*In sum, newly liberated nations need new sources of social order, especially a moral culture to legitimate the new order. Religion, in its moderate, anti-violent versions, is a major source of such a culture.*

The former, associated also with Talcott Parsons and the functionalist school of thought, focuses on the role of shared norms and values in maintaining cohesion in society. For Durkheim, this emphasis arose out of his critique of utilitarian social thought, popular especially among social and political theorists such as Herbert Spencer in Britain , who focused on mutual self-interest and contractual agreements as the basis of social order in increasingly complex industrial societies. For Durkheim, by comparison, questions of morality were central to the explanation of social integration. Moral restraints on egoism arise out of association and form the basis of social cohesion. While Durkheim did not deny the existence of conflict and the use of force, especially in periods of rapid social change, Parsons underlined the importance of a prior moral consensus as a necessary pre-condition for social order. He saw organic solidarity as a modified form of the conscience collective and argued that the acceptance of values by the internalization of norms is the basis of integration and social order in modern societies. Because of the importance which he attached to a shared body of norms and values, Parsons was persistently criticized for over-emphasizing consensus, and for neglecting conflict and change in his sociological analyses. The second explanation of social order derives from the Marxist tradition within the discipline and offers a materialist rather than a cultural account of cohesion. Marx emphasized inequalities in material wealth and political power in capitalist societies. The distribution of material and political resources is the source of conflict between different collectivitiesâ€"social classesâ€"who want a greater share of those resources than they may already enjoy. Conflict implies there is no moral consensus and social order is always precariously maintained. It is the product of the balance of power between competing groups, whereby the powerful constrain weaker groups, and cohesion is sustained through economic compulsion, political and legal coercion, and bureaucratic routine. While many Marxists have increasingly embraced cultural accounts of social order, for example by explaining working-class incorporation through a dominant ideology , others have noted that economic and political coercion has proved a remarkably effective source of stability, especially where power is legitimated as authority. Nevertheless, persistent conflict implies tension and change, rather than enduring stability. In the most original recent contribution to the theoretical debate about social order, David Lockwood Solidarity and Schism, has demonstrated that neither Marxian nor Durkheimian theory satisfactorily resolves the issues, since each approach is forced to employ residual categories which turn out to be the central analytic elements of the other. That is, one theory emphasizes the socially integrative structure of status , the other the socially divisive structure of class. However, Durkheim cannot explain how anomic declassification disorder occurs or is structured schismatic without introducing concepts of power and material interests into his schema, whereas Marx cannot explain the persistence of capitalist societies without recourse to a generalized category of ideology which introduces the unanalysed conceptual problem of the nature and variability of consensus. Explanations of social order tend to be macro-theories which focus on society as the unit of analysis, although studies of family obligations, crime, and leisure to cite but a few examples raise issues of social order at the micro level. Quite different accounts of how social order is reproduced during face-to-face interaction will be found in the writings of symbolic interactionists, in dramaturgy, ethnomethodology, and exchange theory all of which are discussed separately elsewhere in this dictionary. What Unites and Divides Society  Cite this article Pick a style below, and copy the text for your bibliography.

## Chapter 2 : Religion and the Social Order

*The Association for the Sociology of Religion (ASR) is an international scholarly association that seeks to advance theory and research in the sociology of religion. The aim of Religion and the Social Order is to publish edited volumes that center around a particular set of current interests within the sociology of religion.*

Sociology[ edit ] Thomas Hobbes is recognized as the first to clearly formulate the problem, to answer which he conceived the notion of a social contract. For Marx, it is the relations of production or economic structure which is the basis of a social order. For Durkheim , it is a set of shared social norms. For Parsons, it is a set of social institutions regulating the pattern of action-orientation, which again are based on a frame of cultural values. For Habermas, it is all of these, as well as communicative action. Principle of extensiveness[ edit ] Another key factor concerning social order is the principle of extensiveness. This states the more norms and the more important the norms are to a society , the better these norms tie and hold together the group as a whole. A good example of this is smaller religions based on the U. Many Amish live together in communities and because they share the same religion and values, it is easier for them to succeed in upholding their religion and views because their way of life is the norm for their community. The structure inside of these groups mirrors that of the whole society. There are networks and ties between groups, as well as inside of each of the groups, which create social order. Some people belong to more than one group, and this can sometimes cause conflict. The individual may encounter a situation in which he or she has to choose one group over another. Many who have studied these groups believe that it is necessary to have ties between groups to strengthen the society as a whole, and to promote pride within each group. Others believe that it is best to have stronger ties to a group, enabling social norms and values to be reinforced. They are defined as "a subculture having a rather specific rank or status within the stratification system. That is, societies tend to include a hierarchy of status groups, some enjoying high ranking and some low. A certain lifestyle usually distinguishes the members of different status groups. For example, around the holidays a Jewish family may celebrate Hanukkah while a Christian family may celebrate Christmas. Other cultural differences such as language and cultural rituals identify members of different status groups. Smaller groups exist inside of one status group. This may cause strife for the individual in this situation when he or she feels they must choose to side with either their status group or their social class. For example, a wealthy African American man who feels he has to take a side on an issue on which the opinions of poor African Americans and wealthy white Americans are divided and finds his class and status group opposed. Values and norms[ edit ] Values can be defined as "internal criteria for evaluation". Values are also split into two categories, there are individual values, which pertains to something that we think has worth and then there are social values. Social values are our desires modified according to ethical principles or according to the group, we associate with: Norms tell us what people ought to do in a given situation. A society as a whole determines norms, and they can be passed down from generation to generation. Power and authority[ edit ] An exception to the idea of values and norms as social order-keepers is deviant behavior. For this reason, it is generally deemed necessary for a society to have authority. The adverse opinion holds that the need for authority stems from lack of social justice. It is recognized that effective social justice and the need for authoritative social control are inversely related. Norms differ for each class because the members of each class were raised differently and hold different sets of values. Tension can form, therefore, between the upper class and lower class when laws and rules are put in place that does not conform to the values of both classes. Spontaneous order[ edit ] The order does not necessarily need to be controlled by the government. Individuals pursuing self-interest can make predictable systems. These systems, being planned by more than one person, may actually be preferable to those planned by a single person. These stable expectations do not necessarily lead to individuals behaving in ways that are considered beneficial to group welfare. Considering this, Thomas Schelling studied neighborhood racial segregation. His findings suggest that interaction can produce predictability, but it does not always increase social order. In his researching, he found that "when all individuals pursue their own preferences, the outcome is segregation rather than integration," as stated in "Theories of Social Order", edited by Michael Hechter and

Christine Horne. Social honor[ edit ] Social honor can also be referred to as social status. It is considered the distribution of prestige or "the approval, respect, admiration, or deference a person or group is able to command by virtue of his or its imputed qualities or performances". The case most often is that people associate social honor with the place a person occupies with material systems of wealth and power. Since most of the society finds wealth and power desirable, they respect or envy people that have more than they do. When social honor is referred to as social status, it deals with the rank of a person within the stratification system. Status can be achieved, which is when a person position is gained on the basis of merit or in other words by achievement and hard work or it can be ascribed, which is when a person position is assigned to individuals or groups without regard for merit but because of certain traits beyond their control, such as race, sex, or parental social standing. An example of ascribed status is Kate Middleton who married a prince. An example of achieved status is Oprah Winfrey, an African American woman from poverty who worked her way to being a billionaire. The first theory is "order results from a large number of independent decisions to transfer individual rights and liberties to a coercive state in return for its guarantee of security for persons and their property, as well as its establishment of mechanisms to resolve disputes," as stated in Theories of Social Order by Hechter and Horne. The next theory is that "the ultimate source of social order as residing not in external controls but in a concordance of specific values and norms that individuals somehow have managed to internalize. Both arguments for how social order is attained are very different. One argues that it is achieved through outside influence and control, and the other argues that it can only be attained when the individual willingly follows norms and values that they have grown accustomed to and internalized.

## Chapter 3 : Baptist Beliefs: The Christian and the social order | Baptist Messenger of Oklahoma

*This fourth volume in the series examines recent research and theory on quasi-religion. Topics covered include exploration of the boundaries of the sacred, "sacred" cosmology among the avant garde.*

Theoretical perspectives[ edit ] Symbolic anthropology and phenomenology[ edit ] Symbolic anthropology and some versions of phenomenology argue that all humans require reassurance that the world is safe and ordered place â€" that is, they have a need for ontological security. The inability of science to offer psychological and emotional comfort explains the presence and influence of non-scientific knowledge in human lives, even in rational world. Functionalism[ edit ] Unlike symbolic anthropology and phenomenology , functionalism points to the benefits for social organization which non-scientific belief systems provide and which scientific knowledge fails to deliver. Belief systems are seen as encouraging social order and social stability in ways that rationally based knowledge cannot. From this perspective, the existence of non-rational accounts of reality can be explained by the benefits they offer to society. According to functionalists, "religion serves several purposes, like providing answers to spiritual mysteries, offering emotional comfort, and creating a place for social interaction and social control. It provides social support and social networking, offering a place to meet others who hold similar values and a place to seek help spiritual and material in times of need. We cannot explain forms of knowledge in terms of the beneficial psychological or societal effects that an outside observer may see them as producing. We have to look at the point of view of those who believe in them. People do not believe in God, practice magic, or think that witches cause misfortune because they think they are providing themselves with psychological reassurance, or to achieve greater cohesion for their social groups. They do so because they think their beliefs are correct â€" that they tell them the truth about the way the world is. Nineteenth-century rationalist writers, reflecting the evolutionist spirits of their times, tended to explain the lack of rationality and the dominance of false beliefs in pre-modern worlds in terms of the deficient mental equipment of their inhabitants. Such people were seen as possessing pre-logical, or non-rational, mentality. Rationalists see the history of modern societies as the rise of scientific knowledge and the subsequent decline of non-rational belief. Some of these beliefs, such as magic and witchcraft , had disappeared, while others, such as religion, had become marginalized. This rationalist perspective has led to secularization theories of various kinds. Sociological classifications of religious movements One common typology among sociologists, religious groups are classified as ecclesias , denominations , sects , or cults now more commonly referred to in scholarship as new religious movements. Note that sociologists give these words precise definitions which differ from how they are commonly used. For example, Charles Y. Glock is best known for his five-dimensional scheme of the nature of religious commitment. His list consist of the following variables: Secularization and Civil religion In relation to the processes of rationalization associated with the development of modernity , it was predicted in the works of many classical sociologists that religion would decline. In the United States, in particular, church attendance has remained relatively stable in the past 40 years. In Africa, the emergence of Christianity has occurred at a high rate. While Africa could claim roughly 10 million Christians in , recent estimates put that number closer to million. Furthermore, arguments may be presented regarding the concept of civil religion and new world belief systems. For instance, some sociologists have argued that steady church attendance and personal religious belief may coexist with a decline in the influence of religious authorities on social or political issues. Additionally, regular attendance or affiliation do not necessarily translate into a behaviour according to their doctrinal teachings. In other words, numbers of members might still be growing, but this does not mean that all members are faithfully following the rules of pious behaviours expected. In that sense, religion may be seen as declining because of its waning ability to influence behaviour. Religious economy[ edit ] According to Rodney Stark , David Martin was the first contemporary sociologist to reject the secularization theory outright. Martin even proposed that the concept of secularization be eliminated from social scientific discourse, on the grounds that it had only served ideological purposes and because there was no evidence of any general shift from a religious period in human affairs to a secular period. Correspondingly, the more religions a society has, the more likely the population is

to be religious. This points to the falsity of the secularization theory. On the other hand, Berger also notes that secularization may be indeed have taken hold in Europe, while the United States and other regions have continued to remain religious despite the increased modernity. Berger suggested that the reason for this may have to do with the education system; in Europe, teachers are sent by the educational authorities and European parents would have to put up with secular teaching, while in the United States, schools were for much of the time under local authorities, and American parents, however unenlightened, could fire their teachers. Berger also notes that unlike Europe, America has seen the rise of Evangelical Protestantism, or "born-again Christians". Wilson is a writer on secularization who is interested in the nature of life in a society dominated by scientific knowledge. His work is in the tradition of Max Weber, who saw modern societies as places in which rationality dominates life and thought. Weber saw rationality as concerned with identifying causes and working out technical efficiency, with a focus on how things work and with calculating how they can be made to work more effectively, rather than why they are as they are. According to Weber, such rational worlds are disenchanted. Existential questions about the mysteries of human existence, about who we are and why we are here, have become less and less significant. Wilson [14] insists that non-scientific systems â€" and religious ones in particular â€" have experienced an irreversible decline in influence. He has engaged in a long debate with those who dispute the secularization thesis, some of which argue that the traditional religions, such as church-centered ones, have become displaced by an abundance of non-traditional ones, such as cults and sects of various kinds. Others argue that religion has become an individual, rather than a collective, organized affair. Still others suggest that functional alternatives to traditional religion, such as nationalism and patriotism, have emerged to promote social solidarity. Wilson does accept the presence of a large variety of non-scientific forms of meaning and knowledge, but he argues that this is actually evidence of the decline of religion. The increase in the number and diversity of such systems is proof of the removal of religion from the central structural location that it occupied in pre-modern times. Ernest Gellner[ edit ] Unlike Wilson and Weber, Ernest Gellner [29] acknowledges that there are drawbacks to living in a world whose main form of knowledge is confined to facts we can do nothing about and that provide us with no guidelines on how to live and how to organize ourselves. In this regard, we are worse off than pre-modern people, whose knowledge, while incorrect, at least provided them with prescriptions for living. However, Gellner insists that these disadvantages are far outweighed by the huge technological advances modern societies have experienced as a result of the application of scientific knowledge. For example, he accepts that religions in various forms continue to attract adherents. He also acknowledges that other forms of belief and meaning, such as those provided by art, music, literature, popular culture a specifically modern phenomenon , drug taking, political protest, and so on are important for many people. Nevertheless, he rejects the relativist interpretation of this situation â€" that in modernity, scientific knowledge is just one of many accounts of existence, all of which have equal validity. This is because, for Gellner, such alternatives to science are profoundly insignificant since they are technically impotent, as opposed to science. He sees that modern preoccupations with meaning and being as a self-indulgence that is only possible because scientific knowledge has enabled our world to advance so far. Unlike those in pre-modern times, whose overriding priority is to get hold of scientific knowledge in order to begin to develop, we can afford to sit back in the luxury of our well-appointed world and ponder upon such questions because we can take for granted the kind of world science has constructed for us. Michel Foucault[ edit ] Michel Foucault was a post-structuralist who saw human existence as being dependent on forms of knowledge â€" discourses â€" that work like languages. In order to think at all, we are obliged to use these definitions. The knowledge we have about the world is provided for us by the languages and discourses we encounter in the times and places in which we live our lives. Thus, who we are, what we know to be true, and what we think are discursively constructed. Foucault defined history as the rise and fall of discourses. Social change is about changes in prevailing forms of knowledge. The job of the historian is to chart these changes and identify the reasons for them. Unlike rationalists, however, Foucault saw no element of progress in this process. To Foucault, what is distinctive about modernity is the emergence of discourses concerned with the control and regulation of the body. According to Foucault, the rise of body-centered discourses necessarily involved a process of secularization. Pre-modern discourses were dominated by religion, where

things were defined as good and evil, and social life was centered around these concepts. With the emergence of modern urban societies, scientific discourses took over, and medical science was a crucial element of this new knowledge. Modern life became increasingly subject to medical control â€" the medical gaze , as Foucault called it. The rise to power of science, and of medicine in particular, coincided with a progressive reduction of the power of religious forms of knowledge. For example, normality and deviance became more of a matter of health and illness than of good and evil, and the physician took over from the priest the role of defining, promoting, and healing deviance. The study suggests that religion is headed towards "extinction" in various nations where it has been on the decline: The model considers not only the changing number of people with certain beliefs, but also attempts to assign utility values of a belief in each nation. Luckmann points instead to the "religious problem" which is the "problem of individual existence. Two older approaches to globalization include modernization theory , a functionalist derivative, and world-systems theory , a Marxist approach. One of the differences between these theories is whether they view capitalism as positive or problematic. However, both assumed that modernization and capitalism would diminish the hold of religion. To the contrary, as globalization intensified many different cultures started to look into different religions and incorporate different beliefs into society. For example, according to Paul James and Peter Mandaville: Religion and globalization have been intertwined with each other since the early empires attempted to extend their reach across what they perceived to be world-space. Processes of globalization carried religious cosmologies â€" including traditional conceptions of universalism â€" to the corners of the world, while these cosmologies legitimated processes of globalization. This dynamic of inter-relation has continued to the present, but with changing and sometimes new and intensifying contradictions.

## Chapter 4 : The Police, the Social Order, and the Christian: Apologia and Apologies â€" Religion Online

*Religion and the social order, Volume 5 (Religion & the Social Order) [BROMLEY] on theinnatdunvilla.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. This volume argues that deviance is a central process in contemporary American religion.*

Some of the most important functions of religion are as follows: Religion as an Integrative Force 2. Creating a Moral Community 3. Religion as Social Control 4. Provides Rites of Passage 5. Religion as Emotional Support 6. Religion as a Source of Identity 8. Legitimating Function of Religion 9. Religion Acts as Psychotherapy  Religion as an Agent of Social Change  Religion as an Agent of De-politicization  Religion is a cultural universal because it fulfills several basic functions within human societies. It is a basic requirement of group life. In sociological terms, these include both manifest and latent functions. Among the manifest open and stated functions of religion are included defining the spiritual world and giving meaning to the divine. Religion provides an explanation for events that seem difficult to understand. By contrast, latent functions or religion are unintended, covert, or hidden. Functionalists suggest that religion is a requirement for society and individual both because it serves both manifest and latent functions. These functions are discussed below in brief: Religion as an Integrative Force: Durkheim believed that the primary function of religion was to preserve and solidify society. It functions to reinforce the collective unity or social solidarity of a group. Sharing the same religion or religious interpretation of the meaning of life unites people in a cohesive and building moral order. The social cohesion is developed through rituals such as reciting prayer in the honour of God, institutions of worship church, temple, mosque, etc. The unifying rituals of different faiths are also observed by individuals on the most significant occasions such as birth, marriage and death. In his view, religious bonds often transcend these personal and divisive forces. It gives people certain ultimate values and ends to hold in common. Although the integrative impact of religion has been emphasized here, it should be noted that religion is not the only integrative forceâ€"the feelings of nationalism or patriotism may also serve the same end. In contemporary industrial societies, people are also bound together by patterns of consumption, ways of life, laws and other forces. Creating a Moral Community: Religion provides a system of beliefs around which people may gather to belong to something greater than themselves in order to have their personal beliefs reinforced by the group and its rituals. Those who share a common ideology develop a collective identity and a sense of fellowship. Members of moral community also share a common life. This moral community gives rise to social community through the symbolism of the sacred that supports the more ordinary aspects of social life. Religion then legitimizes society. It provides sacred sanction for the social order and for its basic values and meanings. Religion as Social Control: Durkheim also emphasized that besides acting as an integrating force, religion also reinforces social control in oppressive society. Religious beliefs can influence the conduct of those who believe in them. It provides a foundation for mores of society. Religious sanctions are sought for certain desirable patterns of behaviour to persist in society in the forms of mores. Thus, many taboos in various cultures have religious sanctions, e. Provides Rites of Passage: Religion helps us in performing ceremonies and rituals related to rites of passage birth, marriage, death and other momentous events which give meaning and a social significance to our life. Religion as Emotional Support: Religion is a sense of comfort and solace to the individuals during times of personal and social crises such as death of loved ones, serious injury, etc. It gives them emotional support and provides consolation, reconciliation and moral strength during trials and defeats, personal losses and unjust treatments. It provides a means whereby man can face the crises and vicissitudes of life with strength and fortitude. The concepts of karma and transmigration among Hindus and Jesus Christ as son of God and prayer among Christians seek to provide such fortitude and strength. Religion offers consolation to oppressed peoples also by giving them hope that they can achieve salvation and eternal happiness in the afterlife. Why are we here on earth? Is there a supreme being? What happens after death? All religions have certain notions and beliefs that provide answers to the above questions. These beliefs are based on the faith that life has a purpose, and there is someone or something that controls the universe. It defines the spiritual world and gives meaning to the divine. Religion as a Source of Identity: Religion gives individuals a sense of identityâ€"a profound and positive self-identity. It

enables them to cope effectively with the many doubts and indignation of everyday life. Religion may suggest people that they are not worthless or meaningless creatures and thus helps them alleviating the frustrating experiences of life which sometimes force a person to commit suicide. In industrial societies, religion helps to integrate newcomers by providing a source of identity. For example, Bangladeshi immigrants in India, after settling in their new social environment, came to be identified as Indian Muslims. In a rapidly changing world, religious faith often provides an important sense of belonging. Legitimating Function of Religion: According to Max Weber , religion may be used to explain, justify or rationalize the exercise of power. It reinforces the interests of those in power. Even in societies not as visibly ruled by religious dogma, religion legitimates the political sector. According to one theory, caste system is a creation of the priesthood Brahmins â€"the uppermost stratum of this system, but it also served the interests of political rulers by granting legitimacy to social inequality. Marx has acknowledged that religion plays an important role in legitimating the existing social structure. The values of religion reinforce other social institutions and the social order as a whole and as a consequence it perpetuates social inequality in society. It provides peace of mind, promises prosperity and success in life, as well as effective and happy human relations. It is thus a source of security and confidence, and also of happiness and success in this world. But at times religion can be debilitating and personally destructive. Persons convinced of their own essential wickedness can suffer extreme personal difficulties. But, in this role, religion is not always harmful. Many times, it serves as a liberating and integrating force for individuals. For instance, it helps in bringing change sobriety to seemingly hopeless alcoholics. Religion Acts as Psychotherapy: In modern world, religion has also become a supporting psychologyâ€"a form of psychotherapy. Now, God is conceived of as a humane and considerate God. A new vocation of religious practitioner has recently come up in the mental health field as a helping professional. It already existed in village India and other places in the form of shamans, priests and magicians shamans are treated as super-humans endowed with supernatural powers in some tribal societies. Religion as an Agent of Social Change: While religion supports the status quo in its priestly function, it inspires great change in its prophetic function. It can enable individuals to transcend social forces; to act in ways other than those prescribed by the social order. Mahatma Gandhi, Jesus, Thomas More all died upholding spiritual beliefs that were not those of the social order in which they lived. Religion, in its prophetic function, provides individuals with an unshakable foundation of social criticism which later on becomes the basis for social change. Many religious groups of the world protested against Vietnam and Iraq wars and an age-old Buddha statue in Afghanistan. Generally, religion is regarded as an impediment in the path of social change but many religious groups, by criticizing existing rules of social morality and social injustice, and community or government actions, help in bringing about social change. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism can be cited that how Protestant ethic had helped in the development of spirit of capitalism in certain European nations. Despite establishing relationship between religious ethic and economy, Weber argued that the effects of religion on society are unpredictable and varied. Sometimes it might have conservative effect, whereas in other cases it might contribute to social change. Contrary to Weber, Marx has put forth a quite opposite thesis. It is the opiate of the people. It should be noted that many religious leaders have acted in the forefront of many social and political movements. Religion as an Agent of De-politicization: According to Bryan Wilson , religion functions as an agent of de-politicization. In simpler terms, religion keeps people away from seeing their lives and societal conditions in political terms. In feudalism, and now in capitalism, religious control of sexuality is an important vehicle for the production of legitimate offspring.

## Chapter 5 : Sociology of religion - Wikipedia

*RELIGION AND SOCIETY Why religion is so widespread amongst human societies? How religions contribute to the maintenance of social order.*

Egyptian Social Structure Egyptian society was structured like a pyramid. At the top were the gods, such as Ra, Osiris, and Isis. Egyptians believed that the gods controlled the universe. Therefore, it was important to keep them happy. They could make the Nile overflow, cause famine, or even bring death. In the social pyramid of ancient Egypt the pharaoh and those associated with divinity were at the top, and servants and slaves made up the bottom. The Egyptians also elevated some human beings to gods. Their leaders, called pharaohs, were believed to be gods in human form. They had absolute power over their subjects. After pharaohs died, huge stone pyramids were built as their tombs. Pharaohs were buried in chambers within the pyramids. Because the people of Egypt believed that their pharaohs were gods, they entrusted their rulers with many responsibilities. Protection was at the top of the list. The pharaoh directed the army in case of a foreign threat or an internal conflict. All laws were enacted at the discretion of the pharaoh. This grain was used to feed the people in the event of a famine. The Chain of Command Ancient Egyptian royalty, nobility, and clergy enjoyed lives of wealth and comfort while farmers and slaves struggled to subsist. No single person could manage all these duties without assistance. The pharaoh appointed a chief minister called a vizier as a supervisor. The vizier ensured that taxes were collected. Working with the vizier were scribes who kept government records. These high-level employees had mastered a rare skill in ancient Egypt â€" they could read and write. Noble Aims Right below the pharaoh in status were powerful nobles and priests. Only nobles could hold government posts; in these positions they profited from tributes paid to the pharaoh. Priests were responsible for pleasing the gods. Religion was a central theme in ancient Egyptian culture and each town had its own deity. Initially, these deities were animals; later, they took on human appearances and behaviors. Seated here is Thoth, the god of learning and wisdom, carrying a scepter symbolizing magical power. Nobles enjoyed great status and also grew wealthy from donations to the gods. All Egyptians â€" from pharaohs to farmers â€" gave gifts to the gods. Soldier On Soldiers fought in wars or quelled domestic uprisings. During long periods of peace, soldiers also supervised the peasants, farmers, and slaves who were involved in building such structures as pyramids and palaces. Skilled workers such as physicians and craftspersons made up the middle class. Craftspersons made and sold jewelry, pottery, papyrus products, tools, and other useful things. Naturally, there were people needed to buy goods from artisans and traders. These were the merchants and storekeepers who sold these goods to the public. The Bottom of the Heap At the bottom of the social structure were slaves and farmers. Slavery became the fate of those captured as prisoners of war. In addition to being forced to work on building projects, slaves toiled at the discretion of the pharaoh or nobles. Farmers tended the fields, raised animals, kept canals and reservoirs in good order, worked in the stone quarries, and built the royal monuments. Social mobility was not impossible. A small number of peasants and farmers moved up the economic ladder. Families saved money to send their sons to village schools to learn trades. These schools were run by priests or by artisans. Boys who learned to read and write could become scribes, then go on to gain employment in the government. It was possible for a boy born on a farm to work his way up into the higher ranks of the government. The Social Pyramid The pharaoh was at the very top of ancient Egyptian society, and servants and slaves were at the bottom. Who was in the middle? Click on this interactive pyramid to find out how merchants, artists, farmers, and others stacked up. Links at the bottom of the page lead to other facts about ancient Egypt. This page comes from Odyssey Online, a website for kids produced by Emory University.

## Chapter 6 : Religion: 3 Most Important Functions of Religion

*"Religion on the Internet" is the first systematic inquiry into the nature, scope and content of religion in cyberspace. Contributors to this volume include leading social scientists engaged in systematic studies of how organizations and individuals are presenting religion on the Internet.*

Means is chairman of the department of sociology and anthropology at Kalamazoo Michigan College. This article appeared in The Christian Century, March 19, pp. Copyright by The Christian Century Foundation; used by permission. Current articles and subscription information can be found at www. A central and urgent task for the theologian is to address the problems of violence and the need for order within a legal democratic framework. Fear is abroad in the land: A creeping cynicism concerning standards of excellence brings on a numbing terror about the future. In Kalamazoo, Michigan, Go Ask Alice, a heart-rending exposure of the drug death-cult, is removed from the library shelves by a frightened school board. Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world, The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere The ceremony of innocence is drowned; The best lack all conviction, while the worst Are full of passionate intensity. As a teacher of criminology, I cannot gainsay the increase in criminal activity described in the Uniform Crime Reports. The rising figures for homicide, rape, aggravated assault, armed robbery, and other antisocial acts are simply too impressive to be an artifact of statistical manipulation alone. Since crime statistics, like other social statistics, are open to various interpretations, we cannot be certain of the actual rate of increase; but we can agree that it is surely considerable. Riding in patrol cars; working with detectives; witnessing arrests, investigations and incarcerations; seeing the aftermath of robberies, burglaries, shootings and family fights; meeting drunks and runaways -- in these few months I have had more bizarre experiences than I had had previously in my entire life. Some of my liberal illusions have been shattered. In general, I find the police to be more human and more humane than one might expect -- indeed, perhaps better than the public deserves. I have encountered more profound and straightforward discussions of ethics in patrol cars than I have heard in university classrooms or at academic religious conferences. Yet, over and over again, I have been told that "someday we will have a police state. Later, after the night patrol shift, perhaps over a beer in the more relaxed environment of the Fraternal Order of Police hall, I tried to find out what my police friends meant by that statement. What emerged is clear: This is not their hope but their expectation, not a wish but a "warning. Of course, attitudes can become self-fulfilling prophecies; nonetheless, one does not have to prove the frightening possibility of a police state by inductive logic alone. It may be tasted, even smelled, and I for one take the warnings of the police most seriously. My dreams of the future encompass two scenarios. One is the "man on horseback" theme: Caligari, I see the parade ground of Nuremberg, with banners flying. And on the rostrum is a man, looking strangely like the governor of Alabama, shouting to the crowd: The other scenario involves what I call the Lord of the Flies theme. This is the Hobbsian war, with each individual pitted against every other individual. It is Alex and his droogies in A Clockwork Orange. It is the mugging of old people in New York. It is the spraying of carcinogenic pesticides on scarce food. But we may indeed be in for hard times. The Christian churches have, at least in this land, lived a life sheltered from persecution. Unprepared for increasing social pressure, we may not know how to respond. I myself believe that the Christian faith is in a much more precarious position than most wish to recognize. The current revival of religious "feeling" to the contrary notwithstanding, external forces may overwhelm us. The churches may be only weak reeds against incipient totalitarian forces. And that which we cannot fight we will, chances are, embrace. Internally there is great disarray in the churches, Christian against Christian, as the self-immolation of the Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod tragically illustrates. The extent of Christian confusion, clerical masochism and destructive illusions bodes ill for the future. We have let those right-wingers who would subvert a crucial social issue to their own use tarnish and finally destroy the phrase "law and order. It is a real, abiding, central issue for civilization and social survival, and the issue is metaphysical and religious as well as political. As Peter Berger argues in The Sacred Canopy, religious consciousness itself is the imposition of nomos, of order, on experience. If this is so, the question arises: What is to be done? Or to put it differently:

What are the grounds for a Christian response to the need for public order and safety? Clerical Charades of Relevance It may be that what we need is a more "realistic" and logical apologetic. Instead we have had, at least in some quarters, a weak, embarrassed set of apologies, polite excuses for the Christian faith. How did this come about? It seems to me that one element in the situation is what I call the paradox of relevance. Certainly for the Christian who believes that Christ and society, faith and culture, and even what one might call theory and praxis, are intimately and dialectically related, the obligation to connect with secular culture is impelling. Nothing is more pitiable, perhaps even contemptible, than the clerical charades of running up the flag for each social cause that comes down the pike. In the first place, to relate to secular culture in a communicative sense is not the same as to identify with it. It may be that we have confused physiological and logical categories. To show sympathy and understanding is one thing; to lose a sense of transcendence and to negate the categories of Christian thinking is another. Second, it may be that an overemphasis on relevance is merely a way of avoiding work and denigrating reason. I suspect that apologetics, in the classical sense, is hard and difficult work. Also, if one stresses reason -- the Logos or the Word -- then one is by definition running counter to the McLuhanesque one-dimensional world of mass communications. One cannot be quite all the way "with it. The best discussion of this point in Christian apologetic writing is, in my view, to be found in C. From propositions about fact alone no practical conclusions can ever be drawn. Frankly, I find more serious discussion of the problems of moral relativity and political ideology in the sociological writings of Karl Mannheim and Max Scheler, and even in the structuralism of Claude Levi-Strauss, than I do in the writings of many contemporary theologians. It seems as if theologians give their time these days to writing apologies not apologetics for such current social fads as neo-Marxism and transactional analysis. Kierkegaard anguished over whether or not a theologian could be saved. But as a layman, I am not kidding myself: One might as well talk about a theology of Sugar Crisps or the Boy Scouts. Liberal intellectuals often seem to think that historical consciousness is by definition a conservative point of view, a negation of the present. These books have been superseded, quite rightly, by much contemporary work. But it is important to note that these authors stressed that racism is not only a moral issue, or a problem of sentiment or taste, but also a problem of reality, of truth, of scientific validity or invalidity. The mechanisms of stereotyping distorted the objective world, and the doctrines of racism were seen as "bad science" because so many studies -- of IQ testing, of genetics, of reality-distortion -- showed racial prejudice to be invalid. During the past decade or so, when the grounds of discussion shifted to political ideology and the civil rights struggle, much of this earlier material dropped out of the literature. It was simply taken for granted. Also, the liberal view of history, continually stressing the value of the new, along with the market pressure to produce totally new textbooks, meant that the past -- that is, these detailed scientific studies of racial stereotyping -- simply disappeared from required reading lists. The student was simply told that racial prejudice was "wrong"; no real effort was made to convince him on a logical plane. The trouble is, there is no guarantee that the hard-won insights of the past will be passed from generation to generation. In the classes I teach I find that students who were liberal and tolerant last month are peculiarly vulnerable this month to the subtle blandishments of racism. All too easily they fall for new assaults on equality by people like Arthur Jensen and Richard Herrenstein, or for the equally unproven assumptions of the XYY-chromosome theorists who would treat potential criminal behavior by preventive biological segregation. Edmund Burke once wrote: Mutilate the roots of society and tradition and the result must inevitably be the isolation of individuals from their fellow men, and the creation of sprawling, faceless masses. Certainly this omission is the opening wedge for religious intolerance and prejudice. I fear that many of the newer forms of religious bigotry, the Jesus freaks and other sectarian totalitarians, represent the conversion of thoroughly secularized individuals to a Christian tradition that they actually care little about in any historical sense. An Objective Ground for Value Claims Returning to my experience with the police, I recall a young police lieutenant in charge of training, with whom I discussed the qualities that make for a good police officer. One could tell only through job performance. The fancy battery of tests was not too useful. There is a high turnover rate in police work, he said. The hours are erratic, there is a certain amount of danger, and the pay is generally low. Many officers eventually drift into an attitude of cynicism. I think he was really shocked by the suggestion, and the conversation more or less ended there. I might as well have been a man

from Mars. If I had asked him whether a good football player, or a Rotarian, or even a member of the Knights of Columbus, might make a good recruit, I am certain he would have felt more comfortable. This is a measure of where the church is in relation to the police. We have theologies of death, of medical ethics, of modern literature, of pop psychology. We hold conferences, edit symposia, and carry on learned discussions. But we do not have an adequate theology of public order and safety, of police work, and of the criminal justice systems. The very idea is problematical. And as one reads through the theoretical literature on crime and penology, one finds very shortly that the articles on such topics as the Charles Manson case are thin, pale and anemic; for these discussions are wrapped in the folds of a value-neutral social science lingua franca which makes any realistic or in-depth ethical discussion virtually impossible. In any case, what each generation must do is to construct an apologia, a defense of the faith which is without shame and based on integrity. Fundamental to this task is the search for an objective ground for value claims -- a well-reasoned argument for external standards which resists the ever-present tendency to reduce ethics to the subjective whims and passions of personal self-interest.

## Chapter 7 : Social Order | theinnatdunvilla.com

*Social order is a fundamental concept in sociology that refers to the way in which the various components of societyâ€"social structures and institutions, social relations, social interactions and behavior, and cultural features such as norms, beliefs, and valuesâ€"work together to maintain the status quo.*

## Chapter 8 : Religion Creates Social Order and Happiness Â« Conservative Colloquium

*The debate over the proper definition of "religion" has occupied the attention of social scientists for many years without shedding much light on the nature of religion. This volume aims to inspire a re-orientation in the way students of religion think about the task of defining religion.*

## Chapter 9 : Anthropology A: Religion & Social Order :: UC Irvine, UCI Open

*Baptist Beliefs: The Christian and the social order. Posted on September 19, By Mark McClellan. Jesus told the disciples that we are "the salt of the Earth" and the "light of the world" (Matt ).*