

RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS AS FORM OF PUBLIC CONSCIOUSNESS

**Assel Buzhayeva, Ayazhan Sagikyzy, Karlygash Borbassova,
Talgat Mekebayev, Shamshiya Rysbekova
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan
Institute of Philosophy, Political Science
and Religion Studies, Kazakhstan**

Abstract: *An article analyzes religious consciousness as one of the forms of public consciousness. The structural and functional method, the principle of integrity, the principle of historicism, the comparative method and some aspects of synergetic approach are applied as methodology. It was carried out the critical analysis of interpretations of public consciousness structure in historical materialism, and it was shown their insolency. The author's understanding of this structure is offered. The traditional forms of public consciousness are marked out in the horizontal plan in the structure, and two levels of traditional forms-unspecialized (ordinary) and specialized are specified in it. It is noted that in religion as a sociocultural phenomenon the most significant structural element, its kernel, is religious consciousness, and in the last-an image-conception about the Absolute and specific faith in it. It is shown that religious consciousness and its kernel sets the nature of religious practice (and first of all, character of a cult) and also all other structural elements of religion. The structure of religious consciousness is presented in article in the form of level of ordinary consciousness and the risen hierarchy of the specialized forms, crowned by Theology. All these levels are penetrated by faith, interpreted on each of the levels in unusual way. The religion in modern Kazakhstan is balanced in the rights with all other spheres of culture but religious consciousness is still developed insufficiently. It is at the level of ordinary consciousness for the most of believers. However, the tendency of its improvement is amplified that is promoted by positive religious climate in the Republic of Kazakhstan: there is reigned the same consent between faiths, as well as between ethnoses.*

Keywords: religion, faith, public awareness, religious consciousness, structure of religious consciousness, historical materialism, faith, belief, values, Christianity, Islam, Kazakhstan.

The problem of essence of religious consciousness and especially its structure is very relevant now. There are formed, inside of the structure, the moods and ideas as the tolerant, respecting other beliefs, and moods and the ideas of religious intolerance, religious radicalism and extremism, and in extreme variants-also the terrorism which is based on religious extremism. There is a task to analyze critically the main points of view on essence and structure of religious consciousness, also to reveal features of functioning of religious consciousness in the conditions of independent Kazakhstan.

Research methodology

It was applied in the research the number of methods as traditional, already positively proved, and some new, which were appeared rather recently. The structural-functional method allowed to reveal the main structural elements in public consciousness and to define their main functions. The principle of integrity allowed to have constantly the image as whole at the research of these or those structural elements of religious consciousness. The principle of historicism in the form of cultural historicism allowed to consider religious consciousness and its structure in its ethno-cultural characteristics, first of all in relation to the situation in modern Kazakhstan. There was applied the comparative method, and also the synergetic approach which was allowed to understand, how interaction of some elements of religious consciousness generates new effects.

Public consciousness and its general structure

Religious consciousness is the consciousness which is formed and functioning in religion as the special sphere of culture which is rather isolated from other its spheres—from science, art, policy, right, etc. Being public on its genesis, essence and structure, it has as common features with essence and structure of consciousness in other rather independent spheres of culture, and essential differences. In this regard, at first, it is necessary to pay attention to the general structure of public consciousness, and already then to pass to the specifics of structure of religious consciousness.

It was so happened that the problem of structure of public consciousness was put and solved most accurately in the Marxist oriented philosophy, in particular-Soviet. The Soviet philosophy was non-uniform in different aspects including in aspect of compliance of its official ideology. In the light of this ideology, the official philosophy consisted of two main sections-dialectic materialism and historical materialism. Other its sections (philosophical questions of natural sciences, the critic foreign, „bourgeois” (on the Soviet terminology) philosophies and some other) were considered as minor. There were such directions as dialectic logic, philosophy of the person and some other which didn't keep within neither in dialectic, nor historical materialism. The problem of public consciousness and its structure was developed in historical materialism.

Almost all representatives of historical materialism in this matter proceeded from the dogmatic statements of K. Marx and F. Engels early works (mainly „The German ideology”), the known preface of K. Marx to his work „To criticism of political economy” and the so-called „Lenin’s theory of reflection”. The fact that Marx, Engels and V. I. Lenin’s views, underwent changes over time, somehow weren’t considered by them. But they not only reproduced these provisions and dogmatized them, but they vulgarized them as well. For example, mature Marx emphasized that „*public human relations are possible only in that measure in what people think*”,¹ and in 1915 Lenin wrote: „*Consciousness of the person not only reflects the objective world, but also creates it*”.² Nothing was considered in the works of representatives of historical materialism on the problem of public consciousness. Public consciousness was interpreted by them just as *reflection* of social being (i. e. it is formal-in the spirit of early works of the specified classics), and this objective reality was interpreted as the economy sphere. In addition, the social being and public consciousness for some reason turned into two separate spheres, related to each other according to the logic of the cause-effect relations.

The representatives of historical materialism, at a variety of the points of their views, were united that, firstly, in this structure it is necessary to mark out *gnosiological* and *sociological* aspects, secondly, to allocate the structural elements horizontally and vertically. According to this treatment, the *gnosiological* structure includes two levels: *ordinary* and *theoretical* consciousness; the *sociological* structure, according to it, includes three levels: *public psychology*, *ideology* and *science*. Besides, the horizontal structure, according to most of authors, is formed by so-called forms of public consciousness, so they are: *political consciousness*, *sense of justice*, *morals*, *art*, *religion*, *science* and *philosophy*.

Proceeding from so-understood structure of public consciousness, the structure of religious consciousness was investigated as well. As a matter of fact, the religion was actually interpreted as the form of public consciousness there. So, D. M. Ugrinovich claims that „*it is fair to consider religion first of all as the form of public consciousness*”.³ There are marked out in *gnosiological* structure: 1) level of ordinary religious consciousness and 2)

¹ K. Marx, „Economic manuscript of 1861-1863. The process of capital production”, in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Works*, 2nd edition, volume 47, Moscow, Politizdat, 1973, p. 659.

² V. I. Lenin, „Abstract of Hegel’s book *The science of logic*”, in V. I. Lenin, *Complete works*, volume V-29, Moscow, Politizdat, 1973, pp. 77-218.

³ D. M. Ugrinovich, „Religion”, in *Public consciousness and its forms*, Moscow, Politizdat, 1986, pp. 241-276.

the level of „theoretical” consciousness, so it is the divinity (theology). They, according to this position, are different in forms of *reflection* of reality.⁴ The religious ideology and religious psychology can be allocated in sociological aspect. „*Religious ideology*, -D. M. Ugrinovich writes, -*includes divinity as the major component, but isn't exhausted by it. Besides divinity, the sphere of religious ideology includes the philosophical, ethical, esthetic and socio-political doctrines where the cornerstone is the system of religious dogma*”.⁵ Thereby, according to this point of view, the religious ideology as the level of sociological aspect of religious consciousness is more volume, than divinity as the level of gnosiological aspect. But it is the same divinity, if it is about the same religion. Why is there necessary doubling of structural elements? Besides, the sociological structure of public consciousness, according to historical materialism, includes also the third level which is located above ideology. It is science. But there can't be talked about science as the level of sociological structure of religious consciousness: the science and religion, according to historical materialism, are *incompatible*. Therefore, we can't argue for no special reason about three steps of sociological aspect of structure of public consciousness.

The interpretation of structure of public consciousness by historical materialism has more „disagreements”. The forms of public consciousness allocated by historical materialism are listed above. It is possible to determine at once insolvency of reference of three last phenomena to *consciousness* forms. Neither the religion, nor art, nor science can be reduced to consciousness. For example, the science, especially modern, has complex institutional structure, possesses (especially natural sciences) difficult and branched material resources-the compound devices, equipments (for example, accelerators of elementary particles, radio telescopes), etc., that is what can't be interpreted as the consciousness phenomenon in any way. The same is fair concerning religion and art.

But if we distract from it, then there is arisen the number of other questions: 1) why is the gnosiological (i. e. informative) aspect opposed sociological (i. e. social)? Isn't knowledge the *social* phenomenon on the essence? Why is the theoretical level of gnosiological structure opposed to science as the level of sociological structure? Isn't theoretical activity at the same time-scientific activity (if we distract from non-scientific forms of knowledge)? And what can the theoretical level and level of

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ *Ibidem*.

science mean in relation to such forms of public consciousness as morals, art or religion? Representatives of historical materialism didn't think about this unconformity.

Only philosopher B. A. Grushin was questioned this dogma during the Soviet times. He wrote: „*From my point of view, such solution of the question isn't acceptable categorically. The gnosiological and sociological aspects are nothing more than the accents in the analysis of certain formations of social consciousness, therefore they can't be used for emphasizing in any way, creation of independent-„gnosiological” and „sociological”-structures of the system, interesting us*”,⁶ that is public consciousness. He suggested own (with the proviso that it has preliminary character) idea about structure of public consciousness. He noted that „*in public consciousness at the lowermost, fundamental level of his partition it is necessary to mark out first of all the numerous formations, relating to various ways (means) of spiritual development of reality by the person... The last ones are differenced from ways of the subject and practical development of the world and include at least three extremely wide types (classes) of the consciousness elements: I-subject and sensual (emotional and figurative) forms of consciousness; II-abstract and logical (rational) forms of consciousness and III-fantastic (irrational in the broadest sense) consciousness forms*”.⁷ He determined the first type as public psychology, the second as public knowledge and the third as public imagination.

Certainly, the structure, suggested by B. A. Grushin, is much richer then traditional and is closer to the main point. But, it is asked: does the division, suggested by the author make sense, and can be it carried out to infinity in principle? Especially it gives formalism. But the main thing isn't in it. Those phenomena which traditionally are determined as a form of public consciousness, haven't found the place in the structure of public consciousness, suggested by B. A. Grushin. They would need to be *rethought*, but it wasn't necessary to reject from them. Thus, any of interpretations of structure of public consciousness in the Soviet philosophy can't be considered as satisfactory. So, it is useless for disclosure of the structure of religious consciousness.

Religion and the structure of religious consciousness

We consider that in modern structure of public consciousness the form of public consciousness certainly exist. But they didn't always exist

⁶ B. A. Grushin, „Structure and set of public consciousness”. in *Sociological researches*, no. IV, 1983, pp. 17-28.

⁷ *Ibidem*.

such as those. They existed in primitive culture only in a germ, syncretic manner, and-only gradually during historical evolution-they were stood out as those, as such spheres of culture as religion, art, science, etc. were gradually formed. At the same time, ones of them were stood out earlier, and others later. But it is more correct to investigate structure of public consciousness in its developed form, than in germinal. In our opinion, it is necessary to allocate two levels in each of rather independent forms of public consciousness: 1) *ordinary* consciousness (makes the lower level), and 2) *specialized* consciousness (makes the top level). Besides, it is necessary to mark out ideological consciousness as the special form of consciousness. However, right there it is necessary to add that, firstly, ordinary consciousness is syncretistic and includes elements of all specialized levels; secondly, ideological consciousness doesn't make something monolithic integrated, and it accepts character of some other specialized forms of consciousness, so there is a political ideology, religious ideology, etc.; thirdly, in the XX century there was created such phenomenon as the *mass* consciousness which on the level is below ordinary consciousness. At last, it makes sense to speak about *public psychology* which penetrates itself both ordinary, and specialized consciousness, and it is equal also ideology. However, to a greater extent, social psychology, of course, fascinates the sphere of ordinary and mass consciousness, but it traces the roots back to the area of unconscious.

It follows from the foregoing that the religion as a sociocultural phenomenon *doesn't come* to consciousness that religious consciousness is only one of structural elements of religion as integrity. But it is its basic structural element. It is possible to claim that religious consciousness is a *system-forming* element of religion. All other structural elements of religion are not only formed and function on the basis of religious consciousness, but also *arise* from it. The developed religion forms (and those are the world religions) possess complex structure. Specific religious practice which is determined as a cult arises from religious consciousness, about this structure will be told below. The cult is already the phenomenon which doesn't come to only to the sphere of consciousness, but includes also practical aspect. Cult includes different ceremonies, rituals and other actions which are coordinated with the content of religious belief. The cult, in the opinion of adherents of religion, appears as the valid attitude towards the Absolute. As the system of actions the cult is very semiotics overfilled. It is full of various symbols and, in fact, is a symbolical phenomenon in whole. The Russian philosopher of the Silver age P. A. Florensky writes: „*The cult is comprehended from top to down, but not from below*

to up. The cult, from below to up considered, is some activity of the person, the type of his cultural activity, existing along with others”⁸. Various objects, both specific, and usual are used in the course of consideration of the cult. However, all of them equally have specific symbolical sense in the context of this process. The cult, on the sense, is implementation of the attitude of the person to the accepted in this concrete religion towards the absolute Super-creation, or, speaking philosophical language, to the Absolute. „Cult,-A. A. Khamidov wrote,-assumes the set of devotional duties based on dogma, containing rules of behavior for believers concerning the Absolute (sacrifices, spells, meditation, a prayer, etc.-depending on character of dogma), to the Person, to the Nature, to brothers in faith, to gentiles, to opponents of Religion, to religiously indifferent people and to people in general. That is any Religion contains along with other as well the general ethical code, as gives it the status of intimacy to daily activity. The religion pedantically regulates everything, to the smallest detail, aspects of this life activity throughout the day in some religions (for example, in Judaism and Islam)”⁹.

The third structural element of religion is *organizational* level. The system of religious consciousness and cult unite the people, professing this religion in some integrity, in community, owing to what there is risen the quite objective need of management of religious life for this community. Function of management in early cultures is undertaken by priests, castes of priests are formed later, and in world religions there is the whole hierarchy of priests. The fourth structural element of religion is specific infrastructure-different constructions (pagan shrines, churches, temples, cathedrals, mosques, etc.), in which the cult is done.

Let's turn to religious consciousness in its developed form. Its kernel is the image-conception about absolute Super-creation, i. e. about the Absolute. There are in Abrahamic religions - Yahweh (Judaism), who doesn't have the name God (Christianity), and Allah (Islam). But the image-conception isn't just postulated and accepted as givenness. Its recognition is complemented with the specific *attitude* towards it. This relation is *belief*. Faith grows into the *denomination* and *dogma* (doctrine as a system of dogmas) in such developed forms of religion, as it was mentioned above.

It is about specifically religious belief which should be distinguished from *informative* belief. The Russian philosopher D.V. Pivovarov suggested distinction of two types of belief-as faith and belief.

⁸ P. A. Florensky, *Collected works. Cult philosophy. (Experience of the orthodox anthropodicea)*, Moscow, Mysl, 2004, p. 686.

⁹ A. A. Khamidov, „Religion as the world-relational modality”, *Religion in policy and culture of the modern Kazakhstan*, Astana, Elorda, 2004, pp. 10-48.

He writes: „*The Faith is special spiritual knowledge, and the belief isn't knowledge*”. „*The Belief,-he continues,-is only one of the moments of the mind movement to indirectly formed knowledge, but isn't rational knowledge at whole. On the contrary, the faith (the soul's stay in the spirit) is the possession of the most important spiritual truths which are difficult to express in words and concepts*”.¹⁰ A. A. Khamidov accepted this distinction; however, he didn't accept Pivovarov's interpretation. According to his opinion, these two types are rooted in different types of the person relation to the world: faith-in religious, and belief-in informative. At the same time, he notes, elements of each of them as the subordinated moments are contained in both. He writes: „*D. V. Pivovarov defines correctly faith as spiritual belief. This faith, as it was mentioned above, isn't knowledge at all (not in form, of course, but in content); it is the form of emotional and volitional aspiration for the product of imaginative construction. But when D. V. Pivovarov claims that the belief isn't knowledge, it is impossible to agree with him; but he doesn't distinguish these world-relational modalities – religious and cognitive*”.¹¹ The famous theologian P. Y. Tillich notes that „*Faith is opposed by belief, but it isn't knowledge*”.¹² He, however unlike D. V. Pivovarov, doesn't distinguish faith and belief.

The famous religious philosopher M. Buber also distinguishes two types of belief. He writes: „*There are two-and only two-images (or types) of belief. One form of belief is expressed as: I trust someone even if I have no „sufficient basis” to trust this person. Other form of belief is found out: I, without the sufficient basis as well, recognize the validity of something. In both cases the impossibility of justification indicates not on the lack of my mental abilities, but on essential feature of my attitude towards the person, to whom I trust, or to the contents, which I recognize as true. This relation inherently isn't created on the „bases” and doesn't follow from them. Of course, it is always possible to refer to certain bases and the reasons, but they never be able to explain my belief up to the end*”. These two types of belief, Buber notes, meet also in everyday life of people.

As a matter of fact, the types of belief, marked out by M. Buber, are essence only two types of *the same belief*, namely-belief-trust. In one case it is trusted to other person, in another-to the certain statement, knowledge, information in general. In other words, they are different by the addressee or subject. Buber notes that the situation is changed when we address to religious belief. He writes: „*The religious belief represents one of these two images of belief, which are shown in the sphere of unconditional. This means*

¹⁰ D. V. Pivovarov, „*Religion philosophy. Manual*”, Moscow, Yekaterinbugr, Academic project; Delovaya kniga, 2006, p. 639.

¹¹ A. A. Khamidov, „Belief and knowledge”, in *Adam alemi*, no. IV, 2013, pp. 90-102.

¹² P. Tillich, *Selected. Theology of culture*, Moscow, Yurist, 1995, pp. 132-215.

that the attitude of belief here is no longer the relation to someone or something inherently conditioned, but unconditional only for me, but the attitude to what is in itself unconditional".¹³ Thus, everything is determined by the addressee of belief trust. Other person and information obtained by me have the caused character, God is the unconditional addressee. Therefore, in him, and in everything that comes from him (for example, revelation), there is had an unconditional.

It seems to us that the point of view of A. A. Khamidov is more acceptable, according to him, the faith is especially religious faith, and belief is informative. It „is belief trust of the individual (individuals) to knowledge, developed by science”.¹⁴ The ordinary person can't check that knowledge for the validity which is developed by modern science. Besides, the science as integrity is divided into a set of specialties. The physicist is forced to take on trust the data obtained, for example, by the molecular biologist, and he, in turn, is forced to trust physicist on the movement of elementary particles. But the separately taken branch of science comprises the mass of professions, so the expert in one of them has to trust another in all that he states in the publications and reports. According to A. A. Khamidov, the faith is not just the believer's attitude towards the Absolute. He writes: „*The Faith isn't the act of cognition; it is aspiration; it is dominated by an axiomatic moment, whereas in belief-there is dominated the pragmatism moment (in a broad sense). The Belief is belief-trust to the certain information proclaimed as the truth. The Faith also includes trust, but it-is more, than trust; it is also fidelity (fidelity, first of all..., to the Absolute). And it penetrates all the mental and spiritual world of the person and makes, so to speak, his core. The Belief, at valuable component, doesn't capture the person totally. Life in faith is determined as a creed: the person not just trusts, but believes. The Belief-is rational; the faith can't be rational*”.

So, we defined religious belief as the kernel of religious consciousness. Around this kernel-if to take a circle as model-covers of religious consciousness are concentrated. But for simplicity, we will depict them aligned vertically. Moreover, faith (further it will be meant only it) penetrates itself all religious consciousness, being present at each of its levels. But it is present, refracting through the specifics of each of them.

The lower level is ordinary religious consciousness. It is unsystematic as well as in general ordinary consciousness. Various aspects of dogma in it aren't organized in integrity and they present

¹³ M. Buber, *Two images of belief*, Moscow, Republic, 1995, pp. 233-240.

¹⁴ A. A. Khamidov, „Belief and knowledge”, pp. 90-102.

sometimes at quite vulgar form. Ordinary consciousness in general is formed not so much of concepts, but from representations, besides sometimes strongly emotionally charged. Ordinary consciousness is full of various superstitions, prejudices, cogitative stereotypes and a cliché. All this is fully inherent in the ordinary level of religious consciousness. The elements of the confession, accepted in the given confession can be combined with elements of creeds of other confessions. So, there was a so-called national Christianity in medieval Western Europe, in which the church doctrine intertwined with pagan beliefs. The increased emotionality is characteristic for people with ordinary religious consciousness; and the blind, not arguing belief in what is broadcasted from an ambon by the priest. It is noted above that in the XX century mass consciousness as more or less fixed education was appeared, including, of course, and mass religious consciousness. It is lower on the level than ordinary consciousness and therefore all characteristics of the last in it sometimes are considerably strengthened. Criticality of thinking in this consciousness almost absolutely eliminated. Both ordinary, and mass religious consciousness is penetrated itself by public psychology which in many respects and gives them the increased emotionality, which can be reached to fanaticism.

If the flock is satisfied with the ordinary and mass consciousness, then the opposing mass of the clergy towering over it to some extent is the bearer of the specialized religious consciousness. All these priests are corresponded among themselves by the principle of hierarchy. There are concentrated at the below level the small employees (parsons in Christianity) at the high top-the Pope (in Catholicism) or the patriarch (in Orthodoxy). All of them graduated from some initial or highest religious educational institutions and therefore they are carriers of specialized religious consciousness. There is a *theology* in monotheistical religions (and in the modern world they are-Judaism, Christianity and Islam)-special work on the explanation of maintenance of creed. Its task is the rational explanation of God being and these or those aspects of belief content which aren't giving in to usual understanding (for example, creation by God of the world from nothing). These religions have special literature-first of all Sacred texts (Judaism-the Tanakh, Christianity-the Bible, Islam-the Koran), and also the package of other esteemed texts. Buddhism, not recognizing existence of God, has the sacred text-Tripitaka.

It should be noted specially that an essential role in culture is played by values and valuable orientations. They penetrate all its spheres

and levels. At the same time the values have the specifics caused by character of this sphere in each of rather independent spheres of culture. Besides, in one spheres of culture the values and valuable orientations play bigger and in others-smaller role. They play the greatest role in the ethical sphere, in the sphere of art and in religion. In this regard religious consciousness is the consciousness which is entirely sated with specifically religious values. They are present at all levels of religious consciousness and regulate religious behavior of believers. There are even concepts according to which all culture was formed from the cult. So, P. A. Florensky writes: „*There are distinguished in activity of human society at first sight the three peculiar parties-theoretical, practical and liturgical, as we said up to now,-world outlook, economy and a cult -we will say further, being applied to usual terminology*”. According to him, the cult possesses priority, from which, on his belief, all culture grows (so, and all its values): „*Culture, as the etymology of the word „cultura” from „cultus” shows, by its core and root has the cult. Shrines is primary creativity of the person; cultural values are derivatives of the cult, as if exfoliating the husk of a cult, like the dry peel of an onion plant*”. It is, of course, an excess. The cult-is the person affair, and individual, as Florensky recognized, has to be engaged also economy and to explore the world, besides service for the cult. But at the end of XIX century K. Thiele emphasized that „*it is hardly true to consider religion as the creative first cause of all culture, like the maternal soil from which all other heritage of mankind grows*”.¹⁵ And this statement is submitted correct.

Religion and religious consciousness in modern Kazakhstan

Having become an independent state, Kazakhstan renounced from the atheistic ideology that prevailed in the Soviet Union, where our state was the member of the Union Republic. The religion began to revive in the country which, though wasn't pursued by the state in the last quarter of the century of its existence, but nevertheless wasn't encouraged. Only people of advanced age, besides not members of the C. P. S. U., could profess this or that confession openly. Throughout two last centuries Islam and Christianity in the form of Orthodoxy coexisted in the territory of Kazakhstan. Exactly they, as the largest, also became the main religions of modern Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan proclaimed itself as the secular state in which freedom of functioning and development is provided to religion. There are in Kazakhstan also other confessions, and

¹⁵ K. Thiele, „Basic principles of the science about religion”, in *Classics of world religious studies*, Moscow, Canon, 1996, pp. 144-196.

they had the possibility of open existence as well, except Islam and Christianity. In addition, some nonconventional religions got into Kazakhstan. They also exist, without being exposed any oppression. In 1992 it was adopted the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan „The freedom of religion and religious associations”, which in 2011 was edited and was given the name „On religious activity and religious associations”. According to this Law, religious confessions and associations are separated from the state which, as A. G. Kosichenko notes, *„being secular, doesn't interfere with internal affairs of religious associations, but considers the religious factor in domestic and foreign policy”*.¹⁶

The religion is one of culturally significant phenomena in the modern Kazakhstan's society, despite the proclaimed state secularization of culture and the embodiment of the principle of secularism. It is fixed the growth of religiousness in society and at the same time there is a preservation of the traditional national values, rooted in religion. Throughout many centuries up to XX century the religion was the core of any culture. As A. G. Kosichenko notes, *„cultures are very much indebted to religion, it acts as the ideological and substantial basis of traditional cultures. The soul of the people is manifested in traditional cultures, its vision of the meaning of life, and in culture its ways of activity receive justifications. Culture concentrates in itself a vital impulse of the people. Culture has comprehensive character and therefore shows itself and in ordinary practical activities, and in the highest models of spirit creation”*. Throughout many centuries the main cultural values coincided with religious values.

Religion was given the most unenviable fate in the Soviet state; so the person, who was brought up on the religious neutral and frankly atheistic values, didn't connect the leading vital values with religion in any way. Now, when freedom is officially provided to religion, the person gradually begins to realize their deep relation. The deeply believing person feels this way, as A. A. Khamidov characterizes: *„All practical, spiritual and mental experience of the person is involved in the sphere of religion and is reinterpreted in its definitions. Moreover, the person begins to comprehend all the life, all being-from his unconscious depths to the unconscious heights-as having the source in religious life”*. As V. A. Kuvakin notes: *„The higher values of the spiritual world are stable and alive, not because they seem to be irrelevant to the rest of the world, but because the subject commits to be faithful to*

¹⁶ A. G. Kosichenko, *Religion: essence and current problems*, Almaty, Political Science and Religious Studies SC MES RK, 2012, p. 214.

them, as to the most mobile, aspiring, creative relation to the world".¹⁷ Search of the uniting values and ideas promotes strengthening of the Kazakhstan statehood, the general raising, progressing of the country. But the believer in the secular state has to lead also secular life (to work in secular institutions, to study at secular schools and higher education institutions, to participate in political life of the state, etc.). It is easier for Christian to do it because it allows division of life into the sphere sacral and the sphere of secular. But the faithful Muslim is much more difficult. As the modern Islamic theologian notes: „*Islam doesn't accept a dichotomy of the spiritual and secular*".¹⁸ Nevertheless, the Kazakhstan's Muslims are able to combine these, apparently, incongruous instructions.

At the same time it should be noted that citizens of Kazakhstan, more precisely their most part, aren't joined to religion completely. The sociological analysis shown the following: „In answers to the question: „*What factors have more affected your religious beliefs and vital orientations?*”,-*the first position is taken by influence of the nearest environment (relatives, friends, neighbors)-46,9%, the second-mood in society-15,4%, a third-special literature, the Internet-10,3% and the fourth-conversations with the religious figure-8%. Such motivation as spiritual need is insignificant and it isn't chosen by the respondents practically... Consequently, the main factors in the choice of religious beliefs and life situations are certain external impulses and circumstances external to the individual, but it isn't desire for religious spirituality*".¹⁹ The way it indicates that the religious consciousness of the majority of those who consider themselves believers is still at the level of ordinary, and even mass, religious consciousness.

The situation in Kazakhstan was different during the Soviet period. „*For the Soviet period, marks out E. E. Burova,-there was rather reliable a model, according to which the number of believers and atheists made about 24-25% of adult population respectively. Between these cohorts, about half of the population didn't position the world outlook aspirations with sufficient definiteness... There are reproduced at the stage of transformation of the social order in transitional societies the conditions, providing rapid penetration of the quasi-scientific, occult, pseudo-religious ideas into mass consciousness... The religiousness in modern Kazakhstan as line of*

¹⁷ V. A. Kuvakin, *Your paradise and hell: Humanity and inhumanity of the person. (Philosophy, psychology and style of thinking of humanism)*, Sankt Petersburg, Moscow, Aleteya, Logos, 1998, p. 360.

¹⁸ S. M. N. Al-Attas, *Introduction to Islam metaphysics. Statement of fundamental elements of Muslim world outlook*, Moscow, Kuala Lumpur, Institute of the Islamic Civilization, International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization, 2001, p. 410.

¹⁹ ***, *Values and ideals of independent Kazakhstan*, Almaty, Political Science and Religious Studies SC MES RK, 2015, p. 315.

ordinary (mass) consciousness and behavior is shown in various actions: as in the obvious, and latent forms, as in positive on the impact on the personality, society, so in negative forms".²⁰

The current situation wasn't strongly changed in spite of the fact that 65-80% of the population carry themselves to believers and belonging to the certain faith. But, when the question concerns degree of the involvement into the religious way of life, about 43% of family groups noted that they combine religious and secular traditions, and only 10% of the groups point to the indissoluble relation with the religious community, and it is even less (up to 8%)-with strict followings to belief canons. „As for actually believers, among them distinguished passively believers, committed to religious ceremonialism (up to 14-15%), and actively believers, i. e. completely subordinating the way of life to religious canons (9-10%), at the same time no more than 1% of people who called themselves as fanatically devoted to religious beliefs. It is obvious that in two decades the religiousness in the Post-Soviet countries, including Kazakhstan, couldn't undergo cardinal changes and for this reason our country appears as the secular state”. According to sociological researches, the belief in the force, upon which all life on the planet Earth depends, is at the first place for the believer in the category of value orientation; further there are placed: diligence, love to the family, love to the person, love to all live that surrounds the person, love to justice, to cogitative activity, tolerance, disgust for violence, rejection of ready dogmas, manuals or provisions of belief, the self-assessment of honesty, sense of harmony; release of the mind from envy, greed, rage and hatred, from a lie and slander, from the rough speech; refusal of any actions which could damage to the nature. It is also necessary to accept as value the refusal of various addictions. Besides, it is considered that time is important value, and it is recommended not to spend it in vain and seek to do more good. At last, the last value, which is generated by all earlier listed values, is a hope which stimulates the movement in the future.

Inter-confessional tolerance as condition of stability of the religious situation in the Republic of Kazakhstan

It is observed the normal, tolerant inter-confessional atmosphere in Kazakhstan. The main confessions are among themselves in relation of consent. A. G. Kosichenko writes: „*The Kazakhstan's model of*

²⁰ E. E. Burova, „*Trends of new religiosity in modern Kazakhstan (the experience of the socio-humanitarian dimension)*”, Almaty, Institute of Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies SC MES RK, 2014, p. 200.

interreligious consent represents the complex interreligious configuration, placed in a socio-political context of state-social development of the Republic of Kazakhstan".²¹ What is this complexity? This question is answered by the authors of the collective monograph *Values and ideals of independent Kazakhstan*. They write that now the religious situation in the world is very unstable: „Transformation of religious mentality is caused by functioning tendencies of the newest religiousness”. The first and the main from them-is increase of religion influence on spiritual and moral renovation of mankind, on policy, science, culture, economy, the personal world of the person. This tendency is fixed by a concept „a post-secular era”, i. e. return of religion from the private discourse in social space with designing of model on complementary process of interaction for secular and religious segments of life.

The second tendency of opposite, destructive property, is caused by the carried-out now unprecedented in scale and consequences perversion of the essence and content of religion by certain geopolitical „players”, emasculation from religion of its spiritual and moral essence and cultural-creative function, the application of religion as a means of manipulating the mass consciousness and behavior. Always in one religion or another there were outbreaks of fundamentalism and extremism. But from the second half of XX century *terrorism* entered the arena, raising the religious, in this case the Islamic banner. It is clear that Islam is the religion preaching the world and love, but many people (generally youth) from different regions of the planet are recruited by such associations as the Taliban, Jebhat-en-Nusra, IGIL (DAESH) and others. Kazakhstan is free from fighters of these organizations. But there are entered from time to time on its territory the certain emissaries from other extremist organizations, in particular from Hizb ut-Tahrir al-Islami. They extend extremist religious literature, carry out propaganda work among the population, etc.

Fortunately, the first of above the characterized tendencies prevails in Kazakhstan. Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan „On religious activity and religious associations” effectively regulates the inter-confessional relations. So, the 2 paragraph, Article 3, says: „Religious organizations and citizens of Kazakhstan, foreign nationals and stateless persons are equal before the

²¹ A. G. Kosichenko, „Possibilities of religion in reducing the level of challenges and threats of modernity: philosophical and political analysis”, Almaty, Political Science and Religious Studies SC MES RK, 2014, p. 193.

law, regardless of their religious views".²² It is very important the 3 paragraph of this chapter, according to which: „*No religion may be declared to be an official or compulsory religion*".²³ At last, one more important paragraph of this article (sixth): „*Everyone has the right to adhere to religious or other beliefs, to extend them, to participate in activity of religious associations and to be engaged in missionary activity according to the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan*".²⁴ All-both believers and non-believers-are equally equal before the law, and nobody has the right to consider this confession as exclusive. At last, the sixth paragraph approves freedom of the believer and non-believer, but freedom which isn't violating line of the law.

As it is noted, Islam (sunnism of the hanafi madhhab) and Christianity (orthodox religion) are the main confessions in Kazakhstan. It corresponds also to feature of ethnic structure on the population of Kazakhstan: the first ethnos on number are Kazakhs, the second-Russians. Confessional and ethnic affiliations in overwhelming number of cases coincide. In this regard economic, cultural and socio-political stability of the Republic of Kazakhstan depends on mutual consent of these groups. Moreover, it is important religious education of the population: and not only Christians by the ideas of Christianity, and Muslims by the ideas of Islam. It is necessary that each representative of ethno-confessional community was well-informed in contents and meanings of other confession. It is necessary to extend the same also to smaller ethno-confessional groups, inhabiting Kazakhstan. And, of course, there is necessary the continuous and indefatigable prevention of various forms of religiously motivated extremism.

Conclusion

The present article is affected only some, though the main aspects of the problem of specifics and structure of religious consciousness. In this regard it is necessary further, more profound research on disclosure of all other aspects of this phenomenon. It is necessary to conduct for illuminations of the religious situation in Kazakhstan further sociological researches which will help to keep track the real dynamics of change of the level and quality of religiousness the citizens of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

²² Law RK. Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan „On religious activity and religious associations” (www.vainahkrg.kz, accessed in 12. 05. 2017).

²³ *Ibidem*.

²⁴ *Ibidem*.