



Univerzita Karlova v Praze,  
Pedagogická fakulta

**N. V. Nalivayko**

Editor-in-chief, Doctor  
of Philosophical Sciences,  
Professor, Director of the Research  
Institute of Philosophy of Education



SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY  
OF EDUCATION AT NSPU

The Research Institute of Philosophy of Education  
at Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University

ISSN 1811-0916

**The founders of the  
journal:**

Novosibirsk State  
Pedagogical University  
Research Institute of  
Philosophy of Education

Institute of Philosophy and  
Law of the Siberian Branch  
of the Russian Academy of  
Sciences

**With the participation of:**  
Univerzita Karlova v Praze

The journal is included in  
the list of the leading  
reviewed scientific  
editions and journals that  
are recommended by  
the State Commission for  
Academic Degrees  
and Titles (VAK) for  
publication of basic  
scientific results of the  
Candidate of Science  
and Doctor of Science  
dissertations.

The journal  
is included in the Russian  
scientific citation index.

Certificate  
PI № 77-12553

© The Research  
Institute of Philosophy  
of Education at  
Novosibirsk State  
Pedagogical  
University, 2010

**International issue Council**

- Gerasev A. D.** Doctor of Biological Sciences, Professor, Rector  
of Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University
- Hogenova A.** Professor CSc., PhD, Department of Philosophy  
Univerzita Karlova v Praze
- Lepin P. V.** Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Rector  
of Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University
- Mayer B. O.** Executive Editor, Doctor of Philosophical  
Sciences, Professor
- Nysanbayev A. N.** Director of the Institute of Philosophy and  
Political Sciences, Kazakhstan
- Peltsova N.** Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor,  
Univerzita Karlova v Praze
- Pushkareva E. A.** Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Docent,  
Deputy Head of the Council
- Ryapisov N. A.** Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor,  
Pro-Rector of Novosibirsk State Pedagogical  
University
- Smolin O. N.** Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Deputy Chair  
of the State Duma Committee on Education and  
Science, Academician of the Russian Academy  
of Sciences
- Stepin V. S.** Academician of the Russian Academy of  
Sciences, President of the Russian Philosophical  
Society
- Tselishchev V. V.** Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor,  
Director of the Institute of Philosophy and Law  
of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy  
of Sciences
- Zhafyarov A. Zh.** Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences,  
Science Pro-Rector of Novosibirsk State  
Pedagogical University

SCHELER, M. *Řád lásky*. Praha : Vyšehrad, 1971.

SPECK, O. *Erziehung und Achtung vor dem Anderen: zur moralischen Dimension der Erziehung*. München, Basel : Ernst Reinherdt Verlag 1996.

#### NOTES

1. FINK, E. *Natur, Freiheit, Welt. Philosophie der Erziehung*. Würzburg : Köninghausen und Neumann 1992, page 182.
2. *Ibid*, page 183.
3. *Ibid*, page 183.
4. SCHELER, M. *Řád lásky*. Praha : Vyšehrad 1971, page 35 et sequentia.
5. SPECK, O. *Erziehung und Achtung vor dem Anderen: zur moralischen Dimension der Erziehung*. München, Basel : Ernst Reinherdt Verlag 1996.
6. PEŠKOVÁ, J. *Já člověk... Jak pěstovat vědu o člověku dnes a zítra*. Praha : SPN 1991, page 153.
7. FINK, E. *Natur, Freiheit, Welt*, page 186 ff.
8. *Ibid*, page 187.
9. *Ibid*, page 187.
10. Srv. FINK, E. *Hra jako symbol světa*
11. NIETZSCHE, F. *Radostná věda*. Praha : Orientace 1992, page 257.
12. FINK, N. *Natur, Freiheit, Welt*, page 190.
13. *Ibid*, page 179.
14. *Ibid*, page 190.
15. PRUNNER, P. *Výzkum hodnot*. Plzeň : Euroverlag 2002, page 49.
16. RICOEUR, P. *Filosofie vůle I. Fenomenologie svobody*. Praha : Oikúmené 2001, page 86.
17. *Ibid*, page 87.
18. *Ibid*, page 87.
19. PEŠKOVÁ, J. *Já člověk... Jak dělat vědu o člověku dnes a zítra*. Praha : SPN 1991, page 157.
20. *Ibid*, page 158.
21. *Ibid*, page 158.
22. RICOEUR, P. *Filosofie vůle I.*, page 88.
23. RICOEUR, P. *Filosofie vůle I.*, page 91.
24. *Ibid*, page 84.

УДК 316

## A REFLECTION ON THE POSSIBILITY OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

*Tahereh Javidi. K. J.* (Mashhad, Iran)

**Abstract.** *The main purpose of this paper is to explain the possibility of religious education. Accordingly, three major points of view about the relationship between science and religion, including: A) the conflict between science and religion, B) science and religion as two distinct phenomena, and C) religion*

*and science are complementary, are discussed. Consequently, based on evaluating the identity of the religious science, it is elucidated that we can exploit a hypothesis which can be tested through observation and experiment, and the resulted findings can be titled as religious education.*

**Key words:** *religious education, science and religion, religious science.*

## **РАЗМЫШЛЕНИЕ О ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ РЕЛИГИОЗНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ**

**Тахерех Джавиди К. Дж.** (Машхед, Иран)

**Резюме.** *Главная цель данной работы состоит в том, чтобы разъяснить возможность религиозного образования. Соответственно, обсуждаются три основные точки зрения на взаимоотношение науки и религии: а) конфликт науки и религии, б) наука и религия как два отдельных друг от друга явления, и в) взаимная дополнительность религии и науки. Как следствие, основываясь на описании отличительных черт религиозной науки, мы объясняем, что возможно опереться на некоторую гипотезу, которая может быть проверена с помощью наблюдения и эксперимента, и полученные выводы могут быть названы религиозным образованием.*

**Ключевые слова:** *религиозное образование, наука и религия, религиозная наука.*

### *Introduction*

Some scholars suggest that religious education is not a meaningful term. For instance, Hirst (1947) explicitly mentions the conception that the existence of a form of education with particular religious characteristics seems as wrong as imagining there is a distinct form of religious mathematics, engineering or agriculture... In Hirst's view, the dominant principle in this area is that sciences are neither religious nor anti-religious and no decision making can be done properly in any mentioned sciences, including education, by the religious tradition and contexts (Bagheri, 2000).

On the other hand, with regard to religious doctrines, it is observed that although these doctrines have not explained the world phenomena in detail and cannot describe the details which the researchers from various disciplines are looking for, it can be said that the religious doctrines create hypotheses in the minds of those who believe in them. This presents those people with new problems and different solutions. So, these pre-hypotheses and strategies will have particu-

---

**Tahereh Javidi. K. J.**, Assistant Professor of Education Faculty of Education and Psychology Ferdowsi University of Mashhad.

**Тахерех Джавиди К. Дж.**, доцент факультета образования и психологии университета Машхеда.  
**E-mail:** [tjavidi@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir](mailto:tjavidi@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir)

lar characteristics and, above all, there will be divine gifts. Now, a question arises whether the gained cognition of the mentioned pre-hypothesis and strategies can be called “religious science” and whether can we use “religious education” in the educational domain?

In this paper, in order to examine these points of view and to answer the above-mentioned question, first the concepts of “science”, religion” and meaning of “education” are illustrated, then some views about the relationship between science and religion are examined and then whether “religious science” is a meaningful or meaningless term will be examined and, finally, the existence of “religious education” as a symbol of religious science will be examined.

#### *The concept of science*

Science is cognition, which results from empirical research. This research is a complex process in which observation, experiment and theory are combined together in an inseparable way. A part of this combination results from the point that in scientific research, a rational method of induction, generalization and innovation of human imagination are applied together and, in the estimate of scientific findings, both empirical standards in agreement with observation and intellectual standards of coherence and comprehensiveness are used. For explaining this subject, it is important to pay attention to the discords between positivist scholars and post-positivists ones concerning the nature of science. According to the positivists’ belief, science demands close observation of the phenomena, verification and testing. So in this view, the scientist is dealing with pure facts and, as a result of observing and testing such facts, some level of cognition, or knowledge, comes out.

Post-positivist scholars have disagreed with the over-emphasis of positivists on the empirical aspects of science and they have reminded us of the important, dominant role of theoretical concepts in scientific progress. A main reason for this disagreement is that there is no un-interpreted fact. Even in sensory perception the last unchangeable element of perceptible things or sensory findings, as Hume imagines, are not separate pieces of color or other senses, but they are integrated ideas, in which, with Newton and Darwin, there is a combination of empirical and interpreted elements. The empirical ‘profit’ consists of observations and information which are the empirical aspect of science. And the interpreted profit consists of concepts, principles and theories, which are of the theoretical aspect of science. (Barbor, 1983) All observations are theory-laden and all theories depend on assumptions.

Briefly, the scholars begin their work on the level of preliminary knowledge, which has a great influence on the origination and evolution of their hypothesis (Bagheri, 1995).

In sum, the features of science are:

1. To describe and classify
2. to explain: hypothesis, theory, law
3. to predict (verify or falsify)
4. to control

#### *The concept of religion*

There are several interpretations of religion; some of them are as follows:

Religion is a collection of theoretical and practical precepts.

Theoretical precepts contain a special recognition of world and human beings which introduces the beginning and end of the world and human beings, considers a wise purpose for the creation and relates the fulfillment of the true purpose of humankind to the recognition of God and obedience to Him. The practical precepts of religion are those, whose following results in fulfillment of human purpose and which are a combination of religion jurisprudence and legal-moral precepts. (Fathalikhani, 2000)

In other words, religion is a collection of descriptive and prescriptive subjects and there are 'do's and 'don't's in them. To say it differently, religion is a collection of descriptive and prescriptive statements, which are believed to be given by God to humankind. For example, "God is unique and He has no partner." (Bagheri, 2000)

In Paterson's view, religion contains of a collection of beliefs, actions and feelings (individual and groups), which are structured around the concept of eventual fact.

In this writing whenever religion is mentioned, it means divine religion and not Islam in particular.

#### *The concept of education*

The concept of education can be observed from two aspects:

- 1) Education as a process;
- 2) Education as an academic discipline.

In the first sense, education is a reaction between two current poles, which, with regard to the main one, considers a purpose, and it needs a plan and a scheme (Hooshyar, 1968).

In this sense, education is a process in which the society brings up its members through schools (Frankena, 1998).

In the second sense, education is a discipline which studies the mentioned process in various ways.

*The discipline of education contains 3 parts*

The first one is the factual science of education. This science by gathering the general and particular facts, deals with the process of education and describes or tests the educational methods, observed outcomes and so on. The second part is normative. This part suggests the ends, purposes or norms for the process of education and supports particular tools for fulfillment of these purposes. Some performances of this domain are regulated and collected through the research findings resulting from the first part.

The third part is analytical. These parts deal with the analysis of the concepts of factual science of education such as “intelligence” or “development” and with the estimation of the hypotheses and methods of this science. In addition to these, this part analyzes the concepts of the normative parts (Frankena, 1998). It should be mentioned that it is the second meaning of education which is mostly considered in this paper.

*The relationship between science and religion:*

In this part, the question is “what is the relationship between science and religion?” Are they two things which man acquires: one of them by revelation (religion) and the other by experience and reasoning (science)? Are these two compatible or not? In other words, is there friendly relationship between these two parts or not? The relationship between science and religion is one of these old disputes which not only have no final end but also have resulted in deeper questions and answers in every period of human thought. From the historical point of view, there are various opinions about the relationship of science and religion. According to some views, science and religion are opponents and in most occasions they have conflicts. According to others, these two domains are completely separate. There are other views which are trying to bring about a valid relationship between science and religion and, to do so, sometimes consider verbal claims as scientific hypotheses or try to include science and religion into a larger macro-hypothesis or to combine them in similar frames (Peterson, 2000).

For the sake of brevity, a summarized explanation about the mentioned views is sufficient.

A) The conflict between science and religion:

Some people believe that there is a conflict between science and religion. Scientists and fundamentalist Christians disputed about the theory of bio-evolution in the middle of 19th century in a paradigm instance of the conflict between science and religion. This condition resulted from the fact that the opponents considered the subjects,

ends or method of science and religion to be the same. That is, they believed that if one of these two theoretical concepts is right, the other theory is necessarily wrong. Both scientists and religious Christians believed that one function of science and religion is to present explanations. They realized this mission in such a way that they made their concepts directly contradict each other. Concerning the problem of creation, genesis and the biological species evolution and formation, scientists based their conclusions on the evolutionary approaches. Such notions as the age of the Earth, natural selection and survival of the best presented explanations. On the other hand, religion in the form of seeking help from the Holy Book quotations, presented some explanation for this phenomenon based on the creation of our cosmos by God. The scientists' explanatory concepts resulted from empirical hypotheses and assumptions which, with the further research, acquired more confirmation. Religion-oriented individuals' explanatory concepts resulted from the unchangeable creation narration in the Holy Book. Consequently, when these two groups saw their explanations in opposition, they disagreed with each other. So, one aspect of the conflict between science and religion was revealed. Religious people's reaction to the apparent conflict between science and religion was to prefer the statements resulting from Holy Book. They applied their verbal claims as control beliefs; that is, the religious beliefs were considered as "Given" in scientific theories. Therefore, the theory of evolution, so long as it considered the non-existence of God and the ultimate existence of the world and diminished man's special dignity, was among the theories which many (not all) religious people rejected. On the other hand, many evolution thinkers took the position of philosophical naturalism and they saw it in agreement with their evolutionary science. According to philosophical naturalism only physical nature is 'real', factual; this means that all phenomena are 'only' a combination of materials. According to this idea, there is no supernatural creature beyond the physical reality which governs the world and human affairs.

According to this view, man is a lonely creature, who lives in the world of animosity, or spirit; and he should accept that there is no hidden purpose in nature or his world. Many thinkers who believed in this kind of philosophical evolution, rejected religion in general and considered science as the only hope for the humankind progress. They considered science as a comprehensive explanation of the destiny and existence of man.

As can be seen from the mentioned historical adventure, since the subject, ends and the methods of science and religion are not adequately distinguished, there are prepared the grounds for any kind of

competition and conflict. So, some religious people interfere in scientific works and even want to ignore scientific findings with the help of verbal reasons. On the other hand, some scientists and other thinkers who possess scientific information applied the new scientific outcome to deny the truths of religion. Therefore, it is necessary to define the exact boundaries of science and religion to avoid such disputes and conflicts.

B) Science and religion as two distinct phenomena:

Several approaches including Neo-Orthodox, Existentialism, Positivism and the ordinary language philosophy believe that science and religion are two quite distinct fields, each of which has its own particular subjects, methods, purpose, concepts and language. Therefore, in their view, there is no possibility for any kind of conflict occurring between science and religion.

For instance, Karl Barth (1886-1968), the representative of the verbal Neo-Orthodox approach, believed that science and religion are dealing with basically different subjects, the subject of religion is the manifestation of God in Jesus Christ, and the subject of science is the natural world. He also believed that the methods of science and religion are quite distinct. God is known only through His manifestation, but the natural territory can be known through human wisdom. And Barth also believed that the purpose of religion is to prepare man for encountering God, but there is a path followed by scientific cognition to know the patterns governing the empirical world.

The ordinary language philosophy is another example of believers in distinction of science and religion.

The ordinary language philosophers, who studied various functions of language, believed that science and religion are two distinct "*language games*", which are both valid and each of them has its own particular subjects and logic.

With more consideration on these believers' thoughts about the distinction between science and religion, it will be clear that the present Western world situation is based on viewing religion as a personal and individual affair which cannot interfere in the concrete and collective field of science, and this situation has its roots in their thoughts.

C) Religion and science are complementary:

The third approach to the religion and science relationship considers these two fields in harmony and believes that the all-round cognition of a certain special phenomenon can be gained through scientific and religious explanations.

Donald Mackay (1922-1987) was one of those who believed in this idea. According to this idea, science and religion are subjects based on various methods and purposes, which can present different kinds

of explanation for the same phenomena. Therefore, according to him, science and religion are complementary.

Here “complementary” means that scientific and religious explanations, observing the same phenomena, can both be complete and true, each in its own domain. Scientific and religious methods and purposes are different. What science does is to present exact and correct explanation of the empirical phenomena by using its particular research methods and standards, and its purpose is to discover the causes of the events in the universal laws. At the same time, what religion does is to present a complete explanation of some important things by using its own particular concepts, and its purpose is to discover the meaning of events. And one of these explanations is dependent on the other. But to gain the possible full understanding of the phenomena, both scientific and religious interpretations should be looked for.

In other words, the “*complementary*” approach makes it possible to present two exclusive and exhaustive explanations for one thing.

Mackay believes that the “*complementarity principle*” removes some disputes between science and religion. For instance, he states that there is no conflict (religious conflict) between these two statements: “*Arising of the world is a product of natural processes*” (scientific explanation), and “*world is a creation of God*” (religious explanation). Either of these two explanations, in its own particular conceptual framework, interprets the origin of the world.

Although Mackay’s approach has the advantage of avoiding the misleading understanding of scientific methods of the religious subjects and also the trespassing of theology on scientific problems, it cannot explain properly how religious and scientific works are really complementary, and what should be done while facing the apparent conflicts. Is there a measure to indicate the extent to which lack of proportion can be seen among explanations?

Consequently, the exact meaning of “complementary” is that the explanatory tasks of science and religion are connected to each other. As a consequence of this thought, one can say that when an idea (ignore the field it results from) is applied to a particular cognition branch, that idea acquires its total credit according to its methodological branch. The basic point, which is obtained from the above explanation, is that if the meaning of “complementary” is that there is a relationship between religion and science, then there will be provided a proper field for researching the meaningfulness or meaninglessness of religious science. A further explanation is that if, as a rule, a religious pre-hypothesis about a phenomenon can be presented to test those hypotheses in empirical method (observation and

experiment), the question is whether the research findings cannot be seen as “religious science”?

Possibility of religious science: before going through this argument, it is necessary to mention two points; first, what is “science”? And secondly, what is “religious science”?

As mentioned earlier, there are several definitions for “science”. In this paper, “science” is considered as an empirical procedure or ‘method’, which acquires its findings through observation and experiment. There are also various definitions for “religious science”.

For instance, the traditional definition which existed in many religious thinkers’ minds and according to which different activities were done, (maybe these activities had been developed to protect the religious doctrines and not to fall behind in competition with science) was that religious science consisted of those scientific findings which could be approved by some religious doctrines. Therefore, they were trying to present the resulting findings as religious gift. To do this, religious thinkers have tried to bring about a kind of harmony or approval between empirical science and religious doctrines, and to present the results of these activities as religious psychology, religious education, religious medicine, religious physics... Thomas Aquinas was one of those who have tried in this field to attune Aristotle’s writing with Christian religions. Also Galileo Galilei’ idea, the idea of how the earth and sun are moving, was approved relationally by Christian scholars, and it is another example of this kind of consideration about religious science. In recent centuries much evidence can be presented in this field. The basic point that should be mentioned about the consequences of such a thinking about religious science is that, contrary to the aim of those who believed in this consideration and by doing so were trying to protect the religion, the study of history indicates that not only did these people (unintentionally) not serve religion well, but also they might help to weaken and fade the place of religion in the domain of human cognition. For with the progress of observation, experimental methods and other related techniques, scientific findings were always changing. It is clear that the traditional scientific findings, in which religious thinkers presented religious doctrines to approve them, have been rejected and, together with this process, the importance of the religious doctrines were gradually reduced. With these explanations it will be clear that in this writing the meaning of “religious science” is not considered as what these scholars thought.

Here the purpose of “religious science” is the scientific findings, in which their hypotheses are formed according to a religious pre-hypothesis and is tested through scientific method; that is, by obser-

vation and experiment. With regard to the mentioned images of “religious science” in this writing, now the question is whether the concept of “religious science” is meaningful or not? According to the relationship between them - religion and science - the concept of “religious science” can be considered as meaningful or meaningless. As it was mentioned, there can be three kinds of relationship between religion and science; the first one, when science and religion are considered as opposing each other. Those who accept this idea, while considering the same subject and purposes of religion and science, assume them as rivals. It means that if an idea is correct in one field, the opposite idea in other fields is certainly incorrect. In such an atmosphere in which scientists and religious scholars oppose each other, it is impossible or illogical to imagine depicting an atmosphere in which the religious scholars and the scientists’ use of words about the concept of “religious science” can co-exist compatibly. The second one considers these two fields as distinct. As mentioned, positivists, the ordinary language philosophers and existentialists accept this idea. They believe that religion and science are two quite distinct fields, and each of them has its own particular subjects, methods and purposes. According to this group, religion and science are two different explanations about various subjects and methods. For instance, this group considers that scientific findings are empirical and based on observation and experiment, while religious findings are doctrines resulted from Holy Books (Evangel or Koran). According to recent explanations, it is obvious that in this atmosphere the concept of “religious science” can be considered as meaningless like the concept of “Circular Square”.

Finally, the understanding of these two fields as complementary. As mentioned, those who believe in this idea consider that both religion and science can be complete in its own field, but their methods and purposes are different. They believe that, in order to gain a full understanding of the phenomena, both scientific and religious interpretations should be searched. As indicated, if the exact meaning of being complementary is that the explaining tasks of religion and science are connected to each other (separate, but interdependent) then they can have common boundaries. Therefore, it can be said that when an idea (ignore the original field, for instance the religious idea) is applied to a certain cognition branch (e.g. empirical science), that ultimately this idea gains its validity from within the methodology which is adopted by that cognition branch.

Considering the mentioned matters, it will be clear that only in the third sense a proper atmosphere will be prepared for assuming the concept of “*religious science*” as meaningful. This is because this kind

of concept considers religion and science, unlike the first understanding, the same and does not imagine religion and science, as in the second interpretation, to be separated. But the third understanding considers them as connected. It means that, according to the mentioned concept of religious science, if in accordance with the pre-hypotheses appeared from religious doctrines, some hypotheses can be presented so that they can be tested through observation and experiment, then the derived findings can be seen and described as “*religious science*”. It is religious because it presents the findings derived from religious pre-hypotheses, and it is a science because these hypotheses are examined in a particular scientific method that is empirical method of observation and experiment.

Of course, some critics have criticized this kind of understanding.

For instance, some believe that because the hypothesis resulting from the religious pre-hypothesis are examined by the empirical method (observation and experiment), so the gained findings cannot be titled as “*religious science*”, but these findings should be considered as science.

A brief answer to such criticism can be presented by raising another question for the critics and this is the question: cannot this criticism be correct about other human knowledge fields, considering their assumptions as correct? For instance, on what basis can the titles like Psychological science, Sociology, Social science, Communication science, Historical science and so on, can be used? Can we claim that in the mentioned sciences the pre-hypothesis and basic hypotheses are gained only through observation and experiment, while it is not so in religious science? With what reasoning can such a claim be defended? The brief explanation is that the religious science can be meaningful like other sciences. However, “*religious science*” does not claim that all the religious doctrines become scientific as not all the cognitions in various domains are scientific; only a fraction of knowledge related to psychology, society, communication, history, ... is scientific and some part of that knowledge can be philosophical, literary, artistic and verbal. Therefore, the defenders of religious science believe that some part of science, which results from the religious pre-hypotheses, can be titled as “*religious science*”.

Possibility of religious education

Now that the meaningfulness of the concept of “*religious science*” has been cleared, the last question is “can we speak of “*religious education*” as a branch of “*religious science*”?”

Regarding the explanations related to the possibility of religious education, we could speak of religious education as a manifestation of religious science in such a way that if in the basis of the religious

doctrines in educational fields (principles, method, programs) we can exploit the pre-hypothesis, according to which some hypotheses can be presented for the problems arising in education and those hypotheses can be tested through observation and experiment, then the resulted findings can be titled as “*religious education*”. This is because these kinds of pre-hypothesis are followed by a different consideration of education which can be, for instance, different from the behavioral education’s pre-hypothesis or other pre-hypotheses.

In addition to educational perceptions, the methods and principles of education will also be different. This difference both results from the theoretical discussions arising from the pre-hypothesis and also results from the research findings in the sciences, which are formed on the basis of the theoretical field of these pre-hypotheses. Concerning the scientific empirical method in relation to the theoretical dimension, it should be mentioned that the empirical evidence would be used for or against the hypothesis arising from the pre-hypothesis. If the evidence is against the hypothesis, the hypothesis is usually rejected and a new hypothesis emerges, based on those pre-hypotheses. The empirical evidence can separate the correct and incorrect hypothesis, but it is not in the position to remove the aspects belonging to the hypothesis to the pre-hypothesis. Therefore, if the experiment approves a hypothesis it will do so with the same element it gained from the pre-hypothesis (Bagheri, 2000). Therefore, as mentioned, if the indicated pre-hypotheses result from the religious education system, the gained findings will also be “*religion education*”.

### **Conclusion**

In this essay, first the concepts of “*science*”, “*religion*” and “*education*” were to some extent explained. Then some approaches to the relationships of science and religion were mentioned. And then the approaches related to the possibility of “*religious science*” were examined. In this examination the meaningfulness of the concept of “*religious science*” was indicated. And, finally, there was a glance at the possibility of “*religious education*” as a manifestation of “*religious science*”.

*Some points derived from the entire discussion are as follows:*

- 1) The meaning of religious education is the science which is based on religious pre-hypothesis and gained experimentally.
- 2) The believers’ purpose in presenting the conception of “*religious science*” or “*religious education*” as meaningful is not to make all religious doctrines into scientific ones, but is to present a new scien-

tific system which is based on a religious pre-hypothesis. It should be explained that only certain religious doctrines (disputable verses) can be scientific and other religious doctrines (indisputable verses) cannot be scientific in this respect. It is obvious that not becoming scientific does not reduce the importance of other religious doctrines (indisputable and some disputable verses), for as mentioned, science is just one of the fields of human cognition and other cognition fields such as philosophy, art, eloquence, ... are important in their places, and it is necessary for human life to use them.

3) A further result based on the above arguments is that religious cognition, especially in disputable verses, is changeable. Assuming this pre-hypothesis to be true, there will be more chances for religious researchers to start making the religious pre-hypothesis scientific. Some researchers, in spite of this matter that perhaps the empirical evidence can be uncertain about the religious pre-hypothesis, avoid the concept of "*religious science*". However, if they understand this, even if the empirical evidence can target the religious pre-hypothesis, then the religious cognition form will be changed and the truth of religion will not be damaged. As in the scientific domain, although scientists change the science, they cannot induce the changes in facts. In other words, according to empirical evidence their cognition about the phenomena changes, but those phenomena are fixed and unchangeable. For example, once scientists believed that our Sun is circulating around our Earth and now they believe that the Earth goes around our Sun. However, the Earth and Sun have been circulating from the beginning, and the Earth have been circulating around the Sun. The scientists have not changed the relation of the Earth and of creation; they cannot do it and they will not. Therefore in this special case it can be clearly said that the scientists' cognition has changed and the phenomenon has not changed. In the religious domain also the religious doctrines are fixed facts, but human understanding of those facts can change in time.

## REFERENCES

- Ayan, Barboor** (1983), *Science and Religion*, translated by: Khorramshahi, Iran, Tehran, Academic Press Center.
- Bagheri, Khosro** (1995), *Identity of the religious science*, Hozeh and University, Iran, Ghome, Research Center of Hozeh and University, Quarterly, N. 3, PP. 6-18.
- Bagheri, Khosro** (1998), *Meaningfulness and meaninglessness of religious science*, Islamic education, Iran, Ghome, Research Center of Hozeh and University, Quarterly, N. 16-17, PP.16-26
- Bagheri, Khosro** (2000), *Possibility, meaningfulness and adaptation in Islamic ethics and religion*, Iran, Tehran, Islamic education studies center, No. 1.

- Donald, Wiebe** (1994), *Beyond Legitimation: Essays on the Problem of Religious Knowledge*, Toronto, Trinity College.
- Fatalikhani, Mohammad** (2000), *Relationship between religion and ethical education*, Iran, Tehran, Islamic education studies center.
- Frankena, William** (1998), *Philosophy of education*, translated by: S. Beheshti, Iran, Tehran, Virayesh Institute Press.
- Hshyar, Mohammdbagher** (1968), *The principle of education*, Iran, Tehran, Amirkabir press.
- Peterson, Makel and et al** (2000), *Wisdom and religious belief*, Translated by: A. Naraghi and E. Soltani, Iran, Tehran, Minister of culture and Islamic guidance.
- Soroosh, Abdolkarim** (1980), *Science and Belief*, Iran, Tehran, Motahhari press.

УДК 316

## THE VALUE SYSTEM IN RUSSIAN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE: CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL APPROACHES

*V. V. Lygdenova* (Novosibirsk, Russia)

**Abstract.** *In the article an analysis of the value system in Russian organizational culture is carried out using cultural and historical approaches. The organizational culture of Russian educational and industrial organizations is considered. The problems of adaptation of Western organizational culture in the Russian organization are identified. In the article the author comes to the conclusion that there is a necessity to be aware of national values that characterize Russian organizational culture and it is important to take them into account in the management of the organization.*

**Key words:** *values, value system, organization, organizational culture, management, culture, tradition, innovation.*

## СИСТЕМА ЦЕННОСТЕЙ В РОССИЙСКОЙ ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННОЙ КУЛЬТУРЕ: КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ И ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ ПОДХОДЫ

*В. В. Лыгденова* (Новосибирск, Россия)

**Резюме.** *В статье проводится анализ системы ценностей российской организационной культуры при использовании культурологического и исторического подходов. Рассматривается организационная культу-*

---

**Lygdenova Victoria Vasilyevna**, a post-graduate student of the Institute of Philosophy and Law of Siberian branch of Russian academy of science.

**Лыгденова Виктория Васильевна**, аспирант Института философии и права Сибирского отделения Российской академии наук.  
**E-mail:** victoria.lygdenova@gmail.com