# The SAGE Encyclopedia of the SOCIOLOGY OF RELIGION



## **Editors**

Adam Possamai Western Sydney University

Anthony J. Blasi
Tennessee State University (Retired)





#### FOR INFORMATION:

SAGE Publications, Inc. 2455 Teller Road Thousand Oaks, California 91320 E-mail: order@sagepub.com

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
B 1/I 1 Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road, New Delhi 110 044
India

SAGE Publications Ltd. 1 Oliver's Yard 55 City Road London EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom

SAGE Publications Asia-Pacific Pte. Ltd. 18 Cross Street #10-10/11/12 China Square Central Singapore 048423 Copyright © 2020 by SAGE Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. Except as permitted by U.S. copyright law, no part of this work may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

All third party trademarks referenced or depicted herein are included solely for the purpose of illustration and are the property of their respective owners. Reference to these trademarks in no way indicates any relationship with, or endorsement by, the trademark owner.

Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN: 978-1-4739-4220-2

Acquisitions Editor: Natalie Aguilera Developmental Editor: Sanford Robinson Production Editor: Gagan Mahindra

Copy Editor: Hurix Digital Typesetter: Hurix Digital

Proofreaders: Elen Brink; Theresa Kay

Indexer: Integra

Cover Designer: Dally Verghese Marketing Manager: Carmel Schrire

20 21 22 23 24 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

psychological well-being but may actually accentuate mental health problems. These findings may reflect a connection between rigid religious living, strict spiritual beliefs, or both, and anxiety disorders including obsessive compulsive disorder. Although these studies investigate individual-level outcomes, they are relevant for family functioning and must be investigated further.

#### Conclusion

Both the sociology and psychology of religion exhibited dogmatic and often profoundly negative tendencies for much of the 20th century. Much of the empirical work from the latter 20th century, however, yielded salutary findings and correlations in connection with family relationships. These studies, however, typically employed unsophisticated (one- or two-item) measures. The first two decades of the 21st century have seen significant improvements in sophistication, balance, and a trend toward acknowledging both the challenges and benefits of religion in the sphere of family life.

#### Trevan D. Hatch and Loren D. Marks

See also Religion and Health; Longitudinal Study; Psychology of Religion; Quantitative Research; Sexuality

#### **Further Readings**

- Atkins, D. C., & Kessel, D. E. (2008). Religiousness and infidelity. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 407–418.
- Bartkowski, J. P., Xu, X. H., & Levin, M. L. (2008). Religion and child development. *Social Science Research*, *37*, 18–36.
- Bengtson, V. L., Putney, N. M., & Harris, S. (2013). Families and faith. New York, NY: Oxford University
- DeMaris, A., Mahoney, A., & Pargament, K. I. (2010). Sanctification of marriage and general religiousness as buffers of the effects of marital inequity. *Journal of Family Issues*, 31(10), 1255–1278.
- Ellison, C. G., Burdette, A. M., & Wilcox, B. (2010). The couple that prays together. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(4), 963–975.
- Fincham, F. D. (2015). Forgiveness, family relationships and health. In L. Toussaint, E. L. Worthington Jr., & D. Williams (Eds.), *Forgiveness and health* (pp. 255–270). New York, NY: Springer.

- Hardy, S. A., White, J. A., Zhang, Z., & Ruchty, J. (2011). Parenting and the socialization of religiousness and spirituality. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 3(3), 217–230.
- Landor, A., Simons, L. G., Simons, R. L., Brody, G. H., & Gibbons, F. X. (2011). The role of religiosity in the relationship between parents, peers, and adolescent risky sexual behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(3), 296–309.
- Leurent, B., Nazareth, I., Bellón-Saameño, J., Geerlings, M. I., Maaroos, H., Saldivia, S., . . . King, M. (2013). Spiritual and religious beliefs as risk factors for the onset of major depression: An international cohort study. *Psychological Medicine*, 43(10), 2109–2120.
- Mahoney, A. (2010). Religion in families, 1999–2009. Journal of Marriage and Family, 72, 805–827.
- Marks, L. D., & Dollahite, D. C. (2017). *Religion and families*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McDaniel, S., Boco, A. G., & Zella, S. (2013). Changing patterns of religious affiliation, religiosity, and marital dissolution. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 54(8), 629–657.
- Myers, S. M. (2006). Religious homogamy and marital quality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 292–304.
- Roer-Strier, D., & Sands, R. G. (2004). Families challenged by religious change. *Families in Society*, 85, 485–594.
- Spagnola, M., & Fiese, B. H. (2007). Family routines and rituals. *Infants & Young Children*, 20(4), 284–299.
- Stokes, C. E., & Regnerus, M. D. (2009). When faith divides family. *Social Science Research*, 38(1), 155–167.
- Volling, B. L., Mahoney, A., & Rauer, A. J. (2009). Sanctification of parenting, moral socialization, and young children's conscience development. *Journal of the Psychology of Religion*, 1, 53–68.

# FANFANI, AMINTORE

Amintore Fanfani (1908–1999), a leading economist at the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, was a prominent Italian politician. Since the immediate postwar and for over 30 years, he had served as secretary of the Christian Democratic Party ('Democrazia Cristiana' [DC]), minister of labour and foreign affairs, prime minister, and senate speaker. In the late 1970s, his political influence started to decline, although he retained his authority and major position. This entry

describes Amintore's education, career, political activities, and his view of Catholicism, capitalism, and corporatism as a way to recover from the economic effects of the Great Depression or 'Great Slump'.

The Catholic perspective pertaining to Fanfani's political action took shape during the Fascist regime, of which he had been a staunch supporter, and was rooted in the neo-Thomistic and integrist context of Father Agostino Gemelli's Catholic University as well as being inspired by Pope Pius XI's 1931 encyclical 'Quadragesimo Anno' and its corporative view of the society. His interpretation of the origins of capitalism was intended to oppose Max Weber's theory and had an international reverberation; his extensive version of the concept of neo-voluntarism allowed him to shift from endorsing the Fascist authoritarian state corporatism to implementing the pluralist corporatism of Republican Italy: He was therefore an important example of the continuity of the Catholic ruling class across the Fascist and Republican era.

#### **Education and Career**

Son of Joseph, solicitor in the Tuscan provincial town of Sansepolcro, and Annarita Leo, of firm Catholic faith, he moved to Arezzo to complete his high school studies, during which he joined the local Azione Cattolica (lay association founded in 1867 to promote Catholic activism in the society, counterbalancing the Pope's hostility to the new secular Italian state). In 1926, he moved to Milan to study economics and social sciences at the Catholic University, where he formed his outlook on economy, society, and politics, graduating in 1930.

His alma mater was a new institution, founded in 1921 by Father Gemelli; supported by Cardinal Achille Ratti, future Pope Pius XI; and inspired by former main Catholic sociologist Giuseppe Toniolo, Pope Leo XIII's personal advisor. Its aim was to forge a new Catholic ruling class, well equipped for the challenges of modern times; its scope was enhanced by the 1929 Lateran Pacts, which, warranting the mutual recognition between the Catholic Church and the Fascist regime, allowed Catholic institutions alone to function outside the regime's own organisations.

Its policy regarding the prerogatives of the state in social and economic matters was outlined by Pope Pius XI's encyclical 'Quadragesimo Anno'. It claimed the traditional Catholic social doctrine to have been the first to oppose liberal 'atomistic' individualism, in favour of a hierarchical, organised, and corporate conception of society that was also adopted by fascist corporatism.

From this perspective, which was also Fanfani's, traditional integrism was combined with an envisaged interventionism of the state; provided that the primacy of Catholic social doctrine be acknowledged, corporatism could become the common ground between Fascism and Catholics. Well entrenched in this background, Fanfani emerged soon as Father Gemelli's trusted man, the dynamic front-runner of his university's new school of economists.

Since 1933, he was appointed the general editor of their prominent academic journal (*Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sciali e Discipline Ausiliarie*, founded by Giuseppe Toniolo) and climbed the steps of an early academic career. He was a free lecturer in the history of economic doctrines in 1933, and three years later, he became full professor, having already published (or about to publish) his seminal works: *Le origini dello spirito capitalistico in Italia*, Milan 1933; *Cattolicesimo e protestantesimo nella formazione storica del capitalismo*, Milan 1934; and the influential textbook *Il significato del corporativismo*, Como 1937.

### **Political Activity**

During the 1930s, Fanfani was a member of the Fascist party and endorsed its politics such as aggression against Ethiopia, eugenics, alliance with Nazi Germany, and intervention in war at its side. During wartime, he gradually began to distance himself from the Fascist regime. In 1941, he participated in private meetings (with Giuseppe Dossetti, Emanuele Lazzati, Giorgio La Pira) that were to originate the new anti-fascist Christian Democratic Party (DC), to which he initially did not adhere.

After a 2-year exile in Switzerland to escape the German occupation of northern Italy, where he studied the thought of personalist philosopher Jacques Maritain, he joined the DC party, placing himself in Dossetti's 'left' wing. Soon, he was

included in the party's central management. On June 2, 1946, he was elected deputy to the Constituent Assembly in charge of writing the new republican constitution, where he played a pivotal role.

From 1947 to 1950, he was minister of labour, implementing a vast plan of public social housing; in successive ministerial reshufflings, he was minister of agriculture and of the interior. He was also the DC's national secretary from 1954 to 1959, with a programme of organisational modernisation, antagonistic competition with the Communist Party, and increased public spending to foster economic and industrial development on a corporatist basis.

In the 1960s, at the height of the Italian 'economic miracle', he was a member in various positions (prime minister, foreign minister) of the centre-left governments that tried to govern the impetuous Italian modernisation, ultimately without achieving full success. His foreign policy was 'neo-Atlanticism': While maintaining the alliance with the United States and the integration in Europe, he opened to the countries of new independence, particularly in the Mediterranean area.

After the hard phase of protest and social conflict of the early 1970s, Fanfani, who had become the senate speaker, took conservative, and unsuccessful, positions, epitomised by his commitment in the referendum for the repeal of the law on divorce in 1974: Its rejection by a large majority of Italians revealed their detachment from the traditional Catholic morals. From the 1980s onwards, even though he remained a very influential member of the party, he no longer dictated the political agenda but instead practiced successfully as a painter. After the dissolution of the DC in 1994, he ended his political activity as a life senator.

# Capitalism, Catholicism, and Corporatism

Fanfani's research efforts have been driven by the major issues of the time, particularly the 1929 Great Depression. His aim was to restore the economic fabric of Western societies affected by impoverishment and unemployment due to the crisis of capitalism. Christian (and fascist) corporatism was instrumental to that end and had been advocated by Fanfani during the interwar years,

acknowledging the economic intervention of the state with an emphasis on the preservation of social hierarchies. Theoretically, his corporatism was based on the rejection of the hedonist, Smithian principle of the 'homo economicus' and of the spontaneous tendency of the market to balance the economic factors.

This view was considered naturalistic, its main flaw being its detachment from ethics, and therefore potentially destructive. Instead, the well-being of the society (initially understood as a national hierarchical order) was paramount, and all the economic subjects, including the state, were bound to pursue it. Fanfani maintained the political nature of economic forces, the primacy of ethics over politics, and the Christian perspective on which to direct action. This was a modernised version of the integrist social doctrine derived from Pope Leo XIII, which aimed to return Western societies entirely to Christian values ('Instaurare omnia in Christo', to establish everything in Christ).

Capitalism, therefore, was considered not as a mere economic system but as an overall social system. The criticism of Max Weber followed integrist lines mentioned earlier: At the roots of the individualist and hedonistic error was the rupture of Christian unity due to the Lutheran Reform, from which descend rationalism, enlightenment, and liberalism. They had also affected Catholic countries, with the inception of the secular state, which deprived the Church of the direction of society. Building the (fascist but, above all, Catholic) corporative state was an unmissable opportunity for placing a set of intermediate bodies between society and the state, to steer both the institutional and social systems towards Christian purposes.

The denial of the spontaneous action of economic factors and the need to address the direction of society and economy to a common (and Christian) goal were at the bottom of Fanfani's Catholic corporatism. The concept was also the basis for his subsequent endorsement to neo-voluntarist theories such as Thornstein Veblen's, which were intended to shape the social and economic order according to social ends.

The same assumption also entailed the acceptance, which was a novelty for Italian Catholics, of the intervention of the state in the

economy, provided that its action be conditioned by politics, in turn, obedient to the dictates of Christian ethics. It also informed his political action in the first 30 years of Republican Italy as well as providing the justification for the protracted occupation of the state institution by the Christian Democratic Party.

Laura Cerasi

See also Catholicism; Integrism; Modernization and Modernity; The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, by Max Weber

#### **Further Readings**

Fanfani, A. (1934). *Cattolicesimo e protestantesimo nella formazione storica del capitalismo* [Catholicism and Protestantism in the historical formation of capitalism]. Milan, Italy: Vita e Pensiero.

Formigoni, G. (2017). Fanfani, Amintore. Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani [Biographical dictionary of Italians]. Rome, Italy: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana Treccani.

Michelagnoli, G., & Fanfani, A. (2010). *Dal* corporativismo al neovolontarismo statunitense [From corporatism to US neo-voluntarism]. Soveria Mannelli, Italy: Rubbettino.

Ornaghi, L. (2011). La concezione corporativa di Amintore Fanfani e il corporativismo dell'età fascista [The corporate conception of Amintore Fanfani and the corporatism of the fascist age]. Bollettino dell'Archivio per la storia del movimento sociale cattolico in Italia [Bulletin of the Archive for the History of the Catholic Social Movement in Italy], 1–2, 171–188.

## **F**EMINISM

The relation between feminism and religion is a complex one. In many cultures, religious institutions have been a key force in regulating women's sexuality and the restriction of women's autonomy. Some have argued that the control of women has been integral to patriarchal, monotheistic religions. Although monotheism posits a particular logic with a patriarchal God justifying the power of men over women and children, oppression of women is not limited to monotheism.

This essay explores (a) examples of religion providing a resource for women seeking autonomy or venues for exercising leadership not generally possible for women in their societies, (b) the uneasy relationship between feminism and religion in the 19th-century U.S. women's movement, and (c) women's struggles for ordination. It then examines the current movement away from essentialist definitions of women and binary understandings of gender and toward an intersectional analysis. The essay ends with a brief discussion of the projects of the Circle of Concerned African Women Theologians and the questions about agency raised within feminism by Muslim women who choose to wear the veil.

# Religion as a Resource for Contesting Gender Oppression

In many religions today, adherents debate whether patriarchal norms embedded in the laws and practices of religions are remnants of the cultures in which the religions originated and can be put aside or essential to their theology and religious practice. Feminists have challenged sexism in religious traditions, but they have also found personal and cultural resources within religion to advance their struggles for rights for women.

Religions have offered sites where women have been able to contest gender-based oppression using the religion's own arguments about morality to push for fairer treatment of women. In religions that posit sacred beings who speak directly to humans, women have sometimes claimed that their demands for women's autonomy were based in messages from the divine.

We see instances of women who argued that their pursuit of holiness was impeded by religious expectations that validated the claims of husbands to sexual services and confined women to caring for their families. Yet these women framed their claims in terms of their own special callings, and they did not necessarily advocate for women as a group. Anchorites, such as Julian of Norwich (1342–1416), renounced female domesticity to live an ascetic life of prayer and contemplation. These individuals withdrew from the world to live in a small cell attached to a church (*anchored* in place).