

Ecclesial power in the past and the present and origin of humanism

Jonas Eliasson^{1, 2}Petur Petursson¹

¹Professor University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland

²Professor Kyoto University (visiting), Kyoto, Japan

ABSTRACT: *The terms church and ecclesial power is based on the definition by Emile Durkheim: A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, i.e., things set apart and forbidden, which unite all those who adhere to them in one single moral community called a Church. The religious power, originally active in sectarian communities, is defined by Weber as „charisma“. According to Weber’s theories, such power develops into a state divided in three sectors, production, ecclesial power and military, where the ecclesial power rules the others because of the fear for God (or the gods), but this fear gradually changes into respect. When the old system of blood feud is rescinded and lexitationis adapted instead, this means a definite change in morality, and this change develops further due to the teachings of Christ of which the forgiveness is a good example of a theory honored in modern jurisprudence. The methods of contemporary governance are for the most part developed under the European monarchies, where all power is vested in the monarch, but was before that in the hands of God. But the religious root of the power are confirmed by the monarchs, they all claim their divine right as sovereigns, and try to uphold consensus between their laws and the Bible. The final stage in this reign of ecclesial power is the modern democratic state, when the originally ecclesial power is secularized, taken from the monarch and given to civil institutions of government, a law giving institution, government offices and the juridical system. The conclusion is that the basic morale of modern society, the foundation of justice and law, is a cultural heritage that is formed and guarded by the religion.*

KEYWORDS: *Ecclesial power, humanism, religion, church, state, society*

I. INTRODUCTION

Religious power is founded on the religion commonly practiced by the people. Religious power is beyond any doubt the oldest power exercised in human societies, much older than any written documentation. It goes probably thousands of years back to the very oldest of religions. It is probable that the priests (shamans) in the first societies practicing shamanism had considerable power, vested in various deities and taboos everyone had to respect. We shall later see how ecclesial power relates to such power.

According to sociology (Durkheim 1965) and religious studies (Tillich 1957) religion is an integral part of the life of humans as thinking social beings. In addition to this, the religion explained the very existence of the world and all living things. These explanations were generally accepted all the time beyond the middle ages, i. e. all the time political power as we know it today is developing, which is almost until the time modern government is born.

In this paper the discussion is based on Emile Durkheim’s definition of religion and church. Durkheim’s definition is: 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 called a Church”, all those who adhere to them (Thompson 1982 p. 129; excerpt from Durkheim: The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life). What modern people associate with religion and church is mainly prayer and religious services (Durkheim 1995), but Durkheim’s definition is much broader, apart from beliefs and practices forbidden things are also included. Durkheim does not mention taboos but they are included. This definition of religion and church by Durkheim, is accepted by many scholars today, and it may be taken much further. “If religion has given birth to all that is essential in society, it is because the idea of society is the soul of religion.” (Bellah, 1973, p. 191, excerpt from Durkheim: The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life).

In his article on Religious Evolution Robert Bellah (Bellah 1964) argues that the concept of individual selfhood and personality has a religious origin. It is when the shamanic people discover that the soul survives the bodily death and is a stable entity in different kinds of situation, that the individual becomes a stable and consistent entity over time. Thus the individual is a social product and its personality is more or less created by

and maintained by myths and rituals that evolve from sacred things set apart and forbidden to be contaminated by worldly things and acts.

This shows that Durkheim thought of religion as an active source of social cohesion, because religion pulls people together, mentally and physically, in the form of religious services or assemblies. By doing so, religion is able to reaffirm collective morals and beliefs in the minds of all members of society. Religion can thus be seen as the most fundamental social institution of humankind giving rise to other social forms (Allan and Allan 2005) and it was the religion that gave humanity the strongest sense of collective consciousness or collective conscience, which is the set of shared beliefs, ideas and moral attitudes which operate as a unifying force within society.

Robert Bellah goes on with this line of reasoning when he, by referring to Rousseau's Social Contract, introduces the concept of civil religion in America which is a unified system of beliefs, myths and rituals which integrates the American nation into one moral community regardless of social class, ethnic background or church affiliation (Bellah 1967).

The term social conscience was introduced by Durkheim in his *Division of Labor in Society* in 1893 (Durkheim 1997, p. 39, 60 and 108) it refers to a shared understanding of social norms rather than specific morale. Collective conscience is very important when people come together as dynamic group rather than existing as separate individuals.

In his book *Division of Labor in Society* Durkheim compares the more primitive and undifferentiated societies with modern ones that are characterized by division of labor, specialization of different social groups, institutions and associations (Durkheim 1997). The primitive society is characterized by mechanical solidarity mainly because each individual or group is so like all others that it can easily be replaced by other individuals, groups or institutions. In this kind of solidarity the laws and the penal code is based on retribution and vengeance. These kinds of harsh sanctions can easily restore the social order after it has been violated by deviant behavior. In more developed societies there is more differentiation and specialization and each individual, class, group or institution becomes irreplaceable if the social order is to be maintained. The sanctions are motivated by the rehabilitation of the deviant part into the social order again, by education, betterment and resocialization. The church in each type of society legitimizes social order and furthers the enforcement of the laws. The moral base of the organismal solidarity is according to Durkheim (Durkheim 1997), individualism, the human dignity because each individual is in the end special and irreplaceable. He talks about the "cult of the individual" in this respect. Conscious collective is no longer an abstract principle like God but the human being, and Christ may well be considered as a symbol for this modern type of religion as He is both man and God at the same time, fully God and fully human at the same time.

In both types of social solidarity, building up a favorable collective conscience through public relation channels (preaching, indoctrination or other means of mass communication) has therefore a high priority in all ruling power structures. In fact the ecclesial power acts as these principles set forth by Durkheim were indeed known to them. It is the basic proposition of this paper that the moral and political power always remains charismatic no matter how differentiated and composed it is, this can be seen in the discussion on center and periphery by E. Shils and Sten Rokkan, (Shils 1975) and (Rokkan et al 1987).

In this paper the discussion will focus on how modern government with its three independent instruments of power, lawgiving, justice and executive power, have their roots in the religious powers of old. A case study will show how the practices of modern government develop from the principles in the Christian religion. This is not possible to do in any detail; instead the focus will mainly be upon how modern government is based on the humanism and sense of justice originally written down in the religious canon, the Bible. Using this example we must regretfully exclude all other religions, even though there are obvious parallels in the other large religions that certainly preserve the same principle of humanism and sense of justice that probably would lead to the same conclusions if thoroughly researched. It is therefore quite possible, that religion has this universal role in the world, to be the forerunner of humanism and justice in government.

Max Weber claims that sociology can explain social behavior today and in that way show how it influences future social behavior (Weber 1991). His method does regretfully not work backwards; we cannot deduct the social behavior in the past from social behavior today as could be done if social behavior followed the laws of mathematics. We cannot find out how religious power was exercised in the past by studying available historical development. It can only be assumed that the shaman of the tribe exercised the religious

power in the beginning. Max Weber defined such power as charismatic power(Weber 1922) and later he defines charismatic authority as: Resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him. This definition is developed by Weber in his essays (Weber 2015)

II. THE RISE OF ECCLESIAL POWER.

When adapting Weber's theory of charisma (Weber 2015), the question arises what is the next stage. Here it is suggested that the next stage in the development of religious power is the trilateral power structure, consisting of an army lead by a king, a church lead by a religious leader and then the industry or agriculture may be under another leadership.

We can take ancient Egypt as an example (Eliasson 2013). The priests were on top of almost everything, the time for sowing the grains, harvesting, taxation and religious events, even though the king, the pharaoh, had full control of the army and police. There were kings that tried to change the system and take the land in their own hands and thereby the power away from the priests, but in vain. The priests regained their power and kept it until other religions put them aside for good. Mesopotamia was less stable than Egypt, but in this respect its story is similar.

Mesopotamia and Egypt are the first documented examples about the importance of religious power exercised over the fundamental social institutions. The trilateral power structure develops quite naturally from the older society in full accordance with Weber's theories. From the technological point of view, the change from the shamanistic society is from the hunter – gatherer society to the farming society and the priest of Egypt are maximizing the crop by assimilating the agriculture to the floods of the Nile and the land they irrigate. But the very floods of the Nile are governed by the gods and nobody doubts that fact. Their power is charismatic in Weber's sense and not even the king can take it away from them. The king is more or less forced to adapt to the charismatic power of the priests and integrate them into the state order together with other specialized social groups but at the same time he can establish himself as the main agent of the social order by claiming a status of the supreme god, his son, or his specially adopted agent on earth. Thus he is the one who divides and rules at the same time and has the very key of the social order in his power.

III. THE FEAR OF GOD AS THE ROOT OF POWER

The timeline of Biblical events goes back to the Middle Kingdom in ancient Egypt(Eliasson 2013). In this time we see the rise of ecclesial power among the Hebrews(Davies and Rogerson 2005). In the beginning it is the power of the Justice of God. There are many examples in the Bible about the judgment of God from this time, these biblical texts may very well be juridical examples for use in the courts of law in the Judaic society(Eliasson 2012). In this time all power is with God, but later we see the trilateral power structure being established in the state of Israel and the Israelite kingdom. The legislative power is God (the Mosaic Law in the Torah), the priests operate the courts of law, or the judiciary branch of government, and the king exercises the executive power. The three branches, the legislature, the judiciary and the executive branch are definitively not independent, but this system is clearly the forerunner for the modern system with these three independent branches of government.

The old religious states of Israel and later Judea were very different from anything known in our time. God almighty is superior to everything and the strongest relationship between God and his people seems to be the fear of God so frequently mentioned in the Bible. This may seem surprising, but upon closer inspection it is not. The tribal system before the religious state is polytheistic and most of the deities do have a violent nature, sacrificing humans is common and there are all kinds of taboos (Assman 1992). The basic human right in tribal systems of old is the right of retaliation and it is more often than not, a cause of constant feud between families and clans. The fear of retaliation is what can cause the stronger party to yield in a dispute. The Mosaic Law replaced this old system of blood feud, this we can see in "vengeance is mine"(Deuteronomy) and other similar statements in the Bible. This means in practice that you are forbidden to avenge, God will do it for you, and the matter shall be settled in the religious court. In modern terms, the biblical "fear of God" means respect for God and his laws. The Roman Catholic Church also teaches that the fear of God is a gift from God that teaches us to respect him("Holy Ghost"). The fear of God is also in Islam (taqwa)("Takwā").

IV. NEW CUSTOMS REPLACE THE BLOOD FEUD

Based on the fear of God, the ecclesial juridical power of the religious courts little by little replaces the blood feud. This can only be done with tremendous efforts; the generally accepted social rules and morale have to be almost turned around. In the feudal society the stronger is almost always right. The famous Icelandic

Sagas, stories written in the 13th and 14th century, describe a heathen society of Scandinavians before Christianity is accepted in the year 1000. To kill a man and declare the slaying is perfectly honest, but the relatives of the victim have a moral duty to avenge the death of their kinsman. They don't have to kill the slayer, just somebody "equal" of his clan. To kill and rob innocent peasants in Viking raids in other countries is an honest and praiseworthy way of life. Taking slaves and selling them to the highest bidder is honest trade.

All this has to be turned around. A slayer shall turn him in for judgment, and he shall be protected from the avenger until a verdict is proclaimed in his case. Robbery, theft and other mischief is punished according to the retaliation law, *lex talionis*. The very famous quote is "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" describes *lex talionis* very well (Eye for an eye 2015). The religious state of Israel practiced *lex talionis* as may be seen many places in the Bible. But it was not the only one, Ancient Egypt and Babylon had very much the same system and when Islam took over in these countries, they used *lex talionis* too and some Islamic countries still do.

V. RISE OF HUMANISM



Figure 1. Divine inspiration of Thorgeir Ljosvetningagodi to accept Christianity in the year 1000 in the Icelandic Althing. Glass window and artist vision: Leifur Breidfjord. (Courtesy: Leifur Breidfjord)

The accounts of the first kings of Israel in the Bible contain stories that can be interpreted as the first appearance of humanism as we understand it today. In the younger texts to the Bible we also see the encouragement "do not fear" with the underlying meaning God will care for you. In the psalms of David there are examples of God's divine help to his people and concern for their welfare. In these times (about 600 BCE) this is a new voice. Concern and help to others is not a basic instinct of humans or related animals. But today it may be argued, that humanism is indeed a human instinct, after the indoctrinations of the various religions for thousands of years. In this ecclesial power was instrumental. All modern religions instruct the people to help the poor and the weak.

It is especially Christianity that develops humanism until the stage that its principal doctrines can be used as the foundation of civil law. Only one doctrine of many will be discussed here. It's the doctrine of forgiveness; it has a central position in Christianity. Christ himself was executed before he could finalize the details of how to practice this doctrine within the frame of the law, but later church fathers have done this in accordance with his teaching. Here it must be remembered that Jesus was well educated in Judaism, he was a rabbi and knew the law. He was not trying to revolutionize Judaism. From this we can deduct that the judgment of God and punishment for a committed crime must be included when the doctrine is put into practice.

In accordance with this we have to believe that a criminal must be punished as the courts declare. But when he is released he shall be forgiven. Examining this further we see, that this is exactly the main principle in modern jurisprudence, and the judiciary systems in modern societies are supposed to act accordingly. Forgiveness is a very important Christian doctrine, maybe the most important, but more examples can be taken of Christian doctrines that have put their mark on democratic government in states where Christianity is accepted.

This does not mean that modern government is a direct descendant of the ecclesial power of the late antiquity and middle ages. On the contrary, it is very difficult to find a direct thread from the first ecclesial states to modern government. The first state to accept Christianity is the Roman Empire, but it does not arrange its law

according to biblical canon but retains Roman jurisprudence. But the Christian doctrines gain ground little by little. Later Cesaropapism and the Roman Catholic Church developed in Europe.

VI. CESAROPAPISM

Constantine, Roman Emperor from 306 to 337 AD, who sympathized and supported Christianity, introduced Cesaropapism in the Church (Grbešić 2013). This political system will be much more prominent in the Orthodox Church than in the Western Church. Cesaropapism is the idea of combining the power of secular government with the religious power, or making it superior to the spiritual authority of the Church, especially concerning the connection of the Church with government.

In its extreme form, Cesaropapism is a political theory in which the head of state is also the head of the church. It can be called inverted theocracy (Weber 1978, p. XCVI) or hierocracy (Weber 1978, p. 282 and p.



Figure 2. Icon depicting the Roman Emperor Constantine (centre) and the bishops of the First Council of Nicaea (325) holding the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed of 381. (Wikipedia commons)

509), in which institutions of the Church control the state. Cesaropapism and Theocracy are systems in which there is no separation of church and state. According to Weber's political sociology, Caesaropapism entails "the complete subordination of priests to secular power" (Swedberg and Agevall, 2005). Caesaropapism was most notorious in the Tsardom of Russia when Ivan IV the Terrible assumed the title Czar in 1547 and subordinated the Russian Orthodox Church to the state. Cesaropapism in Russia was then again taken to a new level in 1721, when Peter the Great abolished the patriarchate and formally made the church a department of his government. This is formally known as the beginning of the Russian Empire which has great resemblance to the Divine Monarchies to be discussed later.

VII. ROMAN CATHOLIC ECCLESIAL POWER

The fall of the West-Roman Emperor starts a power vacuum in Europe where different kings compete for the leadership of the Holy Roman Empire. These are tumultuous times, but there is a clear development, the rising power of the pontiffs of the Roman Catholic Church, from the position of a spiritual leader to a leader superior to kings and nobility. It is difficult to see where this development begins, but after the papal revolution (Political Science Summaries 2010) it is commonly acknowledged that heads of state needed the blessing of Rome to access the throne legally. This system reigns from the 11th century up to the reformation.

The Roman Catholic Church becomes very powerful and more often than not, the Pope forces his will upon the heads of state, if we acknowledge the individual kingships as states, which may be doubtful. But the Catholic Church has all the qualities of a state. Papal decrees and bulls and papal infallibility are the law together with the Corpus Juris Canonici. There are various courts of law, the most feared was the inquisition from the twelfth to the nineteenth centuries. The manifestations of the ecclesial power are many. The churches, the convents, the crusades and the inquisition, it was all under the supreme leadership of the Pope in Rome.

Being in this powerful position, it is inevitable that the church takes on the leading role in lawmaking. For this task was chosen the monk Thomas Aquinas. He established the first legal system of Western Europe and analyzed existing laws in his work Summa Theologia (Aquinas 1274). It was a great help for Thomas Aquinas that Catholic monks were in his times close to completing their translations of the Platonist works in the Arabic manuscripts of the library of Toledo in Spain. It may be argued, however, that they selected mostly the works they found compatible with the doctrines of Christianity. Through the translations of these monks, Aristotle and many other Greek mathematicians and physicists; who were schoolmasters of military academies

and inventors of new weaponry became known. Now they were presented as thinkers and philosophers and today many believe that they are the founders of modern ethics, an idea that can be traced all the way back to Cicero (Rawson 1983). Nevertheless, it can be safely argued that many of the Greek philosophers were likely influenced by Judaism, both from their own studies and translations of the Old Testament to Greek (Septuagint), as postulated by Judaic scholars (Shurpin 2014)



Figure 3 Cartoon of Napoleon snapping the crown from the pope and crowning himself (Wikipedia commons).

VIII. THE MONARCHY

The most radical change in the power structure in Western Europe is when the kings in Europe become sovereigns with absolute power or monarchs. Not all states in Europe became monarchies, but all the most important and powerful ones. Many kings in Europe had been trying to wrestle themselves free from the power of the Roman Catholic Church, a struggle culminating in the reformation. The ideologies that lead to absolute power for the monarchs were to reform the government, bring justice to the people and oppose the privileges and corruption of the nobility and the clergy. It was the rising class of wealthy civilians or “citizens” that brought about this change.

This could have been the final victory of the kings and the ultimate defeat of the church. But as strange as it may seem, this was the final victory of the religion, even though the religious power changed hands from the pontiff in Rome to local church leaders in the individual states. This may be seen as the target of the reformation, to get rid of the corrupt power of Rome and create a new system where there was true obedience to God. In accordance with this the monarchs of Europe declared to have their power from God, and thereby took on the obligation to rule according to God's will (Divine right of kings). The divine right of the king to rule was a common doctrine all over the world, especially in antiquity when it was common to deify ruling kings. In middle age Europe the original theory about the divine monarchy comes from Jean Bodin (Jean Bodin) and it was supported by Martin Luther. This religious justification of the monarchy is not possible without full cooperation of the church no matter if it is a Christian, Islamic or any other kind of religious institution. This cooperation works both ways, the administration cannot go against the canon and the clergy has to acknowledge the right of the monarch to rule. In this system the laws of God, are above the laws of men. This is the final victory to the Bible in Europe; it becomes the moral foundation of civil law as it already is in Islam.

But another thing happens that by time is going to have far reaching consequences; it is the secularization of the judiciary system. The king appoints county sheriffs that operate this system without direct influence from the clergy. In his religious sociology Max Weber discusses rationalization and secularization in the various sectors of society, i.e. the separation of the religion from the affairs of the state. This separation of the judiciary system by the monarchies was only the beginning of this secularization discussed by Weber (Weber 1971). This development is outlined in Table 1.

Table 1. Outline of the development of governmental power in contemporary democratic states

Aboriginal ? 1000 BCE	Ecclesial 1000 BCE - 1496 AD	Monarchy 1496 - 1917	Democracies
Tribe	Hunting Agriculture Industry	Agriculture	Agriculture
		Industry	Food industry
shaman	Ecclesial power religious events theology		Subordination
		Manufacture	
		Religious governance	Commerce
			Services
chieftain	Army (king)	Monarch Administration Counties	Parishes
			Free churches
			Independent societies.
			State church
			State institutions
			Municipalities
			Legislation
			Executive power
			Judiciary power

Table 1 outlines three paths of development for the power structure, from the aboriginal societies to contemporary democratic states (topmost row). The horizontal direction outlines the historical development of the functions of the tribe, shaman and chieftain respectively. They can be both sociological and technological, e.g. hunting, a very important source of food in the early societies loses importance simply because of the population explosion of the last 500 years, and there are not enough animals to hunt. There are also changes, e.g. the change from subordination to the Monarch to free churches; this change is for spiritual reasons only.

The changes from left to right in the table are thus historical changes that do not have any common reason and thus do not follow any common law. Nevertheless, there is nothing in this historical development that contradicts the previously discussed theory of Weber, that social behavior today can explain future social behavior. To take an example, ecclesial power changes to subordination to the monarch and then the free churches appear when subordination to the monarch is no longer instrumental. Given the change from ecclesial power to subordination to the monarch, the change from subordination to the Monarch to free churches, e.g. churches without connections to the state church, is in accordance with Weber. People do not give up their religion when the monarchy is ended.

IX. THE DEMOCRATIC HUMANISTIC POWER

The period of 1789 – 1917 can be characterized as the decline of the divine monarchist power. In 1789 the American and French revolutions were already over. Democratic government, with lawgiving parliament, independent courts of law and executive power in the hands of elected representatives was formed in the 100 years that followed. In the aftermath, the ancient ecclesial power vested in the monarchs, was taken away from them and given to the democratic institutions by inserting a constitution above the three institutions. The constitution could only be changed in a referendum and thereby a government of the people by the people is established and accepted as modern democratic government.

As before the power structure is divided in three branches, but now they are to be independent. The main change is the secularization; the power does not come from God but from the people, the citizens of the state. This radical change is brought about remarkably peacefully, the king was simply dethroned in practice but allowed to keep the title and become a symbolic head of state.

Most states define themselves as democratic today, even those who accept religious fundamentalism. According to western tradition democracies shall guard the civil rights of each individual, even though the majority of the citizens do not want it. In this way the citizens have certain democratic rights, defined in the constitutions, and these rights cannot be taken away from them. Modern democracy thus guarantees certain rights to the minority that the majority cannot take away from them. The ecclesial power of old did not accept this, except for people of the right faith.

X. DISCUSSION

As already mentioned, there is no direct path from tribal society to democratic government. But there is a path, it is diagonal in Table 1, marked with bold letters and there it is clearly seen that this historical development takes no direct path indeed. This is very important; it shows that even though development of societies can to a certain extent be predicted into the future according to Weber, there is no way to deduct how things developed in the past otherwise than in studies of history. Thus we cannot find how things were before the tribal society developed, except by archeological investigations.

The charismatic powers of the shaman in the tribal societies becomes the ecclesial power, this is later combined with the military power (army) and vested in the divine monarch who loses all his powers to the trilateral secularized civil power vested in the democratic institutions. Where and when the principles of modern government come into being, human rights and equality before the law and government of the people by the people is not easy to see. Many researchers believe it is mostly the work of the thinkers of the Age of enlightenment and the scientific Revolution. They were the chief advocates of humanism in their time, but all the main principles of humanism are already in the Bible, the Quran and other religious writings. But it was very difficult for these influential philosophers to preach the separation of the church from the state as they did, citing the Bible in the same essays. However it may be argued that their ideas became so popular because the humanistic ideas are already a part of the religion which then becomes the underlying driving force in the change to democracy. But religious devotion of the people quite naturally prevents the separation of church and state in many countries.

The remarkable thing is that, with the addition of the constitutions, the main body of the civil law is still today the same as it was in 1917, which in western democracies is in almost full accordance with the 10 commandments which again is mostly the same as the seven laws of Noah (Eliasson 2012). This is possible only because behind this decision are hundreds of years of indoctrination by the ecclesial power. A contemporary reference to the laws of Noah may be seen in the resolution of the US Congress, January 3rd 1991 on Education Day; Public Law 102-14, H.J. Res. 104 by 102nd Congress of the United States of America, March 5, 1991.

XI. CONCLUSION

We can conclude that the strongest source of modern governmental ethics is the religious power of old. Military ruler like the emperors in Rome could wrestle this power to themselves, but the religion came back with ecclesial power and from there it went to the divine monarchs again. Now we have secularized democratic government, but the ethical principle of this government of justice and forgiveness took form when the ancient system of blood feud and revenge was replaced by religious courts of law.

The democratic tradition is very strong today. The main reason is that hundreds of years of preaching and indoctrination have made the ethical principles of the religion take root in the human soul and become a part of humanity itself, in contrast to the ancient tribal societies which accepted the right of the strongest and the obligation to revenge.

The democratic civil rights include the human rights, and it is indeed remarkable how great a resemblance there is between them and the humanistic principles of the religious doctrines. The founding fathers of the modern democratic systems acknowledged this fact. We only need to quote the inscription on USA coins, "In God we trust".

Extending this up to our times we have the conclusion that modern ethical principles of law and justice are a cultural heritage originating from the religion and preserved in its canon. It seems to be a common view in modern societies that humanism is a part of the "human nature" but the social development from tribal societies to our times shows that humanism is not in our DNA, it is religious inspiration planted in our soul by indoctrination of the ecclesial power of old. This might not be a very pleasant thought, because it means that humanism can be uprooted from the human soul. But alas, there are too many examples of just that to turn the blind eye.

The final conclusion must therefore be that preservation of this very important cultural heritage must be taken care of in our secularized democracies. Applying Weber's theory the way back to the system of revenge is open. It is already used by some governments who possess rockets and drones and similar technologies of warfare.

References

- [1] Durkheim, E., (1965); *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. N.Y. Free Press; p. 57
- [2] Tillich, Paul (1957): *Dynamics of Faith*. N.Y. Harper & Row, p. 1 – 6.
- [3] Thompson, Kenneth (1982); *Emile Durkheim*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- [4] Durkheim, E., (1995); *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, The Free Press. New York, p. 44. (Translated by Karen E. Fields)
- [5] Bellah, Robert N. (1973). *Emile Durkheim: On Morality and Society, Selected Writings*. Chicago; The University of Chicago Press.
- [6] Bellah, R. N. (1964). Religious evolution. *American sociological review*, 358-374.
- [7] Bellah, R. N. (1967). *Civil religion in America*. Daedalus, 1-21.
- [8] Allan, K. and Allan, K. D. (2005). *Explorations in Classical Sociological Theory: Seeing the Social World*. Pine Forge Press. p. 112 and 113. ISBN 978-1-4129-0572-5.
- [9] Durkheim, Emile (1997); *The Division of Labor in Society*. Trans. W. D. Halls, intro. Lewis A. Coser. New York: Free Press.
- [10] Shils, E. (1975). *Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- [11] Rokkan, S., Urwin, D., Aarebrot, F. H., Malaba, P., & Sande, T. (1987). *Centre Periphery Structures in Europe: An ISSC Workbook in Comparative Analysis*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- [12] Weber, M. (1991); *The Nature of Social Action*; (In Runciman: W.G.: Weber: Selections in Translation' Cambridge University Press., p 7)
- [13] Weber, M. (2015) *Politics as Vocation* pp. 129-198, and *Discipline and Charisma* pp. 59-72, in *Weber's Rationalism and Modern Society*, edited and translated by Tony Waters and Dagmar Waters, Palgrave MacMillan.
- [14] Eliasson, J. (2013). Hydrological Science and Its Connection to Religion in Ancient Egypt under the Pharaohs. *Advances in Historical Studies*, 2(03), 150 - 171.
- [15] avies, P. R. and Rogerson J., (2005); *The Old Testament World* Second Edition.
- [16] Eliasson, J. (2012) FráhefndogrétlætiDrottinstilréttarríkis; *RitröðGuðfræðistofnunar*; 34, , p. 129 (From vengeance to justice; Series Publication by The Theological Institute of University of Iceland, in Icelandic)
- [17] Holy Ghost". Catholic Encyclopedia. <http://www.catholic.org/encyclopedia/view.php?id=5854> 1910
- [18] Assman, J., 1992: When Justice Fails - Jurisdiction and Imprecation in Ancient-Egypt and the near-East. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 78, 149-162.
- [19] *Deuteronomy* 32:35.
- [20] "Takwā." Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition. Brill Online, 2013. Reference. Augustana. 26 April 2013 <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/takwa-COM_1457
- [21] Eye for an eye; Wikipedia (2015); http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eye_for_an_eye.
- [22] Grbešić, G. (2013). The Understanding and Application of Tolerance in a Persecuted, a Free Constantinian, and a State Church. *Bogoslovskasmotra*, 83(2), 287-308. (In Croatian with English ummary)
- [23] Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (Vol. 1). Univ of California Press.
- [24] Swedberg, R., & Agevall, O. (2005), *The Max Weber dictionary: Key words and central concepts*. Stanford University Press.
- [25] Political Science Summaries (2010): Harold Berman, Law and Revolution (1984), (<http://markdaku.com/poliscinotes/?p=91>Posted on December 31, 2010).
- [26] Aquinas, T. (1274); *Summa Theologica*: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, Calvin College, 3201 Burton St. SE Grand Rapids, MI 49546 USA <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa.html>.
- [27] Rawson, Elizabeth; (1983) *Cicero: A portrait*; Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y.
- [28] Shurpin, Y. (2014), Jewish Impact on Greek and Western Philosophy? http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/1586152/jewish/Jewish-Impact-on-Greek-and-Western-Philosophy.htm
- [29] Septuagint, Wikipedia (2015); <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Septuagint>.
- [30] Divine right of kings, Wikipedia (2015) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Divine_right_of_kings.
- [31] Jean Bodin, Wikipedia (2015); http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean_Bodin.
- [32] Weber, M. (1971); *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Unwin University