

---

## UNIT 10 RELIGION\*

---

### Structure

- 10.0 Objectives
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Religion, Economy and Capitalism
  - 10.2.1 Karl Marx's Perspective
  - 10.2.1 Max Weber's Perspective
- 10.3 Religion and Collective Representation
  - 10.3.1 Émile Durkheim's Perspective
  - 10.3.2 Study of Totemism
  - 10.3.3 Religion and Science
- 10.4 Comparison between Marx and Weber
- 10.5 Comparison between Weber and Durkheim
- 10.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 10.7 References
- 10.8 Specimen Answers to Check Your Progress

---

### 10.0 OBJECTIVES

---

After going through this unit, you should be able to understand:

- Karl Marx's views on religion;
- Max Weber's views on religion;
- Émile Durkheim's contributions to the sociology of religion; and
- the ways in which the views of these authors differed.

---

### 10.1 INTRODUCTION

---

Religion, as you are aware, includes a system of beliefs and practices, which help human beings shape their actions and orientations. It binds people with other followers, bringing about a feeling of identification and unity.

Sometimes it even makes people unite against followers of a different faith. Religion helps people to come to terms with the tragedies and crises of human life by providing explanations for these. It is a social phenomenon intimately connected with other social systems.

We will begin by examining the contributions of Marx and Weber to the study of religion by going over some important points made by them in relating religion with capitalism. Thereafter, we will briefly review Durkheim's main ideas pertaining to religion. Finally, we will highlight the main points of difference in the approaches of Marx, Durkheim and Weber.

---

\*Adapted by Nita Mathur from IGNOU Course Material: Unit 10 of *Society and Religion* (ESO 15) written by Michael Kennedy and Unit 19 of *Sociological Thought* (ESO 13)

---

## 10.2 RELIGION, ECONOMY AND CAPITALISM

---

Economics is generally a matter of production and distribution of goods. Human beings are directly involved in both the processes of production and distribution. What is produced and distributed depends much on the general pattern of consumption characteristic of a society. Understandably, religious beliefs and values affect one's work ethic, business ethic and consumption patterns.

A religion, which prescribes 'hard work' for salvation, naturally inspires its adherents to be dedicated and committed workers. On the other hand, if work is considered to be a punishment for one's sins by a particular religion, then it is less likely that the believer would be a dedicated and sincere worker. However, there is another way of looking at the above situation. If any religion emphasis more on honesty and sincerity in work, the believer might fail to notice or ignore the exploitation in the factory site.

Consumption patterns too may be conditioned by one's religious belief. If conch shells are of much religious value in a society, it is likely that they will be preserved or saved. If religious beliefs go against consumption of all forms of liquor, then there is a possibility that the number of liquor distilleries will not be exorbitant. True, religion influences the economic activities of people. It is also true that, religions themselves may arise out of crisis situations. Among many tribal communities in India, because of land alienation and poverty new cults emerged. New messiahs or prophets began to institute new cults to meet the crisis situation.

So far it has been demonstrated that religious beliefs and values affect the processes of production, distribution and consumption. Classical thinkers like Karl Marx and Max Weber have pondered over this relationship, with special reference to capitalism.

Economic order varies from age to age. Feudalism, capitalism and socialism are three examples of the economic order. Nature and organization of production, distribution and consumption differ widely in various economic orders. Under the impact of science, philosophy and renaissance, feudalism was breaking down in Europe during 15th and 16th centuries. The catholic church had strong roots in many of the feudal countries. On the transformation of feudalism, there are changes in the religious sphere too. The doctrines of the catholic church were challenged by new streams of thought. Among these were the supremacy of the Pope and the interference of the church in the affairs of the state which came under heavy criticism. As capitalism developed, many protestant sects arose in many European countries. Many scholars tried to understand the relationship between capitalism and religion and in particular Protestantism. Karl Marx and Max Weber are two scholars who shed significant on this relationship.

### 10.2.1 Karl Marx's Perspective on Religion

Marx was concerned more with the understanding of capitalist order than with the understanding of religion per se. But in his general understanding of capitalism, Marx also developed a general theory of society extending over almost all social institutions, especially religion and politics. Marx's model of society had an economic base which constrains the superstructure constituted by religion, politics, arts etc.

As you know, according to Marx, society determines man's consciousness. Hence, the misery which necessitates religion comes not just from within the individual—but from specific exploitative social conditions. Thus religion is anchored in the society, in Marx's thought. Broadly speaking, Marx's views on religion and its relationship with capitalism has three themes : Firstly, religion is an illusion which veils real exploitative conditions in society; Secondly, religion is a mode of protest albeit in a mild form; Thirdly, religion can be discarded not through a critique of religion, but only changing the societal conditions which give rise to religion.

Religion has a double-function. It acts as an ideology (political ideas of a social class) of the ruling elite. It acts as an opiate of the masses. Much of Marx's understanding of religion seems to have arisen out of his experience of Protestantism of the Prussian state in the early nineteenth century. Marx was critical of the Prussian state which promoted Protestantism, because it helped the state to justify the economic inequalities. It can also be said that protestantism acted as an ideology of the new class which emerged at the break-down of feudalism.

As you know, a commodity is a product of men's labour. In a commodity, the social character of labour appears as an object. Here, the relationship between producers and their own labour is presented as a relationship not between themselves, but between the products of their own labour. Commodities, then are social things whose qualities cannot be understood through the senses—the relationship between human beings become relations between things. Commodities thus become independent. In the same way, religion which is product of man's alienated labour, becomes independent and begins to reign over him. The social relations of man appear as relations of alien objects—both in the world of commodities and the in the world of religion.

### 10.2.2 Max Weber's Perspective on Religion

Weber applies his concept of rationalization to understand changes in religion, science, arts, administration and politics. For Weber, capitalism itself was born out of a highest degree of economic rationalization.

Weber argues and demonstrates that ideas can become major force in the development process. In the development of capitalism, the ideas supplied by the protestant sects played a major role.

**i) West and the East**

When contrasted with the East, Weber finds that rationalization has reached a high degree only in the West. Take for example, science, Weber says that only in the Western civilization, science has reached a high stage of development. In his eyes, though India, China and Egypt had great traditions of knowledge, due to the lack of experimental method, they lagged behind in economic development. In various spheres such as music, architecture, legal system, printing system, bureaucracy and capitalism, the West has reached a higher degree of rationalization. Weber points to three aspects, which mark the emergence of rational capitalism: firstly, "rational capitalistic organization of free labour", secondly, "rational industrial organization tuned to regular market" and thirdly "technical utilization of scientific knowledge". Cost-benefit calculation, book-keeping, counting of balance are some indicators of capitalistic organization. Before the arrival of capitalism, there were many magical and religious forces. The protestantism gave rise to an economic spirit, which could overtake all the traditional magico-religious forces and thus paved the way for capitalism.

**ii) Catholics and Protestants**

Catholics and Protestants were deeply influenced by their religious beliefs in the choice of occupation and type of education. Citing data, Weber says that while protestants sent their children to technical institutions, industrial and commercial training institutes, the catholics sent their children only to humanities education. Protestants outnumber Catholics, among the skilled labourers and administrators.

**iii) Spirit of Capitalism**

Protestantism, especially Calvinism had an economic ethic conducive for the development of capitalism. The words of Benjamin Franklin such as "Time is Money", "Credit is Money" and "Money can beget money" capture the essence of ascetic protestantism. Earlier in a traditional set-up, people earned for living. But now after the arrival of protestantism, earning becomes a virtue; an end in itself; it shows one's proficiency in his "calling". The labour too becomes an end in itself. After Protestantism, people earned a lot but did not spend lavishly, people worked hard but did not consume luxuriously. This 'spirit of capitalism', had its roots in ascetic protestantism, whose adherents mainly were the rising strata of the lower industrial: middle classes.

**iv) Sense of Calling**

There are major differences in understanding 'calling' as well as 'labour', between Catholicism, lutheranism, and Calvinism. For the catholic church, calling meant the renunciation of the world in favour of monastic asceticism, whereas for Luther, values' which were necessary for the growth of capitalism were not 'natural' but the outcome of historical development; thirdly, both of them agreed that the "new capitalist entrepreneurial classes

did not come from the pre-capitalist financial or merchant classes... (rather) the new capitalist class was a rising one..." Apart from these, 'calling' meant the fulfillment of obligations attached to one's position. 'Labour' is the 'product of selfishness' according to Catholicism, and it is an 'expression of brotherly love' according to Lutheranism. Luther said that the division of labour, forces every individual to work for others. Luther's concept of 'calling' only means that one has to accept his position in the world and hence its 'economic ethic' was not progressive. It was Calvin, whose interpretation of 'calling', coupled with the 'Doctrine of Predestination', generated intense drive for development of capitalism in countries like Holland, Netherlands, Switzerland etc.

#### v) Calvinism and Wordly Asceticism

The 'Doctrine of Predestination' holds the key, to the understanding of capitalist spirit generated by calvinist ethic. The doctrine of predestination states that God has already chosen some men for eternal life (salvation) and some men for eternal death (condemnation). Those who are chosen by God form the invisible church of God. According to Calvin, it is impossible to know God's plan and it is not good to know that. Because, God's grace will not be available to those who are not chosen by them for salvation, whatever they might do. Man has to believe that he is chosen by God and has to work for the glory of God, and thus prove his 'faith'.

The doctrine of predestination creates many social psychological impacts : firstly, the individual is left alone because there is nobody to mediate between him and the God, neither the priest nor the church; secondly, the individual has to find his ways himself, for there is no magical way to attain salvation, like sacraments, religious ceremonies, etc. Now, every Puritan has only one question, at his heart, "Am I one of the God's chosen people?" But, there is no answer for this question; not even, through one's deeds can you guess whether he or she is chosen.

The only option left for the Puritan is to believe that he is chosen. Believing so, he has to avoid all sensuous pleasures and enjoyments and has to fight against all sorts of temptations with confidence. The only way to gain this confidence, is hard work for the glory of God. In doing so, it is established that God is acting through the hardworking, confident, ascetic puritan. A puritan has to create the conviction of salvation for himself, and behave carefully at every step in life, for if he commits mistakes there is no place for repentance and rectification. A puritan practices self-control, but works tirelessly to demonstrate his 'faith' that he is one among the " chosen.

When a puritan works hard and earns a lot of money, but avoids luxury, naturally capital accumulates. This can be used for further productive investment. Thus the protestant sects had an economic ethic, which helped the growth of capitalism, particularly in Western European countries.

### Check Your Progress 1

1) What is the similarity between commodity and religion?

.....  
.....  
.....

2) What are the social impact of the doctrine of predestination?

.....  
.....  
.....

---

## 10.3 RELIGION AND COLLECTIVE REPRESENTATION

---

Durkheim’s work *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* is an important one. Why was Durkheim interested in the ‘elementary forms’ of religious life? Could he not have directed his attention to major religions like Hinduism, Islam and Christianity? Let us try to answer this question by taking a simple example from day-to-day life. If you can ride a bicycle, you will find it easier to balance on a motor-bike. Similarly, if the simplest form of religion is understood, it will be of immense use in understanding the complexities of ‘organised’ religions, in Durkheim’s view. The most elementary or simple form of religion will be found in those societies with a correspondingly ‘elementary’ social organisation, namely, amongst the aborigines or primitive tribal communities. It is by understanding the aboriginal religion that Durkheim hoped to contribute to the understanding of complex systems of thought and belief.

In the following sub-sections, we will try and see how he does this.

### 10.3.1 Durkheim’s Perspective

To define religion, says Durkheim, we must first free the mind of all preconceived ideas of religion. Durkheim discards the notion that religion is concerned only with ‘mysterious’ or ‘supernatural’ phenomena, with gods, spirits and ghosts. He points out that religion is as concerned with the ordinary as the extraordinary aspects of life. The rising and setting of the sun, the regular patterns of the seasons, the growth of plants and crops, the birth of new life are as much a part of religious ideas as miracles and spectacular happenings. To define religion, he says, the various religious systems of the world must be examined in order to derive those elements, or characteristics, which they have in common. As Durkheim (19 12:38) puts it, “religious cannot be defined except by the characteristics which are found wherever religion itself is found”.

According to Durkheim, all religions comprise two basic components, namely, beliefs and rites. Beliefs are the collective representations and rites determined modes of action, which are influenced by beliefs. Religious beliefs as studied by Durkheim presuppose the classification of all things into ‘sacred’ and ‘profane’. There is an opposition between these two spheres which has to be carefully regulated through rites and ceremonies. The sacred is that which is set apart, considered holy and venerated or dreaded and avoided. The sacred is usually in a higher position, valued more than profane things, and its identity and power are protected by social rules. The profane, on the other hand, refers to the mundane, ordinary aspects of day-to-day existence. The sacred and profane are kept apart, says Durkheim, because they are heterogeneous (different), antagonistic (in conflict) and isolated (separated).

Beliefs and rites, says Durkheim, unite to form religion. Beliefs are the moral ideas, the rules, the teachings and myths. They are the collective representations which exist outside of the individual, yet integrate the individual into the religious system. Through beliefs, human beings understand the sacred and their relationship to it. They can lead their lives accordingly.

Rites are the rules of conduct that follow from beliefs, which prescribe how human beings must behave with regard to sacred things. In Durkheim’s view rites serve to sustain the intensity of religious-beliefs. They bring individuals together, strengthening their social natures. They are modes of expression of the collective conscience, which, as you have studied, refers to the commonly held values, beliefs and ideas of the community (see Giddens 1978: 84-89).

Durkheim’s (1912:62) definition of religion taking into account these factors is as follows.

“A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden — beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community....”

### 10.3.2 Study of Totemism

As has been mentioned earlier, Durkheim believes that to understand the more complex religions, one must understand first the simple forms. Durkheim maintains that totemism is the most simple form of religion. He chose to study totemism as practised by the aborigines of Central Australia. Ethnographic information on these groups was available in plenty. Their social organisation was the simplest known to sociologists and anthropologists. Totemism is linked with the social organisation of clans. The members of the clan believe themselves to have descended from some common ancestor — an animal, a plant or even some non-living object. The “common ancestor” is the “totemic object”. It is the totemic object that gives the clan its name and identity. But it is more than just a name, it is an emblem. It is often carved, engraved or designed on other objects belonging to the clan, even on the bodies of the clan members. This makes otherwise ordinary or common objects special. They are endowed with

sacredness. Many taboos or 'don'ts' are attached to the totemic object. It cannot be killed or eaten, it must be treated with reverence. All things arranged in the clan are connected with and extensions of the totemic object. The clan members may not be related by blood, but they have a common name, a common emblem. Clan exogamy is thus an important rule. Religion and social organisation are thus intimately connected in such simple societies.

The totemic object and all that is concerned with it is considered sacred. Why? Durkheim maintains that it is not actually the animal or plant itself that is worshipped or held sacred, but a nameless and impersonal force which exists throughout the world and is diffused amongst all the material objects of the world. This force is described by various names "mana" by the Samoans, "wakan" by the Melanesians, "orenda" by some North American tribes. The totemic object is merely a symbol of the 'totemic principle' which is nothing but the clan itself. The clan is given a reality of its own. It is personalised and represented through the totemic object. In Durkheim's view, 'god' is nothing but society apotheosised or glorified and given a different shape and form. Why is society worshipped? Durkheim says that it is physically and morally superior to individuals. It is 'sui-generis', with a reality of its own. Its power is feared, its authority is respected. When a soldier gives up his life to defend the flag of the country, he is not worshipping the flag itself, but what the flag stands for, namely, the nation. Society exists in and through individual conscience. It demands our sacrifices, it strengthens and elevates the divine or sacred within each one of us. This is particularly evident during important religious ceremonies and festivals, which require the participation of the whole clan. Rituals such as festivals help to produce "collective effervescence" or a feeling of collective enthusiasm and involvement which strengthens social bonds and promotes social solidarity.

Briefly, members of a clan venerate a certain totemic object from which they claim descent. This object gives them their identity. But according to Durkheim, it is not the object itself that is being worshipped, but the clan itself. Religion is nothing but giving society itself a divine form because it stands outside of individuals, exerting physical and moral constraints on them. Worshipping society produces in its members a feeling of oneness, solidarity and enthusiasm, helping them to participate in the collective life and expressions of the society.

### **10.3.3 Religion and Science**

Durkheim maintains that scientific thought has its origins in religious thought. Both religion and science reflect on nature, human beings and society. Both attempt to classify things, relate them to one another and explain them. Scientific thought is a more developed and refined form of religious thought. The terms used in modern science like force and power have a religious origin.

Durkheim writes that religious thought will ultimately give way to the advance of scientific thought. He points out that social sciences are in fact undertaking a scientific study of religion itself!

Both religious and scientific thought contribute to the collective representations of society. There cannot be any conflict between the two because both are directed towards seeking universal principles. Thus the goal of both systems of thought is to help human beings rise above the limitations of private, individual nature and lead a life which is both, individual and social. Individuals need society in order to be truly human, and religion and science both contribute to unifying individuals with society (see Jones 1986:149-152). We have just seen how Durkheim focuses on the role of religion in forging social solidarity by unifying individuals in the worship of an entity far greater than themselves, namely, society itself.

**Check Your Progress 2**

**Answer the following questions in 2 sentences each. Use the space below to write your answer.**

1) Why is society worshipped, according to Durkheim?

.....  
 .....

2) Why, in the view of Durkheim, there can be no conflict between religion and science?

.....  
 .....  
 .....

---

**10.4 COMPARISON BETWEEN MARX AND WEBER**

---

Birnbaum (1953) points to many similarities between Marx and Weber. Some of them are important ones and worth citing: Firstly, both Marx and Weber agreed that capitalism is not a mere economic system, but it permeates and spreads throughout the society; secondly, both of them agreed that ‘social values’ which necessary for the growth of capitalism were not ‘natural’ but the outcome of historical development; thirdly, both of them agreed that the “new capitalist entrepreneurial classes did not come from pre-capitalist financial or merchant classes.....” Weber agreed with Marx on the idea that capitalist class was the rising class.

The major difference is that, while Marx considered ideas to be simple reflections of social and economic realities, Weber considered ideas to be important for development. Weber did not establish a one-to-one relationship between religion and development. Weber's thesis allows us to say that, after a certain stage of development, religion may serve as the ideology of those who benefitted out of the development. Another difference between Marx and Weber is that, while Weber asserted the criticism of religion from within, Marx ruled that out. For

Marx, the criticism of religion is possible from outside the religion. Moreover, Marx's view of religion as a veiling mechanism applies to all ages, societies and cultural systems, whereas Weber's view of religion as a bearer of ideas for potential development applies to specific historical-cultural systems. In Weber's thesis, we find the emphasis on 'individual', in Marx we do not find the same.

Apart from the above specific differences between Weber and Marx on understanding religion, there are several general differences. For Marx, history is divided into many epochs, characteristic of particular way of the distribution of ownership of means of production. Capitalism is one such epoch in history. Whereas for Weber, capitalism is the specific stage one long drawn out historical process called 'rationalization'. Capitalism is not just an economic system or social system alone for Weber, for him capitalism is also a cultural system marked by rationalization in all walks of life--namely, administration, judiciary, science etc.

---

## **10.5 COMPARISON BETWEEN WEBER AND DURKHEIM**

---

Each thinker's methodology provides a certain framework with which he/she approaches substantive issues. You have seen how Durkheim stresses the exteriority of social facts, which he regards as 'things'. Society is 'sui-generis', it exists over and above the individual. Individuals are born and die, but society is more or less eternal. Society imposes certain constraints in order to make the individual a part of it. Weber focuses on the role of individuals as actors, orienting their behavior-patterns in terms of their values and beliefs. It is the task of the sociologists to study these through "verstehen" or interpretative understanding. Weber's and Durkheim studies of religion get their distinct focii or emphases as a consequence of their distinctive approaches to human beings and society.

Let us look at the different types of religious systems, located in very different social settings that they handle, i.e., their units of analysis.

### **i) Unit of Analysis**

Emile Durkheim studies religion in what he believes is its most elementary form. He focuses on tribal society where collective life is pervasive. Ideas are held in common by all individuals and there is an intensity of shared ideas and feelings. This is a society without written historical records. Religion and clan organisation overlap. Thus Durkheim emphasises the role of religion as a collective phenomenon which serves to strengthen social bonds.

Weber, on the other hand, studies the major features of the great world religions. He is interested in their historical roots and their capacity to guide and shape economic activity. These world religions are also seen as responses to the prevailing social situations. For instance, Buddhism and Jainism in India hit out

against the caste system. Judaism was the religion of the oppressed Palestinian peasantry. Protestantism as you have seen was a “protest” against the decadence of the orthodox Catholic Church. Thus, Durkheim’s emphasis on tribal religion visualises the role of religion in maintaining social order, Weber’s analysis looks at the creative role of religion in helping to shape new ways of thinking and acting.

## ii) The Role of Religion

Taking the above point further, we can see that Durkheim basically sees religion as an expression of the collective conscience. Worshipping the totem according to him is nothing but worshipping the clan itself. Ideas and beliefs cherished by the clan as a whole thus become part of the individual conscience. The separation between the sacred and the profane aspects of the world is mediated through certain rites. The participation of the whole clan in some important rites helps to bring about collective enthusiasm, linking individuals into social bonds and making them aware of the awesome power of society.

Weber, in contrast, wishes to understand religion in relation to economic, political and historical factors. He sees religion as part and parcel of a larger historical trend, namely, the move towards capitalism, industrialisation and rationality. He is concerned with the role of religion in making the world-view of individuals in different societies favourably or unfavourably inclined towards capitalism and rationalisation.

You have seen how the units of analysis used by these thinkers differ. The role assigned to religion by both of them is also distinctive. Naturally, some of the concepts or categories they use also differ. Weber does not hesitate in using certain concepts that Durkheim strictly avoids.

## iii) Gods, Spirits and Prophets

Durkheim denies that religion is concerned with the mysterious, with gods and spirits. He holds that the object of worship is society itself, transformed and represented through certain symbolic objects. Weber does not hesitate to use the idea of gods and spirits. Remember, Weber is dealing with religions, which are of relatively recent origin as compared to the tribal religions. These religions discussed by Weber express certain personal qualities and display a certain level of abstraction. When individuals abstract, they engage in symbolic activity. Let us look at totemism in this respect. Durkheim argues that the totem is the symbol of the clan. Weber takes the example of a totem, which while worshipped as a symbol, is an animal that is sacrificially killed and eaten. The spirits and gods of the tribe are called to take part in the feast. Whilst eating the animal, clan members believe themselves to be united because the spirit of the animal enters them. They are united not merely by the totem as an emblem or a symbol, but they are united by sharing the substance of the sacred animal which is not merely flesh, but spirit.

Weber, unlike Durkheim, attaches great importance to prophets in propagating religious beliefs. Religions like Judaism, Christianity and Islam are characterised by great ethical prophets who people revere as the representatives of god, or individuals who have directly spoken to god. They are the charismatic leaders like Abraham, Moses, Jesus and Mohammed who capture the imagination and fancy of the people.

Briefly, Durkheim denies that religion is basically concerned with spirits and gods. He maintains that it is society itself, which is worshipped in order to strengthen social bonds and make individuals who are born and who die feel the power and eternity of society. Weber speaks of religion in terms of its creation of abstractions. Thus spirits and gods are reflections of symbolic thought. The role of charismatic, ethical prophets in redefining and remaking religious beliefs is also accounted for.

Let us now compare the views of Durkheim and Weber on religion vis-s-vis science.

#### **iv) Religion and Science**

You have seen how Durkheim views both religion and science as providing society with its collective representations. The classifications of science derive from those of religion. Thus there is no conflict or opposition between the two. Weber is not of this view. His comparative studies of world religion show how religious ethics in India and China prevented the growth of capitalism, which basically requires an ethic of mastery, of rational calculation. It is only the Protestant ethic, which provided the appropriate world-view for rational capitalism. Science, as Weber views it, is an expression of rationality and a challenge to the traditional and mystical claims of religion. Science provides empirical knowledge or verifiable factual information, which helps human beings to know and master the world. Thus science and religion, in Weber's view, exist in contrast to each other.

Comparing the views of these authors is not an easy task. They are dealing with such vastly different societies that their findings are bound to be different. But some points do emerge.

Durkheim sees religion as a means whereby individuals acknowledge the physical and moral power of society. Religion is a way of classifying and ordering concepts and is thus the fore-runner of science. Weber studies religion in terms of its meanings for those who follow it, and how these meanings help them orient their actions in other social activities. Science arises as a challenge to religious ideas, driving out ghosts and spirits and replacing them with empirical observations and factual information. You can illustrate the difference between perspectives on religion, advanced by Durkheim and Weber as shown in Table 10.1

**Table 10.1 Perspectives on Religion: Durkheim and Weber**

ÉMILE DURKHEIM	MAX WEBER
i) Studied primitive religion	Studied world religions
ii) Views religion as an expression of the collective conscience	Views religion in relation to political, economic and historical factors
iii) Strictly avoids using concepts like ‘gods’, ‘spirit’, ‘prophets’	Makes use of these concepts
iv) Considers science as an extension of religion, sees no conflict between them	Considers science and religion in contrast to each other

---

## 10.6 LET US SUM UP

---

In this Unit, we have tried to see how Marx, Durkheim and Weber dealt with religion as a social phenomenon. We began by examining the views of Marx and Weber on religion in the larger framework of capitalism. We tried to understand the views of Durkheim. We saw how and why he studied ‘elementary forms’ in simple societies. We examined how he arrived at his definition of religion, how he understood totemism as an expression of clan worship and how he saw the continuity between religious and scientific thought. Finally, we compared the views of Marx and Weber, and Durkheim and Weber in terms of the kinds of societies that they studied, the role they ascribed to religion, the concepts they used in their studies and their conflicting views on religion and science.

---

## 10.7 REFERENCES

---

Durkheim, Émile. (1965). *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, New York: Free Press.

Giddens, Anthony (Edited and translated). (1978) *Émile Durkheim: Selected Writings*, Harvester Press: Hassocks.

Indira Gandhi National Open University Course Material (2005). *Sociological Thought* (ESO 13), IGNOU: New Delhi.

Indira Gandhi National Open University Course Material. (2005). *Society and Religion* (ESO 15), IGNOU: New Delhi.

Jones, Robert Alun. (1986). *Émile Durkheim: An Introduction to Four Major Works*, Sage Publications: Beverly Hills.

---

## 10.8 SPECIMEN ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

---

### Check Your Progress 1

- 1) Commodity and religion, both are man's creation but, they exist over and above him and sedate him.
- 2) The social impact of predestination is:
  - the individual is left alone because there is nobody mediate and there is no magical cure.
  - work becomes an end in itself. A puritan has to work for the greater glory of God.
  - Conviction of salvation has to be demonstrated through work and self-control.
  - When a puritan earns but desists from spending, monet accumulates which can be productively invested.

### Check Your Progress 2

- 1) Society exerts physical and moral force and authority on the individuals. It is 'sui-generis' and has a reality of its own. Hence it is worshipped.
- 2) Both religion and science contribute to the collective representations of society. Both seek universal principles which will help people lead lives that are both, individual and social. Since religion and science both seek the same goals, they cannot be in conflict.