

RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR PARADIGMS OF JUSTICE*

¹Toktarbekova L., ²Seitakhmetova N., ³Zhandossova Sh.**

^{1,2,3}Institute for Philosophy, Political Science and Religion Studies MSHE CS RK
(Almaty, Kazakhstan)

¹lauratoktarbekova@gmail.com, ²natalieseyt@gmail.com, ³sholpan_zhandosova@mail.ru

¹Токтарбекова Л.Н., ²Сейтахметова Н.Л., ³Жандосова Ш.М.

^{1,2,3}КР ФЖБМ FK Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институты (Алматы, Қазақстан)

¹lauratoktarbekova@gmail.com, ²natalieseyt@gmail.com, ³sholpan_zhandosova@mail.ru

Abstract. This article presents a comparative analysis of religious and secular paradigms of justice. The first part examines key concepts of justice in Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism: as a divine attribute and moral ideal in the Abrahamic religions, and as the law of karma in Buddhism. The analysis highlights the role of mercy and forgiveness in the Christian tradition, rationalism and ethical imperative in Islam through adherence to Sharia, the combination of pragmatism and charity in Judaism, and the non-violent, tolerant order in Buddhist doctrine. The second part of the article analyzes the major paradigms of secular theories: utilitarianism, libertarianism, John Rawls's liberal egalitarianism, the approaches and concepts of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum, and deliberative democracy. It is emphasized that each paradigm focuses on different aspects of justice: individual and collective well-being, individual freedom and rights, equality of opportunity, and access to educational, social, and political resources.

Key words: Justice, Religious Paradigms, Secular Theories, Utilitarianism, Liberalism, Deliberative Democracy, Comparative Analysis.

Introduction

«Justice is a complex phenomenon that has been different in all periods, but the concept of «justice» has always had a huge impact on the entire system of public relations» [1, p. 325]. This concise statement sets the direction of this research: no matter how much cultural and institutional forms of life change, the need for justice remains the axiomatic basis of collective existence, pushing each new generation to rethink norms, institutions and values. Indeed, «justice seems to be one of the fundamental values without which the existence of a civilized society would be impossible; therefore, the need for justice is precisely a need, an urgent need, and not an invented artificial category» [2, p. 49]. It is possible to comprehend this «urgent need» only at the junction of several discourses: religious, philosophical, legal, and socio-political, since each tradition sets its own accents – from the eschatological hope for final retribution to the procedural ideal of an impartial law. Within the framework of

* This research has been funded by the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (BR20280977 «Contemporary conceptual approaches to the content of Justice and its implementation in Kazakhstani society within the context of Global transformations»)

** Author-correspondent - Zhandossova Sh., sholpan_zhandosova@mail.ru

religious worldviews, justice is either attributed to God himself (Judaism, Christianity, Islam) or understood as an impersonal law of moral retribution (Buddhism), whereas in secular thought it is interpreted through the prism of utilitarian happiness, distributive equality, or deliberative legitimacy. Nevertheless, convergence is already observed in the classical liberal canon: «justice is the first virtue of public institutions, just as truth is the first virtue of thought systems» [3, p. 139]. With this aphorism, John Rawls emphasizes that the normative validity of any order should be measured not by external successes, but by internal compliance with the principles of honesty, sovereignty and respect for the individual.

This work is based on the idea that for a deep understanding of justice it is necessary to consider religious and secular concepts together. In real life, believers and non-believers constantly interact, compete and influence each other, forming ideas about justice.

In the Abrahamic religions, justice is closely linked to the divine principle. God acts as the measure of truth and the guarantor of retribution. In Buddhism, justice is determined by the impersonal cosmic law of karma, which ensures the inevitability of the consequences of every act.

Modern challenges are reflected in secular theories that institutionalize ancient moral intuition. Utilitarianism seeks to quantify the concept of «greatest happiness». Liberal egalitarianism guarantees equal basic freedoms and seeks to minimize inequality. Libertarianism protects the integrity of the individual. The «abilities approach» is aimed at ensuring real rather than nominal well-being. And a deliberative democracy turns public argumentation into a source of legitimacy.

A comparison of these paradigms shows that seemingly distant concepts address the same issues. These are questions about who the bearer of the ultimate normative authority is, how benefits and responsibilities are distributed, how individual rights and the public good relate, and by what criteria the moral validity of power is assessed. In the era of globalization, when digital inequality and environmental challenges are becoming more urgent, the issue of justice is reaching a new level. Now it must be both related to local specifics and understandable to representatives of different cultures to ensure the harmonious interaction of different views within the framework of a common political agenda.

Methodology

The study provides a comparative analysis of primary sources – Sacred texts and fundamental theological commentaries by Thomas Aquinas and Sayyid Qutb. This approach helps to reveal the inner logic of religious teachings about justice and to trace the development of key concepts in their original context. The methodological base of the article includes comparative analytical and theological methods, as well as hermeneutic analysis of religious texts and philosophical concepts. The authors compare the paradigms of justice in Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism, drawing on the scriptures and authoritative commentaries to identify the specifics of each tradition. Additionally, the article uses the principles of historical and philosophical analysis: the views of Thomas Aquinas, Sayyid Qutb, John Rawls, Amartya Sen and Robert Nozick and other authors are studied, which allows us to trace the evolution of ideas about justice in religious and

secular concepts. The text attempts a synthesized interpretation of primary sources and a conceptual analysis of the category's «justice», «mercy», «equality» and «rights».

Religious Paradigms of Justice: Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Buddhism

In Christianity, justice is traditionally considered one of the basic qualities of God and one of the most important human virtues. In the Bible, these concepts are closely related. For example, the Greek word «dikaiosune», found in the New Testament, simultaneously means both justice and righteousness [4]. In the Holy Scriptures, God appears as the embodiment of justice, which He administers in accordance with the deeds of people. «Righteousness and justice are the foundation of Your throne; Mercy and truth go before Your face» (Ps. 88:15) [5]. Justice is an inherent quality of God, which is manifested in the fact that He rewards everyone according to their merits.[6] «Declaring justice as an absolute value, Christianity initially opposes it with another value, which also has the status of an absolute in society – force» [7, p. 2]. At the same time, Christianity asserts that God is the source of all virtue. Therefore, justice in this teaching is determined by how much a person's actions correspond to God's will and commandments. Man's fulfillment of God's commandments is the way to establish justice, because in Christianity God is seen as the source of all truth and goodness. «Christianity considers Divine justice in connection with original sin. Theologians explain this statement as follows: if original sin perverted human nature, then God's justice is manifested in man's freedom of choice and participation in his salvation by God. Christianity proclaims God as absolute justice. Justice, from their point of view, is largely seen as God's love and compassion for man» [8, p. 3].

A distinctive feature of Christian philosophy is the combination of Divine justice and mercy. Christian theologians emphasize that God is not only just, but also a loving Father. His justice is manifested in love and compassion for man. In the New Testament, the idea of mercy occupies a central place, eclipsing the idea of strict legal retribution. As the Bible says: « For judgment is without mercy to the one who has shown no mercy. Mercy triumphs over judgment» (James 2:13) [5]. This means that, despite His justice, God is ready to forgive the repentant sinner. Mercy becomes an integral part of, and even surpasses, harsh, retributive justice. Many Christian thinkers point out that the Old Testament understanding of justice, based on the principle of «an eye for an eye», is transformed in the New Testament into the idea of forgiving offenses and not resisting evil with violence. However, the category of justice itself is not disappearing, but is being rethought. For a Christian, the highest justice lies in establishing a right relationship with God, which is made possible by Divine grace. Thus, justice in Christianity is both a divine attribute and a moral ideal for man. It includes both retribution and forgiveness based on supreme love.

In the Bible, justice is repeatedly mentioned as an ideal that God seeks to embody in human relationships: «He has shown you, O man, what is good; And what does the LORD require of you But to do justly, To love mercy, And to walk humbly with your God» (Micah 6:8) [5]. This dictum emphasizes that a true religious life must combine both justice and mercy. Orthodox theology also pays special attention to mercy, without which no one can be saved.

In his work «Summa Theologica», Thomas Aquinas considers justice as an inherent quality of God, through which He asserts, preserves, and distributes all things

in accordance with the order determined by His wisdom. Thus, God «gives everyone his own», that is, what corresponds to the nature, dignity and place of each thing. At the same time, it remains a measure of what is due and a source of goodness, from which both just retribution «according to merit» and generosity exceeding all expectations flow [9].

Aquinas also distinguishes between two types of justice: the one that is associated with mutual (voluntary and involuntary) exchange and distributive. The first does not apply to God, «for who gave Him in advance that He should repay»; the second is truly divine: just as a good ruler «gives everyone what they deserve», so the order of the universe, observed both in natural causes and in the actions of the will, «demonstrates divine justice» [9].

In the works of modern Christian philosophers and theologians, a significant place is given to the problem of social justice. By this concept, they mean creating conditions in which all people in society will have equal rights and opportunities, as well as providing support for those in vulnerable situations. These ideas are the basis of the ideas of a just society.

In the Islamic religious and ethical system, justice (al-adl) is a fundamental principle that permeates both faith and Sharia law. In Islam, justice is understood as «taking everything to its proper place and treating all people equally and impartially» [10]. This means observing the divine order, in which no one's right is violated and there is no unfair preference for anyone. Islamic thought emphasizes that justice is closely linked to the idea of balance in society: fulfilling the duties of each person and respecting the rights of others create harmony. In the classical sense, justice is equality in the distribution of rights and responsibilities. Therefore, for a Muslim, everything that is established by Allah and His Messenger is considered fair, and the main criterion is to follow God's law. However, Islam recognizes that equality does not always imply justice. In some cases, a fair decision may mean an unequal distribution of benefits based on real needs or merits.

In the Islamic faith, one of the names of Allah is Al-Adl (the Just), which means «Just». Al-Adl is the One who is the source of the highest justice and gives everyone what they deserve [11]. The Quran repeatedly proclaims that Allah does not do injustice even by a small fraction: «In truth; and Allah wants no injustice to the worlds» (al-Imran 3:108). The meaning of this is that all good comes from God, while evil and injustice are the result of human error and sin. «...in Islam, the justice of the law and the verdict based on it is taken as the main standard. And justice is far from the only requirement for laws in Islam, but the highest rule, the truth of truths, the greatest value. Therefore, Allah, in 28 places of the Holy Quran, emphasizes the issue of justice» [12, p. 163]. For example, Surah an-Nahl says: «Indeed, Allah orders justice and good conduct and giving to relatives...» (an-Nahl 16:90). It is also prescribed in Surah al-Nisa: « O you who have believed, be persistently standing firm in justice, witnesses for Allah, even if it be against yourselves or parents and relatives...» (An-Nisa 4:135). This verse emphasizes the need for trust and fair legal proceedings. Surah Al-Ma'ida (5:8): « O you who have believed, be persistently standing firm for Allah, witnesses in justice, and do not let the hatred of a people prevent you from being just. Be just; that is nearer to righteousness. And fear Allah; indeed, Allah is Acquainted with what you do». It emphasizes the need to be fair, even if it contradicts personal interests. Surah

Al-Hadid (57:25): « We have already sent Our messengers with clear evidences and sent down with them the Scripture and the balance that the people may maintain [their affairs] in justice...» This verse indicates that one of the purposes of the message of the prophets was to establish justice among people [13].

Thus, being just is a religious duty of a Muslim; unrighteousness (zulm) is categorically condemned. «In a broad sense, justice means giving everything its due place, treating everything equally. If we talk about human qualities, then adl includes such human qualities as justice, righteousness, a clear conscience, sincerity, and impartiality» [10].

The Islamic legal tradition (Sharia) elevates the observance of divine precepts to the rank of absolute justice: any norms established by Allah and His Prophet are considered unequivocally fair. «In the hadith of Qudsi narrated by Prophet Muhammad, Allah says: «O my slaves! I have forbidden Myself injustice, I have forbidden it between you. Do not treat each other unfairly!» [11] and «Indeed, Allah commands you to render trusts to whom they are due and when you judge between people to judge with justice. Excellent is that which Allah instructs you. Indeed, Allah is ever Hearing and Seeing». (An-Nisa 4:58). From the prohibition of usury and the regulation of inheritance rights to the protection of property estates and restrictions on punishment, all this is aimed at preventing the oppression of the weak and harmonizing social relations.

The modern understanding of social justice in Islam, according to Sayyid Qutb, is based on «On these three foundations, then – an absolute freedom of conscience, a complete equality of all mankind, and a firm mutual responsibility in society – social justice is built up and human justice is ensured». [14, p. 45]. For Qutb, Islamic justice is primarily a comprehensive, integrative approach based on the unity of spiritual and material principles, freedom of conscience, equality and mutual responsibility, as well as a balance between individual rights and the demands of society.

Therefore, the Muslim doctrine of justice insists that God will not punish an innocent person and will not leave evil without retribution, otherwise it would contradict His justice. G.M. Shakirova points out that for Islam, justice is the leading concept of spirituality associated with the category of divine justice. Muslim theologians of the classical period even developed a special section of the kalam dedicated to the problem of theodicy – combining the evil existing in the world with the absolute justice of Allah [8]. Thus, for Islam, justice is both the moral quality of a believer, the purpose of government, and a sign of a divine order in which everyone gets what they deserve.

There are two fundamental truths: the absolute, just and logical unity of existence and the shared responsibility of each person and society for their actions. It is on these two foundations that Islam builds its concept of social justice, considering both the basic features of human nature and the individual characteristics of people [14].

In Judaism, «justice» (tzedek, tzedaka) is the highest moral value of Judaism. The Bible contains the injunction: «Tzedek, tzedek tirdof» («You shall follow what is altogether just»; Deut. 16:20)» (Deut. 16:20) [15]. «The repetition of the word tzedek underlines the exceptional importance of this principle. Tzedek in the Bible is often also translated as «truth» or «righteousness»; the related word tzedakah means not only justice, but also charity. This indicates the close connection between the concepts of justice and mercy in Jewish ethics. According to the Tanakh, God is the source of

justice and the standard of righteousness: « For You have maintained my right and my cause; You sat on the throne judging in righteousness» (Gen. 18:25; Psalm. 9:5)» [15]. All the commandments were given to establish justice on earth. Following God's laws, people strive to create a world based on truth and honesty. When a person follows the laws of God, he fulfills his destiny and imitates God's justice. In the Jewish tradition, justice is not opposed to love, but, on the contrary, is closely related to it.

In the Jewish tradition, a righteous person is not only a person who follows the laws of God, but also one who acts justly. The prophets condemn social injustice (Isaiah 1:17, Amos 5:24) and the Psalms praise God, who loves righteousness and justice (Psalm 32:5) [5]. The last hope lies with the coming of the Messiah, when universal prosperity will reign in the world and evil will be eradicated. In Judaism, justice is an order established by God, in which everyone gets what they deserve in accordance with God's judgment and law.

Unlike the Abrahamic religions, in Buddhism there is no idea of divine judgment or divine virtue, that is, there is no single supreme judge who would administer justice. However, Buddhist philosophy has its own concept of justice based on the principle of causal retribution, which is known as the law of karma. «Karma is the law of just retribution. It is usually understood as follows: if a person has done something bad in this life, then in the future life, reborn in a different shell, he will experience all the bad things that he brought to others» [16]. Karma is often explicitly called the «law of just retribution»: any committed act inevitably bears fruit – good deeds lead to well-being, evil ones to suffering. Classical texts emphasize the inevitability of retribution. Thus, in the Dhammapada (collection of sayings of the Buddha) it says: «...if someone speaks or does with an impure mind, then misfortune follows him, like a wheel following the track of a lucky one». The opposite is also true: «...if someone speaks or does with a pure mind, then happiness follows him like an ever-present shadow» [17, p. 63]. These images convey the idea that there is an automatic moral order in the Buddha's universe – everyone reaps the fruits of their deeds, and nowhere in the universe can you hide from the consequences of your actions. Thus, «the concept of justice in Buddhism is represented by the equality of all in the development of their wisdom. Belonging to a lower caste is not an obstacle to achieving the Dharma within the monastic culture. In addition, the Buddhist concept of justice is crucial for equality under the rule of karma, since no one can escape the consequences of their actions» [18].

Buddhist morality teaches that any conscious action leaves a mark in karma that determines a person's future. The concept of samsara, an endless cycle of rebirth, ensures justice throughout life: if not in this life, then in the next one a person will face the results of his actions. Thus, karma guarantees moral retribution, even if it does not come immediately. The Buddhist understanding of justice is based on the idea that the world is organized according to moral laws: evil does not go unpunished, and good is rewarded. Everyone is responsible for their own liberation, so they must act fairly towards all living beings in order not to increase suffering in the world [19].

In Abrahamic religions such as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, justice is closely linked to the image of God, who is presented as righteous and merciful. It manifests itself through divine commandments and judgments. Judaism places justice at the center of the Covenant, requiring a person to seek the truth and live according to God's law, combining both judgment and mercy. Christianity, having inherited the idea of

Old Testament justice, reinterpreted it through the prism of the Gospel. God's justice, embodied in the sacrifice of Christ, granted forgiveness to the whole world. Therefore, for a Christian, the highest justice lies in restoring relations with God through grace, where mercy prevails over judgment. Islam proclaims justice as the foundation of the world order, the name and commandment of Allah. In Islam, righteousness consists in obeying divine decrees that ensure inevitable retribution and a balance of rights and responsibilities. Buddhism offers a unique view of the world: in this religion, justice is not the result of the actions of a particular creator but is an integral part of the karmic order of things. This is not the result of a judgment, but a natural law according to which good and evil return to their source.

Despite the differences in theological views, the concepts of justice in different religious traditions have common features. Both Abrahamic religions such as Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism consider justice to be the most important moral ideal necessary for a harmonious society and a proper life. In each of these traditions, justice is associated with retribution, good deeds should be rewarded, and evil ones will suffer negative consequences.

Secular Paradigms of Justice in Philosophy

Utilitarianism is an ethical and philosophical paradigm according to which the justice of a social system is determined by the total well-being or happiness of its members. The classical formulation of this principle belongs to Jeremy Bentham: «the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people» [20, p. 6]. Throughout the 19th and the first half of the 20th century, utilitarianism remained the dominant ethical doctrine in Anglo-American thought: it was expected that it would give moral philosophy the rigor of «scientific» calculation and precision in determining morally obligatory actions [21].

By the middle of the 20th century, the utilitarian paradigm was facing a crisis. Firstly, internal paradoxes and contradictions of various versions of utilitarianism have emerged; secondly, criticism from deontological theories has intensified. Classical utilitarianism has been accused of ignoring distributive justice and failing to protect the rights of individuals for the sake of total benefit.

In response, John Rawls, in his book *Theories of Justice*, proposes a model of «justice as honesty» where, behind a «veil of ignorance», rational individuals «Justice becomes a kind of efficiency, unless equality is preferred» [22, p. 77]. He formulates two principles: 1. The principle of equal basic liberties. Everyone should have equal basic rights and freedoms that will not restrict the freedoms of others. 2. The difference principle. Socio-economic inequality is acceptable if it brings the greatest benefit to the least privileged strata of society and does not limit their opportunities [22].

Despite the importance of J. Rawls's concept, it has been criticized. Amartya Sen, an economist and philosopher, pointed out that focusing solely on proper institutions and procedures is not sufficient to achieve genuine justice. Instead of looking for ideal principles, Sen suggests focusing on eliminating specific manifestations of injustice in the world: poverty, hunger, incarceration, and other similar problems. The scientist notes that «the requirements of a theory of justice include bringing reason into play in the diagnosis of justice and injustice» [23, p. 5], therefore, «...justice cannot be indifferent

to the lives that people can actually live» [23, p. 18]. He emphasizes that formal equal access to rights is not sufficient if social conditions do not allow people to realize their life projects. The philosopher A. Sen introduces the concept of capabilities, developing an approach that focuses on what people can really do and who they can become. Justice, according to A. Sen, should be assessed in terms of the real opportunities that people must achieve well-being, and not only by the formal allocation of resources [23, p. 18]. Developing this theory, Martha Nussbaum argues that «capabilities are a more appropriate benchmark for comparison than satisfaction or resources» [24, p. 98]. Thus, justice is determined by the extent to which people have access to real opportunities to be healthy, educated, and protected from violence and discrimination. The concept of «minimum social justice» acquires a specific content: the state is obliged to guarantee ten basic abilities and not just declare formal equality of rights.

Thus, justice is not only the «first virtue of institutions», but also a principle that connects the design of rules with the real experience of people. Only with a combination of institutional, ability-oriented and procedural levels can, as Sen notes, «...removing injustice, rather than to offer resolutions of questions about the nature of perfect justice» [23, p. IX].

Understanding justice as honesty, J. Rawls emphasizes that its principles are those norms « that free and rational persons concerned to further their own interests would accept in an initial position of equality as defining the fundamental terms of their association » [3, p. 26]. Criticizing utilitarianism, he notes: «The main idea is that society is rightly ordered, and therefore just, when its major institutions are arranged so as to achieve the greatest net balance of satisfaction summed over all the individuals belonging to it» [3, p. 34]. Utilitarianism does offer a clear, rationally computable criterion – maximizing utility, but it risks neglecting the distribution of benefits and individual rights [25].

Libertarianism, on the other hand, places individual freedom and the inviolability of property at the center. Robert Nozick in «Anarchy, the State, and Utopia» (1974), «in which he argumentatively refuted Rawls' ideas of justice. Unlike his opponent, R. Nozick did not put justice at the center of his theory, but freedom» [2, p. 51]. His paradigm is based on the principle of personal self-ownership: everyone has an inalienable right to himself, the results of work and legally acquired property. Nozick formulates two key principles of distributive justice: 1) the principle of fair appropriation – any object of nature can become human property if it is obtained as a result of honest initial appropriation (provided that there remains «enough and equally good» for others); 2) the principle of fair transfer – property should pass from one owner to another only by voluntary consent (through exchange, donation, inheritance, etc.) [27, pp. 194-195]. If both conditions are met, then any resulting allocation of resources is considered fair, no matter how unequal it may be.

Freedom, from the point of view of libertarians, is the highest value and implies minimal government intervention. Equality means only equality of formal rights; attempts to equalize the final well-being are considered arbitrary and unfair. «If the real story that led to the emergence of a real society was fair, then society is fair», Nozick emphasizes [27, pp. 359-360].

Deliberative democracy shifts the focus to collective discussion procedures. Unlike theories that focus only on the content of distribution or principles, the

deliberative approach asserts that fair norms and decisions are those that result from an open, equal and reasonable discussion of citizens. The concept took shape in the 1980s as a reaction to the crisis of traditional representative democracy and the search for new forms of legitimization of power [27].

The deliberative paradigm focuses on the procedure of deliberation, i.e., joint discussion. It is assumed that citizens not only vote periodically but also participate in a reasoned dialogue on socially important issues. The legitimacy of a collective decision stems from the fact that it was made during a free and rational discussion by those affected by it [28]. In other words, the normative ideal is «the power of public reason»: laws are fair if they are adopted not under pressure from some groups over others, but because of an exchange of arguments, where everyone had an equal opportunity to convince and was open to persuasion.

U. Habermas introduces the concept of an «Ideal Speech Situation» [29, p. 139], where participants in the discourse have equal voting rights, equal access to information, are free from external coercion and internal strategy, and sincerely strive for understanding. In real politics, this ideal is unattainable, but it serves as a regulatory principle. A deliberative democracy seeks to institutionalize procedures that are as close to this ideal as possible: public hearings, consultations, civic forums, independent media, transparent authorities, etc. [30].

The liberal egalitarianism of J. Rawls remains an influential secular concept. Behind a «veil of ignorance», individuals would agree to principles that guarantee basic freedoms and protect the weak. The first principle asserts the inviolability of fundamental freedoms; the second, the principle of differences, allows inequalities only if they benefit the least well-off and are accompanied by honest equality of opportunity.

The «Capability Approach» by A. Sen and M. Nussbaum originated as a critique of utilitarian and Rawlsian optics: justice is measured by what people can do and who they can become. The key concept of «capability» describes the totality of achievable functions; the struggle for justice turns into the task of expanding these opportunities here and now, rather than searching for ideal institutions.

To summarize, it can be noted that no paradigm exhausts the concept of justice. Utilitarianism emphasizes welfare, libertarianism emphasizes freedom, the Rawls model emphasizes guarantees of rights and protection of the weak, «capabilities» emphasizes dignity and development, recognition theory emphasizes respect and inclusion, and the deliberative approach emphasizes participation and consent. The dialogue between them continues, giving rise to integrative approaches. Modern secular theories respond to the challenges of globalization, climate and migration justice, but the basic guidelines – freedom, equality, rights, resources, participation, dignity – remain the coordinates in which concepts of justice are formed. Each of the paradigms makes an irreplaceable contribution to understanding what a just and humanly decent social order should be.

Conclusion

The conducted research has shown that justice is a multidimensional phenomenon combining normative, ethical and institutional-political levels. Religious paradigms,

from the Christian synthesis of retribution and mercy to the Islamic principle of al-adl, the Jewish ideal of Tzedek, and the Buddhist law of karma, reveal justice as a cosmic or divine order in which retribution is inevitable and goodness is inseparable from compassion. Secular theories, on the other hand, shift the focus to the design of institutions and procedures: utilitarianism proceeds from maximizing the common good.; The liberal egalitarianism of J.Rawls from equality of freedoms and protection of the vulnerable; the abilities approach of A.Sen and M Nussbaum from the expansion of real opportunities; Nozick's libertarianism from the inviolability of self-ownership; deliberative democracy from public reason and participation. Despite the differences, both groups of traditions agree on the recognition of justice as a criterion for the legitimacy of power and the distribution of benefits.

Justice is a phenomenon that arises only within the social space and whose historical evolution demonstrates how ideas about «due» are transformed along with changes in the forms of social structure: in the liberal democratic world order, its practical provision was often reduced to the mechanical projection of natural laws on the social sphere [31, p. 149]. Thus, justice is both a social and a religious problem, and it also contains its ambiguous conceptual meanings. In secular paradigms, justice very often becomes a topic of political engagement, acquiring a vivid ambiguous connotation. In egalitarian, liberal doctrines, justice is a social category that focuses on the equal distribution of benefits, the rights to freedom and equality, equal access to education, enlightenment, and social elevators. Religious paradigms of justice, in which the implementation of justice is carried out through divine law and conveyed by prophetic missions, are universalized in modern secular societies through social and ethical contexts. Justice in all religious traditions is the highest value, being an effective practice that promotes the principle of justice in all forms of social and practical life.

Justice is not a fixed dogma, but a dynamic axis around which freedom, equality, good and power revolve. It is only in their continuous dialogue between the divine and the human, the universal and the culturally specific, the norm and practice, that it is possible to build a society where «mercy is exalted above judgment», and everyone receives the conditions for a decent, free and responsible life.

List of references

1 Булгаков В.В., Булгакова Д.В. Понятие «справедливость» на исторических этапах развития общества // Вестник ТГУ. – 2012. – №5 (109). – С. 325-328.

2 Булгаков В.В., Булгакова Д.В. Идея справедливости в философии и ее проявление в праве // Социально-политические науки (Тамбов). – 2020. – Т.10, №3. – С. 49–55.

3 Ролз Дж. Теория справедливости. – Новосибирск: Изд-во Новосиб. ун-та, 1995. – 500 с.

4 Лобанов И. Понятие справедливости у апостола Павла // Журнал «Решение вместе». – 2021. – №93. – С. 56–60.

5 Библия // [Электронный ресурс] URL: <https://azbyka.ru/biblia> (дата обращения: 08.07.2025).

6 Справедливость // [Электронный ресурс] URL: <https://azbyka.ru/spravedlivost#:~:text=%D0%A1%D0%BF%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B2%D0%B5%D0%B4%D0%BB%D0%B8%CC%81%D0%B2%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%82%D1%8C%20%E2%80%93%20%D0%B2%D0%BE%D0%B7%D0%B4%D0%B0%D1%8F%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0>

8 Шакирова Г. М. Проблема «Божественной справедливости» // Современный мусульманский мир – 2018 – №4 – С. 15–23

9 Фома Аквинский. Сумма теологии. Часть I. Вопрос 21. - Издательство: Киев: Эльга, Ника-Центр, Элькор-МК, Экслибрис. – 2002 // [Электронный ресурс] URL: <https://azbyka.ru/otekhnik/konfessii/summa-teologii-tom-1/21> (дата обращения: 05.07.2025)

11 Аль-Адль – Справедливый // [Электронный ресурс] URL: <https://azan.kz/durus/view/29-al-adl-spravedliviy-3312> (дата обращения: 05.07.2025)

12 Мухаммад Садик Мухаммад Иусуп. Права человека в исламе. – Москва – Санкт-Петербург: «Диляя», 2008. – 258 с.

13 Құран Қәрім // [Электронный ресурс] URL: <https://kitap.kuran.kz#!/bet/149/kk> (дата обращения: 05.07.2025)

14 Qutb Sayyid. *The Nature of Social Justice in Islam*. – Islamic Publications International, 2000. – P. 324.

15 Электронная еврейская энциклопедия // [Электронный ресурс] URL:<https://eleven.co.il/judaism/religious-ethics/13929/> (дата обращения: 05.07.2025)

16 Горбатов В. Ключевые понятия буддизма: карма, сансара, нирвана, дхармы // Образовательная платформа Level One. – 2019 // [Электронный ресурс] URL: <https://levelvan.ru/pcontent/buddizm-6/ponyatiya> (дата обращения: 05.07.2025)

17 Дхаммапада. Пер. с пали В. Н. Топорова // Памятники литературы Востока. – М.: Наука, 2020. – С. 47–98.

18 Hettiarachchige Kavindu Pabasara. Buddhist Teachings Emphasized by the Preamble of the Indian Constitution // [Электронный ресурс] URL: <https://icermediation.org/the-preamble-of-the-indian-constitution/#:~:text=As%20a%20result%2C%20it%20can,the%20consequences%20of%20their%20actions> (дата обращения: 05.07.2025)

19 Далай-лама XIV. Этика для нового тысячелетия. – СПб.: Амфора, 2016. – 320 с.

20 Бентам И. Введение в основания нравственности и законодательства. — М.: Россспэн. — 1998. — 415 с.

21 Балашов Д.В. Дистрибутивные теории справедливости: от утилитаризма и обратно // Антиномии. – 2021. – Т. 21. – №3. – С. 7–29.

22 Rawls J. A Theory of Justice: Original Edition. – Harvard University Press, 1971. – 538 р.

23 Sen A. The idea of justice. – Cambridge, Massachusetts, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009. – 468 р.

24 Nussbaum M. Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach. – Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011. – 237 р.

25 Singer P. The Most Good You Can Do. – Yale University Press, 2015. – Р. 219.

26 Нозик Р. Анархия, государство и утопия. – М.: ИРИСЭН, 2011. – 432 с.

27 Фурс В.А. Перспективы развития делиберативной демократии в условиях цифровизации коммуникативных технологий // Журнал политических исследований. – 2022. – Том 6. – № 4. – С. 20–30.

28 Shablianskii A. On Mini-Publics in Deliberative Democracies: Inefficient Instrument or Arendt's "Oasis of Freedom"? // [Электронный ресурс] URL: https://sociologica.hse.ru/data/2018/12/30/1143881198/RusSocRev_17_4_103-116_Shablianskii.pdf (дата обращения: 05.07.2025)

29 Хабермас Ю. Моральное сознание и коммуникативное действие. – СПб., 2000. – 380 с.

30 Итиуридзе Л. А. Потенциал делиберативной демократии в диалоге власти и общества в России // Вестник Московского государственного лингвистического университета. Общественные науки. – 2024. – Вып. 4(857). – С. 24–31.

31 Батурина В. Справедливость и либерально-демократический миропорядок // Аль-Фараби. – 2022. – №79(3). – С. 139–152.

Transliteration

7 Hristianstvo o spravedlivosti [Christianity about justice] // [Elektronnyj resurs] URL: <https://dspace.nuft.edu.ua/server/api/core/bitstreams/c0e1efcd-ccfc-4fdf-bffa-cde3f1f662ddaa/>

8 Shakirova G. M. Problema «Bozhestvennoj spravedlivosti» [The Problem of "Divine Justice"] // Sovremennyj musul'manskij mir. – 2018. – №4. – S. 15–23.

9 Foma Akvinskij. Summa teologii. Chast' I. Vopros 21 [Summa Theologia. Part I. Question 21]. - Izdatel'stvo: Kiev: Jel'ga, Nika-Centr, Jel'kor-MK, Jekslibris. - 2002 // [Jelektronnyj resurs] URL: <https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/konfessii/summa-teologii-tom-1/21> (data obrashhenija: 05.07.2025)

11 Al'-Adl' – Spravedlivyyj [Al-Adl - Fair] // [Elektronnyj resurs] URL: <https://azan.kz/durus/view/29-al-adl-spravedlivyy-3312> (data obrashhenija: 05.07.2025)

12 Muhammad Sadik Muhammad Iusuf. Prava cheloveka v islame [Human Rights in Islam]. – Moskva – Sankt-Peterburg, «Dilja», 2008. – 258 s.

13 Kyran Kərim [Quran Karim] // [Jelektronnyj resurs] URL: <https://kitap.kuran.kz/#/bet/149/kk> (data obrashhenija: 08.07.2025)

14 Qutb Sayyid. *The Nature of Social Justice in Islam*. – Islamic Publications International, 2000. – P. 324.

15 Jelektronnaja evrejskaja jenciklopedija [Electronic Jewish Encyclopedia] // [Jelektronnyj resurs] URL:<https://eleven.co.il/judaism/religious-ethics/13929/> (data obrashhenija: 05.07.2025)

16 Gorbatov V. Kljuchevye ponjatija buddizma: karma, sansara, nirvana, dharmy [Key concepts of Buddhism: karma, samsara, nirvana, dharma] // Obrazovatel'naja platforma Level One. – 2019 // [Jelektronnyj resurs] URL: [https://levelvan.ru/pcontent/buddizm-6/ponyatia\(data_obrashhenija: 05.07.2025\)](https://levelvan.ru/pcontent/buddizm-6/ponyatia(data_obrashhenija: 05.07.2025))

17 Dhammapada. Per. s pali V. N. Toporova // Pamjatniki literatury Vostoka. – M.: Nauka, 2020. – S. 47–98.

18 Hettiarachchige Kavindu Pabasara. Buddhist Teachings Emphasized by the Preamble of the Indian Constitution // [Jelektronnyj resurs] URL: <https://icermediation.org/the-preamble-of-the-indian-constitution/#:~:text=As%20a%20result%2C%20it%20can,the%20consequences%20of%20their%20actions> (data obrashhenija: 05.07.2025)

19 Dalaj-lama XIV. Jetika dlja novogo tysjacheletija [Ethics for the New Millennium]. – SPb.: Amfora, 2016. – 320 s.

20 Bentam I. Vvedenie v osnovaniya nравственности i zakonodatel'stva [Introduction to the Foundations of Morality and Legislation]. – M.: Rossppjen. – 1998. – 415 s.

21 Balashov D.V. Distributivnye teorii spravedlivosti: ot utilitarizma i obratno [Distributive Theories of Justice: From Utilitarianism and Back] // Antinomii. – 2021. – T. 21. – №3. – S. 7–29.

22 Rawls J. *A Theory of Justice*: Original Edition. – Harvard University Press, 1971. – 538 p.

23 Sen A. *The idea of justice*. – Cambridge, Massachusetts, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009. – 468 p.

24 Nussbaum M. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. – Cambridge MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011. – 237 p.

25 Singer P. *The Most Good You Can Do*. – Yale University Press, 2015. – P. 219.

26 Nozick R. *Anarhija, gosudarstvo i utopija [Anarchy, state and utopia]*. – M.: IRISJeN, 2011. – 432 s.

27 Furs V.A. *Perspektivny razvitiya deliberativnoj demokratii v uslovijah cifrovizacii kommunikativnyh tehnologij [Prospects for the Development of Deliberative Democracy in the Context of Digitalization of Communication Technologies]* // *Zhurnal politicheskikh issledovanij*. – 2022. – Tom 6. – № 4. – S. 20-30.

28 Shablinskii A. *On Mini-Publics in Deliberative Democracies: Inefficient Instrument or Arendt's "Oasis of Freedom"?* // [Elektronnyj resurs] URL: https://sociologica.hse.ru/data/2018/12/30/1143881198/RusSocRev_17_4_103-116_Shablinskii.pdf (data obrashhenija: 08.07.2025)

29 Habermas Ju. *Moral'noe soznanie i kommunikativnoe dejstvie [Moral consciousness and communicative action]*. – SPb., 2000. – 380 s.

30 Itiuridze L. A. *Potencial deliberativnoj demokratii v dialogue vlasti i obshhestva v Rossii [Potential of deliberative democracy in the dialogue between government and society in Russia]* // *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta. Obshhestvennye nauki*. – 2024. – Vyp. 4(857). – S. 24–31.

31 Baturin V. *Spravedlivost' i liberal'no-demokraticheskij miroporjadok [Justice and the liberal democratic world order]* // Al'-Farabi. – 2022. – №79(3). – S. 139–152.

Токтарбекова Л.Н., Сейтахметова Н.Л., Жандосова Ш.М.
Діни және зайырлы әділеттілік парадигмалары

Аннатація. Бұл мақалада әділеттіліктің діни және зайырлы парадигмаларына салыстырмалы талдау жасалады. Бірінші бөлімде христиан, ислам, иудаизм және буддизмдегі әділеттілік ұғымының негізгі тұжырымдамалары қарастырылады. Әділеттілік ибрахимдік діндерде Құдай сипаты және адамгершілік ретінде, ал буддизмде карма заны ретінде көрініс тапқан. Христиан дәстүрінде мейірімділік пен кешірім, исламда шаригатқа бағыну арқылы жүзеге асатын рационализм мен этикалық императив, иудаизмде прагматизм мен қайырымдылықтың үйлесімі, буддизмде зорлық-зомбылықсыз, толерантты тәртіп көрсетілген. Екінші бөлімде зайырлы теориялардың негізгі парадигмалары: утилитаризм, либертариандық, Джон Роулздин либералды әгалитаризмі, Амартия Сен мен Марта Нуссбаумның көзқарастары мен тұжырымдамалары және делиберативтік демократия ұғымдары зерттеледі. Әрбір парадигма әділеттіліктің әртүрлі аспектілеріне: игілікке: жеке және қоғамдық игілікке, жеке тұлға бостандығы мен құқықтарына, мүмкіндіктер тенденцияне, білім беру, әлеуметтік және саяси ресурстарға коллежтімділікке баса назар аударалыны атап өтіледі.

Түйін сөздер: әділеттілік, діни парадигмалар, зайырлы теориялар, утилитаризм, либерализм, делиберативті демократия, салыстырмалы талдау.

Токтарбекова Л.Н., Сейтахметова Н.Л., Жандосова Ш.М.
Религиозные и светские парадигмы справедливости

Аннотация. В статье проводится сравнительный анализ религиозных и секулярных парадигм справедливости. В первой части рассматриваются основные концепции

справедливости в христианстве, исламе, иудаизме и буддизме: как божественный атрибут и нравственный идеал в авраамических религиях, а также как закон кармы в буддизме. Выделяется роль милосердия и прощения в христианской традиции, рационализм и этический императив, следование шариату в исламе, сочетание прагматизма и благотворительности в иудаизме, а также ненасильственный, толерантный порядок в буддистской доктрине. Во второй части статьи анализируются ключевые парадигмы светских теорий: утилитаризм, либертиаранство, либеральный эгалитаризм Ролза, подходы и концепции Амартии Сен и Марты Нуссбаум, а также делиберативная демократия. Подчеркивается, что каждая парадигма акцентирует различные аспекты справедливости: благо: индивидуальное и общественное благо, свобода и права индивида, равенство возможностей, доступ к образовательным, социальным и политическим ресурсам.

Ключевые слова: справедливость, религиозные парадигмы, светские теории, утилитаризм, либерализм, делиберативная демократия, сравнительный анализ.

Received 29.07.2025

Accepted 01.09.2025