality is autonomous and does not rely on religion, on the contrary, religion is based on morality. The human being does not need religion to understand what his moral duties are. The will of a person has claimed that he can lead a virtuous life if he is subject to the voice of the moral law in him and therefore acts in accordance with the duties, and acts as a ‘purpose’ because he is a rational person, not as a ‘tool’ serving his own interests. [14, 321 p.]. So, then what is the place of God and religion in Kant’s moral philosophy? Now let’s focus on this issue.

According to Kant’s moral philosophy, in order for the “highest good” (summum bonum) to be possible, it is necessary to exist first of God, the soul and the afterlife as a postula. If there is no God, there is no point in talking about the autonomy of morality or the moral principles of man. That is, reaching the ‘highest good’ can only happen thanks to an excellent omnipotent God [9, 38 p.]. Therefore, the three posts of practical reason – the existence of God, the immortality of the soul and human freedom – are an important and integral part of Kant’s understanding of morality, and without them it is impossible to base morality [17, 352 p.]. In short, Kant’s moral proof tried to show that God is the source of ideal moral values by finding an indifferent, unconditional obligation in man’s moral experience [18, 29 p.].

As Kant stated, in fact, man has the capacity to perceive some moral values within the framework of his own experience. For example, it does not need any revelation to understand that killing or torturing a person is good or bad [1, 321 p.]. In this regard, Hz. The life of the Prophet is a great example for us. Hz. The fact that the Prophet described him as «Muhammad’ul-emin», which means a human being who can be trusted in his word, essence and work, before he was given prophethood, is an indication of his strong character and moral maturity before the prophet. The religion and values of Islam are also built on this beautiful moral ground [22, 54 p.]. A similar example is Hz. It is possible to see in a dialogue between the Prophet and his companions. One day, a Companion named Judge bin Hizam Hz. He comes to the Prophet and says, «O Messenger of Allah! What I did before I became a Muslim; I had some favors such as keeping relations with relatives alive, liberating slaves, helping the poor and poor, will they be rewarded?» He asks. Hz. The Prophet also answers, «You have already done before, you have become a Muslim thanks to your good deed» [22, 56 p.].

Secular Morality and Its Philosophical Resources.

In order to understand the religion-moral relationship in the context of secularism, it is necessary to first review the basic features of modernism. While the issue of religion-moral relationship in traditional societies includes priority, this situation has been left to reason and science in modern societies. While some thinkers try to establish a positive relationship between religion and reason in this regard, others have separated them from each other and

argued that religion and reason will not be compatible in any way. For example, Descartes (1596-1650) said that God bestowed reason on man and that with this mind, man would reach God, while philosophers such as Diderot (1713-1784) saw religions as people's imagination by putting the mind on top of everything else. As can be seen, the way people establish with religion has changed with the modernization processes. Technological, scientific developments have directed the mentalities of religion and the world in the context of classical universe conception to a different view [24, 78 p.]. Thus, morality has ceased to be a theological teaching in the modern period, and people sought the source of morality in philosophy. Religious morality has lost its quality of being the close source of morality to intermediaries such as reason, conscience and society. To put it differently, modernism, while asserting rationalism in science, has pushed the religion and the sacred out of life. Its main pillars can be listed as urbanization, differentiation, industrialism, capitalism, rationalism, secularism, secularism. Now we can move on to secularism, which is our main topic.

Security or Secularism, comes from the Latin word 'saeculum', the English word 'secular' In general terms, this term is used to mean 'worldly, worldization'. As we know, the word secular contains many currents and theories and also means a very broad meaning. In other words, while this word refers to the worldly in general sense, it refers to the isolation of moral rules from all thoughts originating from faith in the moral sense, in other words, the creation of principles and values without taking into account any religious belief. The term secularism was first used by Christian George Jacob Holyoake (1817-1906) [13, 4 p.]. From this point of view, it should not be ignored that the religion expressed within the scope of secularism is mostly Christianity. J Q

In general terms, secular morality is morality built on the basis of disconnection from religion. In other words, some have argued that a moral order can be built separate from the reality of revelation and religion. This type of morality is called 'secular morality'. As we know, secular morality tries to take all values from the field of qualified love to the field of quantitative physics. As a result, man has become a being that consists of psychological impulses, physical and economic needs [25, 5 p.]. With the beginning of the bright age in the post-Renaissance west, some thinkers and scientists were influenced by centuries of hostility to religion and tried to reconcile moral thoughts and views with reason or to reconcile them with general value judgments. They believed that «the measures that dominate morality and the effort to base these measures on evidence were separable from religion and religious beliefs.» Based on this, the attempt to regulate secular ethics began and many ethical echols emerged.

Secularization, although the term secularization does not meet the full meaning, is sometimes referred to with the word 'secularization'. Secularization refers to the isolation of human thought, keeping away from religious and

metaphysical control. In other words, secularization or secularization is the purification and independence of all areas of social life; culture, civilization, politics, education and science from values based on religion [12, 43 p.]. Religious beliefs; It is one of the general attitudes of secularization to ignore as a guide in personal and social decision-making, actions and practice. In this sense, secularization tries to turn people's gaze and judgments into this world and this time by losing the importance and authority of religion in society. However, secularization asserts that religion should be withdrawn from the field of politics in the sense of secularism, and that religious and state affairs should be kept separate. This means the narrowing of the influence of religion on the public sphere and its corporate authority.

After the above explanations, it would be useful to include the religion-moral relationship in the context of secularization for a better understanding of the subject. As we know, each society has its own understanding of morality. Likewise, religion, just like morality, may differ from culture to culture, from society to society, from region to region. In general terms, morality is the whole of the rules of behavior and principles that regulate people's relationships with each other. Religion, on the other hand, is when people believe in supernatural forces and various sacred beings and act accordingly [13, 7 p.]. Although morality and religion are different from each other, their purpose coincides at the same point. The purpose of both areas is to make a person happy in integrity with his environment. However, the understanding of happiness in religion covers the hereafter together with this world.

Although religion and morality have important junctions, it is also very difficult to say that the two always agree. Because there are non-moral religions, as well as non-religious moral understandings. The basis of religion lies in the despise of this world, the search for happiness and competence in another world, the connection of human will to God's will (heteronomy) and the lack of asking about his wisdom. On the basis of morality, there is the loyalty of conscience to its own principles, the autonomy of the will, the competence and value of the moral subject, and the belief that human efforts can be effective in this world. The most obvious difference, even contrast; between autonomy and heteronomy [26, 53-55 pp.]

Positivist sociologist Albert Bayet says in his book 'Secular Morality and Enemies': «Ask the 'Secularists' the basis on which morality is based: one will call the other black. Ask those who believe the same question, they will all say the same thing, that is, God» Metaphysically, there can be no talk of a single secular principle that is the source of morality. According to some, this source can be reason, according to others, nature, conscience, emotion, pleasure, etc. From Enlightenment philosophers to Comte, secular philosophers sought the source and sanctions of morality in this world; According to them, while hell

was the evils of this world, they put forward different visions of heaven. Bayet claims that these differences are not a defect for philosophy, but that 'real' secularism is scientific and unique, and that moral teaching should be based on this. Because, according to him, the purpose of moral education should not be to teach children a certain moral law, but to make them understand why certain moral values are suitable for that country and that period. In other words, the aim was not to raise children who were more 'good', but more suitable for the needs of the society. In this respect, Bayet not only affirmed that sociological morality, but even his founder, Durkheim, was criticized for being too philosophical, not scientific enough [27, 147-149 pp.].

The secular morality built on a humanist, rationalist and secular philosophical basis does not actually reject God. But he's not interested in proving it either. The conscience that allows us to separate good and evil does not false God, but does not prove him as Catholicism claims. Durkheim emphasized that secular moral education made a significant difference in the point of separating the moral forces from religious allegories, symbols and presenting them in their naked rationality, making the child feel the reality of these forces without a mythological intermediary [28, 11 p.].

The moral ideal of secularism denied that morality was the domain of religion and proposed a universal morality on the basis of human rights and responsibilities [29, 49 p.]. On the other hand, although it derives its secular moral source from the idea of the Enlightenment, it emerged as a bourgeois social engineering project that was not only theoretical, but also involved and interfered with the practical transformations that took place in the 19th century [27, 3 p.]. This situation has put some obstacles in front of its development and socialization. Because for this project, it is thought that God - through the 'order' - can also perform an important function in the acceptance of class position and state authority, and it is not abandoned.

Since secularization aims to provide a certain lifestyle and understanding of action to man, although it is a moral aspect, political and philosophical principles also emerge in the understanding of lifestyle and action it offers. Because secularization as a thought reveals a type of information that will guide the person in every field so that people can develop and heal in all respects and easily obtain living conditions, and in this sense, it values the experienced knowledge. With this in mind, various theories have been developed that base morality with non-religious phenomena and human feelings. Since all of the value provisions created by these theories are based on individuals, periods and various cultures, they are constantly variable, they cannot develop objective, general and continuous moral principles. As we mentioned earlier, Epicurean, Hume, Mill, B. Russel and A. Philosophers such as Ayer have developed irreligious moral theories and criticized the moral origin of religion in various

ways [13, 10 p.]. It is possible to collect the criticisms made in this regard in a few articles.

Secularization accepts that in the determination of moral good and evil on the grounds that religion is not experimentable and experienceable, religion can be rejected and a morality that can be developed a solid, consistent and will lead to human happiness based on naturalness to reason and physics world only by secular means. At the same time, secular moralists «is a moral principle good because God commands it, or is it because it is good that God command it?» By asking the question, they oppose the religious moral relationship. ‘How will we know God’s wishes correctly and make them moral?’ By asking the question, it has been argued that religion should not be a source of morality, and even that it should be kept completely out of the field of morality. By citing the Bible and the Torah as an example, there are serious contrasts among the moral principles on the religion-moral relationship, as well as justifications [30, 410 p.]. Accordingly, «There are perhaps thousands of different interpretations of religions and morality with reference to God.» They oppose the religion-moral relationship on the grounds. It is even pointed out that religion should be completely excluded from the moral field.

It has been opposed that religious morals do all their orientations and arrangements completely towards the afterlife, without taking into account the world, making the world’s life miserable, and the source of morality and religion on the grounds. According to those who adopt secular morality; religion restricts the right of choice and freedom of the individual [31, 295 p.]. Attributing a supernatural quality to moral principles sanctifies all moral principles. This sanctification also prevents the discussion, questioning and criticism of moral principles. In this case, too, morality turns into an ordinary stereotypical structure and can never be perfected [30, 404 p.]. For such reasons, it is emphasized that it is necessary to keep religion away from the field of morality.

These criticisms can be defended in some ways or criticized in many ways. Some of the points that are the subject of criticism may apply to some religions that have lived or lived in the world. However, the mistake of evaluating all religions with a generalist approach is a known fact. On the other hand, the phenomenon of «religion» should be taken into account as long as there is a believer. Especially if some determinations are made about morality, which somehow enters every area of human life, the religion that those people consider valuable and sacred must be taken into account. Otherwise, the determinations made will not give the desired result. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate the criticisms directed about the religion-moral relationship, taking into account the believers.

Conclusion

Today, secularism and secularism appear above all as a politically weighted term. As we mentioned before, secularism is the way of thinking and living that pushes all kinds of values and principles attributed to religion out of social life and prioritizes these worldly phenomena instead of beliefs and religious actions. Thus, secularism, by accepting this world as livable, breaks the relations of the individual and society with the hereafter and the sacred. Although it seems at a glance that secularism rejects everything sacred, in fact, secularism in real sense sanctifies its own worldly principles. That is, this is man's blessing himself and the products he produces.

When we look at the general studies on religious morality, the view that there will be no irreligious morality is more common. According to them, when moral values are not based on God or superhuman authority, but reduced only to human resource, morality loses its meaning to a certain extent and leads to Nietzsche's understanding that 'everything has been allowed since God died' [32; 178]. But here, we should also point out that it is not a very correct approach to limit or base moral values only by revelation. Because man is a being prone to morality by nature. As we stated above, regardless of a certain experience of revelation that has emerged in history, man has some information about good and bad, right and wrong. The existence of moral values in the nature of man is a kind of law of nature. It is quite natural that there is morality where people live in the same way as there is life where water is. Here, the duty of people is to develop these moral values, to perfect them and thus to create a virtuous society.

There are basic points that distinguish between secular morality and religious morality. One of the most important features that distinguishes religious morality from secular morality is that it takes care to raise a good person rather than raising a 'good citizen'. The primary ideal of secular moral teaching is worldly gain, its mainstay is physics, strength. The primary ideal of the religious moral teaching is to satisfy spiritual gain and God and reach the happiness of two worlds as humanity. The main point is justice. Problems are tried to be solved with the concern of a fair solution.

The method used in secular morality is 'I' centrist, and competition and competition for success are sanctified. The life principle of secular moral teaching is struggle. Since life is a struggle, 'it may not be important to think of someone else to be successful', which can be acted with pre-acceptance. In the religion-centered moral teaching, the principle of life is struggle and at the same time cooperation. Man has a sense of fulfilling his life responsibilities not only for himself, but also for his family, society and humanity. Sharing morality is prioritized. It is advisable to think of his neighbor, the weak, the poor and other people before him. In religious morality, man is free, but he constantly feels

control of God in his heart. Thus, the conscience of the individual is controlled by the fear of God instead of the fear of the police.

List of references

- 1 Aydın M. Din Felsefesi / M. Aydın. – İzmir: İzmir İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2018. – 364 s.
- 2 Goodman L. Etik ve Tanrı. Din-Ahlak Okumaları / der. H. Aydeniz, F. Topaloğlu. – Ankara: Elis Yayınları, 2016. – S.155-176.
- 3 Warburton N. Felsefeye Giriş / N. Warburton; çev. A. Cevizci. – İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları, 2000. – 193 s.
- 4 Aristoteles. Nikomakhos’a Etik / Aristoteles; çev. S. Babur. – Ankara: BilgeSu Yayıncılık, 2017. – 240 s.
- 5 Güntöre S. Ö. Jean Stuart Mill’in Ahlâk Anlayışı / S. Ö. Güntöre. – İzmir: İlya Yayınevi, 2007. – 147 s.
- 6 Elmalı O. George Edward Moore’da Etik / O. Elmalı. – İstanbul; Arı Sanat Kitabevi, 2007. – 176 s.
- 7 Bergson H. Ahlâkın ve Dinin İki Kaynağı / H. Bergson; çev. M. Karasan. – Ankara: M.E.B. Basımevi, 1949. – 444 s.
- 8 Özturan H. Ahlaki Önergelerin Kaynağı Olarak Akıl. Ahlâkın Temeli / H. Özturan; ed. Ö. Türker. – Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık, 2015. – S. 92-97.
- 9 Akdemir F. Ahlâki Normların Ontolojik Kaynağı ve Epistemolojik Değeri Bağlamında Din/Tanrı-Ahlâk İlişkisi / F. Akdemir // Muhafazakâr Düşünce. – 2009. – C. 5. – № 19-20. – S. 35-53.
- 10 Peterson M. vd. Din Felsefesi seçme metinler / M. Peterson, W. Hasker, B. Reichenbach, D. Basinger. çev. R. Açar. – İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013. – 843 s.
- 11 John R. Muslim Ethics: Sources, Interpretations and Challenges / R. John // The Muslim World. – 1979. – V. 69. – № 3. P. 163 – 177.
- 12 Attas S. N. Modern Çağ ve İslami Düşünüşün Problemleri / S.N.Attas; nşr. M.E. Kılıç. – İstanbul: İnsan Yayınevi, 1989. – 254 s.
- 13 Aydın İ. H. Seküler Ahlak Bağlamında Din-Ahlâk İlişkisi / İ.H. Aydın // Atatürk Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. – 2011. – № 35. S. 1 – 23.
- 14 Tüzer A. Din ve Ahlak. Din Felsefesi. / A. Tüzer. ed. Latif Tokat. – Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018. – S. 313-330.
- 15 Davies B. Din Felsefesine Giriş / B. Davies. çev. F. Taştan. – İstanbul: Paradigma Yayıncılık, 2011. – 292 s.
- 16 Jordan M. C. İlahi Tutumlar, İlahi Buyruklar ve Ahlaki Hakikatlerin Modal Statüleri, Din-Ahlak Okumaları. / der. H. Aydeniz, F. Topaloğlu. – Ankara: Elis Yayınları, 2016. – S.131-154.
- 17 Kılıç R. Din ve Ahlak İlişkisi, Din Felsefesi / ed. R. Kılıç, M. S. Reçber. – Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2014. – S. 343-364.
- 18 Aydın M. Tanrı-Ahlak İlişkisi / M. Aydın. – Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1991. – 238 s.
- 19 Aydın M. Kant’ta ve Çağdaş İngiliz Felsefesinde Tanrı-Ahlak İlişkisi / M. Aydın. – Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1991. – 238 s.
- 20 Tillich P. Ahlâk ve Ötesi / P. Tillich. çev. A. Çınar. – Ankara: Elis Yayıncılık, 2006. – 168 s.
- 21 Yazoğlu R. Din-Ahlâk İlişkisine Genel Bir Bakış / Uluslararası Din Bilimleri Çalıştayı. – Iğdır: Iğdır Üniversitesi Yayınları. 2017. – S. 33-45.
- 22 Uysal E. Dindarlığın Ahlâki Temeli Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler / E. Uysal // Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. – 2005. – C. 1. – № 14. – S. 41-59.

- 23 Çilingir L. Din mi Ahlak mı? / L. Çilingir // International Journal of Science Culture and Sport. – 2014. – №1. – S.711-720.
- 24 Zhanykulov N. Modern Toplumda Din ve Ahlak / N.Zhanykulov // Tabula Rasa: Felsefe Ve Teoloji. – 2022. – № 38. – S. 77-88.
- 25 Sorokin P. A. Çağın Bunalımı, Dirilişi. / P.A. Sorokin; nşr. T. Akman. – 1989. – № 14. – S.48-51.
- 26 Ülken H. Z. Ahlâk / H.Z. Ülken. – İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 2001. – 320 s.
- 27 S. Phyllis. Moral Education for a Secular Society: The Development of Morale Laique in Nineteenth Century France / Phyllis S. – Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988. – 231 s.
- 28 Durkheim E. Moral Education. / E. Durkheim. çev. Everett K. W., Herman S. Editör Everett K. W. – New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. – 288 s.
- 29 Chadwick O. The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century / O. Chadwick. –Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, – 286 p.
- 30 Hazlitt H. Ahlakın Temelleri / H. Hazlitt. çev. M. Aydın, R. Tapramaz. – Ankara. Liberte Yayınları, 2006. – 462 s.
- 31 Cevzici A. Paradigma Felsefe Sözlüğü / A. Cevzici. – İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları, 2000. – 1043 s.
- 32 Ayer A. J. The Meaning of Life / A. J. Ayer. – New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990. – 212 p.

Transliteration

- 1 Aydın M. Din Felsefesi [Philosophy of Religion]. / M. Aydın. – İzmir: İzmir İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2018. – 364 s. (In Turkish)
- 2 Goodman L. Etik ve Tanrı. Din-Ahlak Okumaları [Ethics and God. Religious-Moral Readings] / der. H. Aydeniz, F. Topaloğlu – Ankara: Elis Yayınları, 2016. – S.155-176. (In Turkish)
- 3 Warburton N. Felsefeye Giriş [Introduction to Philosophy] / N. Warburton; çev. A. Cevzici – İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları, 2000. – 193 s. (In Turkish)
- 4 Aristoteles. Nikomakhos'a Etik [Ethics to Nikomakhos] / Aristoteles; çev. S. Babur. – Ankara: BilgeSu Yayıncılık, 2017. – 240 s. (In Turkish)
- 5 Güntöre S. Ö. Jean Stuart Mill'in Ahlâk Anlayışı [Understanding of Morality]. / S.Ö. Güntöre. – İzmir: İlya Yayınevi, 2007. – 147 s. (In Turkish)
- 6 Elmalı O. George Edward Moore'da Etik [Ethics in George Edward Moore]. / O. Elmalı. – İstanbul; Arı Sanat Kitabevi, 2007. – 176 s. (In Turkish)
- 7 Bergson H. Ahlâkın ve Dinin İki Kaynağı [The Two Sources of Morality and Religion]. / H. Bergson; çev. M. Karasan. – Ankara: M.E.B. Basımevi, 1949. – 444 s. (In Turkish)
- 8 Özturan H. Ahlaki Önergelerin Kaynağı Olarak Akıl. Ahlakın Temeli [Reason as the Source of Moral Propositions. The Basis of Morality]. / H. Özturan; ed. Ö. Türker. – Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık, 2015. – S. 92-97. (In Turkish)
- 9 Akdemir F. Ahlâkî Normların Ontolojik Kaynağı ve Epistemolojik Değeri Bağlamında Din/Tanrı-Ahlâk İlişkisi / F. Akdemir // Muhafazakâr Düşünce [Religion / God-Morality Relationship / F in the Context of the Ontological Source and Epistemological Value of Moral Norms]. – 2009. – C. 5. – № 19-20. – S. 35-53. (In Turkish)
- 10 Peterson M. vd. Din Felsefesi seçme metinler [Philosophy of Religion selected texts]. / M. Peterson, W. Hasker, B. Reichenbach, D. Basinger. çev. R. Açar. – İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2013. – 843 s. (In Turkish)
- 11 John R. Muslim Ethics: Sources, Interpretations and Challenges / R. John // The Muslim World. – 1979. – V. 69. – № 3. P. 163 – 177. (In English)

- 12 Attas S. N. Modern Çağ ve İslami Düşünüşün Problemleri [The Modern Age and the Problems of Islamic Thought]. / S.N.Attas; nşr. M. E. Kılıç. – İstanbul: İnsan Yayınevi, 1989. – 254 s. (In Turkish)
- 13 Aydın İ. H. Seküler Ahlak Bağlamında Din-Ahlâk İlişkisi [The Relationship between Religion and Morality in the Context of Secular Morality]. / İ.H. Aydın // Atatük Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. – 2011. – № 35. S. 1 – 23. (In Turkish)
- 14 Tüzer A. Din ve Ahlak. Din Felsefesi [Religion and Morality. Philosophy of Religion]. / A. Tüzer. ed. Latif Tokat. – Ankara: Bilimsel Araştırma Yayınları, 2018. – S. 313-330. (In Turkish)
- 15 Davies B. Din Felsefesine Giriş [Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion]. / B. Davies. çev. F. Taştan. – İstanbul: Paradigma Yayıncılık, 2011. – 292 s. (In Turkish)
- 16 Jordan M. C. İlahi Tutumlar, İlahi Buyruklar ve Ahlaki Hakikatlerin Modal Statüleri, Din-Ahlak Okumaları [Divine Attitudes, Divine Commandments and the Modal Status of Moral Truths, Religion-Morality Readings]. / der. H. Aydeniz, F. Topaloğlu. – Ankara: Elis Yayınları, 2016. – S.131-154. (In Turkish)
- 17 Kılıç R. Din ve Ahlak İlişkisi, Din Felsefesi [The Relationship between Religion and Morality, Philosophy of Religion]. / ed. R. Kılıç, M. S. Reçber. – Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2014. – S. 343-364. (In Turkish)
- 18 Aydın M. Tanrı-Ahlak İlişkisi [The Relationship between God and Morality]. / M. Aydın. – Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1991. – 238 s. (In Turkish)
- 19 Aydın M. Kant'ta ve Çağdaş İngiliz Felsefesinde Tanrı-Ahlak İlişkisi [The Relationship between God and Morality in Kant and Contemporary British Philosophy]. / M. Aydın. – Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1991. – 238 s. (In Turkish)
- 20 Tillich P. Ahlâk ve Ötesi [Moral and Beyond]. / P. Tillich. çev. A. Çınar. – Ankara: Elis Yayıncılık, 2006. – 168 s. (In Turkish)
- 21 Yazoğlu R. Din-Ahlâk İlişkisine Genel Bir Bakış / Uluslararası Din Bilimleri Çalıştayı. [An Overview of the Relationship between Religion and Religion / International Religious Sciences Workshop]. – İğdır: İğdır Üniversitesi Yayınları. 2017. – S. 33-45. (In Turkish)
- 22 Uysal E. Dindarlığın Ahlâkî Temeli Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler [Some Thoughts on the Moral Basis of Religiosity]. / E. Uysal // Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi. – 2005. – C. 1, – № 14. – S. 41-59. (In Turkish)
- 23 Çilingir L. Din mi Ahlak mı? [Religion or Morality]. / L. Çilingir // International Journal of Science Culture and Sport. – 2014. – №1. – S.711-720. (In Turkish)
- 24 Zhanykulov N. Modern Toplumda Din ve Ahlak [Religion and Morality in Modern Society]. / N.Zhanykulov // Tabula Rasa: Felsefe Ve Teoloji. – 2022. – № 38. – S. 77-88. (In Turkish)
- 25 Sorokin P. A. Çağın Bunalımı, Diriliş [The Depression of the Age, the Resurrection]. / P.A. Sorokin; nşr. T. Akman. – 1989. – № 14. – S.48-51. (In Turkish)
- 26 Ülken H. Z. Ahlâk [Morality]. / H.Z. Ülken. – İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları, 2001. – 320 s. (In Turkish)
- 27 S. Phyllis. Moral Education for a Secular Society: The Development of Morale Laïque in Nineteenth Century France / Phyllis S. – Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988. – 231 p. (In English)
- 28 Durkheim E. Moral Education. / E. Durkheim. çev. Everett K. W., Herman S. Editör Everett K. W. – New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. – 288 p. (In Turkish)
- 29 Chadwick O. The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century / O. Chadwick. –Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, – 286 p. (In English)
- 30 Hazlitt H. Ahlakın Temelleri [The Foundations of Morality] / H. Hazlitt. çev. M. Aydın, R. Tapramaz. – Ankara. Liberte Yayınları, 2006. – 462 s. (In Turkish)
-

31 Cevizci A. Paradigma Felsefe Sözlüğü [Paradigm Dictionary of Philosophy] / A. Cevizci. – İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları, 2000. – 1043 s. (In Turkish)

32 Ayer A. J. The Meaning of Life / A. J. Ayer. – New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990. – 212 p. (In English)

Жаныкулов Н., Досалиев Т., Сайфунов Б.

Діни ахлақ және зайырлы ахлақ контекстінде дін-ахлақ арақатынасы

Аңдатпа. Адамдардың бақытты өмір сүруі үшін жасалған ең маңызды жүйелердің бірі ол - ахлақ. Жалпы алғанда, ахлақ - бұл қоғам тарапынан қабылданған дәстүрлердің, әдет-ғұрыптардың, ережелердің, заңдардың, ойлар мен сенімдердің тұтас жүйесі. Сондықтан сенім мен парасатқа ие адам баласын ахлақи қағидалар мен құндылықтарсыз елестету мүмкін емес. Ахлақи принциптер әлеуметтік тәртіпті қамтамасыз етіп қана қоймай, қоғамға ең көркем өмір салтын ұсынады. Бірақ бұл жерде айта кететін маңызды жайт, ахлақи принциптер философиялық ағымдарға қарай бір-бірінен ерекшеленеді. Кейбір ахлақ философтары ахлақты негіздеу және ахлақи принциптерді анықтау тұрғысынан дінді қажетті деп санаса, кейбірі дінді ахлақ саласынан аулақ ұстау керек деп қабылдады. Мұндай әртүрлі көзқарастар мен тәсілдер философия тарихында елеулі тартыстарға жол ашты. Бұл мақалада біз көптеген тартыстардың тақырыбы болған зайырлы ахлақ пен діни ахлақтың негізгі сипаттамаларына және олардың бір-бірінен ерекшеленетін негізгі тұстарына тоқталамыз. Сонымен қатар, ахлақи жүйелерде туындаған мәселелерді біртұтас және сыни тұрғыдан шешуге тырысамыз.

Түйін сөздер: ахлақ, діни ахлақ, зайырлы ахлақ, дін мен ахлақ арақатынасы, зұлымдық пен ізгілік.

Жаныкулов Н., Досалиев Т., Сайфунов Б.

Религиозно-нравственные отношения в контексте религиозной морали и светской морали

Аннотация. Одной из наиболее важных систем, разработанных для того, чтобы люди могли вести счастливую жизнь, является мораль. В общих чертах, мораль - это совокупность традиций, обычаев, предписаний, законов, взглядов и верований, принятых обществом. Следовательно, невозможно представить человека, обладающего верой и разумом, без моральных принципов и ценностей. Моральные принципы не только обеспечивают общественный порядок, но и предлагают обществу наилучший образ жизни. Но здесь важно отметить, что моральные принципы различаются в зависимости от философских течений. В то время как некоторые философы-моралисты утверждают, что религия в значительной степени необходима с точки зрения обоснования морали и определения моральных принципов, другая часть придерживается мнения, что религию следует держать подальше от сферы морали. Такие разные взгляды и подходы привели к значительным дискуссиям в истории философии. В этой статье, которую мы обсуждаем, мы сосредоточимся на основных характеристиках светской морали и религиозной нравственности, которые являются предметом многих дискуссий, и основных моментах, по которым они разделяются. В то же время мы постараемся подойти к проблемам, возникающим в обеих моральных системах, целостно и критически.

Ключевые слова: нравственность, религиозная мораль, светская мораль, соотношение религии и морали, зло и добродетель.