

## **Civil Religion and Its Significance in Modern Socio-Political Structure**

Dr. Hafiz Abdul Qayyum \*

Although modern thinkers have discarded religion but they were influenced by its organizational nature. So they had to study religion from socio-political perspective, these philosophers or thinkers given a new outlook to that aspect of religion which can bring about unity, discipline and socio-political integration in a modern nation state. This idea later on took the shape of a new religion which is named "Civil Religion." This new religion is based on empiricism. Durkheim who was an atheist branded religion as social phenomena in the same back ground. He further propounded the theory of "functional equivalents." So he enunciated the theory of Civil Religion.

### **Determination of "Civil Religion" Concept:**

A paradigm shift was brought about by renaissance and reformation in the man's way of thinking. Prior to renaissance and reformation, the ideas and thoughts of man were based on revelation. It was the staunch belief of the man that this universe is made by Allah the Almighty and all phenomenon of nature by his command. Man also believed in spirit, angels and the life hereafter which depends on the deeds of man. But after reformation this idea of life changed out rightly, and materialistic approach was given priority at the expense of spiritualism. Now society sought secular and philosophical foundation and religion became personal matter of the man.

The man did away with the metaphysical basis of knowledge and empiricism was made the foundation of his knowledge. Hereafter was scarified at the altar of these worldly pleasures.

This shift in man's thinking influenced religion, politics, society and history to the greater extent.

On October 31, 1517 A.D Martin Luther wrote his thesis which contained objections over church, and in this way he declared independence from the church or religion. His thesis enabled people to decide the things according to their own whims and wishes, unlike traditional method in which religion had prime authority. Consequently, those moral standards which were derived

---

\* Assistant Professor, Sheikh Zayed Islamic Centre, University of the Punjab, Lahore

from revelation lost their significance.

In the backdrop of these developments John Calvin declared interest lawful, which was previously not allowed by religion. So religion was discarded by modern philosophers and thinkers because they thought religion is an obstacle in the way of progress.

George Santayana branded religion as a kind of poetry. To Croce religion is mythology only and nothing else. Emile Durkheim took religion as a sociological phenomenon and Karl Marx opined that religion is opium for masses. Due to this blunt criticism of religion truth faded away from human life and the belief which is prerequisite of religion was replaced by scientific naturalism.

Auguste Comte presented a thesis about the evolution of human mind which has three stages. He says:

“We may proceed at once to investigate the natural laws by which the advance of the human mind proceeds. The scientific principle of the theory appears to me to consist in the great philosophical law of the succession of the three states—the primitive theological state, the transient metaphysical, and the final positive state—through which the human mind has to pass, in every kind of speculation.”<sup>1</sup>

Three stages mentioned by Auguste Comte are given below:

1. Theological state
2. Metaphysical state
3. Positivism<sup>2</sup> state

In the epoch of religion each and every development was attributed to god and goddess. In the metaphysical period man sought help from the metaphysical hypothesis. The life hereafter was taken into consideration for the interpretation of all events.

Third period is positivism which means scientific and it is modern era. In this period the interpretation of events is induced with the help of experiments and evidences. Comte pay gratitude to religion that it helped human mind to reach up to this scientific era.

Thus there is no more need of religion because human mind has got maturity.

John Stuart Mill thins Comte’s terminology badly chosen as

implying unintended connotations, at least to the English mind. He prefers:

1. Personal or Volitional
2. Abstractional or Ontological
3. Phenomenal or Experimental<sup>3</sup>

Lester Frank Ward opined that human mind has passed through three phases namely:

1. Teleological
2. Ontological
3. Positivism<sup>4</sup>

It can be inferred after analyzing above mentioned philosophers that the era of religion has gone with the winds and modernism has started. Thus to construct a society on the revealed knowledge is no more valid.

Although modern thinkers have discarded religion but they were influenced by its organizational nature. So they had to study religion from socio-political perspective, these philosophers or thinkers given a new outlook to that aspect of religion which can bring about unity, discipline and socio-political integration in a modern nation state. This idea later on took the shape of a new religion which is named "Civil Religion." This new religion is based on empiricism. Durkheim who was an atheist branded religion as social phenomena in the same back ground. He further propounded the theory of "functional equivalents." So he enunciated the theory of Civil Religion.

Civil Religion means that religion which can unite and integrate a secular society. So that modern nation state can attain the allegiance of the masses. Howsoever modern western thinkers devised a new concept of God, prophets, sacred scriptures and religious icons for this new religion. Besides this they also presented the concept of national holidays. One can view the preliminary shape of Civil Religion at the time of French revolution. During French revolution its slogan and state became sacred.

Durkheim writes about it in these words:

"This aptitude of society for setting itself up as a god or for creating gods was never more apparent than during the first years of the French Revolution. At this time, in fact, under the influence of the general enthusiasm, things purely laical by nature

were transformed by public opinion into sacred things: these were the Fatherland, liberty, and reason.”<sup>5</sup>

Robert Bellah also writes:

“The French revolution was anticlerical to the core and attempted to set up an antichristian Civil Religion. Throughout modern French history, the chasm between traditional catholic symbols and the symbolism of 1789 has been immense.”<sup>6</sup>

Before we go into further detail, it seems appropriate to analyze Civil Religion from its variant definitions.

### **Definition of Civil Religion:**

Samuel P. Huntington says about civil religion that “‘in the United States’, Tocqueville said, ‘Religion...is mingled with all the habits of the nation and all the feelings of patriotism, whence it derives a peculiar force’. The mingling of religion and patriotism is evident in America’s civil religion. Writing in the 1960s, Robert Bellah defined civil religion, ‘at its best’ as a ‘genuine apprehension of universal and transcendent religious reality as seen in or, one could almost say, as revealed through the experience of the American people’. Civil religion enables Americans to bring together their secular politics and their religious society, to marry God and country, so as to give religious sanctity to their patriotism and nationalist legitimacy to their religious beliefs, and thus to merge what could be conflicting loyalties into loyalty to a religiously endowed country.

America’s civil religion provides a religious blessing to what Americans feel they have in common. It is perfectly compatible with each American belonging to his or her own denomination, believing in a Christian or non-Christian god, or being Deist, as were several of the Founding Fathers. It is not compatible, however, with being atheist, for it is a religion, invoking a transcendental being apart from the terrestrial human world. The American civil religion encompasses four major elements.

1. First, central to it is the proposition that the American system of government rests on a religious base. It presupposes a Supreme Being. The views of the framers of the Constitution that the republican government they were

creating could survive only among a people imbued with religion and morality have been endorsed and repeated by subsequent generations of American leaders. Our institutions 'presuppose a Supreme Being', as Justice William O. Douglas put it, and President Eisenhower similarly declared that 'Recognition of the Supreme Being is the first, the most basic expression of Americanism. Without God there could be no American form of government, nor an American way of life'. To deny God is to challenge the fundamental principle underlying American society and government.

2. A second core element of the civil religion is the belief that Americans are God's 'chosen', or, in Lincoln's phrase 'almost chosen' people, that America is the 'new Israel', with a divinely sanctioned mission to do good in the world. The core of the civil religion, as Conrad Cherry has said, is "the sense of America's special destiny under God." Two of the three Latin phrases the Founding Fathers chose for the republic they were creating sum up this sense of mission: *Annuit Coeptis* (God smiles on our undertakings), and *Novus Ordo Seclorum* (New order for the ages), and *E pluribus unum* (From many one).
3. A third element of American's civil religion is the prevalence of religious allusions and symbols in American public rhetoric, rituals, and ceremonies. Presidents have always taken their oath of office on a Bible and, with other officials, formally assume their offices when, at the conclusion of their oaths, they utter the words, 'So help me God'. Except for Washington in his two-paragraph second inaugural remarks, all presidents have invoked God in their inaugural addresses and in most other major addresses as well. The speeches of some presidents, most notably Lincoln, are filled with religious resonance and biblical references. Eight words, and only eight words, appear on every piece of American currency, bills and coins: 'United States of America' and 'In God We Trust'. Americans pledge allegiance to 'One nation under God'. Major public ceremonies begin with an invocation by a clergyman from one denomination and end with a benediction by a clergyman of a different denomination. The military

services have a substantial corps of chaplains, and the daily sessions of Congress open with prayer.

4- Fourth, national ceremonies and activities themselves take on a religious aura and perform religious functions. Historically, as Lloyd Warner argues, celebration of Memorial Day was ‘an American sacred ceremony’. So also is the celebration of Thanksgiving, as well as presidential inaugurations and funerals. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Gettysburg Address, Lincoln’s second inaugural, Kennedy’s inaugural, Martin Luther King’s ‘I have a dream’ speech have all become sacred texts defining America’s identity.

The marriage of religion and politics in America’s civil religion is well caught in Peter Steinfels’s account of the inauguration of Bill Clinton in 1993:

“At its core [was] the solemn administration of an oath on the Bible, preceded and followed by prayers and accompanied by hymns as well as patriotic music....The week was rich with religious gestures alongside moments when the religious overtones, though not explicit, were unmistakable. The inaugural week officially began with a nationwide ringing of church bells. At Howard University, Bill Clinton invoked the memory of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., echoing his lessons and quoting the verse from Scripture that would also close the Inaugural Address....The President was surrounded throughout the day by an array of religious leaders.”<sup>7</sup>

Huntington further says that ‘this was not the ceremony of a secular, much less atheistic, society or polity. As the British scholar D. W. Brogan pointed out, in the past when children recited daily the ‘American’s Creed’<sup>8</sup> in schools, they performed a religious Exercise as truly as if they began their day by saying, ‘I believe in God the Father Almighty’ or ‘There is no God but God’. Civil religion converts Americans from religious people of many denominations into a nation with the soul of a church.

But, apart from its being American, what is that church? It is a church that has included Protestants, Catholics, Jews, other non-Christians, and even agnostics. It is, however, a church that is profoundly Christian in its origins, symbolism, spirit,

accoutrements, and, most importantly, its basic assumptions about the nature of man, history, right and wrong. The Christian Bible, Christian references, biblical allusions and metaphors, permeate expressions of the civil religion. 'Behind the civil religion at every point lie Biblical archetypes,' Bellah has said: 'Exodus, Chosen People, Promised Land, New Jerusalem, Sacrificial Death and Rebirth'. Washington becomes Moses, Lincoln becomes Christ. 'The deepest source of the symbols, beliefs and rituals of the [civil] religion,' Conrad Cherry agrees, 'lies in the Old and New Testaments'. America's civil religion is a nondenominational, national religion and, in its articulated form, not expressly a Christian religion. Yet it is thoroughly Christian in its origins, content, assumptions, and tone. The God in whom their currency says Americans trust is implicitly then Christian God. Two words, nonetheless, do not appear in civil religion statements and ceremonies. They are "Jesus Christ." While the American Creed is Protestantism without God, the American civil religion is Christianity without Christ'.<sup>9</sup>

Martin E. Marty tells us about the formation of civil religion in its historical background that it was Benjamin Franklin who began the advocacy of republican piety when in 1749 he pointed to "*the necessity of a Publick Religion*." He argued that it would be useful to the public, advantageous in promoting a religious character among private persons, and helpful—was he here twitting the regular sects?—in countering the mischiefs of superstition. Later, in his Autobiography, Franklin defined the substance of public religion when he spelled out "the essentials of every religion." He took pains to exclude all elements of what the Christian majority called saving faith and kept for his canon only "the existence of the Deity, that he made the world, and governed it by his Providence; that the most acceptable service of God was the doing good to men; that our souls are immortal; and that all crime will be punished and virtue rewarded, either here or hereafter." Then, as is well known, he announced his "different degrees of respect' for the sects, depending on the degree to which these essentials were 'more or less mixed with other articles" that did not promote public morale and that did divide citizens.....Thomas Jefferson suggested that republican religion had to be voluntary, no more a part of fundamental law than was churchly religion. Yet even Jefferson worried over how the

liberties of a nation would be secure if removed from ‘their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of people that these liberties are the gift of God’.

Presidents of the United States soon became the priests of public religion. George Washington bade citizen farewell with the view that “religion and morality are indispensable supports”—he significantly differentiated the two and called them twin pillars—for political prosperity. John Adams followed in 1798 with formal claim that the nation need ask “the protection and the blessing of Almighty God” for the “promotion of that morality and piety without which social happiness cannot exist nor the blessings of a free government be enjoyed.”

Then, in the middle third of the twentieth century, advocates of a public religion, still united against the churchly sects but disunited about their own alternatives, made new claims. Thus, in 1934, philosopher John Dewey promoted *A Common Faith*, which took democracy as both its setting and its object, over against inherited church religion. Leaving behind the founding fathers, he now wanted a godless religion to turn “explicit and militant.” With verbal sleight of hand, he joined the great cloud of witnesses to public religion in the act of conceptually reducing the great number of sects down to only two. “Never before in history,” Dewey began his book, “has mankind been so much of two minds, so divided into two camps, as it is today.” The educator did not want religious belief any longer to be organized “in a special institution within a secular community,” evidently not regarding the public school, which would have been the established church of this common faith, to be such an institution. Dewey would allow churches to survive if they dropped their supernaturalism and then celebrated or reinforced naturally in “different ways and with differing symbols” the one “fund of values that are prized and that need to be cherished.”

Fear of chaos after World War II led the followers of Dewey to promote social morale through such a naturalist and democratic faith. J. Paul Williams typically argued that denominational faith was a useless distraction because it was not “shared with the members of a whole society.” After blasting the churches for being imperial and exclusivist, he called on government to become so by asking it to teach “the democratic ideal as religion.” More alert to ritual than many of his colleagues,

he hoped democratic society would support such a religion with metaphysical sanctions and ceremonial reinforcements that would be more effective than those of its Nazi, Fascist, or Communist counterparts:

“Democracy must become an object of religious dedication. Americans must come to look on the democratic ideal (not necessarily American practice of it) as the Will of God or, if they prefer, the Law of Nature.”<sup>10</sup>

Horace M. Kallen summarized this case by the Dewey school:

“For the communicants of the democratic faith it is the religion *of* and *for* religions....It is the religion of religions, all may freely come together in it.”<sup>11</sup>

Robert Bellah who formalized the idea of civil religion in Daedalus conference on American Religion in May 1966 says:

“Although matters of personal religious belief, worship, and association are considered to be strictly private affairs, there are, at the same time, certain common elements of religious orientation that the great majority of American share, These have played a crucial role in the development of American institutions and still provide a religious dimension for the whole fabric of American life, including the political sphere. This public religious dimension is expressed in a set of beliefs, symbols, and rituals that I am calling the American civil religion.”<sup>12</sup>

Bellah goes on to point out that America’s civil religion is certainly not Christianity in anything like the specific sense such as would necessitate belief in Jesus Christ and the Atonement, but is rather more “Unitarian,” in the sense of regarding God as a sort of single supernatural being. But this God is not to be understood simply in the deistic tradition of an aloof Maker who set the world in motion and then left it to shift for itself. But no:

“He is actively interested and involved in history, with a special concern for America.”<sup>13</sup>

At the heart of civil religion is the idea that America is the Promised Land that God has led people to—out of the land of bondage like Europe and Asia. Thus this nation is to be dedicated

to order, law, and justice as God would have them carried out. Bellah quotes extensively from Washington and Jefferson as well as from John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, pointing out the idea of America as charged with a divinely ordained mission to fulfill in bringing about God's will for mankind. Out of the trauma of the Civil War emerged new themes of sacrifice and rebirth. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address was replete with Christian symbolism without being specifically Christian ("that those who here gave their lives, that nation might live"). Lincoln's own "sacrificial" martyrdom enhanced the concept Memorial Day ceremonies and to a lesser extent the ceremonies of the Forth of July, Veterans' Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays provided ritual vehicles for the civil religion. Dr. Robert N. Bellah says:

"Behind the civil religion at every point lie biblical archetypes: Exodus, Chosen People, Promised Land, New Jerusalem, and Sacrificial Death and Rebirth. But it is also genuinely American and genuinely new. It has its own prophets and its own martyrs, its own sacred events and sacred places, its own solemn rituals and symbols. It is concerned that America be a society as perfectly in accord with the will of God as men can make it, and a light to all nations."<sup>14</sup>

Coleman formalizes a definition of civil religion and lists three central characteristics of American civil religion. He defines civil religion as:

"the set of beliefs, rites and symbols which relates a man's role as citizen and his society's place in space, time and history to the conditions of ultimate existence and meaning."<sup>15</sup>

Three characteristics, according to Coleman, typify American civil religion:

1. The nation is the primary agent of God's meaningful activity in history. This belief gave rise to the doctrines of manifest destiny and world obligation.
2. The nation is the primary society in terms of which individual Americans discover personal and group identity. Like the historic church, through the doctrine of the melting pot, America was called to be "catholic."

3. The nation also assumes a churchly feature as the community of righteousness.<sup>16</sup>

Civil Religion has its own theology and beliefs. In this context Robert Nisbet Writes:

“It is no exaggeration to say, in all, that the American Civil Religion had its widely recognized theology, one complete with creed, catechism and dogmas. A complex ritual surrounded the American flag and other symbols of national civil unity.”<sup>17</sup>

Tony Lawson defines Civil Religion in this way:

“Where secular symbols such Flags and national anthems function to promote social solidarity in the way that religion has traditionally done. Durkheim used the term to indicate that there were ‘Functional Equivalents’ to religion in every society, even those which did not have a single or unifying religion.”<sup>18</sup>

Beth B. Hess definition of Civil Religion:

“This ‘Universal religion of the nation’ Civil Religion has served the essential functions of any belief system: to legitimize and sanctify (make sacred) the social order and to integrate its members, despite differences of faith. The intermix of nationalism and religion is visible both when we make secular holidays sacred, as on the Forth of July and When we transform sacred holy days into commercial orgies, as tat Christmas. The Civil Religion even has its own integrating rituals that reaffirm collective values.”<sup>19</sup>

B.B Sharma propounded Civil Religion in these words:

“The Quasi-Religious beliefs and rituals e.g. salutes to the national Flag, parades, Coronation Ceremonies or even international sporting events, which can be seen to perform the function of fostering social solidarity and the achievement of political legitimacy within a society.”<sup>20</sup>

Anthony Giddens’s definition of Civil Religion is brief but comprehensive:

“Forms of ritual and belief similar to involved in religion, but concerning secular activities such as political parades of ceremonials.”<sup>21</sup>

Alexis de Tocqueville, the great 19th century political scientist, described what he observed in America as a “republican religion”:

“In the United States even the religion of most of the citizens is republican, since it submits the truths of the other world to private judgment, as in politics the care of their temporal interests is abandoned to the good sense of the people. Thus every man is allowed freely to take that road which he thinks will lead him to heaven, just as the law permits every citizen to have the right of choosing his own government.”<sup>22</sup>

De Tocqueville observed that the United States had achieved a unique balance between religion and government, whereby the two were disconnected in the Constitution but connected in a broader level through “the prevailing habits and ideas of the people:

“These partisans of liberty [Americans] know that liberty cannot be established without morality, nor morality without faith.”<sup>23</sup>

He writes:

“That Providence has given to every human being the degree of reason necessary to direct himself in the affairs that interest him exclusively is the grand maxim upon which civil and political society rests in the United States.”<sup>24</sup>

Civil religion goes by many different monikers: civic faith, public piety, republican religion. Benjamin Franklin called it “public religion,” Abraham Lincoln called it “political religion.” Like its different names, civil religion has many variations of expression and definition. But “Civil Religion” is a scholarly term for the widely but informally held set of fundamental political and social principles concerning the history and destiny of a state or nation that help to bind that state or nation together. It is a collection of beliefs, values, ceremonies, and symbols that gives sacred meaning to the political life of the community, provides the nation with an overarching sense of unity that transcends all internal conflicts and differences, and relates the society to the realm of ultimate meaning. It allows a people to look at their political community in a special light and thereby to achieve purposeful social integration and cohesion. Many religious scholars and sociologists claim that some kind of civil religion is indispensable for the maintenance of

the social order. Essentially, it is a general faith independent of the power of both the state and the institutional church.

According to the Brill Dictionary:

“Civil religion denotes a system of linguistic formulae (metaphor, citations, slogans), symbols, rituals, and myths, in representative public life and in politics, that defines the meaning and demarcation of a society vis-à-vis the state, legitimates its goals, works by bestowing meaning and promoting community, familiarizes the population with the values and basic attitudes it embodies, and mobilizes strength and energy for the realization of these goals. The language of the formulae, symbolic actions, and collective representations avails itself of such already existent religious motifs, forms of expression, and systems of belief as can be accepted by the greatest number of members of society as possible, and seeks to create a comprehensive political culture and generally bonding system of values. Civil religion is part of a society’s political culture and public discourse, without reverting to institutionalized religion. Motives in support of civil religion thus emerge from concrete organized spirituality and enter ‘civil space’, in celebrations at monuments and memorial parks, in political rallies and addresses, on the occasion of civil festivals and burials, and in the political cult of the dead.”<sup>25</sup>

Dictionary says more that the concept of civil religion was introduced, in 1967, by U.S. sociologist Robert N. Bellah, in the sense of a ‘religion of/for the citizen’. Bellah had analyzed the inaugural addresses of important U.S. American presidents and had established that religion and God played a key role, without reference to a particular religion. The point of departure of his investigations is the conceptualization that rituals and symbols are important and informative for the functioning of societies. Key elements of the U.S. American civil religion are taken from the Hebrew Bible: the ideas of Exodus, the Land of Promise, the chosen people, the covenant with God, and the New Jerusalem. The history of the United States—so runs the consensus of civil religion—is the product of divine providence: the presidents of the United States can be understood in this context as ‘prophets’, the Declaration of Independence and the constitution as ‘sacred texts’ of a civil religion in festivals like Thanksgiving and Memorial Day, individual citizens and families are ritually integrated into civil religion. The later offers, from its side, the integrative design

for a (national) citizen's religion as a system of basic political attitudes and moral values, of societal patterns for classification and perception—which, together, condition the lifestyle of a loyal and self-controlled, patriotic citizen.

Civil religion must be conceptually distinguished from:

(a) *state religion*, where what is at hand is the legally fixed (by concordate, for example) close cooperation between the state and a religion;

(b) *bourgeois or civilians' religion*, where what is at hand are forms of privatistic, apolitical religion, in which a clear distribution of responsibilities is posited between the religious domain and public/political life. Yet civil religion also claims to lay an obligation on persons who belong to no specific religion, and 'functions' without religious institutions as a quasi-neutral instance;

(c) *political religion*, which attempts to extend civil-religion projects to a totalitarian ideology, or even to a 'religion defined by the state', and to replace existing religious communities and traditions—one recalls the state ritual and liturgical composite erected by National Socialism.

The discourse of civil religion is conceivable only in the context of modernity, the 'separation of church and state', and the demand for freedom of religion. Important roots of the concept lie in the French Enlightenment. In a letter, Jean-Jacques Rousseau responded to the question of the legitimization of the secular state as early as 1756, if the latter is to be altogether separated from religion, with the postulate of a *religion civile* ('civil religion'). For Rousseau, this construct is preponderantly this-worldly: a moral code, a kind of 'citizen's creed'; it includes belief in a powerful and 'rational' godhead, but its heart is the 'sanctity of the social contract and the law. Rousseau's design was adopted in the French Revolution, and liturgically translated in, for example, Robespierre's *Culte de la Raison* ('Cult of Reason'). Bellah himself saw the danger of the political abuse of civil religion, against the background of the foreign policy of the United States in the Vietnam War. Since then, comparable scenarios of the legitimization of foreign policy by civil religion have developed repeatedly, as in the 'War on Terrorism' after the 9/11 attacks. When soldiers die abroad for 'human rights and freedom', civil religion will function as a solution to the problem raised by the

obvious contingency of their dead. Fallen soldiers can be vindicated on the basis of civil religion, on the one hand; and on the other, it will be possible to sacralize battle even more by appealing to the grand theme of sacrifice. Civil religion's legitimization of 'imperialistic adventures' or a military imposition of interests of a policy of power and economics, is just as possible under the banner of 'human rights and freedom' as it is under the motto 'People and Fatherland' or 'God with Us'.<sup>26</sup>

### **Types of Civil Religion:**

The existence of a civil religion in world is now widely accepted. According to Robert Bellah, who stimulated much of the discussion about civil religion with his seminal essay in 1967, "civil religion in America" is "an understanding of the American experience in the light of ultimate and universal reality."

Russell Richey and Donald Jones have divided civil religion into five-category schema for the organization of civil religion literature.<sup>27</sup> These categories were folk religion or culture religion, transcendent universal religion of the nation, religious nationalism, democratic faith, Protestant civic piety, and transcendent universal religion of the nation.<sup>28</sup> Richey and Jones felt that all of the various descriptions of civil religion offered by scholars would readily fall under these five categories.

While all have a certain validity, the last (transcendent universal religion of the nation) is most central. This is the meaning originally stressed by Bellah and then refined in the conceptual of Coleman,<sup>29</sup> Gehrig,<sup>30</sup> and Hammond.<sup>31</sup> Gehrig characterizes it as the most comprehensive perspective because it is capable of performing all three of the traditionally expected religious functions (legitimation, integration, and prophetic guidance), as well as the most inclusive approach because any or all of the other four models may be viewed as manifestations of it.<sup>32</sup>

Robert Wuthnow in his book, "The Restructuring of American Religion," provided a simplified schema for the study of civil religion. It was of two categories: conservative and liberal. He asserted:

"The civil religion to which we so blithely pay homage has become deeply divided. Like the fractured communities found in our churches, our

civil religion no longer unites us around common ideals. Instead of giving voice to a clear image of who we should be, it has become a confusion of tongues. It speaks from competing traditions and offers partial visions of America's future. Religious conservatives offer one version of our divine calling; religious liberals articulate one that is radically different."<sup>33</sup>

Wuthnow described in general terms the basic frameworks of the conservative and liberal forms of American civil religion.

### **Conservative and Liberal Civil Religion:**

Dr. Bellah tells us about the kinds of civil religion:

"There have been behind the civil religion from the beginning two great structures of interpretation, the one I shall call biblical, the other utilitarian. The biblical interpretation stands, above all, under the archetype of the covenant, but it is also consonant with the classical theory of natural law as derived from ancient philosophy and handed down by the church fathers. The utilitarian interpretation stands, above all, under the archetype of the social contract and is consonant with the modern theory of natural rights as derived from John Locke. The meaning of every key term in the civil religion—certainly liberty and the pursuit of happiness, but also equality and even life—differs in those two perspectives."<sup>34</sup>

According to Bellah, civil religion has following two kinds:

1. Biblical
2. Utilitarian

Bellah says that "as an expression of the biblical archetype that stands behind the civil religion let me turn to that great initial sermon of John Winthrop, "A Model of Christian Charity," delivered on board ship before the landing in Massachusetts in 1630." This discourse was planned for new society which the colonists were to build (which is in old English):

"From hence wee may frame these Conclusions:

1. First all true Christians are of one body in Christ.<sup>35</sup> Ye are the body of Christ and members of [your?] parte.

21y. The ligamentes of this body which knitt together are love.

31y. Noe body can be perfect which wants its propper ligamentes.

41y. All the partes of this body being thus united are made soe contiguous in a speciall relacion as they must needes partake of each others strength and infirmity, joy, and sorrowe, weal and woe. 1 Cor: 12, 26. If one member suffers all suffer with it, if one be in honour, all rejoyce with it.

51y. This sensiblenes and Sympathy of each others Conditions will necessarily infuse into each parte a native desire and endeavour, to strengthen defend preserve and comfort the other.

To insist a little on this Conclusion being the product of all the former the truthe hereof will appeare both by precept and patterne i. John. 3. 10. ye ought to lay downe your lives for the brethren Gal: 6.2. beare ye one anothers burthens and soc fulfill the lawe of Christ.”<sup>36</sup>

Only a little further in the sermon he adds:

“The next consideration is how this love comes to be wrought; Adam in his first estate was a perfect modell of mankinde in all their generacions, and in him this love was perfected in regard of the habit, but Adam Rent in himselfe from his Creator, rent all his posterity alsoe one from another, whence it comes that every man is borne with this principle in him, to love and seeke himselfe onely and thus a man continueth till Christ comes and takes possession of the soule, and infuseth another principle love to God and our brother.”<sup>37</sup>

Bellah writes that in Winthrop’s time, there is a great tension between the situation of fallen men, whose disobedience to God rends them also from each other so that they love themselves alone, and the truly Christian community where all are one body in mutual love and concern. The whole Puritan project was an effort

to overcome the failings of fallen or natural man and create a holy community, based on love. In an effort to actualize the biblical commandments Winthrop and his friends sought to create a holy commonwealth in England, and if not there then in America. The moral and religious fervor at the root of that effort was the source of much that is good in American society ever since, but we must not forget its dark side: the moral crusade, the holy war, what Paul Tillich called the sin of religion, to confuse one's own will with the will of God. And Winthrop, for all his moderation and humanity, did display that dark side as when several times he turned persecutor and drove religious dissidents from the Bay Colony.<sup>38</sup>

Partly in reaction against the Puritans the great founders of modern philosophy in England, Hobbes and Locke created a position that was in a sense the dialectical opposite of that of the Puritans. Disturbed by sectarian fanaticism, finding the Puritan goal utopian and finally destructive because, they thought, unrealistic about human nature, they drastically lowered the moral demand, abandoned the principles of Christian politics, and started with natural man, the fallen man of Winthrop, the man who loves himself alone. Thus when, over fifty years after Winthrop's sermon, John Locke discusses the purpose or the end of government he finds it to be not love, as Winthrop would have said, nor justice, as Aristotle would have said, but:

“The great and chief end therefore, of Mens uniting into Commonwealths, and putting themselves under Government, is the Preservation of their Property.”

Or again:

“The commonwealth seems to me to be a society of men constituted only for the procuring, preserving, and advancing their own civil interests. Civil interests I call life, liberty, health, and indolency of body; and the possession of outward things, such as money, lands, houses, furniture, and the like.”<sup>39</sup>

Bellah further says that now one can read the great tenets of the civil religion in either of the two perspectives—as Winthrop would have read them, or as Locke would have read them. Is equality a condition for the fulfillment of our humanity in covenant with God or is it a condition for the competitive struggle to attain our own interests? Is freedom almost identical with virtue—the freedom to fulfill lovingly our obligations to God and our fellow

men—or is it the right to do whatever we please so long as we do not harm our fellow men too flagrantly? Is the pursuit of happiness the realization of our true humanity in love of Being and all beings, as Jonathan Edwards<sup>40</sup> would have put it or is it, as Locke would contend, the pursuit of those things—notably wealth and power—which are means to future happiness, in Leo Strauss's words, “The joyless quest for joy”? Does life mean biological survival in our animal functions or does it mean the good life in which our spiritual nature and our animal nature are both fulfilled?<sup>41</sup>

It would simplify matters if Christians had consistently followed what I am calling the biblical interpretation of our civil religion, and deists and rationalists had followed the utilitarian interpretation. Such was not, however, the case. Not only have Christians been on both sides of the fence but we can find the same cleavage in the Enlightenment thought of the founding fathers. The stress on virtue that we have already noticed—Jefferson's “love of others,” Franklin's “zeal for the public good”—is very close to the biblical archetype, while the stress on self-interest that is also common among the founding fathers suggests the powerful influence of the utilitarian archetype.<sup>42</sup>

### **Biblical or Conservative Civil Religion:**

Robert Wuthnow writes:

“The civil religion to which we so blithely pay homage has become deeply divided. Like the fractured communities found in our churches, our civil religion no longer unites us around common ideals. Instead of giving voice to a clear image of who we should be, it has become a confusion of tongues. It speaks from competing traditions and offers partial visions of America's future. Religious conservatives offer one version of our divine calling; religious liberals articulate one that is radically different.”<sup>43</sup>

Wuthnow described the basic framework of the conservative and liberal forms of American civil religion. The conservative version posits that America is a chosen nation. On this interpretation, our form of government enjoys lasting legitimacy because it was designed by founding fathers sensitive to God's leadership. While the framers omitted specific references to God in the Constitution,

they made certain that the documents reflected biblical truths, such as the separation of powers which was intended as an auxiliary check on human sinfulness. As Francis Schaeffer, a popular evangelical author, asserted in *A Christian Manifesto*:

“These men truly understood what they were doing. They knew they were building on the Supreme Being who was the Creator, the final reality. These were brilliant men who knew exactly what they were doing.”<sup>44</sup>

In 1953, Congress, under encouragement from President Dwight Eisenhower, sought to solidify the nation’s religious moorings by adding the words “under God” to the pledge of allegiance. A year later, it decreed the nation’s motto to be “One Nation Under God.”<sup>45</sup>

### **Conservative Civil Religion and Capitalism:**

Derek H. Davis writes about the legitimization of Capitalism by Conservative civil religion:

“Conservative civil religion also sanctifies the American economic order. Typically, capitalism is praised as being fundamentally biblical. Economist George Gilder, who identifies himself as an evangelical Christian, once argued, ‘Give and you’ll be given unto’ is the fundamental practical principle of the Christian life, and when there’s no private property you can’t give it because you don’t own it....Socialism is inherently hostile to Christianity and capitalism is simply the essential mode of human life that corresponds to religious truth’. And for Jerry Falwell, American capitalism enjoys divine sanction: “God is in favour of freedom, property ownership, competition, diligence, work, and acquisition. All of this is taught in the Word of God in both the Old and New Testaments.”<sup>46</sup>

Robert Wuthnow also says same thing in the following words:

“Conservative civil religion also voices strong arguments about the propriety of the American economic system. These arguments grant capitalism absolute legitimacy by drawing certain parallels between capitalist principles and biblical teachings.

Economist George Gilder, who identifies himself as an evangelical Christian, has argued, 'Give and you'll be given unto' is the fundamental practical principle of the Christian life, and when there's no private property you can't give it because you don't own it.....Socialism is inherently hostile to Christianity and capitalism is simply the essential mode of human life that corresponds to religious truth'.<sup>47</sup> Falwell has also been an outspoken apologist for American capitalism. 'I believe in capitalism and the free enterprise system and private property ownership....people should have the right to own property, to work hard, to achieve, to earn, and to win'. For Falwell, this is not simply an assertion of personal opinion, but a position that has divine sanction: 'God is in favor of freedom, property ownership, competition, diligence, work, and acquisition. All of this is taught in the Word of God in both the Old and New Testaments'.<sup>48</sup> Other spokespersons for conservative civil religion also connect Christian doctrines to American capitalism. Ronald H. Nash, arguing against liberation theology, for instance, suggests that capitalism is the preferred system because it is impossible to have 'spiritual freedom' without 'economic freedom'.<sup>49</sup> Pat Robertson draws directly on Gilder's work to arrive at the conclusion that 'free enterprise is the economic system most nearly meeting humanity's Godgiven need for freedom'.<sup>50</sup>

On the conservative side, religious leaders argue that America's vitality rests on a distinct, historic relation to God. According to this interpretation, our form of government enjoys lasting legitimacy because it was created by Founding Fathers who were deeply influenced by Judeo-Christian values. Although in their personal convictions they may have strayed occasionally from this standard, Washington, Franklin, Witherspoon and Adams knew the human heart from a biblical perspective and thus understood what kind of government would function best. As the late Francis A. Schaeffer, a popular evangelical author, asserted in *A Christian Manifesto*:

“These men truly understood what they were doing. They knew they were building on the Supreme Being who was the Creator, the final reality. And they knew that without that foundation everything in the Declaration of Independence and all that followed would be sheer unadulterated nonsense. These were brilliant men who understood exactly what was involved.”<sup>51</sup>

This view has deep roots in conservative thinking. In the 19th century a close relation between America and God was often heralded in millennialist language. America not only was called of God, but existed as a chosen people, brought into being for the final fulfillment of God’s purposes on earth. Herman Melville’s much-read novel *White-Jacket*, for example, described Americans as “the Israel of our time” and the nation as a “political Messiah” sent as an advance guard to “bear the ark of the liberties of the world.” Walt Whitman’s epic poem “Passage to India” drew an even more direct connection between the nation’s wonders and God’s purposes. In the 20th century, war and economic depressions dampened much of this millennial enthusiasm. Yet as America increasingly found itself in the forefront of world military and economic affairs, some of the traditional zeal continued to be voiced.

Francis Ching-Wah Yip relates Tillich’s theology to contemporary theological interpretations of global capitalism and modernity. Yip argues that one should go beyond Tillich’s analysis by placing much more emphasis on the material-economic basis of culture. He draws on Durkheim to show the quasi-religious dimension of capitalism as a global civil religion and as the culture of modern society.<sup>52</sup>

### **Utilitarian or Liberal Civil Religion:**

The liberal version of American civil religion is also linked to religious values, but in a different way. As Wuthnow points out, few spokespersons for the liberal version make explicit reference to the religious views of the founding fathers or suggest that the United States is God’s chosen nation. Indeed, the idea of one nation under God is rejected because all nations are considered to have the equal concern and affection of God. Derek H. Davis says about this version:

“America's role in world affairs is perceived much differently in the liberal version of civil religion. The nation has a responsible role to play in the world not because it is a chosen people but because it is uniquely blessed with vast resources to be shared. Rather than focusing on issues of personal morality, liberal civil religion is likely to stress global issues such as human rights, nuclear disarmament, world hunger, and peace. The importance attached to these issues is generally not legitimated with reference to any particular secular mandate, but simply on the belief that these are matters of life and death. Nevertheless, religious faith is frequently the motivation for involvement, differentiating civil religion from purely secular or humanist beliefs. The cry of the Old Testament prophets for peace and justice is the authoritative directive for liberal civil religion. Liberal civil religionists typically show a greater concern than their conservative counterparts in seeking peace and justice. Feeding the world's poor is a central focus, as illustrated by liberal support for such organizations as Bread for the World, Lutheran World Relief, Catholic World Relief, and World Vision. And a recent survey by the American National Election Study indicated that liberal religious lobbies are more than twice as supportive of defense spending reductions as conservative religious lobbies.”<sup>53</sup>

Robert Wuthnow says about this version of civil religion:

“The liberal version of American civil religion draws on a different set of religious values and portrays the nation in a very different light. Few spokespersons for the liberal version make explicit reference to the religious views of the founding fathers or suggest that America is God's chosen nation. Indeed, the idea of one nation under God is often rejected because of its particularistic connotations and, more generally, because of the way it has been interpreted by conservatives.”<sup>54</sup>

The liberal view of civil religion focuses less on religion as such, and more on humanity in general. Robert Wuthnow says:

“In this view, America has a vital role to play in world affairs not because it is the home of a chosen people but because it has vast resources, has caused many of the problems currently facing the world, and simply as part of the community of nations has a responsibility to help alleviate the world's problems. Rather than drawing attention to the distinctiveness of the Judeo-Christian tradition, liberal civil religion is much more likely to include arguments about basic human rights and common human problems. Issues like nuclear disarmament, human rights, world hunger, peace and justice receive special emphasis.”<sup>55</sup>

The problem of nuclear arms occupies an especially prominent place in liberal civil religion. Liberal clergy have so often taken the lead in seeking solutions to the arms race that the peace movement has come to be identified in many circles as a religious issue. Other issues in the liberal version of American civil religion include civil rights, international justice and ecology.

### **Objectives of Civil Religion:**

Why Rousseau too much concerned with civil religion, Bellah tells us about it in the following lines:

“It is instructive to reflect on why Rousseau was concerned about civil religion, advocated it, and coined the term for it. No doubt part of the reason was to provide a substitute belief system for those whose faiths had been shattered by the forces of Enlightenment. But there is a more important reason. Civil religion was not to be just another religion; its purpose was precisely to harmonize religion and politics. Pagan religions had been so co-extensive with their political orders that ‘there was no way of converting a people but by enslaving them.’ Christianity, by projecting a ‘kingdom of the other world,’ changed all that. ‘Jesus came to establish on earth a spiritual kingdom, which, separating the religious from the political system,

destroyed the unity of the State. [A] perpetual conflict of jurisdiction has resulted from this double power, which has rendered any good polity impossible in Christian States; and no one has ever succeeded in understanding whether he was bound to obey the ruler or the priest'. Authority, then, is the crux of the matter—more precisely, authority to set jurisdictional boundaries and invoke transcendental sanctions. For these twin problems Rousseau offers a single solution: civil religion. Civil religion is religious because it is necessary that citizens be disposed to 'love their duties', and it is civil because its sentiments are those of 'sociability, without which it is impossible to be either a good citizen or a faithful subject'. Therefore, 'the dogmas of civil religion ought to be simple, few in number, precisely fixed, and without explanation or comment. The existence of a powerful, wise, and benevolent Divinity, who foresees and provides the life to come, the happiness of the just, the punishment of the wicked, the sanctity of the social contract and the laws: these are its positive dogmas. Its negative dogmas I would confine to one—intolerance', Rousseau's overall concern in *Social Contract* is to identify an effective but nondespotic government, a vehicle for expressing the general will. In the book's final part, he discusses several means for 'strengthening the constitution of the State', and it is in this context he introduces the notion of civil religion, an aid in governing. Clearly, by calling it 'civil', he intended it in some sense to be independent of the church, and, by calling it 'religion' he likewise intended it to be independent of the ruling regime."<sup>56</sup>

But there is a difference between Bellah's and Rousseau's concept of civil religion. Rousseau's civil religion has no transcendental reference point. The general will of the people is sovereign and stands under no "higher law." In this respect Rousseau's civil religion differs from that described by most

interpreters of American civil religion in which the state stands under the judgment of a higher law.

### **Is CR a Secularization of Religion?**

#### **Revitalization of Secularism in Postmodern Age:**

The term secularism itself is actually of very recent origin. It was coined in 1854 to express “a certain positive and ethical element which the terms ‘infidel’, ‘skeptical’, and ‘atheist’ do not express.”<sup>57</sup>

Secularization refers to the “diminishing social significance of religion.” Berger contends that “secularization has occurred on three levels: societal, cultural, and individual. At the societal level, religious institutions no longer exercise substantial control or influence over the state or other important social institutions, such as education. Secularization involves the separation of other institutions from organized religion and religious ideas. To illustrate, we can point to the degree to which functions such as education, social welfare, and social control, once the responsibility of religious institutions, have become the responsibility of the liberal democratic state. In this sense, religious symbols and institutions have been relegated to a position in which their influence over the larger society has diminished. Patterns of secularization have also influenced various aspects of cultural life. As secularization precedes, the arts, literature, and philosophy less frequently draw on religious sources for inspiration.”<sup>58</sup>

Berger further says that “the main cause of secularization is modernism. The western scientific and technical mood of the Enlightenment claimed that science knew better than religion. The attack took its toll. Religion wasn’t defeated but, henceforth, competed with other claims to truth. Science has proved to be a formidable adversary.”<sup>59</sup>

But contrarily in civil religion, religious enthusiasm its religious symbols, and religious teachings are used in support of secular ideas and its socio-political institutions. We can say in other words, to legitimate, support, and justify various aspects of secular ideas and pattern of life is called civil religion. Secularism minimizes the role of religion in society but in civil religion, traditional religious teachings are legitimized in a society only for the justification of liberal and non-religious ideas and institutions. We can say, it is also a dimension of secularization which is a

secularization of religion. Civil religion thus borrows from the sacred to give meaning to the secular.

In enlightenment period, two ideologies were developed. Although the western philosophers of these ideologies were agreed on one point that religion has no right to play any role in socio-economic-political structure of society. So science and modern philosophy took over and replaced religion.

First was that to perish the religion and religious ideas.

Second was that to see the religion as a social phenomenon.

On the basis of first ideology, U.S.S.R. was being into existence, because Karl Marx called the religion opium. So his followers perished the religion and religious ideas people in their country after revolution. But western countries did not follow this ideology, they considered religion only a personal matter of an individual. Due to the lack of religion and religious emotions, Russian society was collapse in 1989. Russian philosophers could not understand that elements of general religiosity to be necessary to the creation of a unified social order and religious doctrines are essential for society, because these doctrines develop enthusiasm and unite the people. Rousseau had all these things in his mind, so he developed the idea of civil religion. This viewpoint focuses on the power of religion to legitimize the liberal and democratic ideas.

From Rousseau to Bellah, civil religion or transcendent universal religion concept is consisting of one meaning which was religious nationalism. When Bellah reconsidered this idea in 1965, it was introduced in the background of American nationalism. Now it has another meaning which would be the secularization of traditional religion.

Civil religion is itself set against the backdrop of secularization in the West. We can say that in the postmodern age secularization theory now has failed. Roger O'Toole says same thing in the following words:

“Through the secularization thesis has fallen on hard time, no new paradigm has yet emerged to administer the coup de grace invoked and anticipated by its most vehement critics. Despite all the slings and arrows that assail it, the concept of secularization persists in intriguing sociologists of religion and in dictating their subdisciplinary agenda. Paradoxically, the tenacity of the

secularization thesis seems to be rivaled only by that of the phenomenon of religion itself. Roberson depicts a mutual politicization of religion and religionization of politics on an international scale, while Cipriani perceives a secular adoption of religious elements are appropriated. Lambert discerns the emergence, in a French village, of a privatized and secularized Catholicism (characterized as 'transcendental humanism') which is nonetheless capable of sacralizing area of public life. Said Amir Arjomand explores intellectuals' political conditioning of the contemporary Islamic religious revival and stresses the importance of modern political, organizational, and ideological elements in this puritanical espousal of all-embracing fundamentalism. In a number of contributions, empirical findings provide a basis for cogent criticism of the secularization thesis. Lambert suggests that secularization theory underestimates the limits of modern rationality as well as the adaptive and productive capacities of religion."<sup>60</sup>

### **Global Theology and CR:**

After the fall of U.S.S.R. 1989, the importance of religion as social phenomena has been considered. Now western philosophers want to compatible religions of the world with democracy, capitalism, and other secular ideas like human rights, freedom, etc. Euben<sup>61</sup> and Fukuyama<sup>62</sup> developed the idea of compatibility of traditional religions with secular democratic ideas. We can say it a secularization of religion. We can also say it Global Theology or Universal Religion. Global theology is a relatively new way of thinking. It is an attempt to understand the present global situation from the secular viewpoint. According to Global theology:

“We are now having to think of the totality of our earthly existence, and of its new, or newly discovered, limits. There is a limit to human interference with life on the globe, beyond which the globe begins to die. There is a limit to the accumulation of military defence, beyond which it

becomes, paradoxically, a threat to our very existence. And there is a limit to the economic exploitation of other human beings, beyond which the global economy begins to founder and growth goes into reverse.”<sup>63</sup>

Global theology means to tend the religion from dogmas, self-purification of all the outer and inner defilements to humanitarian and worldly issues like poverty, unemployment, environmental crisis human rights and family planning and other democratic and enlightenment values.

Civil religion or Global theology will be the part of universal civilization. So, these are interrelated concepts.

### **Universal Civilization and CR:**

What is meant by universal civilization? Huntington says:

“The idea implies general the cultural coming together of humanity and the increasing acceptance of [Enlightenment] common values, beliefs, orientation, practices, and institutions by peoples throughout the world”.<sup>64</sup>

He further says:

“The concept of a universal civilization is a distinctive product of Western civilization. In the nineteenth century the idea of ‘the white man’s burden’ helped justify the extension of Western political and economic domination over non-Western societies. At the end of twentieth century the concept of a universal civilization helps justify Western cultural dominance of other societies and the need for those societies to ape Western practices and institutions. Universalism is the ideology of the West for confrontations with non-Western cultures.”<sup>65</sup>

In this way, civil religion is a movement to secularize the traditional religions of world so that they might be compatible with the idea of universal civilization or enlightenment ideology. Tocqueville also did this work during enlightenment period, Tocqueville indicates in his discussion of Christianity that the alliance between Christianity and liberal democracy was much more fragile.

## **Conclusion:**

Conor Cruise O'Brien argues in his book<sup>66</sup> that the American civil religion may be the major force working for the preservation of the Enlightenment, and with it democracy, in the world.

The Enlightenment secular tradition has even produced its own kind of generic public religion, a religion of the Republic, which Bellah has immortalized with the term civil religion. Historically, it is this common faith that supports the republic and tends to identify with its secular values. Civil religion has provided a sacred legitimation for capitalist and democratic system.

Although civil religion's roots are found in Enlightenment period, but this idea has now developed in Muslim countries. After Enlightenment period, religion could not be relegated from society. So the western philosophers developed the idea of civil religion to secularize the religious teachings or to use it for secular purposes.

If we use religious feelings for nationalism, in fact we borrow religious doctrines from any traditional religion. If we use it to unite and strength the modern society which is multicultural or plural society, it will also be called civil religion.

We have inferred from the above discussion that civil religion contains two aspects. Our further discussion will envisage these aspects of civil religion:

- ❖ Civil religion is to the "use" of traditional religion as an instrumentality for the attainment of national goals, as we shall discuss it in the coming chapters.
- ❖ Civil religion is a movement to secularize the traditional religions, so that they can be compatible with modern socio-political structure liberal democracy and enlightenment values, as we shall see it in detail in second part of this dissertation.

**Civil Religion→Global Theology or Universal  
Religion or Secularization of  
Religion→Universal Civilization  
NOTES AND REFERENCES**

---

<sup>1</sup> Comte, Auguste, *The Positive Philosophy*, freely translated and condensed by Harriet Martineau, (London: George Bell & Sons, 1886), p. 522. This six volumes of the Positive Philosophy were condensed and liberally translated by

Harriet Martineau and first published in 1855 two years before the death of the distinguished author and it was reprinted in 1886—the edition used in this dissertation.

<sup>2</sup> The word “positive” as a synonym for “scientific” in its generally accepted sense.

<sup>3</sup> Mill, J. S., *Auguste Comte and Positivism: The Essential Writings*, (New York: Kessinger Publishing; 5th edition, 2003), p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> Ward, Lester, Frank, *Dynamic Sociology*, vol. I, pp. 86-87.

<sup>5</sup> Durkheim. Emile, *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, trans., Joseph Ward Swain, (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1926), p. 214.

<sup>6</sup> Bellah, Robert, “Civil Religion in America,” in *Beyond Belief, Essays on Religion in a Post-Traditional World*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), p. 186.

<sup>7</sup> Huntington, Samuel P., *Who Are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004), pp.103-106.

<sup>8</sup> “I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the government; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes. I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies.”

<sup>9</sup> Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity*, pp. 103-106.

<sup>10</sup> Marty, E. Martin, *Religion and Republic, The American Circumstance*, p. 60.

<sup>11</sup> Marty, E. Martin, *Religion and Republic, The American Circumstance*, (Boston: Bacon Press, 1987), pp. 60-63.

<sup>12</sup> Bellah, Robert, *Religion In America*, ed., William G. McLoughlin and Robert N. Bellah (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), pp. 5-6.

<sup>13</sup> Bellah N. Robert, *Religion in America*, p. 9.

<sup>14</sup> Bellah N. Robert, *Beyond Belief*, p. 186.

<sup>15</sup> Coleman, John A., “Civil Religion,” in *Sociological Analysis* 31, no. 2 (1970), p. 76.

<sup>16</sup> Coleman, John A., “Civil Religion,” *Sociological Analysis* 31, no. 2 (1970): p. 74.

<sup>17</sup> Nisbet Robert, *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed., Mircea Eliade, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987), vol. III, p. 526.

<sup>18</sup> Lawson, Tony and Garrod, Joan, *The complete A-Z Sociology handbook*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1999), p. 94.

<sup>19</sup> Hess B. Beth, Markson, W. Elizabeth and Stein J. Peter, *Sociology*, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, 1993), p. 403.

<sup>20</sup> Sharma, B. B., *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology*. (New Delhi: Anmol Publication, 1992), p. 126.

<sup>21</sup> Giddens Anthony, *Sociology*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, 1997), p. 588.

<sup>22</sup> Tocqueville, de Alexis, *Democracy in America*, (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980), vol. 2, p. 110.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid p. 115

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 116

<sup>25</sup> Stuckrad, Kocku von, (ed.), *The Brill Dictionary of Religion*, Revised edition of Metzler Lexikon Religion, edited by Christoph Auffarth, Jutta Bernard and Hubert Mohr, trans. From German by Robert R. Barr, (Leiden: Brill, 2006), vol. I, p. 412.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., vol. I, pp. 413-414.

<sup>27</sup> Russell E. Richey and Donald G. Jones, (eds.), *American Civil Religion*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), pp. 4-18.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>29</sup> Coleman, John, A., "Civil Religion," *Sociological Analysis*, 31(2):67-77 (Summer 1970).

<sup>30</sup> Gehrig, Gail, *American Civil Religion, An Assessment*, (New York: Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, 1981), p. 18.

<sup>31</sup> Hammond, Phillip, E., and R. Bellah, (ed.), *Varieties of Civil Religion*, p. 132.

<sup>32</sup> Gehrig, Gail, *American Civil Religion, An Assessment*, p. 23.

<sup>33</sup> Wuthnow, Robert, *The Reconstructing of American Religion*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp.123-124.

<sup>34</sup> Bellah, Robert, *The Broken Covenants: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial*, (New York: Seabury Press, 1975), p. 65, in Robert, Bellah, "The Revolution and the Civil Religion," Jerald C. Brauer, (ed), *Religion and the American Revolution*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), Chapter, 3, p. 115.

<sup>35</sup> *The Bible* 1 Corinthians 12: 12, 13, 17, (The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians).

<sup>36</sup> Morgan, Edmund, S., (ed.), *Puritan Political Ideas*, pp. 84-86, in Robert, Bellah, "The Revolution and the Civil Religion," Jerald C. Brauer, (ed), *Religion and the American Revolution*, Chapter, 3, p. 115.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p.86, Robert, Bellah, "The Revolution and the Civil Religion," Jerald C. Brauer, (ed), *Religion and the American Revolution*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), Chapter, 3, p. 116, (Winthrop's statement is in original old English).

<sup>38</sup> Bellah, Robert, "The Revolution and the Civil Religion," Jerald C. Brauer, (ed), *Religion and the American Revolution*, Chapter, 3, p. 116.

<sup>39</sup> Locke, John, *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, ed., Charles L. Sherman, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1937), p. 17.

<sup>40</sup> Edwards, Jonathan, *The Nature of True Virtue*, (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1960), in Robert, Bellah, "The Revolution and the Civil Religion," Jerald C. Brauer, (ed), *Religion and the American Revolution*, Chapter, 3, p. 118.

<sup>41</sup> Robert, Bellah, "The Revolution and the Civil Religion," Jerald C. Brauer, (ed), *Religion and the American Revolution*, Chapter, 3, p. 118.

<sup>42</sup> Bellah, Robert, "The Revolution and the Civil Religion," Jerald C. Brauer, (ed), *Religion and the American Revolution*, Chapter, 3, p. 119.

<sup>43</sup> Wuthnow, Robert, "Divided We Fall: America's Two Civil Religions," *The Christian Century* (Journal) 115 (1988): 398.

<sup>44</sup> Schaeffer, Francis, *A Christian Manifesto*, (USA: Crossway Books, 1981), p. 33.

<sup>45</sup> Wuthnow, Robert, "Divided We Fall: America's Two Civil Religions," *The Christian Century* (Journal) 115, 399.

<sup>46</sup> Davis, Derek H., "Law, Morals, and Civil Religion in America," *Journal of Church and State*, Summer 97, vol. 39, issue 3, p. 4.

<sup>47</sup> Rodney Clapp, "Where Capitalism and Christianity Meet," *Christianity Today* February 4, 1983, in Wuthnow, Robert, "Divided We Fall: America's Two Civil Religions," p. 401.

<sup>48</sup> Falwell, *Wisdom for Living*, Victor, 1984, pp. 131, 102, in Wuthnow, Robert, "Divided We Fall: America's Two Civil Religions," p. 401.

<sup>49</sup> "The Christian Choice Between Capitalism and Socialism," in *Liberation Theology*, edited by Ronald H. Nash Mott, 1984, quoted in Wuthnow, Robert, "Divided We Fall: America's Two Civil Religions," p. 402.

<sup>50</sup> *The Secret Kingdom: A Promise of Hope and Freedom in a World of Turmoil*, (Thomas Nelson, 1982), p. 151, quoted in Wuthnow, Robert, "Divided We Fall: America's Two Civil Religions," p. 403.

<sup>51</sup> Schaeffer, Francis, *A Christian Manifesto*, p. 33.

<sup>52</sup> See Yip, Francis, Ching-Wah, *Capitalism as Religion? A Study of Paul Tillich's Interpretation of Modernity*, (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2007), pp. 10-18.

<sup>53</sup> Davis, Derek H., "Law, Morals, and Civil Religion in America," *Journal of Church and State*, Summer 97, vol. 39, issue 3, p. 4.

<sup>54</sup> Wuthnow, Robert, "Divided We Fall: America's Two Civil Religions," p. 405, see also Wuthnow, Robert, *The Reconstructing of American Religion*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 250.

<sup>55</sup> Wuthnow, Robert, "Divided We Fall: America's Two Civil Religions," p. 406, see also Wuthnow, Robert, *The Reconstructing of American Religion*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), p.251.

<sup>56</sup> Hammond, Phillip, E., "The Condotions for Civil Religion: A Comparision of the United States and Maxico," *The Rudimentary Forms of Civil Religion*," and "Pluralism and Law in the Formation of American Civil Religion," in *Varieties of Civil Religion*, ed., R. Bellah and P. E. Hammond, (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), chapter, 3, p. 2.

<sup>57</sup> Holyoake, George, Jacob, *The Reasoner, Journal of Freethought and Positive Philosophy*, (12 December, 1854), In fact the term secularism was used to describe the emphasis Jewish ethics places on concerns for human welfare on earth, rather than in the afterlife. This corresponds to the term's Latin root, *saecula*, meaning measurable in time, i.e., the created world, as opposed to *aeterna*, the timeless and everlasting world of the creator. George Jacob Holyoake was mainly self-educated and a vigorous campaigner for secularism and freethought during the 19th century. He wrote 160 books and pamphlets and

edited several magazines, including *The Movement* and *The Reasoner*. Holyoake was the last person in England to be imprisoned on a charge of atheism, for saying at a public lecture in Cheltenham in 1842 (at a time of economic hardship): "If I could have my way, I would place the deity on half pay as the Government of this country did its subaltern officers." It was Holyoake who suggested the term 'secularism' and organised the early Secular Societies, becoming Vice-President of the National Secular Society. Bradlaugh was preferred as President because he was a much more eloquent speaker. He campaigned with Bradlaugh for secular affirmations. Some of the other causes Holyoake championed were a free press, the rights of women and the liberation of oppressed nationalities. In 1899 he presided at the inaugural meeting of the Rational Press Association which has spent the last 100 years publishing books such as the Cheap Reprints of The History of Science series and The Thinker's Library, in order to undermine religious superstition and help the spread of rationalist principles. See also: *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, editor: Tullius Gould, p. 625, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, editor: James Hasting, (Edinburgh: T & T. Clark, 1955), vol. XI, p. 347.

<sup>58</sup> Berger, Peter, *The Sacred Conopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*, (New York: Doubleday: 1967), p. 25.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>60</sup> Beckford, James A., and Thomas Luckmann, (eds.), "The Changing Face of Religion," Reviewed by: Roger O'Toole, *Contemporary Sociology* (Journal), vol. 19, No. 5, Sep., 1990, pp. 736-737.

<sup>61</sup> See for detail, Euben, Roxanne L., *Enemy in the Mirror, Islamic Fundamentalism and limits of Modern Rationalism: A Work of Comparative Political Theory*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>62</sup> Fukuyama, Francis, *The End of History and the Last Man*, (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1992).

<sup>63</sup> Clarke, Paul Barry, and Linzey, Andrew, *Dictionary of Ethics, Theology and Society*, (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 403-404, see also Ambler, R., *Global Theology: the Meaning of Faith in the Present World Crisis*, (London: Trinity Press, 1990), Balasuriya, T., *Planetary Theology*, (London: SCM and Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1984), McFague, S., *Models of God: Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age*, (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press and London: SCM, 1987), Race, A., (ed.), *Theology against the Nuclear Horizon*, (London: SCM, 1988).

<sup>64</sup> Huntington, Samuel, P., *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, (New York: The Touchstone Book, 1997), pp. 56-64.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>66</sup> O'Brien, Conor Cruise, *On the Eve of the Millennium*, (New York: Free Press, 1996), p. 28.