

HEGEL ON RELIGION AND STATE

by

EDA HAYRİOĞULLARI

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Sabancı University
SPRING 2010

HEGEL ON RELIGION AND STATE

APPROVED BY:

Assistant Prof. Dr. Nedim Nomer
(Thesis Supervisor)

Assistant Prof. Dr. Ayhan Akman

Prof. Dr. Gürol Irzık

DATE OF APPROVAL:

© EDA HAYRİOĞULLARI 2010

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

HEGEL ON RELIGION AND STATE

EDA HAYRİOĞULLARI

Political Science MA Thesis, 2010

Assistant Prof. Dr. Nedim Nomer

Keywords: Hegel, Early Hegel, religion, Christianity, state, secularity, separation of religion and state

This thesis analyzes the relation between religion and state in G. W. F. Hegel's thought. There is an agreement in Hegel literature that Hegel affirms both separability and inseparability of religion and state. This seemingly contradictory affirmation constitutes the main problematic which this work attempts to provide a clarified solution. To understand the true nature of the problem, Hegel's *Early Theological Writings* has been analyzed first. In these works, Hegel identifies the basic principle of Christianity to be freedom but takes state as a coercive institution. To overcome this opposition which is also alienating, Hegel later posits a theory of modern state which is based on freedom. Indeed, this thesis argues that including the earliest writings on religion, Hegel has always argued for separation of religion and state at institutional level, but objected to their opposite conceptions in his later thought. Hegel attempts to resolve this opposition by positing unity of religion and state at historical and metaphysical levels. Historically, modern state is realization of freedom which emerges first in Christianity and shares the same content of truth and same principle of freedom with religion at metaphysical level but has a different form of expression. For Hegel, not their unity of content but different forms should be institutionalized as a political principle. In conclusion, Hegel's state is secular at institutional level but at the level of thought, his understanding of secularity, by providing a common basis to state/religion, reason/faith antitheses, is distinguished from Enlightenment which can not overcome these dichotomies.

ÖZET

HEGEL FELESEFESİNDE DİN VE DEVLET

EDA HAYRİOĞULLARI

Siyaset Bilimi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2010

Yard. Doç. Dr. Nedim Nomer

Anahtar Sözcükler: Hegel, Erken Hegel, Hıristiyanlık, din, devlet, laiklik, din ve devlet işlerinin ayrılması

Bu tez G. W. F. Hegel'in din ve devlet ilişkisiyle ilgili görüşlerini inceler. Hegel üzerine yazılmış kaynaklarda, Hegel'in hem din ve devletin ayrılabilirliğini ve hem de ayrılamazlığını ileri sürdüğü üzerine bir fikir birliği sağlandığı görülmektedir. Hegel'in görünürde bir çelişki olarak ortaya çıkan konu üzerindeki bu tutumu, bu çalışmanın aydınlığa kavuşturacak bir çözüm önerme girişiminde olduğu, temel sorunsalını oluşturur. Problemin gerçek doğasını kavramak için, öncelikle Hegel'in *Erken Teolojik Yazıları* incelenmiştir. Bu eserlerde Hegel Hıristiyanlığın temel prensibini özgürlük olarak belirlerken, devleti temel olarak baskıcı ve zora dayalı bir kurum olarak ele alır. Hegel, geç dönemde aynı zamanda yabancılaştırıcı da olan din ve devlet arasındaki bu karşıtlığı aşmak için, özgürlüğe dayalı bir modern devlet fikri ortaya atar. Bu tez, Hegel'in din üzerine yazdığı en erken eserlerinden itibaren, din ve devletin kurumsal kademede hep ayrılması gerektiğini fakat geç dönem düşüncesinde bu ayrılığın bir karşıtlık olarak düşünülmemesi gerektiğini savunduğunu ileri sürmektedir. Hegel bu karşıtlığı tarihsel ve metafizik kademelerde din ve devlet arası bir birlik ortaya atarak çözmeye çalışır. Hegel'e göre modern devlet; tarihsel olarak, öncelikle Hıristiyanlıkta ortaya çıkan özgürlük prensibinin gerçekleşmesidir. Dinle soyut-metafizik bir düzeyde aynı doğruluk içeriğine ve özgürlük prensibine sahip olmasına rağmen, Hegel'in modern devleti bu ortak içeriğin dinden farklı bir biçimsel ifadesidir. Hegel, din ve devlet arasındaki içeriksel birliğin değil, biçimsel farklılığın, politik bir prensip olarak kurumsallaşması gerektiğini savunur. Sonuçta, Hegel'in devleti kurumsal düzeyde laik bir devlettir fakat düşünce düzeyinde Hegel'in laiklik anlayışı din/devlet, akıl/inanç ikililiklerini aşamayan Aydınlanma düşüncesinden, bu ikililiklere ortak bir zemin sağlamasıyla kendini ayırır.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank to my thesis supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Nedim Nomer for sharing his extensive knowledge on German philosophy and broadening my perspective on political theory by introducing me wide range of ideas, works and authors of the field. Without his patient guidance and deep theoretical insights, the completion of this study would be impossible. I also would like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Ayhan Akman. During my study at Sabancı University, I had the opportunity of attending his lectures, in which I have learnt the fundamentals of critical approach. I have benefited a lot from all these lectures and discussions while writing this thesis. I am also particularly grateful to Prof. Dr. Gürol Irzık, who was a member of the jury, for his careful reading and asking the right questions which helped me to clarify my mind on the basic points of the present work. I also wish to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif Çırakman who introduced me the essence of Hegelian philosophy and made my access possible to difficult and challenging terminology of Hegel.

I owe special thanks to my friend Özge Minare who always believed and encouraged me to finish this work. Finally I can not express my gratitude to my parents for their never ending support and love not only during the course of this work but also during my entire life. Thus, this thesis is dedicated to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2. Legality and Religion in Early Hegel.....	5
2. 1. Folk Religion.....	7
2.2. Autonomy and Authority.....	14
2.3. Community of Love and Law.....	24
CHAPTER 3. Religion at the Foundation of State.....	33
3.1. History, Providence, State.....	33
3. 2. State: Realization of Christian Principle.....	38
3. 3. Unity of Religion and State.....	45
CHAPTER 4. Religion in State.....	54
4.1. System of Right in General and Religion.....	54
4. 1. 1. Abstract Right and Religion.....	55
4. 1. 2. Morality and Religion.....	56
4. 1. 3. Family and Religion.....	58
4. 1. 4. Civil Society and Religion.....	59
4. 2. Separation of Religion and State.....	62
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION.....	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	73

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an attempt of analyzing the complex relation between religion and state in Hegel's thought and is motivated by George Kelly's assertion which suggests that Hegel's discussion of religion and state "encapsulates much of what is most distinctive in Hegel's political philosophical outlook."¹

To start, there seems to be an agreement in the literature that Hegel affirms both separation of religion and state and inseparability of both somehow. Indeed, Paul Franco suggests that;

Hegel's attitude is typically complex. On the one hand, he rejects the Enlightenment liberal idea that church and state should be kept strictly separate. On the other hand he wants nothing to do with theocracy.²

Similarly Timothy Luther, in his *Hegel's Critique of Modernity. Reconciling Individual Freedom and Community* points to the same complexity in Hegel's philosophy and argues that while advocating a certain unity with religion and state; Hegel also recognizes the need for separation between religion and state.³ Moreover according to Walter Jaeschke, Hegel's ideal solution to the problematic relation between religion and state is not a theocratic and ultimately a religious state. But says Jaeschke, it equally stands in contrast to emancipation of autonomous ethical life and rational law from religion.⁴ Furthermore Peter Hodgson approves other authors by asserting that Hegel's

¹ in Paul Franco, , *Hegel's Philosophy of Freedom* (Yale University Press: New Heaven and London, 1999), p. 296

² Ibid, p.296

³ Timothy Luther, *Hegel's Critique of Modernity. Reconciling Individual Freedom and Community* (Lexington Books: Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK, 2009), p. 221

⁴ Walter Jaeschke, "Christianity and Secularity in Hegel's Concept of the State," *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (Apr., 1981), p. 141

state is neither theocratic and nor secularist. According to Hodgson, Hegel's vision of state-religion relationship can not be constructed as in Protestant England in which laws, governmental authority and political constitution derive from God since under this condition; there is no adequate means for preventing the abuses that would result from the conjunction of religious and political power. It is equally not possible to take France as model in which religion and state have different laws and stand in opposition to each other. American model in a similar vain, can not constitute an adequate example of Hegel's vision in which state and religion have been separated but principle of state is not traced back to its ultimate ground; God. For Hodgson, there should be found a form of polity that adequately institutionalizes Hegel's vision of state-religion relationship but Hegel himself does not offer such an alternative.⁵ Moreover Merold Westphal suggests that affirming both separability and inseparability of religion is both the genius of Hegel and constitutes one of his greatest difficulties. According to Westphal, it is important to keep in mind that Hegel has no problem about holding these views simultaneously.⁶ This work affirms that Hegel holds both of these views but *at different levels*.

To understand, how these contradictory attitudes could be held together, starting point will be his earlier writings on religion. This thesis searches for the central problem of Hegel in these so called Theological Writings in Chapter 2. The result of the analysis is that Christianity as the religion of freedom, either in the form of moral autonomy or in the spirit of reconciliation, could not realize its emancipating potential. It either degenerated into an oppressive church or remained alienated from the actual world of politics by positing a Kingdom of God beyond. The real problem of Hegel is alienating aspects of Christianity. This is the opposite of his ideal folk religion which can unite people to public and social life and reconcile them. Second motif and which is at the very root of alienation problem is the opposition of legal/political sphere and religion. This thesis claims that including his very early writings, Hegel has always supported separation of religion and state but objected to their opposition which is alienating. In his early period, Hegel seems to adopt an understanding of state which is primarily

⁵ Peter C. Hodgson, *Hegel and Christian Theology. A Reading of the Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, New York, 2005), p. 196 - 197

⁶ Westphal Merold, *Hegel, Freedom, and Modernity* ((State University of New York Press: Albany, 1992), p. 173

coercive and based on force and a view of Christianity which has freedom as its basis. For overcoming this antithesis, Hegel in his later period will adopt a theory of state which is based on freedom. The emergence of this modern state constitutes the topic of the third chapter.

In the Chapter 3, Hegel's understanding of history is assessed first since modern state has been posited as the goal of history. It is argued that Hegel's history can be read either as only a human history towards more progress and rationality, or as the arena of the realization of divine providence. His easy switch between religious and secular discourses has been emphasized as the focal point. This attempt of Hegel distinguishes him from the Enlightenment, if read as a project of reconciliation of religion with modernity. Second attempt in the third chapter is explaining Hegel's understanding of history as the realization of Christian principle of freedom. His post reformation idea of modern state is based on Christian principle. This might be understood as Christianity historically gave rise to modern state and so fulfilled its historical function. The dialectic in his *Lectures on Philosophy of Religion* which ends in establishment of Ethical Life (*Sittlichkeit*) as a form of cult, and a very limited reference to Christianity in *Philosophy of Right* seems to validate this argument. However, this assumption is rejected by Hegel, himself. Furthermore, two other common grounds of religion and state has been labeled in Hegel's thought and argued for that these arguments in no way gave rise to religious fundamentalism or any kind of theocratic form of polity. One such argument depends on his specific understanding of *Volksgeist* (Spirit of People), shaped primarily by religious conviction of people. It has been claimed by Hegel that religious conviction of people shapes their polity. Protestant conviction gave rise to an understanding of divine earthly realm and most remarkably a divine conception of state for Hegel. Hard and soft readings of this assertion have been debated. Second unity of religion and state has been found in Hegel's conception of truth. By positing that both religion and state are embodiments of truth, it is argued that Hegel establishes an identity between religion and state at metaphysical level. Moreover, by claiming that all religions have the same truth in their content; Hegel similarly recognizes a type of unity among all religions but distinguishes them according to their forms. The pluralist implications of this assertion have been discussed. The chapter concludes by suggesting that it is not the metaphysical unity but formal distinction between religion and state is to be institutionalized.

Fourth chapter first intends to show that none of the institution of Hegel's system of Right is shaped by religious dogma. The moments of the System of Right namely;

abstract right, morality, ethical life (family, civil society and state) are not established according to Christian teaching. Moreover except the long remark of paragraph 270, there is almost no mention of religion in *Philosophy of Right*. Individual appears as a right bearer, moral subject, burgher and citizen but not as believer. Secondly, separation of church and state is discussed in the chapter. It has been reaffirmed that Hegel supports an institutional separation. But at historical and metaphysical levels Hegel tries to synthesize dichotomies of faith/reason, secular/Christian and state/religion.

In the concluding chapter, main points and arguments of the thesis have been reconsidered and its further implications have been stated. The chapter ends with a discussion on Hegel's position with reference to Enlightenment.

CHAPTER 2: LEGALITY AND RELIGION IN EARLY HEGEL

Herman Nohl, edited some earlier manuscripts of Hegel, discovered after his death, which predates his Jena period, and published them under the title *Hegels theologische Jugendschriften in 1907*.⁷ English translation of these earlier manuscripts by Richard Knox appears in 1948 as *Early Theological Writings*. Starting from the title of these manuscripts which Nohl chose to publish under, the character of these early works and Hegel's attitude towards Christianity is highly debated. Some scholars⁸ argued that the title of work is misleading, these earlier manuscripts of Hegel, written during 1793 – 1800, have nothing to do with theology. Hegel's treatment of religion is historical; he focuses on political, economic, social aspects of religious phenomenon. More than theologian, Hegel's attitude is that of an anthropologist of religion. On the other hand, stands the opponents' idea which claims that, although Hegel criticizes the current theology of his time, these works are not anti – theological⁹ or they at least belong to the field of political theology.¹⁰ Although it is not the central problem of this thesis, whether these earlier manuscripts are theological or anti theological, this work implicitly supports the view that Hegel's early writings on Christianity can not be

⁷ *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961) p. v

⁸ Please see Walter A. Kaufmann "Hegel's Early Antitheological Phase," *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (Jan., 1954), pp. 3, 12. Georg Lukács, *The Young Hegel. Studies in the Relationship Between Dialectics and Economics*. (trans) Rodney Livingstone (Merlin Press: London, 1975), p. 64 . Sholomo Avineri, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1972), p. 13

⁹ Raymond Keith Williamson, *Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Religion* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1984), p. 9

¹⁰ William Desmond, *Hegel's God, A Counterfeit Double?* (Ashgate: England, USA, 2003), p.32

subsumed under theology. Hegel's treatment of the subject is both historical and philosophical. Moreover, one who has some acquaintance with the abstract, obscure terminology of Hegel's later works will be surprised with the concrete analysis employed in these works.

Secondly, there is also the debate whether these works are anti-Christian¹¹ in its promise or part of a project of reconsidering and reconstructing the Christian religion which will serve as a basis for his consideration of modern society.¹² This thesis approves that Hegel is critical of religion but this criticism does not end in total rejection of Christianity. On the contrary, Hegel characterizes early Christianity as a religion of freedom in its inception. But, his analysis of the history of Christianity shows that this liberating potential of Christianity is not realized, Christian religion becomes an oppressive force under Roman Catholic Church. Moreover he also argues that since the time of Jesus, Christianity is alienated and alienating from actual world of politics. Therefore, alienation is also a Christian problem. To solve this problem, Hegel will later posit a theory of modern state which is founded on freedom and thus which accords with his understanding of Christianity as the religion of freedom. The role of this religion of freedom in his later understanding of state will be discussed in the fourth chapter of this thesis. In this chapter, I will put emphasize on Hegel's distinction between legal sphere and religion which stand in opposition to one another in his early writings. I will try to show that although Hegel supports the separation of church and state, but he considers it as a problem that separated components are also opposed to each other. His folk-religion, modeled on ancient Greece, reflects his search for a harmonious and integrated relation of religion and legal institutions in a free society.

¹¹ Following works interpret Early Hegel as anti-Christian. See Walter A. Kaufmann "Hegel's Early Antitheological Phase," *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (Jan., 1954), pp. 3, 12. Georg Lukács, *The Young Hegel. Studies in the Relationship Between Dialectics and Economics*. (trans) Rodney Livingstone (Merlin Press: London, 1975), p. 68. Robert C Solomon, *In the Spirit of Hegel. A Study of G.W.F. Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit* (Oxford University Press: Oxford New York, 1983), p. 587

¹² Variances of this line of argument are found for example in: Charles Taylor, *Hegel* (Cambridge University Press: New York, 1977). Raymond Plant, *Hegel* (Routledge: New York, 1999). Laurence Dickey, *Hegel. Religion, Economics, and the Politics of Spirit* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1987)

2. 1 Folk Religion

In his so called Tübingen Essay written in 1793, stayed unpublished during his life-time, Hegel occupies himself in developing a certain understanding of religion which he defines as folk- religion (*Volksreligion*). Analyzing this essay is crucial for a study that engages in explaining the complex relationship between religion and political-social arrangements in Hegel's thought. Indeed, the concept of folk religion is significant primarily because it reflects the centrality of religion in Hegel's thought. Secondly, the essay shows Hegel's critical attitude towards Enlightenment understanding of religion which he associates with Kant's conception of religion within the limits of reason alone. Thirdly, it is his first attempt in defining the role of religion in collective life of people.

To start, Tübingen Essay is rich in analytics of religion. He defines certain ideal types of religion including subjective, objective, public, private, folk, pure rational, positive religions together with fetish faith and superstition. For, the central interest of this section is folk-religion; all these types are not of equal significance. However, since the analysis of subjective/objective dichotomy is constructive for the meaning of folk-religion, it will be the starting point of this analysis.

Objective religion is abstract theology in which understanding and memory are operative powers.¹³ It is the religion which is arranged in one's own mind and organized into a system, expressed in a book and communicated in discourse. It is the religion, says Hegel, that "we are taught at school from youth up."¹⁴ Subjective religion on the other hand, is not the religion of knowledge but of feeling and action. Subjective religion is fully individuated religion which affects individual's feeling and is an active force in his outward behavior.¹⁵ Hegel remarks that his distinction is similar to the distinction suggested by Fichte in the *Kritik aller Offenbarung* between theology and religion.¹⁶

¹³ G. W. F. Hegel, *Unter objektiver Religion (The Berne Plan of 1794)* in Harris H. S., *Hegel's Development Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 508

¹⁴ G. W. F. Hegel, *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 485

¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 484

Distinguishing between objective and subjective religion, Hegel gives his preference to subjective religion over objective one. He notes that;

Everything depends on subjective religion – it is this that has true and genuine worth – let the theologians content about the dogmas, about all that belongs to objective religion; about more precise interpretations of the propositions;....When I speak of religion here, I abstract absolutely from all scientific or, more precisely, metaphysical knowledge of God, and of our relation to him, or that of the whole world, etc. evidence of this sort, with which only the discursive understanding is concerned, is theology not religion any longer. I include here under religion only such knowledge of God and immortality as the need of practical reason demands, and all that in the easily perceived connection with it - Those more precise deductions about special arrangements of God for the benefit of man are not excluded. With the objective religion I am concerned only in as much as it constitutes one factor in subjective religion-¹⁷

Thus, it can be said that for Hegel, religion is primarily a practical, down to earth matter, not an abstract endeavor of technical understanding. In an attempt of contextualizing this attitude of Hegel, Keith Williamson in his *Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Religion* argues that Hegel's experience of theology at Tübingen, which reduced Christianity to a matter of book learning, is responsible for his disdain for contemporary Christianity.¹⁸ More than this but, it would be more appropriate to approach this issue from Hegel's critical engagement with Enlightenment which we can also provide textual support.

Firstly, Hegel's attitude towards religion differs significantly from French *philosophes* who consider religion in terms of superstition. Indeed, Hegel affirms that religion can become mere superstition when religion and fear of god becomes the motive for action in situations where mere prudence should be the guide.¹⁹ Genuine

¹⁶ H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972) p. 129

¹⁷ G. W. F. Hegel, *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), pp. 485 -486

¹⁸ Raymond K. Williamson, *Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Religion* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1984), p. 13

religion on the other hand, must be grounded on reason but this is not enough for Hegel.²⁰ In his attempt of transcending religion of reason, he also distinguishes himself from Kant and Lessing. It is true that he appreciates the works of Enlightenment and mentions Lessing's Nathan as the noble example of them. However enlightenment's understanding of religion has a defect and this is its lack of practicability. Basically, enlightenment is the intent to work through understanding. But, in clarifying and purifying its principles it only serves objective religion.²¹ It is not a force of action and can not influence our lives. In other words, it can not guarantee that its moral principles will be active in life. Similar to Rousseau, he argues that Enlightenment "makes us cleverer but not better."²² Furthermore, if our purpose is to establish human society, there must be universal principles which are not only valid for common sense but also constitute the foundation of every genuine religion. There are few such principles, but they are so general and abstract that they do not correspond to experience and can not be adapted to the living condition of the people easily. Therefore it is impossible to constitute a religion out of universal principle for the general populace. Beside reason, additional elements which appeal to sensible and empirical side of man must be introduced. Apart from Kant's pure respect for the law, man needs other motives which affect his sensibility.²³ Sensibility arose in tendencies among which he mentions compassion, benevolence and friendship.²⁴ Therefore, fundamental principle of man's empirical character is love and love has a common point with reason. In fact, just as reason acknowledges the principles of universally valid laws recognizes itself as a

¹⁹ G. W. F. Hegel, *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 487

²⁰ Ibid. p. 492

²¹ Ibid. p.489

²² Ibid. p. 490

²³ Ibid. pp. 491 - 492, 495

²⁴ D. Joshua, Goldstein *Hegel's Idea of the Good Life*. From Virtue to Freedom, Early Writings and Mature Political Philosophy. Studies in German Idealism. Vol. 7 (Springer: Netherlands, 2006), p. 2

fellow citizen of an intelligible world and know itself in each rational being, love similarly finds itself in other men.²⁵

In short, ideal religion for Hegel would be the one which is founded on reason and in that sense objective but transcend it by appealing to sensible side of man which he defines as compassion, benevolence and friendship and so has practical, subjective and public aspects as opposed to clerical religion. This ideal religion is folk religion which Hegel characterizes as;

Its doctrines must be grounded on Universal Reason
Fancy, heart and sensibility must not thereby go empty away
It must be so constituted that all needs of life- the public affairs of the
State are tied in with it.²⁶

With respect to the first feature of folk religion, Hegel adds that its doctrines, which are grounded on reason, must be simple and humane and also must not be alien to the spiritual culture of people.²⁷ Secondly, these doctrines of religion should not interfere with civic justice or made the basis for a moral censorship in private life. Therefore, the power of the priests will be limited. There can be no room for separate ecclesiastical courts or any religious juridical institution. Moral censorship on the other hand which is detrimental to the natural growth of the personality and spontaneous expression of feelings is also wrong.²⁸

On that account, it can be said that, Hegel distinguishes between legal, private spheres and folk religion. This point becomes more apparent when his division of public/private religion is considered. Indeed, he argues that forming the moral character of individual is the task of private religion together with parental training, personal effort and particular circumstances. On the other hand, folk-religion which itself is a type of public religion is concerned with forming the spirit of people, i. e. the task which folk religion

²⁵ G. W. F. Hegel, *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 496

²⁶ Ibid. p. 499

²⁷ Ibid, p. 500

²⁸ H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 147

shares with political institutions.²⁹ Moreover, the development of individual in accordance with his character is assigned to private religion because there are various ways of developing character and in this experience, only individual can help him. Secondly virtue and comfort in suffering can only be provided by private religion; making them a matter of teaching and preaching produces just the opposite results.³⁰ This distinction of private/public religion echoes Rousseau's distinction between religion of man and religion of citizen. Rousseau in Book VIII of his *Social Contract* defines this distinction in the following way;

The first, without temples, without altars, without rites, limited to the purely internal worship of the supreme God and to the eternal duties of morality, is the pure and simple religion of the Gospel, the true theism, and what may be called the natural divine law. The other, inscribed in a single country, gives to it its gods, its peculiar and tutelary patrons. It has its dogmas, its rites, its external religion prescribed by the laws; outside the single nation which observes it, everything is for it infidel, foreign, and barbarous; it extends the duties and rights of men only as far as its altars. Such were all the religions of early peoples, to which may be given the name of divine law, civil or positive.³¹

Although both Rousseau and Hegel distinguishes between private and public forms of religion, Hegel does not see public religion as a source for law, therefore keeps a autonomous sphere of legality.³² This point is further elaborated in his *1794 Berne Plan (Unter objektiver Religion)*. Accordingly, in that manuscript Hegel argues that public legal system has only legality as its purpose, not morality. No specific institutions are established for the fulfillment of respect for the moral law and of the disposition to fulfill the laws of spirit. Morality is but the supreme purpose of man and religion, among other tendencies, is the most important one in contributing to this.³³ Demarcation

²⁹ G. W. F. Hegel, *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 507

³⁰ Ibid. pp. 497- 498-499

³¹ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and the First and Second Discourses*. (ed) Susan Dunn. (Yale University Press: New Heaven and London, 2002), p. 248

³² Compare Joshua Goldstein argument in his *Hegel's Idea of Good Life* (Springer: Netherlands, 2006), p. 7, which supports that Rousseau's distinction corresponds to Hegel's distinction of subjective/ objective religion.

of legality and religion, whose primary aspect is the nourishment of moral law, is the central motive of Hegel's early writings which will reoccur constantly. However at this point it is crucial to ask that if the sphere of religion and legality are so clearly distinct how it would be possible to link folk-religion with all aspect of public life including all the affairs of state (the third characteristic of folk religion). In fact, although these two spheres have their distinguished purposes, i. e. religion has morality as its purpose and legality is the aim of public legal sphere, Hegel argues that;

The spirit of people, its history, its religion, the level of its political freedom - [these things] can not be treated separately either with respect to their mutual influence, or in characterizing them [each by itself]- they are woven together in a single bond...³⁴

Therefore, we can derive that Folk Religion is part of *Volksgeist*, (spirit of people) and they are in relation of mutual influence. Marcuse in *Reason and Revolution* compares Hegel's use of *Volksgeist* to Montesquieu use of the spirit general of a nation. The national spirit is not a mystic metaphysical entity, but depicts all the natural, technical, economic, moral and intellectual conditions that shape nation's historical development.³⁵

On the other hand, Folk-Religion goes in hand with political freedom because it generates and nourishes noble dispositions.³⁶ Thus in their distinctive purposes, folk religion and legal system mutually influence each other because they are part of the higher unity defined as *Volksgeist*. The aim of folk religion is partly making up the morality of community. It can accomplish its task by making reason sensible and practicable and thus establishing a community of love and virtue. These noble dispositions of community are necessary to sustain a free constitution and thus

³³ G. W. F. Hegel, *Unter objectiver Religion (The Berne Plan of 1794)* in Harris H. S., *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 508

³⁴ G. W. F. Hegel, *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 506

³⁵ Herbert Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution. Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory* (Routledge & Kegan Paul: London, 1955), p. 32

³⁶ G. W. F. Hegel, *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 505

contribute to political freedom. Harris argues that Hegel accepts Kant's regulative idea of holiness but it is *Sittlichkeit* (ethical conduct) that Hegel has in mind as the concrete ideal that can actually be realized. Holiness on the other hand is an infinite process.³⁷

A quite innovative reading of Joshua Goldstein saw in Tübingen Essay, the seed of Hegelian reoccurring idea of being at home in world. He suggests that by stating that 'religion must help man build his own house', Hegel does not talk only metaphorically but also affirms literally that religion is the solution to being at home in the world. Folk religion directs human spirit to this world not some other world, because it is humane. Unity in folk religion is not won against the external world of institutions, but necessitates them (culture, education) for the actualization of human capacities.³⁸

The model he has in mind is the ancient Greek society in which its religious and public institutions are integrated into a harmonious whole. With respect to the three requirements of folk-religion; reasonability, sensibility and publicity, Harris develops a model. He argues that minimum standard of rationality is met by Jewish religion. Secondly Catholicism especially satisfies the second requirement of sensibility. But publicity, the linkage with all the needs of life and public affairs, is only accomplished by Greeks.³⁹

In Tübingen Essay, Hegel refers to Greek faith and takes the model of popular festival of Greeks which are at the same time religious festivals in the honor of a god as a model for the ceremonies of folk religion.⁴⁰ However, depending on the necessity that he attributes to private religion, I argue that early religious thought of Hegel also implicitly deviates from Greek ideal.

³⁷ H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972) pp. 149, 142

³⁸ . Joshua Goldstein, *Hegel's Idea of the Good Life. From Virtue to Freedom, Early Writings and Mature Political Philosophy. Studies in German Idealism. Vol. 7* (Springer: Netherlands, 2006), pp. 26, 34, 37, 38

³⁹ H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972) p. 145

⁴⁰ G. W. F. Hegel, *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), pp. 501, 505

Lastly, in this section it is also urgent to refer to the eligibility of Christian religion as a folk-religion. In Berne Plan of 1794, Hegel identifies Christianity as a private religion. He states that it is not designed for imagination as with the Greeks, it is a sad and melancholic religion, its ceremonies lost their spirit and it commands withdrawal from public affairs.⁴¹

In summary, folk religion is an ideal form of religion which is conducive to build a community of virtue and love. This religion does not stay external to other public institutions but constitutes the belief of a fully integrated and harmonious society. This ideal society heavily draws upon ancient Greece. However, since there is room for individual private faith, it has been argued that it transcends the Greek ideal as well. Folk religion, has its purpose of building a communal morality, and in turn does contribute to political freedom by creating noble dispositions in people. Legal and religious institutions vary in their purposes but mutually reinforce each other and together make up the spirit of people. Christianity in this discussion appears as a private religion and could not be integrated to public affairs in its essence. Next two section of this work deals with Christianity and its relation to civil and legal sphere in Hegel's early works in a more detailed manner. The section titled as *Autonomy and Authority*, on the whole, discusses the distinction between Christianity as the moral religion of freedom and its degeneration into a political organization. The last section of this chapter; *Community and Law* put emphasis on Hegel's elevation of early Christianity above both legality and morality.

2.2 Autonomy and Authority

During his stay in Berne (1793- 1796) as a private tutor, Hegel has continued to think and write on Christianity, later his essays of this period are collected and reconstructed under the title; *Positivity of Christian Religion* (Positivity). This work is inconsistent especially when the divergent and contradictory analysis of Christian religion that is given in the main text of Positivity and the later added part; *How Christianity Conquered Paganism* are considered. In this later added part, Hegel is more critical of Christian religion which he thinks that suited for the needs of corrupt and

⁴¹ G. W. F. Hegel, *Unter objectiver Religion (The Berne Plan of 1794)* in Harris H. S., *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 509

unfree people, whereas in the main text of *Positivity*, Hegel talks of Christian religion, at least in its earliest inception, as the religion of freedom

In this section, I will first start from the added part of *Positivity* essay; *How Christianity Conquered Paganism*. In this part, emergence of Christian religion is linked to the fall of Ancient Greece and Roman Republic and rise of Rome as an empire. This corresponds to loss of freedom and emergence of Christianity as a slave religion. Secondly I will turn to the analysis of the main text of *Positivity* essay. In *Positivity* briefly, Hegel compares two types of religion; one based on autonomy and other on authority by which he means positive religion. Christianity degenerates, throughout its history into a positive; authoritarian form of religion, the excess point of which is church's subordination of civil state and appearance of itself as a political/legal institution.

To start, Hegel describes Greeks and Romans as free men and their religion which is suitable for free people only. Indeed;

As free men the Greeks and Romans obeyed laws laid down by themselves, obeyed men whom they had themselves appointed to office, waged war on which they had themselves decided, gave their property, exhausted their passions, and sacrificed their lives by thousands for an end which was their own. They neither learned nor thought [a moral system] but evidenced by their actions the moral maxim (222) which they could call their own. In public as in private and domestic life, every individual was a free man, one who lived by his own laws⁴².

Therefore Greeks and Romans were autonomous people in their implicit morality and democratic in their political constitution. Their free spirit was further integrated by their religion.⁴³ In his idealizing Greek and Romans but, as Lukács once has noted, Hegel totally disregard slavery at this point. According to Lukács, Hegelian conception of classical society is classless. But as soon as class distinctions emerged, the freedom came to an end.⁴⁴ In line with Lukács' comment, Hegel adopts a materialist explanation

⁴² G. W. F. Hegel, *The Positivity of Christian Religion in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), p. 154

⁴³ *Ibid*, p. 154

⁴⁴ Georg Lukács, *The Young Hegel. Studies in the Relationship Between Dialectics and Economics*. (trans) Rodney Livingstone (Merlin Press: London, 1975), p. 48

for the fall of Roman Republic. In fact, he asserts that emergence of an aristocracy of wealth and military glory is the reason behind the end of autonomy in Roman Republic.⁴⁵ Moreover, the imperial ambitions of Ancient Rome; the subjection of number of states from both east and west to its power, has furthered this process. Imperial Rome, with its aristocracy of wealth is no longer a free state. Quoting Montesquieu, Hegel affirms that Rome lost its republican virtue which was being ready to give one's life for an ideal. This in turn, prepared the way to the rise of individualism, which characterized the spirit of citizens in Imperial Rome. What happened was that citizens could no longer see the state as product of their own labor. This new mechanical state, as Hegel describes it, treats each individual as cogs in a machine. Individual can no longer relate himself to the state; the administration of which is now secured in the hands of small number of rulers.⁴⁶ Loosing his connection with the whole, citizen was compelled to work for himself or for some other individual. Political freedom was lost and replaced by mere right of property. Individual, alienated from his fellows, feels the terror of death which he had little idea previously, and this profoundly alters individual's relationship with his own existence. This new existence requires a different conception of deity which will appear as an alien, infinite master.⁴⁷ During the Republican period, citizens did not need to seek refuge in their gods in front of death, since the republic survived them. Thus, under the despotism of Roman rulers, which alienated citizens not only from the political life, but also from their entire existence, emerges Christian God. The realization of autonomy can no longer be willed but wished for from a divine being in a passive mood. This divine being in Christian religion, which shares nothing in common with human beings, has the right to all legislation. Moral autonomy is not a law of man but becomes exclusively a divine trait. Christian consciousness becomes an unhappy consciousness which expect happiness in some other world. The idea of church replaces the free polity and church is intimately linked

⁴⁵ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Positivity of Christian Religion* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), p. 155

⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 154 – 156

⁴⁷ Hegel will later attribute these traits of God, to the conception of deity in Judaism. See Hegel G. W. F., *The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), pp. 182 – 205. See in this work section 2.3

to heaven.⁴⁸ Christians are not interested in state which they are not active in its workings, but in the transcendent Kingdom of God. Kojève in his analysis of the *Phenomenology of Spirit* argues that unhappy consciousness is the slave consciousness of Christianity. Christian tries to flee from slavery by creating another world in which his master and himself are equal in front of God. But Christian only frees himself from his human master by subjection to a divine master. Apart from freeing himself, the entire essence of Christian becomes slavery. Christian slave is more slave than pagan slave since he is mastered both in his inner essence and outer existence. According to the reading of Kojève, overcoming this opposition is only possible by acceptance of death and by implication atheism. For Kojève, the dialectic in world history takes the direction towards atheistic awareness of essential finiteness of human existence.⁴⁹ Hegel but, did never further his criticism of Christianity to the level of atheism. Firstly, later in his *Philosophy of History* he argues that under Christianity, slavery is impossible, since in principle man is man before God. Greek independent subjectivity, on the other hand is still conditioned by slaves and oracles.⁵⁰ But this does not mean that, Christianity never become authoritarian in its history. His early writings emphasize mostly the oppressive and alienating forms that Christianity takes until modern times. He opposed to the doctrine of two-separate kingdoms; Augustinian⁵¹ understanding of purely secular world which has no spiritual aspects and which transforms Christian into an exile in this world. But if finding an identity with god and world is a kind of atheism, Hegel would certainly be a candidate. In fact, this is the charge against Spinozism in Hegel's life time. Hegel however while considering Spinoza in his *Encyclopedia*, rejects to consider this affirmation as a form of atheism. He argues that;

⁴⁸ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Positivity of Christian Religion* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), pp. 157, 162, 158, 160, 162

⁴⁹ Alexandre Kojève, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel. Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*. (ed) Allan Bloom. (trans) James H. Nichols (Cornell University Press: Ithaca, London, 1980), pp. 55 - 57

⁵⁰ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 351-352

⁵¹ Emmet Kennedy, *Secularism and Its Opponents from Augustine to Solzhenitsyn* (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006), p. 17

A philosophy which affirms that God and God alone is should not be stigmatized as atheistic, when even those nations which worship the ape, or the cow, or the image of stone and brass are credited with some religion.⁵²

Furthermore, whether Hegel rejects the Christianity or defending it in a way is the point where his followers begin to diverge as Left and Right Hegelians. Left upholds that Hegelian conception of Christianity is secular in its content, whereas Right reads Hegel as providing a rational basis to traditional Christianity.⁵³ This thesis contents to show that Hegelian Christianity significantly differs from traditional Christianity. Hegel's central problem is Christian in its origin; deportation of Christian in this world. But the solution he offers, is arguably the one in which Christianity has a very limited practical role. On the other hand but, furtherance of Left position to the point of materialist atheism has limited textual support in Hegel's early writings. As Birchall has argued Hegelian critique of religion is a critique in Heideggerian sense; a two sided process of distangling of truth from error, not only fault finding.⁵⁴ Truth of Christianity in the main text of Positivity appears as moral autonomy which will be discussed below.

In the main text of Positivity essay, Hegel talks about Jesus intention to be establishment of moral autonomy. But the history of Christianity is the story of the loss of this autonomy, the culmination of which is the degeneration of church from a community of friendship into a state. In the essay, Christian religion in its seminal form is conceived in term freedom. It is contrasted with positive faith which grounds itself on authority.⁵⁵ It is also important to emphasize that state in abstraction is not a self-actualizing agent of freedom in this early period of Hegel. In *German Constitution*

⁵² G. W. F. Hegel, *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. [Third and final edition of 1830] (trans) William Wallace (1873) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/index.htm> (16.10.2009), p 48

⁵³ B. C. Birchall, *Hegel's Critique of Religion* in *G. W. F. Hegel. Critical Assessments*. (ed) Robert Stern. Volume IV (Routledge: London, New York, 1993), p. 495

⁵⁴ Ibid. pp. 494- 495

⁵⁵ Hegel's distinction between moral faith and positive faith can be based on Kant's distinction between autonomy and heteronomy. Indeed autonomous will, the supreme principle of morality, has the ground of law in reason whereas heteronomy is resting law on an authority external to reason. See. Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (trans) H. J. Paton. (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1964), p. 108

which he started to write two years after Positivity essay reflects his idea of state as necessarily a positive institution. Indeed, at that period Hegel argued that only a mass of people can be accepted as state if it forms a common military force and political authority.⁵⁶ His notion of law approximates to legal positivism in its strict demarcation between civil law and morality and in its emphasis on the author but not the content of law while describing the civil law.

Hegel in this essay make Jesus preacher of Kantian morality.⁵⁷ According to him, in the teaching of Jesus, fundamental condition of God's favor was following the moral law which one himself is the author. Jesus for Hegel "undertook to raise religion and virtue to morality and to restore morality to the freedom which is its essence... instead of obedience, he ascribed value to moral law."⁵⁸ But although, the aim of Jesus was autonomy; virtue that is grounded not on authority but which emerges from man's own being, he has to insert some positive elements to his teaching due to the condition of Jewish society at his time. Indeed, Jewish people for Hegel were not capable of understanding this call of Jesus, so he had to apply to miracles, and appeal to their Messianic hope. Miracles became the basis of faith in Jews and Jesus who performed them, appeared as the authority of the new religion. Secondly, Jews could accept a teaching which is different then their own only if it was presented by awaited Messiah who would rebuild Jewish state from its foundation. The religious and moral commands of Judaism was at the same time law of the land and laws of that kind, suggests Hegel, can only produce legality not morality. Jesus, who intends to change their attitude of

⁵⁶ G. W. F Hegel, *German Constitution* (1798- 1802) in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Lurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), p.16

⁵⁷ We know that approaching Christianity from Kantian perspective was adopted by some teachers of Hegel in Tübingen *Stiff*. A young tutor, Immanuel Diez, declared Kant as the true messiah and Jesus as the betrayer of reason. See H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development to 1807* in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993), p. 27. Please also see Laurence Dickey, *Hegel. Religion, Economics, and the Politics of Spirit* (Cambridge University Pres: Cambridge, New York, 1987), pp. 157- 158

⁵⁸ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Positivity of Christian Religion* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), pp. 69 – 70

mind showed that morality can contradict with what was required by the civil laws and those religious commands which had become civil laws. He tried to show that observance of these commands is not the essence of virtue but only acting out of respect for duty that man can become virtuous.⁵⁹ However to change their mind, Jesus himself had to introduce authority of his personality into his teaching as a messiah who could perform miracles. This is the first element of positivity which has its source in Jesus himself.

Second element of positivity, comes from disciples. For Hegel, disciples lack spiritual energy of their own and are heavily dependent on Jesus. They did not attain freedom and truth by their own labor but through Jesus. They tried to understand and protect this doctrine of Jesus faithfully and transmit it to others without any addition and transformation.⁶⁰ This was the only way of establishing Christianity as a public religion. Hegel contrasts the disciples with the pupils of Socrates and asserts that the latter had their own distinctive aims and used their own capacities and established their own schools. As Harris has noted, they did not isolate themselves from their public and private lives as did the disciples of Jesus.⁶¹ Moreover the command to spread the doctrine of Jesus and his name, make disciples of Jesus authoritative figures. This command is the second step in rise of Christianity as a positive religion.

The third element of positivity comes from expansion of Christianity. The section of Positivity essay titled as *What is Applicable in a Small Society is Unjust in a State* explains the negative results of this expansion.⁶² For Lukács, Hegel here relies on Rousseau's idea of quantitative changes bring about qualitative differences in democracies. Rousseau argued in *Social Contract* that quantitative expansion of democracy can be quite dangerous and fatal for democracies. Lukács suggests that this idea is taken from Rousseau by Hegel, and is applied to Christianity.⁶³ Indeed, Hegel argues that:

⁵⁹ Ibid. pp. 70 – 79, 99

⁶⁰ Ibid. p .81

⁶¹ H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 217

⁶² G. W. F. Hegel, *The Positivity of Christian Religion in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), p. 86

Purely as a result of the fact that the number of the Christians increased and finally comprised all the citizens in the state, ordinances and institutions, which hurt no one's right while the society was still small, were made political and civil obligations which they could never in fact become.⁶⁴

The early Christian community was a community of friendship based on shared faith. The main traits of this community were common ownership of goods and equality. Hegel suggest that canceling of property suits well to the man who has no possessions, but is a serious problem who had property and for whom this was the whole sphere of his activity before joining to the community. This principle of common ownership could not be retained. If it was retained, this would be detrimental to the further expansion of Christianity. But free offerings, as a means of buying place from heaven, is introduced instead. Not to mention improving the condition of poor, says Hegel, these free offerings of charity did only enrich monasteries, churches and priests and made rest of mankind beggars. Moreover, the meaning of equality has also changed over time. Equality was the principle of the early Christians. Slave was brother of his master. The value of man was not to be found in honors, dignity, talents etc. but only in faith. This principle did not disappear but started to be understood as equality in the eyes of heaven which has little earthly implications.⁶⁵ Moreover, growth of Christian community into a universal church made what was once a matter of free will, an obligation. Indeed, confession of one's fault was not a voluntary act of disclosure to a close friend but became a duty of every citizen of this spiritual state. Secondly, early Church was a kind of representative republic, for Hegel.⁶⁶ Each congregation had the right to choose its own bishops. But "when church expanded and became a state, this right was lost."⁶⁷ Church by becoming a state turns out to be a source of rights and duties, parallel to civil state. Its chief aim is surveillance of Christian morality. It has power to punish sinful impulses and thoughts which is outside the scope of state. If a crime against temporal state is also a sin, it is punished by

⁶³ Georg Lukács, *The Young Hegel. Studies in the Relationship Between Dialectics and Economics*. (trans) Rodney Livingstone (Merlin Press: London, 1975), p. 63

⁶⁴ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Positivity of Christian Religion in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), p. 87

⁶⁵ Ibid. pp.87 - 89

⁶⁶ Ibid, pp. 104, 120

⁶⁷ ibid. p. 104

church as well. In canon law says Hegel; the list of punishments is endless. However, this spiritual state now produces the opposite of the basic promise. State has legality as its proper aim for Hegel. But it is state's greatest interest to ensure that its citizens are also morally good. Doing this directly, by enacting laws on morality is a contradiction since morality is following one's own reason, not observing the commands of laws created by civil authority. Enforcing the ordinances of religion as civil laws is contradictory in a similar vein. It is therefore the very condition of autonomy that state and religion should be separated. But as it is the interest of state that its citizens should also be moral and religion is the best way of ensuring this, state needs help of religion indirectly. Religious community of a small size; as a bond of friendship, could only realize this objective by means of mutual encouragement and reward without doing harm to rights of other individuals and state.⁶⁸ In brief, Hegel suggests that to perform its true function church must return to its original form. Otherwise there will always be conflict between church and civil state which are detrimental to the rights of individuals. As parallel legislative powers, civil state and church are by nature incompatible. As an executive power Catholic Church claims independence of civil state. Protestant church on the other hand, has subordinated itself to the civil state but when there is a contradiction between church and state, it is always civil state which had to sacrifice its right in both protestant and catholic countries.

Further problem arises when all the members of state are united in a church. Such a society has right to exclude anyone who does not consent to its laws. Church in such society claims right to exclude any citizen who does not adopt its faith and since the church embraces the whole state, the dissenter is also excluded from the civil state as well. Moreover, Hegel's conception of state in Positivity essay is interestingly quite liberal. State is a contract of all with all to create a legal system for protection of personality and property and this has nothing to do with religious opinion of individuals. But when church's right as an ecclesiastical state prevails over the civil state, the civil rights of individuals are invaded and this is the case in both catholic and protestant states. Dissenters in these states can not acquire real estate, hold public office and can be subjected to a different treatment of taxation. Although asserting that Protestant countries are much tolerant in these matters, Hegel did not exclude them from his criticism of violation of rights. Indeed, in protestant countries failure to attend public worship on

⁶⁸ *ibid.* pp. 104 -106, 97 – 98, 102

repetition meant punishment for Jews.⁶⁹ But apart from this, says Hegel, protestant church did not go beyond its limits.

Further conflict arises between church and state in matters of education. Hegel argues that granting the duty to educate children in the hands of church is detrimental to man's free development. This duty is imposed primarily on families and state, but state had transferred this responsibility to church. Church educates child to believe in faith, whereas reason and intellect are not trained to develop their own principles. In fact, church's educational methods substitute reason and intellect to religious speculation and fill the imagination with terrors of other world. Reason and intellect are deprived of their freedom. This for Hegel, is not education but the very violation of right to education.⁷⁰

To sum, Hegel argues that when church grows from a small community of believers and acquire state like characteristics, it becomes an oppressive institution and deviates from the real message of Jesus.⁷¹ Christians, under the authority of Roman Catholic Church is reverted back to the position of Jews whose character is mostly shaped by obedience to authority. This has been detrimental to the development of autonomous spirit which Hegel attributes to Jesus. Christianity but event went further than Judaism, in the sense that Judaism commands only actions but church try to control by prescribing laws for every mode of thinking, feeling, being and acting.⁷² For autonomous individual to emerge, church must be restored to its original form. Sectarian tendencies in the middle ages and modern times are attempts of returning to the original message of Christianity, but it is inevitable that these sects also lean towards

⁶⁹ Ibid. pp. 105 -109, 131

⁷⁰ Ibid. pp. 114 - 115

⁷¹ Ibid. p. 135

⁷² This analysis belongs to Moses Mendelsshonn, 18th Jewish century philosopher. Nohl asserts that arguments presented in Positivity, after section 21 is based on *Mendelsshonn's Jerusalem* see. Hegel G. W. F. , *The Positivity of Christian Religion in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), footnote 13, p.95. See also, Hegel G. W. F. , *The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), footnote 17, p. 195

ecclesiastical state all over again.⁷³ Here, Hegel seems to accept that positivity is inevitable. Accordingly, Avineri argues that Hegel in his later period admits the immutable patterns of history and cancels the criticism of positivity.⁷⁴ In the collection of essays titled as *the Spirit of Christianity and its Fate*, beside positivity of Christianity, the alienation, as a distinct condition of unfreedom is also attributed to Christianity. Besides, Hegel profoundly transforms his hierarchy of morality, religion and legality in that work.

3) Community of Love and Law

Spirit of Christianity and its Fate is the last manuscript in Hegel's pre-Jena period that deals with Christianity in a detailed manner. This essay is written during 1798 – 1799, while Hegel was working as a private tutor in Frankfurt. In this manuscript Hegel no longer equates morality with religion as opposed to legality, but elevates religion above both morality and legality. It appears to Hegel that Kantian morality, in its taking reason as the authority and suppression of inclinations, is also positive and therefore does not differ much from legality. Jesus, on the other hand, rises above both moral law and civil law through love and reconciliation. The history of Christianity is more or less the same; its liberating potential is not realized. However, this time, he does not emphasize oppressive church but the tendency of Christianity to alienate itself from the actual world of politics since the time of Jesus. But the pure example of alienated spirit is Jewish spirit, for Hegel. I will first start from his criticism of Jewish spirit and then turn to his renewed understanding of morality, religion and legality. Lastly, the conditions of the alienation of the community of love from actuality and possible solutions to this problem will be discussed.

Hegel traces history of Judaism back to Noah. Noah, for Hegel, saved himself from the hostile power of nature by subjecting both himself and nature to something more powerful. This new powerful being promised Noah that no flood would destroy

⁷³ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Positivity of Christian Religion* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), p. 142

⁷⁴ Avineri Sholomo, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1972), p. 28

mankind ever again if they set themselves within their limits. The mankind was subjected to the law of this new being (god) which commands them not to kill each other. Transgressing this command was to fall under the power of this being and losing one's life. The servitude of mankind to this new alien being is recompensed by 'being given mastery over animals' Hegel reads this new mastery over nature that is conceived as hostile, as alienation from nature. Abraham furthers this process by alienating man from man and man from god. In Hegel's mind, Abraham has an alienated personality. He left his country, family and kins 'to be a wholly self-subsistent, independent man, to be an overlord himself. In his encounters with strangers he kept his relation on legal base and did not go beyond that.⁷⁵ Hegel describes Abraham in the following way;

He was a stranger on earth, a stranger to the soil and to man alike. Among man he always was and remained a foreigner, yet not so removed from them and independent of them that he needed to know nothing of them whatever, to have nothing whatever to do with them.⁷⁶

Abraham, having such a personality, did come up with an idea of god that has nothing in common with world. According to Hegel;

The whole world of Abraham regarded as simply his opposite; if he did not take it to be a nullity; he looked on it as sustained by the God who was alien to it. Nothing in nature was supposed to have any part in God; everything was simply under God's mastery.⁷⁷

Moses, on the other hand, who appears as the liberator of Judaism, did nothing but furthered this process of alienation, says Hegel. Quoting from Hegel;

The liberator of this nation was also its lawgiver; this could only mean that the man who had freed it from one yoke had laid it on it other. A passive people giving laws to itself would be a contradiction.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ G. W. F. Hegel. , *The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), pp. 184 - 185

⁷⁶ Ibid. p.186

⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 187

⁷⁸ Ibid. p. 191

Sanctions of the Law of Moses were loss of pleasure and fortune. Hegel thinks, quite prejudicially, that this terror of physical force is consistent with the image of their slavish spirit. What Jews wanted was only possession of land and posterity, for Hegel. They did not rise above the physical existence. The existence of god was not a truth but a command for them. After the death of Moses, Jews lived for a while independently and then throughout their long history, they were mostly subjected to foreign nations. According to Hegel, the slave-like faith of Jews has its source in their conception of god as an alien being. What hold Jews together were, chains; laws given to them by this superior power. They did not make any distinction between religious, moral and civil laws and all were equally positive; coming from an alien god which stands in absolute opposition to human beings.⁷⁹

Jesus came to scene in this condition of slavery and opposed to Jewish fate wholly. As Harris has rightly asserted; Jesus opposed to the whole spirit of opposition and to that effect, he is also opposed to the faith of Judaism.⁸⁰ Against purely positive commands of Jews, Jesus set the principle of subjectivity. What Jesus demanded was the “elevation above the sphere of rights, justice, equity and property.”⁸¹ Moreover, Hegel describes the spirit of Jesus which goes also beyond the morality, therefore strictly deviates from his commitment to Kant in Positivity essay. Indeed, Hegel argues that;

...but he (Jesus) took a different attitude to those laws which from varying points of we call either moral or civil commands. Since it is natural relations which these express in the form of commands, it is perverse to make them wholly or partly objective.⁸²

Hegel defines law as unification of opposites in a concept. As a concept, but law exist in opposition to reality and has the form of *ought*. The moral law unifies the opposite powers of individual in thinking, whereas in civil law clashing interests of individuals, groups are united by an external force. Hegel argues, contrary to his previous

⁷⁹ Ibid. pp. 195-196, 200, 240, 206

⁸⁰ H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 333

⁸¹ G. W. F. Hegel. , *The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), pp. 209, 222

⁸² ibid. p. 209

position that acting out of respect for moral law does not make one autonomous. It is not the case that one who obeys civil law is slave, and other who listens the commands of his reason, is free. The only difference between them is that while the former has his lord outside, the other let himself to be mastered inside.⁸³ According to Kant one should act out of respect for duty no matter what his inclination is. Kant argues that an action done for the sake of duty has to set aside all the effect of inclination and every object of will until there is nothing left to determine the will except its own maxim.⁸⁴ But Jesus, tells Hegel, can not act in accordance with the duty and contradict inclination because both inclination and duty are part of the spirit. Therefore, Jesus is;

...a spirit raised above morality, is visible, directly attacking laws, in the Sermon on the Mount, which is an attempt, elaborated in numerous examples, to strip the laws of legality, of their legal form. The Sermon does not teach reverence for the laws; on the contrary, it exhibits that which fulfills the law but annuls law and so higher than obedience to law and makes law superfluous. Since the commands of duty presuppose a cleavage [between reason and inclination] and since the domination of concept declares itself in a “thou shalt” that which is raised above this cleavage is by contrast an “is”, a modification of life...⁸⁵

This point is important since the first traces of dialectics are manifested which will be central to his mature thought, as Dallmayr has pointed out.⁸⁶ What Hegel ascribes to Jesus, namely; ‘unification of inclination with the law whereby the latter loses its form as law’ is a dialectical process in the sense that opposites are united, in the higher reality of life. Indeed here, *ought* is replaced by an ‘*is*’ and ‘*is*’ for Hegel is the synthesis of subject and object where they loose their opposition. Accordingly, virtue is a synthesis in which both subject as a particularity and law, as universal, lose their

⁸³ *ibid.* p. 209- 211

⁸⁴ . Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (trans) H. J. Paton. (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1964), p. 68

⁸⁵ G. W. F. Hegel. , *The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), p. 212

⁸⁶ R. Fred Dallmayr, *G.W.F. Hegel: Modernity and Politics. Modernity and Political Thought Volume 3* (Sage Publications: California, 1993), p. 35

opposition. For Hegel, Kant could not resolve this opposition, in his conception of virtue, universal becomes the master and particular the mastered. This is the spirit of reconcilability of Jesus in which the law loses its form and the concept is displaced by life. Jesus did not oppose Jewish complete subjection under an alien lord by subjecting particular beings to their own moral law. What he thought was virtues without authority, virtues which are modifications of love. Reconciliation in love is liberation in contrast to Jewish reversion to obedience. This spirit cancels the whole authority and establishes a living bond of love among human beings which now Hegel considers to be the highest freedom. Love itself can not be commanded since it annuls all authority. Hegel defines love as “sensing of a life similar to one’s own, not a stronger or a weaker one.”⁸⁷ This new perspective of Hegel which identifies freedom not with moral autonomy but with love needs to be stressed. Harris suggests that for understanding the centrality of love, we should consider Plato’s *Symposium and Phaedrus* and romantic Spinozism of Hegel’s own time. Harris claims that Hegel, similar to Plato, believes that love is the most significant manifestation of reason as a living bond. Moreover, the affinity to the Christian doctrine of ‘God is love’ is quite apparent. But according to Harris, Hegel is not thinking primarily in terms of this doctrine.⁸⁸ Richard Kroner on the other hand reads this twist of Hegel as a significant shift of perspective from that of enlightenment to romanticism.⁸⁹ Charles Taylor in a different context argued that Hegel’s work in general, is an attempt of combining the two aspirations of Romantic generation which are specified as aspiration to radical autonomy and expressive unity with nature and society.⁹⁰ It is true that Hegel shares with early romantics these aspirations but in the context of this chapter, it is also important to point out different attitudes that late Romantics’ and Hegel adopted

⁸⁷ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), pp. 214-215, 244, 241, 247

⁸⁸ H. S. Harris, *Hegel’s Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972) pp. 326, 295

⁸⁹ Richard Kroner, *Introduction* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961) p. 8

⁹⁰ Charles Taylor, *Hegel and Modern Society* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1979), p. 69

towards religion. Indeed, after the disappointment of French revolution romantics turn back to church and monarchy as true models of institutions during the restoration period. The ideal church was that of medieval church.⁹¹ Moreover as a reaction to rationalism they converted to Catholicism and blamed Protestantism for breaking the organic development of humanity. Hegel on the other hand has always valued Protestantism as a world historical event that contribute to the actualization of freedom in world which was the initial trust of Christianity, and interpreted Romantics' conversion to Catholicism as a voluntary acceptance of intellectual servitude.⁹² Thus, in his emphasis on love in this essay, it is true that Hegel comes close to Romantics, but this shift of emphasis does extend to the point of abjuring his trust on reason that he shares with enlightenment. In fact, love for Hegel is not absolutely a religious action. But religious is fulfillment of love. It is the unification of reflection and love in thought.⁹³ Hegel is not arguing against reflective rationality here, but wants to transcend it by love and make the promise of reason real in life through reconciliation. Furthermore, Hegel's idea of divine is similar to his conception of love. Hegel suggests that 'the activity of the divine is only a unification of spirits.'⁹⁴ The divine is pure life and it is free from any opposition. The divine is God as spirit. God as spirit is not an alien lord as in Judaism. The conception of Jesus' relationship to God in terms of father and son reveals this in the way that they are not of opposite essences but the modifications of the same essence. Jesus is not only son of God, but is also son of man. There is no opposition between divine and man; divine appears in the shape of a man. For Hegel, we can have faith in the divine if we have something divine in

⁹¹Dieter Sturma, *Politics and the New Mythology: the Turn to Late Romanticism in The Cambridge Companion to German Idealism*. (ed) Karl Amerix (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 2000), p. 220, 231

⁹² Kenneth Westphal, *The Basic Context and Structure of Philosophy of Right*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993), p. 240

⁹³ G. W. F. Hegel. , *The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate in On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961), pp. 248, 253

⁹⁴ Ibid. p. 255

ourselves.⁹⁵ The kingdom of god is not heaven but is the development of the divine among men, the living unity of men with his fellows in God. Indeed;

In the Kingdom of God what is common to all is life in God, love, a living bond which unites the believers, it is the feeling of unity of life, a feeling in which all opposition, all pure enmities, and also rights are annulled... They make up not a collection but community since they are unified not in a concept but through life and love... This idea of Kingdom of God completes and comprises the whole of the [Christian] religion as Jesus founded it.⁹⁶

This Kingdom of God which Hegel takes to be the worldly community of love united in God could not be realized in its full potential in this world, because Jesus' relation with state was passive, and so a crucial part of freedom was lost. In fact, reaction of Pharisees (Jews of Jesus' time) to the call of Jesus was indifference and hostility. Jesus did not attempt to reconcile himself with all of them but restricted himself to the working on few individuals. Subjection to Roman taxation like Jews, although was a contradiction, Jesus again made no resistance. Instead, he adopted the principle of giving unto Caesar what is Caesar's and started to talk about the Kingdom of God as not of this world. Accordingly, the citizens of the Kingdom of God became private persons, excluding themselves from a hostile state.⁹⁷ Hegel describes this fate of Christianity in the following way;

“Since the state was there neither Jesus nor his followings could annul it, the fate of Jesus and his followings remains a loss of freedom.”⁹⁸

It is a loss of freedom since, there is an element of opposition introduced here, between God and world, between terrestrial city and city of god and this is contrary to the spirit of Jesus in Hegel's mind who attempted to transcend all opposition through reconciliation and love. In all forms of Christian faith, including Protestantism, this opposition between god and word is upheld.⁹⁹ How this opposition between kingdom of god and the earthly state would be overcome, becomes the central problem of Hegel

⁹⁵ Ibid. pp. 255, 260-262, 266

⁹⁶ Ibid. pp. 278

⁹⁷ Ibid. pp. 283-284

⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 284

⁹⁹ Ibid. p.301

in his early period that he will attempt to solve in his mature philosophy. One way of overcoming the opposition is annulling state totally as envisaged in *Earliest System Programme of German Idealism*. Indeed it is written there that;

Since state is a mechanical thing, it gives us only an idea of machine. Only something that is objective of freedom is called an Idea so we must go even beyond the state. For every state must treat free men as cogs in a machine; and this, it ought not to. So it must stop.¹⁰⁰

Hegel himself would not choose this path. Moreover there is a further problem in modern society which hinders reconstruction of community of love as a kingdom of god. Indeed Hegel during Frankfurt years started to study economics and he knows that the idea of community of love when applied to property does not work.¹⁰¹ Property always involves a distinction between mine and *thine*.¹⁰² For Lukács concepts such as love that Hegel applies always includes elements of protest against capitalist system.¹⁰³ Nevertheless Hegel does view property as the embodiment of freedom and does not seem to be willing to give it up. That is partly why John Rawls take him to belong to the tradition of liberalism of freedom. Indeed, political and civil freedoms have priority over other principles in Hegel's thought and that makes Hegel a reform minded liberal, according to Rawls.¹⁰⁴

Second path and the one that Hegel chooses, this thesis argues, is the spiritualization of state so that there would be no opposition between kingdom of god and earthly power. Indeed, this thesis highlights that the central difference between Hegel's early thought and his mature philosophy is their different understandings of

¹⁰⁰ *The Earliest System Programme of German Idealism* (Berne, 1796) in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972), p. 511

¹⁰¹ Alice Ormiston argues that reflective rationality and its schismatic tendency is the main cause behind the failure of the love in late Hegel, not private property relations. See Ormiston Alice, "The Spirit of Christianity and Its Fate": Towards a Reconsideration of the Role of Love in Hegel, *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Sep., 2002), pp. 516

¹⁰² H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972) p. 345

¹⁰³ Georg Lukács, *The Young Hegel. Studies in the Relationship Between Dialectics and Economics*. (trans) Rodney Livingstone (Merlin Press: London, 1975) , p. 204

¹⁰⁴ John Rawls, *Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy* (ed) Barbara Herman (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 2000), p. 330

state. In his early period, state for Hegel or legal/political sphere in general depends on force and authority whereas original Christianity is an expression of freedom whether in the form of morality or in the form of reconcilability. Reformation actualized the Christian freedom by eliminating the power of church.¹⁰⁵ In other words it eliminated the positivity in a way, but not alienation entirely. Since reforming church, where state itself is oppressive does not eliminate alienation as a Christian problem. For this; the ethical, legal and political system should also be reformed¹⁰⁶ and grounded on freedom. French revolution is an attempt to construct such a system but it can not sustain itself, since France is a catholic country and so church and state is opposed there. The shape of this reformed ethical, legal, political system grounded on freedom is explored and explained in his later political philosophy, which will be analyzed in the next chapters. For now on, it is sufficient to tell that, religion appears at the foundation of this new system both historically and metaphysically but plays a very limited role inside the system, as will be seen. However, religion goes beyond and above state and appears as a form of knowledge, although an inadequate one. Separation of religion and state is still preserved but is not conceived as a separation of opposites.

¹⁰⁵ G. W. F. Hegel. , Lectures on the Philosophy of History (1827 – 1831) in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), p. 202

¹⁰⁶ G. W. F. Hegel, *Address on the Tercentenary of the Submission of the Augsburg Confession (25 June 1839)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), p. 189

CHAPTER 3:

RELIGION AT THE FOUNDATION OF STATE

3. 1 History, Providence, State

It is said that Machiavelli invented secular politics by divorcing it from religion and natural law. He distinguished between Christian virtues and *virtù*, which for him meant necessary powers and skills to achieve a political and a military goal. State was taken no longer as a corporate body serving the interest of its members but an instrument of power and domination. Parallel to his understanding of state, Machiavelli also believed that history is driven more by accident than reason. He substituted fortune for providence and argued that history is not a linear progress which will end in the second coming of Christ but a cycle of human success and failure.¹⁰⁷ Since that time, as Alan Wood has argued, the state has been defined as a coercive institution. For liberals it was the protector of individual rights and liberties, for conservatives a guarantor of peace and order and for radicals the promoters of ruling class interest, but implicitly, all agree on that state is an enforcer. Hegel, on the other hand, distinguishes himself from all modern theorists by arguing that state is primarily an ethical institution founded on freedom¹⁰⁸ History on the other hand appears as a rational process in Hegel's system. Unlike Machiavelli, he thinks that events in history can not be explained by chance or external contingent causes, there is a providence that controls it.¹⁰⁹ Joseph de Maistre,

¹⁰⁷ Emmet Kennedy, *Secularism and Its Opponents from Augustine to Solzhenitsyn* (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006), pp. 57, 63 - 65

¹⁰⁸ Alan Wood, takes the starting to be Hobbes, I modified the argument so it starts from Machiavelli, see. Allan Wood, *Hegel's Ethics*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993), p. 230

¹⁰⁹ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), p. 24

Hegel's contemporary in France, similarly believed in the invisible hand of a providence governing the events in history. Indeed, any disorder in history was commanded by a sovereign for contributing to a higher good. The history starts from the fall and the several epochs of it are defined in biblical term. Man; born with original sin, is radically evil and social order can only be maintained by regular application of violence. Moreover, Maistre considers French Revolution as one of the most terrible events in history. Any possible human institution must be based on a religious concept and a form of government based on human reason alone is destined to fail from the very beginning. The terror and revolutionary wars following the French revolution were understood as punishments of Providence by Maistre.¹¹⁰ Hegel similarly believed in the hand of providence in history and to some extent shares Maistre's critical attitude towards French Revolution. Moreover, Hegel also thinks that religion is the basis of state. Isaiah Berlin in an essay on Maistre argued that this deeply pessimistic vision is central to totalitarianism.¹¹¹ Hegel has rightly been criticized for his providential, dialectical understanding of history, which can justify any type of oppression as the will of God. However, surprisingly Hegel's philosophy of history shares enlightenment's confidence in progress.¹¹² Indeed, he states that history is 'the development of consciousness of freedom.' The actor of this progress is World Spirit (*Geist*) whose essence is freedom.¹¹³ There is debate in Hegel literature whether this World Spirit can be identified with human spirit or above humans spirit there is God, or some cosmic entity, using human beings in history to realize itself, whose realization means achievement of self consciousness as Spirit. Feuerbach, one of the earliest follower and critic of Hegel argued that Hegelian philosophy is alienating, since it attributes man's own wishes, fears and needs to God. For Feuerbach, all the attributes of God are nothing but traits of human nature.¹¹⁴ Furthermore Houlgate's and Solomon's¹¹⁵

¹¹⁰ Alex Callinicos, *Social Theory. A Historical Introduction* (New York University Press: New York, 1999), pp. 72 -74

¹¹¹ Ibid, p. 74

¹¹² Kenneth Westphal, *The Basic Context and Structure of Philosophy of Right*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993), p. 238

¹¹³ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 33-24

analyses suggest that Hegel's Spirit is actually nothing more than human spirit. Whereas Paul Lakeland claims that Hegel's Spirit and its manifestation in history has its origin in Christian theological symbols such as trinity and incarnation, but such symbols are unfamiliar to philosophers, scientists and public at large, thus they can not see the affinity.¹¹⁶ Charles Taylor on the other hand does not mention God, but argues that Hegel's Spirit is not identical with human spirit. However, it is equally not a super-individual subject of society, as assumed. According to Charles Taylor, 'there is only a very difficult doctrine of a cosmic subject whose vehicle is man.'¹¹⁷ in Hegel's philosophy. Hegel himself makes it clear that his Spirit is not identical with transcendent personal god of traditional theism. But he still claims that Spirit is most adequately expressed in Christianity as the revealed religion but best in his speculative philosophy. Indeed he asserts in *Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* that God is Spirit insofar it is in his community.¹¹⁸ Moreover, a Spirit which does not manifest itself becomes a dead Spirit. Quoting from Hegel;

Spirit if it is thought immediately, simply at rest is no spirit. For spirit's essential character is to be altogether active. More exactly, it is the activity of self-manifestation... Manifesting signifies becoming for an other. As becoming for an other, it enters into antithesis, into distinction in general, and thus is a finitizing of spirit... This spirit that manifest itself, determines itself, enter into

¹¹⁴ Timothy Luther, *Hegel's Critique of Modernity. Reconciling Individual Freedom and Community* (Lexington Books: Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK, 2009), p. 260

¹¹⁵ For Stephen Houlgate Hegel's history of Spirit is a history of civilizations, there is no metaphysical subject which exists prior to human history. See. Stephen Houlgate, *World History as the Progress of Consciousness: An Interpretation of Hegel's Philosophy of History* in G. W. F. Hegel. *Critical Assessments*. (ed) Robert Sern. Volume IV (Routledge: London, New York, 1993), p. 409. Solomon on the other hand takes the Spirit to be our shared recognition of our mutual interdependence and ultimate collective identity. Please see Solomon Robert C., *Continental Philosophy since 1750. The Rise and Fall of the Self* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, New York, 1988), p. 61

¹¹⁶ Paul Lakeland, *The Politics of Salvation: The Hegelian Idea of the State* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1984), p. 14

¹¹⁷ Charles Taylor, *Hegel* (Cambridge University Press: New York, 1977), p. 385

¹¹⁸ G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures On the Philosophy of Religion*. (ed) Peter C. Hodgson, (trans.) R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of H.S. Harris. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988), p. 90

existence, gives itself finitude, it is the second moment. But the third is manifesting of itself according to its concepts, taking its initial manifestation back into itself, sublating it, coming to its own self and being explicitly the way it is implicitly... The third moment is that it is the object to itself, is reconciled with itself in the object, has arrived at freedom.¹¹⁹

Apart from this mystic language of spirit, Hegel also describes the process of world history as development of the Idea of freedom. In purely secular terms, he takes the world history to be a rational progress. On the other hand but, he also posits that history is controlled by a Providence.¹²⁰ Moreover, elsewhere he identifies God with reason and suggests;

This good, this Reason, in its most concrete form, is God. God governs the world; the actual working of his government- carrying out of his plan – is the history of world. This plan philosophy tries to comprehend.¹²¹

Moreover, essence of god is freedom. His purpose is nothing other than his own will and the nature of his will is freedom. Will is free when only it does not will anything alien, foreign to itself, but wills itself alone, when it does not depend on anything but itself.¹²² Indeed, both Taylor and Pippin argues that Hegel's conception of freedom is a specific from of the understanding of freedom as rational self-determination and belongs to the tradition of Rousseau, Kant, and Fichte. On this view, freedom is realized when the subject acts on not on what is merely given but on his own reasons.¹²³ The whole history of world has the sole aim of realization of freedom in concrete.¹²⁴ What is striking here is Hegel's easy switch between religious and secular discourses. His description of history can be understood only in secular terms, as a progress of human rationality and freedom. At the end of this historical activity, human beings become conscious of themselves as historically self-productive and self-determining agents, building their own

¹¹⁹ Ibid. pp. 102-103

¹²⁰ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 447, 25 -26

¹²¹ Ibid. p. 51

¹²² Ibid, p. 462

¹²³ in Patent Alan, *Hegel's Idea of Freedom*, (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2002), p. 27

¹²⁴ Ibid. pp. 34, 31, 33

world freely.¹²⁵ But, it is also equally possible to read this, as the divine plan of Providence towards self-actualization whose culmination is modern state. Hegel does not choose purely secular discourse over a religious one, or vice versa. What is more, he transforms and translates them into each other in his entire philosophical project. This attempt of reconciliation is what Hegel can still offer, apart from his left / right critics and heirs. In a different context Thomas Lewis takes the fundamental strategy of Hegel to be the reconciliation of tradition with freedom.¹²⁶ Moreover, there is no binary opposition between reason and faith in Hegel's thought, both include truth as their content, but philosophy based on thought is a more adequate form of expression.¹²⁷ The real existence of this truth; unity of subjective and universal will on earth is state for Hegel. The state is the objective existence of freedom on the world. It is the unity of rational will with the subjective will of humans which are in turn means in realizing this activity of God.¹²⁸ He defines state as follows;

This essential being is the union of the subjective with the rational will: It is the moral Whole, the State, which is the form of reality in which the individual has and enjoys his freedom, but on the condition of his recognizing, believing in, and willing that which is common to the whole.¹²⁹

This state issues from Christianity.¹³⁰ Hegel's argument which claims that religion is at the foundation of state¹³¹ can be understood both historically and metaphysically.

¹²⁵ Houlgate S. , *An Introduction to Hegel: freedom, truth and history* (Blackwell Publishing; Malden, Oxford, Victoria, 2005), p. 21

¹²⁶ Lewis Thomas, *Freedom and Tradition in Hegel. Reconsidering Anthropology, Ethics, Religion* (University of Notre Dame Press: Notre Dame, Indiana, 2005), p. 187

¹²⁷ G. W. F. Hegel, *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. [Third and final edition of 1830] (trans) William Wallace (1873) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/index.htm> (16.10.2009), § 573

¹²⁸ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), p. 54, 64

¹²⁹ Ibid. p. 53

¹³⁰ Ibid. p. 351

Indeed whole history is the development of subjective freedom which first emerges in Christianity and then gives rise to modern state, the nature of which is explored in his political philosophy. Not only the dialectic in history but also the one in his *Lectures on Philosophy of Religion* comes to a parallel conclusion; religion gives rise to Sittlichkeit (Ethical Life)¹³² This can be understood as Joachim Ritter has once rightly noted that Christianity has only a historical function of mediating the transition from Greek freedom to modern freedom, although Ritter himself does not think this to be the case in Hegel.¹³³ Whether Ethical Life wholly replaces religion or not, will be discussed in the fourth chapter of this thesis. But beyond history, Hegel also claims in abstraction that the foundation of religion and state are one and the same.¹³⁴ The second argument, I call metaphysical argument. It is therefore necessary to investigate whether Christian religion has finished its historical function and gave rise to Ethical Life or the unity that he finds in both religion and state is institutionalized in Ethical Life. I will first start from his analysis of history as the realization of subjective freedom that first emerges in Christianity. Christianity is comprehended as the religion of freedom as in his earlier writings. But the nature of the state that emerges out of the dialectics of history is not grasped as coercive anymore.

3. 2. State; Realization of Christian Principle

To start, the consciousness of freedom first emerges among the Greeks and Romans but their consciousness of freedom was limited. Hegel, unlike his earlier

¹³¹ Ibid, p.66

¹³² G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures On the Philosophy of Religion*. (ed) Peter C. Hodgson, (trans.) R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of H.S. Harris. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988), p. 484

¹³³ Joachim Ritter, *Hegel and the French Revolution. Essays on the Philosophy of Right* (trans) Richard Dien Winfield (the MIT press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 1982), p. 186

¹³⁴ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Relationship of Religion to the State (1831)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), p. 226

position, is now aware of the institution of slavery in Ancient Greece and Rome; hence they are not appreciated anymore as ideally perfect, free societies. In Greece and Rome only some were free. But it is with the introduction of Christianity that man as man comes to be understood as essentially free, for Hegel. Under Christianity, man has infinite value as the subject of God's grace regardless of his birth and country. Second principle, is that of independent subjectivity that comes with Christianity. Greek unreflected morality can not sustain itself against subjective freedom. Socrates has been killed by Athenian democracy. Subjective principle is the soil on which the truth grows for Hegel. Man is no longer dependent on divine but is in unity with it in love. Hegel merges these two principles, defines them as the principle of freedom and argues that they are won by Christian religion for the secular state. But realization of this principle is a long process.¹³⁵ He states that

This consciousness first arose in religion, the inmost region of spirit; but to introduce the principle into the various relations of the actual world involves a more extensive problem than its simple implementation; a problem whose solution and application require a severe and lengthened process of culture. In proof of this we may note that slavery did not cease immediately on the reception of Christianity. Still less did liberty predominate in States; or Governments and Constitutions adopt a rational organization, or to recognize freedom as their basis.¹³⁶

Thus, freedom emerges first at Christian religion. Then after the long labor of Spirit, it becomes the basis of state, tells Hegel. This freedom of subjectivity was lacking in Greek Spirit, their unity was natural and unreflective. An element of it, Hegel finds among Romans, which later in *Philosophy of Right*, he will call it personality. Indeed Roman world recognize the principle of personality, entitled only to possession whereas the emperor as Person of Persons possess all the individuals and thus the right to possession also loose its validity under this condition of domination.

Secondly the unity of God with man in the person of Jesus appears in Christian religion. This does not mean that god appears as man alone, asserts Hegel. But man as man, can elevate to the level of God if he annuls what is merely natural in him.¹³⁷ The

¹³⁵ G. W. F. Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 332, 351- 352, 32

¹³⁶ Ibid. p. 32

¹³⁷ Ibid., pp. 338 -339, 343

principle of unity of God with man that first appears immediately in the person of Jesus had to be realized for the whole humanity in the history. The first form of this unity apart from Jesus, Hegel finds in the early community of love, parallel to his position in *Christianity and its Fate*. It is in the community that unity of God and man appears first.¹³⁸ Although, a form of reconciliation with God, the early community is limited since reconciliation is achieved in abstraction from the world, in a monkish withdrawal from it.¹³⁹ This community found itself in Roman world and at first kept itself apart from the state, did not react against it. But when it was secluded from the state and did not recognize its emperor as the absolute sovereign, Christian community became the target of hate and persecution. This alienation of community was mentioned in Hegel's early writings, but he did not envisage that out of its principle, there will grow a state which is based on freedom. This does not take place during the Roman Empire. Under the Roman Empire, the theoretical aspect of religion; the dogma has been developed and church turned into a particular form of secular existence parallel to other secular institutions. In its early form, church was a perfect democracy of the spiritual community but during middle ages, it degenerated into an aristocracy.¹⁴⁰ Hegel is still critical about church, just as in his earlier writings. But this time he sees corruption of church as a necessary moment in the history.¹⁴¹ The actors of the realization of freedom on earth would be Germanic people. There is nothing chauvinistic as both Avineri and Taylor remarked about Hegel's trust on Germanic people. Indeed, Taylor suggests that Hegel means by Germanic the barbarians who invaded Roman Empire. Montesquieu also pointed out that modern European polities had their origin in Germanic barbarian kingdoms.¹⁴² Furthermore, Avineri makes it clear that Hegel's use of Germanic

¹³⁸ Ibid. p. 345

¹³⁹ G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures On the Philosophy of Religion*. (ed) Peter C. Hodgson, (trans.) R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of H.S. Harris. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988), p. 482

¹⁴⁰ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 346, 349-350

¹⁴¹ Merold Westphal thinks the concept of externality that Hegel employs to criticize the church, is synonym for positivity that he used in his early writings. See. Merold Westphal, *Hegel, Freedom, and Modernity* ((State University of New York Press: Albany, 1992), p. 152

¹⁴² Charles Taylor, *Hegel* (Cambridge University Pres: New York, 1977), p. 398

includes France, Italy, Spain, England etc.¹⁴³ but before coming to that epoch of Germanic people; it is also necessary to refer Hegel's interpretation of Byzantine Empire. Under Constantine the Great, Christianity becomes the state religion. Hegel does not appreciate the Byzantine since the real principle of Christianity was not activated there. Accordingly, the organization of state, its laws was not harmonized with that principle.¹⁴⁴ The Germanic people only after Reformation will make this principle true. Hegel talks about the mission of Germanic people as follows;

The destiny of Germanic people is, to be the bearers of the Christian principle. The principle of Spiritual Freedom – of Reconciliation [of the Objective and Subjective], was introduced into the simple, uninformed minds of those peoples; and the part assigned to them in the Service of the World – Spirit was that of not possessing the Idea of Freedom as the Substratum of their religious conceptions, but of producing it in free and spontaneous development from their subjective self consciousness.¹⁴⁵

The Germanic world is divided into three periods and what characterizes this world is the antithesis of the church and state, and neither of them is founded on the principle of freedom. The first epoch which he calls the period of Father, start with the appearance of German nations in the Roman Empire and extend to reign of Charlemagne. This period is simply characterized as immediate unity of Christendom which has secular and spiritual aspect.¹⁴⁶

The real antithesis between church and state appears in the second period; that of Son, starts with early middle ages and extends until the time of Charles V's reign. This is the second attempt of reconciliation with world, but it could not be realized, humanity is still not at home in the world. Quoting from Hegel;

Worldliness and religiosity remains external to each other. But they had to enter relation all the same. Hence the relation in which they stand can itself only be an external one, or more precisely, a relation in which one prevails over the other, and thus there is no reconciliation at all. The religious it is felt, should be the dominant

¹⁴³ Avineri Sholomo, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1972), p. 228

¹⁴⁴ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 353, 355

¹⁴⁵ Ibid. p. 368

¹⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 360

element: what is reconciled, the church ought to prevail over what is unreconciled, the worldly realm.¹⁴⁷

He describes the church in this period as a theocracy and state appears as a feudal monarchy. The theocracy of church is just the opposite of Christian freedom. It is characterized by harsh bondage and decline into every kind of externality and worldliness, for Hegel. Indeed, the doctrines of Christianity was firmly settled by Councils of Church and one of the essential feature of that doctrines is the recognition of divine nature with the unity of human nature. But external realization of the unity of divine with human, the presence of Christ in world has been done in a sensuous form, in miraculous images, places and times.¹⁴⁸ Catholicism is a form of idolatry, for Hegel. God in Catholicism, as Paul Lakeland has indicated, is a bad infinite of Hegel; which has no relation with the finite, and which in turn is reduced to finite. Moreover God here stand in opposition to real human world and appears alien to it.¹⁴⁹ The medieval state on the other hand, is full of contradictions, tells Hegel. On the one side there is an empty imperial rule, constituting the secular arm of church; on the other side there is the bond of fidelity which for Hegel is the most unfaithful bondage depending on the arbitrary choice of man's disposition not on the authority of right and law. Both church and state in the second period of Germanic world is founded on the opposite of Christian principle of freedom. It is only in the third period; the period of Spirit, that this antithesis is reversed. Indeed, in the third period, which starts with reformation and extends to French Revolution and Hegel's own time, the principle of freedom will become the foundation of secular state. Secular existence for Hegel started to understand its own intrinsic value and independent validity in the third epoch. The centralization and rationalization under the absolute monarchy is an advantage over feudalism for Hegel because capricious will of the individuals is subordinated to the

¹⁴⁷ G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures On the Philosophy of Religion*. (ed) Peter C. Hodgson, (trans.) R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of H.S. Harris. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988), p. 483

¹⁴⁸ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 361, 408 - 409

¹⁴⁹ Paul Lakeland, *The Politics of Salvation: The Hegelian Idea of the State* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1984), p. 106

common interest of whole.¹⁵⁰ In Monarch he says; “...there is one lord and no serf, for servitude is abrogated by it, and in it Right and Law are recognized; it is the source of real freedom.”¹⁵¹ Moreover vassals become officers of state and individuals quitted their individual capacity and become members of estates and corporations. Hegel tells that monarch can no longer rule by arbitrary will. He has to get consent of various estates and corporations for the maintenance of his rule. For Hegel, there is a constitution of various orders of estates and corporations in modern monarchy and this is the advantage of it over the feudal rule which does not recognize such orders.¹⁵² Reformation as the second world historical event of this era resulted from the corruption of church, which abused its power and recognized deity only in sensuous externality according to Hegel. Luther’s doctrine but, took deity in its true spirituality and purified Christian principle. Secondly, by setting up the authority of bible and testimony of human spirit against the authority of church, Luther cancelled the distinction between laymen and priests. The possession of the truth is no longer in the hands of one class but belongs to whole mankind, says Hegel. Thus, for Hegel the Christian freedom started to be actualized. But this subjective side of feeling must also be reconciled with the objective side of truth. In fact law, property, government etc. must be conformed to this principle of freedom.¹⁵³ By replacing the monastic vows of chastity, poverty and obedience, Luther affirmed the spheres of Hegel’s Ethical Life (*Sittlichkeit*) and so the participation in familiar, economic and political institutions of modern society. As Merold Westphal has noticed, what is central in Hegel’s interpretation of Protestantism is repudiation of 3 monastic vows; its worldliness, whereas most of the understandings of Protestantism takes justification by faith alone as decisive.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵⁰ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 399-400, 389, 362, 417

¹⁵¹ Ibid, p. 418

¹⁵² Ibid. p. 419

¹⁵³ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 432 - 436

¹⁵⁴ Moreover Merold Westphal suggests that, Hegel understands by *sola fide* only the priesthood of all believers. For other principles that are intimately linked with the fist principle of Luther; *sola scripta* and *sola gratia*, (which in turn would mean accepting

Repudiation of three monastic vows in turn opens the possibility for the acknowledgement of worldly realm as divine. Indeed, Hegel argues that;

The harmony [of Objective and Subjective Will] which has resulted from the painful struggles of History, involves the recognition of the Secular as capable of being an embodiment of Truth: whereas it had formerly been regarded as evil only, as incapable of Good – the latter being considered essentially ultra mundane. It is now perceived that Morality and Justice in the State are also divine and commanded by God, and that in the point of substance there is nothing higher or more sacred.¹⁵⁵

Therefore, the result of history is an idea of state which is divine. Similarly, in *Philosophy of Religion* Hegel mentions the last phase of the dialectic of religion to be Ethical Life of which state is a part.¹⁵⁶ This might be understood as religion is transformed into the cult of Ethical Life. This argument gains support when absence of religion as one of the central institutions of Ethical Life is considered. But this is not the argument that Hegel wants to pursue. Apart from claiming that religion leads to Ethical Life historically, so reconcile Christian subject with worldly political social existence in an entirely secular but spiritual life, Hegel also wants religion not to disappear but to be the very foundation of state. Moreover, he affirms that;

...the state, on the other hand, regulated by the selfsame reason, is a temple of Human freedom concerned with the perception and volition of a reality, whose purport may itself be called divine. Thus freedom in the State is only the carrying out of that which constitutes the fundamental principle of Religion. The process displayed in History is only the manifestation of Religion as Human Reason- the production of the religious principle which dwells in the hearth of man, under the form of Secular Freedom. Thus discord between the inner hearth and the actual world is removed.¹⁵⁷

divine authority in cognitive and existential realms) are not emphasized by Hegel. See. Merold Westphal. *Hegel, Freedom, and Modernity* ((State University of New York Press: Albany, 1992), p. 159

¹⁵⁵ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), p. 441

¹⁵⁶ G. W. F. Hegel *Lectures On the Philosophy of Religion*. (ed) Peter C. Hodgson, (trans.) R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of H.S. Harris. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988), p. 484

¹⁵⁷ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), p. 353

Furthermore, France tried to realize the principle of freedom in abstraction from religion. But this can not happen according to Hegel. There can be no revolution without reformation.¹⁵⁸ Indeed post-French Revolution is still alienating since, there is opposition between an unfree church and state founded on abstract freedom. French Revolution reflects the limited understanding of Enlightenment. Enlightenment has an abstract and undeveloped idea of pure Reason, says Hegel. It takes religion to be its adversary and can not relate itself to the absolute substance of universe. In Germany on the other hand, enlightenment was conducted in the interest of theology. Reformation reconciled worldly realm with religion, the principle which would result in the further development of equity in political sphere was already present.¹⁵⁹ In this context of criticizing France, Hegel asserts foundation of state to be religion; this argument is the topic of next section that necessitates detailed analysis.

3. 3. Unity of Religion and State

The argument which asserts religion to be the foundation of state is related to Hegel's specific understanding of the character of people; the *Volksgeist* (Spirit of People). For him religion is the most important factor in shaping the conscience of communities. Read in this light, I argue the legitimacy of state does not come from God but from the conviction of people. In other words there should not be opposition between the conviction of people and political constitution, which will bring alienation. There is nothing theocratic about Hegel's understanding of state. But apart from this, Hegel also supports this argument at metaphysical level by claiming that the content of both religion and idea of state is truth and freedom. This argument again, apart from being a plea for fundamentalism, is an attempt of a search for reconciliation between purely secular and religious minds. Not thinking religion as philosophically false, Hegel appears tolerant in recognizing the plural expressions of the same truth, at the level of consciousness. But in his practical philosophy, he asserts that not the unity of content but difference of form should be the principle, religion and state are to be separated. In both *Voksgeist* and metaphysical arguments; neither dogma nor other authorities of

¹⁵⁸ Ibid. p. 473

¹⁵⁹ Ibid. pp. 463- 464

religion has been emphasized. Instead the people's convictions and abstract truth of religion are taken as decisive by Hegel.

To start, religion for Hegel is the sphere in which a nation gives itself its own conception of truth. He claims that the conception of God; the truth, constitutes the general character of people.¹⁶⁰ Accordingly, it is impossible to design a political constitution without taking into consideration the general character of people which is mostly shaped by their religion. He argues that 'A people which had a bad conception of God also had a bad state, a bad government and bad laws.'¹⁶¹ Therefore, the starting point of inquiry for determining the general character of people would be the content of their religion. For Hegel, religion which has the genuine truth in its content is the one which recognizes God in its unity with human actualities. Religion which considers the truth; God, to be separate from world, and which does not see the real and positive existence in the idea of incarnation has a superstitious form. The target of Hegel as a committed Lutheran is again Catholicism. Catholicism, although has in it the true content; God, it represent it in sensuous forms but not as spirit. Therefore under Catholicism no rational constitution is possible, for Hegel. In Catholic world, the holy and non holy is strictly separated.¹⁶² Indeed, the holy in Catholicism is bestowed on external objects, times and places. Prayer is directed towards images and miracles are expected from them. It leads to justification by external works but in these works the very meaning of spirit is misconceived and law, justice, morality are corrupted.¹⁶³ Moreover he claims that;

Along with the principle of spiritual bondage, and these applications of it in the religious life, there can only go in the legislative and constitutional system a legal and moral bondage, and a state of lawlessness and immorality in political life.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 66

¹⁶¹ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Relationship of Religion to the State (1831)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), p. 226

¹⁶² G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), pp. 65, 446, 465

¹⁶³ Hegel G. W. F. , *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. [Third and final edition of 1830] (trans) William Wallace (1873) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/index.htm> (16.10.2009), § 552

¹⁶⁴ Ibid, § 552

Against the argument that Catholicism guarantees the stability in governments, he proposes that this can only apply to governments which have the spiritual bondage at the basis of their institutions but not legal and moral freedom.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, Catholicism claims exclusive control of human activity, it can impose precepts opposed to worldly rationality. If the subjective freedom becomes the basis of state, Catholic religion will stand necessarily in opposition to it. This is what happened in France after the revolution, for Hegel. Catholicism demands unconditional submission to the church and renunciation of all freedom. In France, who adheres to the principle of secular freedom, necessarily ceases to belong to Catholic religion.¹⁶⁶ Revolution in France could not realize the emancipation that it promised, since it was based on abstract understanding of freedom and people's character was shaped by Catholic Religion. In short, revolutionaries attempted to bring right and freedom in a condition of oppressive religion. Hegel argues that such a project is doomed to failure;

Thus liberalism as an abstraction, emanating from France, traversed the Roman World; but Religious slavery held that world in the fetters of political servitude. For it is a false principle that the fetters which bind Right and Freedom can be broken without the emancipation of conscience – that there can be a Revolution without a Reformation.¹⁶⁷

Therefore a free state and a slavish religion are not compatible. The prerequisite of building a political system on freedom and rights is reforming the religion. Trying to separate these spheres and assuming that they can be maintained in their separation peacefully is an impossible mission for Hegel. Indeed it is self deception to expect that individuals will follow law but not spirit of their religion which shapes their inner conscience and determines their obligation.¹⁶⁸ The religious conviction of individuals

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, § 552

¹⁶⁶ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Relationship of Religion to the State (1831)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), pp. 229 - 231

¹⁶⁷ G. W. F Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), p. 473

¹⁶⁸ Hegel G. W. F. , *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. [Third and final edition of 1830] (trans) William Wallace (1873) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/index.htm> (16.10.2009), § 552

determines their outlook on political constitution. Modern consideration of them as separate is, one-sided and inadequate understanding for Hegel. He asserts that;

These two aspects, conviction and the formal constitution, are inseparable and can not do without one another. But modern times have seen the emergence of that one-sidedness whereby the constitution is supposed to be self-supporting on the one hand, while the other conviction, religion, and conscience are to be set as irrelevant on the grounds that whatever conviction and religion individuals may subscribe to have nothing to do with political constitution.¹⁶⁹

As Merold Westphal suggests that, in this context Hegel tends to identify religion with *Volksgeist* rather than treating it as one of its expression. But his holism requires, more than Hegel himself notices, to adopt also the materialist historical position. In his holistic logic, there is no distinction between independent and dependent variables, remarks Westphal. Therefore it is not contrary to Hegel's own position to argue that there can be no reformation without a political and economic revolution.¹⁷⁰ Hegel in his Positivity Essay did in fact adopt such a materialistic explanation of the emergence of Christianity, as had been analyzed in the first chapter of this thesis. However, in his late period, his vision seemed to be more akin to idealists.

Thus freedom in the state is preserved and established by religion, since moral rectitude in the State is only the carrying out of that which constitutes the fundamental principle of Religion. The process displayed in History is only the manifestation of Religion as Human Reason – the production of religious principle which dwells in the hearth of man, under the form of Secular Freedom. Thus the discord between the inner life of the heart and the actual world is removed.¹⁷¹

The religion that he talks in abstraction is Protestantism, since only after the reformation that the two fold division between the inner life of the hearth and actual world is overcome. It is through reformation that divine spirit introduces itself in actuality. In

¹⁶⁹ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Relationship of Religion to the State (1831)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), p. 232

¹⁷⁰ Merold Westphal, *Hegel, Freedom, and Modernity* ((State University of New York Press: Albany, 1992), pp. 174 - 176

¹⁷¹ G. W. F Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), p. 353

Protestantism, the conviction of people gives rise to free constitution since it values the worldly as spiritual and becoming capable of moral. In fact, Roman Catholic Church previously valued that unmarried state as holier than having a family.¹⁷² Marriage of priests after Luther further removes the distinction between laity and clergy; spiritual and worldly.¹⁷³ The Roman Catholic Church also took poverty to be a sacred virtue, and declared the socioeconomic sphere as unholy. The Roman Catholic Church does not value man's productivity and honest administration of property as a means for sustaining life and helping others. This condemnation of work and acquisition of wealth did only resulted in enrichment of clergy, says Hegel.¹⁷⁴ After the reformation; industry, crafts and trades has been recognized as having the moral validity. The third sanctity of Roman Catholic Church; the blind obedience has also be rejected and instead the obedience to the laws of state was made the principle of action. For Hegel in the obedience to state man is free since subjection that is required from him is a free allegiance; to yield the particular for the General.¹⁷⁵ This idea which claims that obedience to state is also divine reveals the ideological character of religion which can legitimize any unjust and tyrannical action of state over its subjects. Popper attacks Hegel on this point and asserts that Hegel wants us to worship the state, for him individual is nothing and state is everything.¹⁷⁶ Moreover, Marx in a different context suggested; "where as under Protestantism, there is no supreme head of the church, the rule of religion is nothing but the religion of rule, the cult of governments' will." However in the same article Marx

¹⁷² G. W. F. Hegel, *Address on the Tercentenary of the Submission of the Augsburg Confession (25 June 1839)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), p. 192

¹⁷³ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), p. 442

¹⁷⁴ G. W. F. Hegel, *Address on the Tercentenary of the Submission of the Augsburg Confession (25 June 1839)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), pp. 192 - 193

¹⁷⁵ G. W. F Hegel. , *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001), p. 442

¹⁷⁶ . Popper Karl P., *The Open Society and Its Enemies. Volume II, The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx and Aftermath* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey, 1966), pp. 234, 251

mentions Hegel as one of the philosophers who regard state through human eyes and not theology.¹⁷⁷ On the other hand there are also softer readings of this argument. Indeed, Stephen Houlgate emphasizing Hegel's identification of religion with spirit of people comments that state's laws must be recognized by faith otherwise not having roots in the hearts of people, laws of state appears as a superstructure which are at odds with people's convictions.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, James Doull, comments that if religion denies its common point with worldly wisdom it becomes worldlier, and similarly when secularism denies its common root with religion, it becomes more religious.¹⁷⁹ Merold Westphall's interpretation, not distinguishing state from the general framework of Ethical Life, offers that by that argument Hegel means social bonds are sacred as opposed the bonds of calculated self interest.¹⁸⁰ Critics have right in their claims whereas arguments of proponents are equally plausible. However, it is necessary to highlight that Hegel himself is aware of the tyrannical implications of his argument and asserts that;

Now if you say that, the state must be grounded on religion you may mean that it should rest on rationality and arise out of it; but your statement may also be misunderstood to mean that man are most adroitly schooled to obedience if their minds are shackled by a slavish religion. (Christian religion however is the religion of freedom, thought it must be admitted that this religion may become changed in character and perverted from freedom to the bondage...)¹⁸¹

It is clear that, above Hegel refers to Catholicism. But he also recognizes the same danger of tyranny that will result of his proposition of the unity of state and religion in Protestant countries, in which this unity is already present. In Hegel's words;

¹⁷⁷ Karl Marx, Supplement (*Rheinische Zeitung No. 195, July 14, 1842*), in *Marx and Engels on Religion*, (Progress Publishers: Moscow, 1957) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1842/07/10.htm> (27. 06. 2010)

¹⁷⁸ S. Houlgate, *An Introduction to Hegel: freedom, truth and history* (Blackwell Publishing; Malden, Oxford, Victoria, 2005), p.274

¹⁷⁹ In Jackson F. L., "Hegel On Secularity And Consummated Religion," *Animus* 9 (2004), p. 150 www.swgc.mun.ca/animus

¹⁸⁰ Merold Westphal, *Hegel, Freedom, and Modernity* ((State University of New York Press: Albany, 1992), p. 177

¹⁸¹ G. W. F. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right* (trans) T. M. Knox (Oxford University Press: London, Oxford, New York, 1976), § 270A, from now on (PR, § 270)

Expressed formally, the proposition thus runs as follows; one ought to obey laws, whatever they may be. In this way governing and legislation are left to arbitrary will of the government. This situation arise in Protestant states, and it is only in such states that it can occur, for in them only the unity of religion and state [already referred to] is present...But if we go no further than formal proposition, the way is left open for arbitrariness, tyranny and oppression.¹⁸²

Hegel thinks such an arbitrary rule appeared in England during the last king of House of Stuarts in which the king believed that he was divinely ordained. Under Protestantism says Hegel there is no distinction between layman and priests and it is equally contradictory that one layman have such a privileged status.¹⁸³ Moreover, in his *Philosophy of Right*, his attack on von Haller against identification of the right of the might with divine law makes it clear that force has no divine origin. (PR, § 158) This has been considered as one of the points of his deviation from restoration Prussia. In fact, as Kenneth Westphall has indicated, Karl Ludwig von Haller was one of the leading intellectual figures of the restoration period.¹⁸⁴

Moreover, Walter Ullman suggests that emergence of European political theory was formed by contact between ascending and descending principles of Kingship. According to ascending theory, power ascends from community. On the other hand, stands the approach which takes power to be descending from God.¹⁸⁵ I argue that, Hegel's theory is more close to ascending theory, since God ascends to community and appears in various *Volksgeists* in history.

Lastly, as Hegel's unity of religion and state rejects implication of divine right of kings, it equally rules out the establishment of state religion. Comparing Hegel's position with that of Hobbes will be more illuminating here. Indeed Hobbes in the establishment

¹⁸² G. W. F. Hegel, *The Relationship of Religion to the State (1831)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), p. 227

¹⁸³ *Ibid*, p. 227

¹⁸⁴ Kenneth Westphal, *The Basic Context and Structure of Philosophy of Right*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993), p. 235

¹⁸⁵ in Bryan Turner, *Religion and Social Theory. A Materialist Perspective*. (Humanities Press. New Jersey, 1983), p. 178

of his Leviathan rejects descending theory of authority in which right to rule comes from God to sovereign. Different than Hegel but, his state is established on contract. Hobbes ideal is a protestant state in which sovereign is also head of the church in both secular and religious matters.¹⁸⁶ Hegel on the other hand as will be seen, does not institutionalize the unity of religion and state by positing Protestantism as a state religion. Toleration appears an indispensable part of freedom in *Philosophy of Right*.

Last point that necessitates emphasis is the metaphysical dimension of unity of state and religion. This argument, I suggest is much related to Hegel's understanding of truth. Indeed a speculative truth for Hegel is the unity in difference; synthesis of subjective/objective, particular/universal To express it is very difficult by one sided proposition.¹⁸⁷ All religions, in spite of his dislike for Catholicism and to some extent criticism of Judaism, appear as including the truth in his thought.¹⁸⁸ But they differ in their forms of expressing this truth. Peddle argues that, modern state in Hegel is not conceived as freed from the particularities of all religion but it has its grounds in the underlying principle of all religions¹⁸⁹ On the other hand but, religion represents its truth in the form of feeling and representation. It is only philosophy that adequately expresses truth of religion by transforming the representative form of it into concepts.¹⁹⁰ But this does not alter the true content of religion. This toleration for multiple expressions of the same content of truth makes Hegel still an appealing thinker. Similarly both state and religion have the same content of truth. Moreover he argues that;

¹⁸⁶ Andrew Shanks, *Civil Society, Civil Religion* (Blackwell: Oxford UK, Cambridge US, 1995), pp. 98 – 99

¹⁸⁷ G. W. F. Hegel, *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. [Third and final edition of 1830] (trans) William Wallace (1873) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/index.htm> (16.10.2009), p. 83

¹⁸⁸ G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures On the Philosophy of Religion*. (ed) Peter C. Hodgson, (trans.) R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of H.S. Harris. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988), p. 78

¹⁸⁹ David Peddle, "The Construction Of The Secular In Rawls And Hegel: Religion, Philosophy And Public Reason" *Animus* 9 (2004), p. 147 www.swgc.mun.ca/animus

¹⁹⁰ G. W. F. Hegel, *Lectures On the Philosophy of Religion*. (ed) Peter C. Hodgson, (trans.) R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of H.S. Harris. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988), pp. 133, 292

In general, religion and foundation of the state is one and the same thing – they are identical in and for themselves. In the patriarchal condition and the Jewish theocracy, the two are not yet distinct and still outwardly identical. Nevertheless the two are also different, and in due course, they become strictly separated from one another; but they are once more posited as genuinely identical...Religion is the highest knowledge of truth, and this truth, defined more precisely, is free spirit...The state is merely freedom in the world, in actuality...there is one conception of freedom in [both] religion and the state.¹⁹¹

Thus, both state and religion have the same content of truth. Truth means for Hegel the mutual adequacy of subject to object.¹⁹² Although each finite being tries to realize this adequacy, they can become the expression of truth in a limited way. Truth can be only the whole then, not a value attributed to logical propositions but an ontological concept. The realization of adequacy of subject to object is a historical process in Hegel's philosophy. Truth which is adequately realized in history is God for Hegel. Moreover, Hegel notes that freedom has the same definition as that of truth: unity of subject with the object.¹⁹³ In such a unity, there is an identity between subject and object. In entering the determination of the objective, subject is reconciled with the object and is determined still by itself since subject realizes in this process that object is not something totally alien to itself, and thus finds itself in its other. The engagement of God with world can be explained in these terms. Religion is the knowledge of this highest truth; the God as freedom and state is the actualization of this freedom in the world.¹⁹⁴ Their forms of expression this truth differs yet. Relying on this distinction of form, Hegel posits the institutional separation of religion and state. But conceived at metaphysical level, they are united. The analysis of this formal separation is the topic of the next chapter, which is described in the long remark of paragraph 270 of *Philosophy of Right*. But apart from that paragraph, religion is hardly mentioned in his account of system of right and this need to be emphasized firstly.

¹⁹¹ G. W. F. Hegel, *The Relationship of Religion to the State (1831)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999), pp. 225- 226

¹⁹² C Peter Hodgston, *Hegel and Christian Theology. A Reading of the Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* (Oxford University Pres: Oxford, New York, 2005), p. 96

¹⁹³ *Ibid.* p. 96

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 196

CHAPTER 4:

RELIGION IN STATE

4. 1. System of Right in General and Religion

The most elaborate account of Hegel's mature political thought is found in his *Philosophy of Right* (1821) and a brief synopsis is also presented in his *Encyclopedia* (1817, Heidelberg 1817, rev. Berlin 1827, 1830). What is striking about arguments and proposals conferred in *Philosophy of Right* (PR) is their very limited if not absent appeal to religion, compared to his other works. Walter Jaeschke while considering the implications of this absence of religion in PR, concludes that state appears in this work of Hegel self-justified and does not need religion. However, according to Jaeschke, in the *Encyclopedia* of 1830, Hegel modifies his understanding of the relationship between religion and state, corrects the position of PR and this unity of religion and ethical life proposed in paragraph 552 of *Encyclopedia* is the last word of Hegel on this issue.¹⁹⁵ It is necessary to cast doubt on the idea which expresses that separation of religion and state is incompatible with some higher abstract level unity. In my opinion Hegel holds both of these views, and what he does in *Encyclopedia* is not modification of his position, since in PR the model of separation of religion and state is not the separation of opposites but a type of unity in difference. On the other hand, but, institutions of *Right* are almost purely secular institutions, the dialectic here shows that, it is possible to sustain system without appeal to religion. But this does not mean that they are antithesis of religion, on the contrary they are the very realization of the principle of Christian freedom, for Hegel. I will first attempt to show that the religious foundation of right is not institutionalized in Hegel's system of right, and then proceed to analyze the model of separation of religion and state as posited in PR.

¹⁹⁵ Walter Jaeschke, "Christianity and Secularity in Hegel's Concept of the State," *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (Apr., 1981), pp. 131 - 132

To start, Right (*Recht*) for Hegel is the existence of free will. He takes the term in a comprehensive sense not merely in the limited usage of juristic law but as the actual conditions of freedom.¹⁹⁶ Indeed, as Knox makes it clear, the *Recht* includes not only civil law but also morality, ethical life and world history.¹⁹⁷ Ethical life in turn, is the commonly used translation of *Sittlichkeit*. Other translations include objective ethics, concrete ethics. But as Charles Taylor has noted, no translation can adequately capture the meaning of this term. It refers to moral obligations that a person has to a community in which he is a part of. These obligations are established on norms and uses of community.¹⁹⁸ The institutions of ethical life appear as family, civil society and state. In *PR*, he start from the abstract concept of free will which wills only itself and proceeds dialectically to more concrete and adequate forms of expression of this free will namely; abstract right, morality and ethical life. In turn, individual appears as bearer of right, moral subject, family member, burgher and citizen but not as believer or church member, if we skip the long remark of paragraph 270.

4.1.1 Abstract Right and Religion

Abstract right is the first mode of the free will. It includes institutions of personality, property, contract, wrong and punishment. It is abstract and has a negative attitude to reality. (*PR*, §34) Any content is a limitation to it. Staying at this level only will bring a fanaticism; French Revolution is the political example of this abstract level. Any differentiation of talent or authority or appears as a limit to abstract right, and it have tendency to destroy these limits. (*PR*, §5A) Nevertheless, the individual, as the possessor of abstract right appears as person. (*PR*, §35) The personality involves capacity for rights. (*PR*, §36) This is the sphere of liberty, life, property. As Franco has asserted, Hegel recognize the importance of fundamental rights and freedoms which are

¹⁹⁶ G. W. F. Hegel, *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. [Third and final edition of 1830] (trans) William Wallace (1873) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/index.htm> (16.10.2009), 486

¹⁹⁷ G. W. F. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right* (trans) T. M. Knox (Oxford University Press: London, Oxford, New York, 1976), p. vi

¹⁹⁸ Charles Taylor, *Hegel* (Cambridge University Pres: New York, 1977), p. 376

at the core of liberal theory. But he reveals the incompleteness of them. Moreover he does not take basis of these rights to be any natural or divine right but, recognition of others. Abstract right is the sphere of legal personality and is distinguished from moral subjectivity.¹⁹⁹ The defect of the level is this; recognition in the contract arises out of arbitrary will, but not moral will. Will is common but not universal between the contracting parties. (PR, §75) The importance of this level for this thesis lies in the fact that Hegel does not derive rights from a divine source but takes the basis of them to be recognition.

4. 1. 2. Morality and Religion

Morality is the second level in the system of Right. It is will, reflected into itself. The free individual is characterized as subject, it turns into itself, internalize its will; and appears as a particular will.²⁰⁰ Subject is moral agent who has responsibility and a distinctive conception of good and welfare of its own. Morality is related to determination of our lives and satisfaction we got in our choices.²⁰¹ Although a higher ground than abstract right, this level has certain defects. Indeed, subject is conscious of universality as something different from subjectivity. It does not achieve concrete synthesis of universality and subjectivity. It therefore remains at the level of ought, always a demand. (PR, §108) Kant's criticism is present in *PR* too. Absence of contradiction as a criterion for determining our duty does not prove a genuine criteria, for Hegel. Kant believed in that certain type of action for example, breaking promises or telling lies can be rejected a priori as moral maxims. Trying to universalize these type of actions will involve an contradiction. Kant, as Michael Inwood has also noticed, oversimplifies Kant's position and claims that by the criterion of absence of contradiction, practical reason can not go beyond abstract formalism of theoretical

¹⁹⁹ Paul Franco, , *Hegel's Philosophy of Freedom* (Yale University Press: New Heaven and London, 1999), p. 194

²⁰⁰ G. W. F. Hegel, *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. [Third and final edition of 1830] (trans) William Wallace (1873) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/index.htm> (16.10.2009), p.503

²⁰¹ Allan Wood, *Hegel's Ethics*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993), p. 217

reason.²⁰² For Hegel, if there is a contradiction, it must be a contradiction of some content which is already presupposed from the start. Kantian categorical imperative remains abstract, there is no criterion to decide whether a principle is duty or not, so any wrong can be justified. (PR, §135R) Moreover, whether the conscience of individual corresponds to what is good can be known only when we know the content of good. This content is provided by ethical life.²⁰³ (PR, § 137) Hegel has reversed his early position which sees any content coming out of individual as detrimental to autonomy.

Secondly, Kenneth Westphall interprets the divinity of state in Hegel, by appealing to divine tasks that Kant attributes to God. Indeed, for Kant, following one's inclinations brings happiness. But whether our inclinations will correspond to our duty is a matter of chance, and happiness is a gift of divine grace. Hegel's state by providing a rational framework of action can provide this knowledge and so happiness becomes a real possibility to be achieved in this world, not a matter of divine grace.²⁰⁴ Robert Pippin similarly approaches to this issue from Kant's postulates of practical reason; existence of God and immortality of soul. These had to be assumed in Kant for the possibility of achievement happiness along with moral righteousness. Hegel does not need these assumptions of god and immortal soul, in his emphasize on the role of ethical community at the formation of individuals. For Pippin, both Kant and Hegel believe that we are subjected to laws that we are the author. But in Hegel authorship of law and self subjection to it, is collective, gradual and historical.²⁰⁵

Moreover, having a conscience is a modern phenomenon, says Hegel. But to have conscience means to have a capacity for evil (PR, §139) Morality is only a formal conscience and to determine what is right and good is not the property of individual. Ethical life is the true conscience which in turn unites formal subjective will with

²⁰² M. J., Inwood *Hegel* (Routledge & Kegan Paul: London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley, 2003), p. 474

²⁰³ For a defense of Kantian morality against Hegel' charge of abstraction see; Brooks Thom, *Hegel's Political Philosophy. A Systematic Reading of the Philosophy of Right* (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 2007), p. 59

²⁰⁴ Kenneth Westphal, *The Basic Context and Structure of Philosophy of Right*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993), p. 240

²⁰⁵ Robert Pippin, *Hegel's Practical Philosophy: the Realization of Freedom in The Cambridge Companion to German Idealism.* (ed) Karl Amerix (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 2000), pp. 193 -194

universal in a concrete way. Moreover he adds that feeling is not the true form of it (PR, §137). By arguing in that way, he implicitly disregards religious conscience which has the form of feeling. So, in turn suggest that religion can not be a source for law and right. But this does not mean that religious conscience will be totally disregarded in Ethical Life. As Frederick Neuhauser emphasized, Hegel's attitude towards conscientious dissenters such as Jews, Quakers and Mennonites is quite liberal.²⁰⁶ Hegel's understanding of toleration will be covered in the next section, it is sufficient to mention here that, Hegel's system has a room for religious conscience, but true conscience is not identical with religious conscience, in the form of feeling. Hegel, unlike his early position does not identify religion with morality or consider religion to be above morality in *PR*.

4. 1. 3 Family and Religion

Ethical life says Hegel; "...is the concept of freedom developed into the existing world and the nature of self consciousness. On the other hand, it is the good become alive" (PR, §. 142) The substance of ethical life; these laws and institutions are duties binding on the will of individual. (PR, §148) The bond of duty can appear as a restriction only on indeterminate subjectivity. Quoting from Hegel;

...that in duty the individual finds his liberation form; first liberation from dependence on mere natural impulse and from the depression which as a particular subject he can not escape in his moral reflections on what ought to be and what might be; secondly, liberation from the indeterminate subjectivity which never reaching reality.. remains self enclosed. In duty the individual acquires his substantive freedom. (PR, §149)

Thus, individuals find liberation in Ethical Life for Hegel. Family is the most immediate and primitive form of Ethical Life in Hegel. It is characterized by love, which is mind's feeling of its unity. Its members achieve self consciousness not as independent persons but as members. (PR, §158) Early Hegel characterized love with the spirit of Jesus and his community. But here love seems to be restricted to the sphere family. He argues that in the state love disappears, and unity is achieved through law, the content of which must be rational and known to us. (PR, §158A) The duty of

²⁰⁶ Frederick Neuhauser, *Foundations of Hegel's Social Theory. Actualizing Freedom* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 2000), p.262

education of children is bestowed upon parents and he does not mention church or religious education as necessary for the moral development of children. (PR, § 174) Family is dissolved when children grows and becomes self-subsistent individuals of civil society. (PR, §181)

4. 1. 4. Civil Society and Religion

Civil society, second moment of Ethical Life, is a complex arrangement which includes a market economy and civic sphere of corporations. Moreover, Hegel also locates coercive institutions of state; administration of justice, police, law in civil society. (PR §188) Civil society appears as an external state based on need (*Notstaad*) For Hegel, civil society is in constant need of state control and supervision.²⁰⁷ Alan Wood argues that, Hegel does not deny coercive functions of state, but he assigns them to *Notstaad*. In other words state appear as coercive from the self-interested perspective of individuals.²⁰⁸

Individual, who has needs, wants and a capacity for satisfying them through his own labor, is dependent upon the labor of others. The system of needs in civil society is a complex system of interdependence in which individual finds satisfaction by means of others. (PR, §182) Individuals in their capacity as burghers are modern interest-seeking private persons. (PR, § 187) The interest of individual can not be defined simply as natural needs. As a reflective being, man has capacity of multiplication of needs and means of satisfying them. (PR, § 191)Hegel reads this as a kind of liberation from mere natural existence, but it remains abstract since its content remains in particularity of self-interest. (PR, §194 § 195) Moreover, multiplication of needs and means of satisfying them subdivides production and brings division of labor and which in turn creates class distinctions. (PR, §198, §199) The division of classes reproduces the inequality by nature and transforms it into an inequality of mind, skills, and even moral

²⁰⁷ John Keane, *Despotism and Democracy. The Origins and Development of the Distinction between Civil Society and the State 1750 -1850* in *Civil society and the State : New European Perspectives* (ed) Keane John (University of Westminster; London, 1998), p.35

²⁰⁸ Allan Wood, *Hegel's Ethics*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederich C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993), p. 231

and intellectual development. (PR, § 200) There are three classes in Hegel's system; substantial agricultural class, reflecting business class and universal class of civil servants. (PR, §202) Hegel assigns modes of consciousness and dispositions to these material existences. Indeed, agricultural mode of existence requires little reflection on the mode of its subsistence and its primary disposition is trust. (PR, § 203) Individualistic business class on the other hand has to produce its own livelihood through reflection and intelligence. (PR, § 204) Lastly, the class of civil servants has to realize the universal interest of the community. (PR, §205). The modern class system is distinguished by its recognition of subjective particularity. When it is lost; indeed when class positions were assigned by guardians like in Plato's *Republic*, or through the accident of birth as in ancient Indian caste system, corruption of whole system follows. It can either happen like in ancient Greek states and Roman Republic through the overthrow of society, or society can preserve itself by force as a religious authority, like in ancient Sparta and caste system of India. (PR, § 206R) However, although modern civil society is an improvement, it has its own structural problem of poverty. Poverty, says Hegel, deprive people from all the advantages of society. (PR, § 241) In turn, there arises a mass of paupers which has a hostile disposition towards rich, government and society. (PR, § 244) For this problem, Hegel can hardly offer a solution. He considers direct measures of public authority like providing direct help, offering of jobs, (PR, §245) but none Hegel considers to be the real solution of the problem. Moreover, as Eric Weil has remarked, against the widespread common misunderstanding, Hegel does not propose that religion could solve the social question.²⁰⁹ Oppressed can not find peace in religion which in turn will block its opposition and hostility towards state. On the contrary, poor has no access to religion as well. Quoting from Hegel,

...their poverty leave them more or less deprived of all the advantages of society, of the opportunity of acquiring skills or education of any kind, as well as the administration of justice, the public health services, and often even of the consolidation of religion and so forth. (PR, § 241)

Moreover, while searching for consolation in religion, oppressed can find itself in one of the harshest bondage, depending on the nature of religion, Hegel remarks. (PR, § 270R) Charity but as a practical solution, stemming from subjective morality, is

²⁰⁹ Eric Weil, *Hegel and The State* (The John Hopkins University Press : Baltimore and London: 1998), p. 107

appreciated by Hegel. He takes charity to be the “the place where morality finds plenty to do despite all public organization.” (PR, §242) But it is still a false opinion, for Hegel that charitable disposition can be the only solution without universal regulations and ordinances which are obligatory.

In civil society, particularity prevails over universal interest of whole society. Society can not sustain itself, has a problem of poverty, this direct society to search for external markets abroad and colonize other societies. (PR, § 248) The unity that is provided by public authority is also limited, since it involves separation and merely relative identity of controller and controlled. Corporations actualize this unity but they would still remain restricted in Hegel’s mind.

In *Philosophy of Right*, there are two conceptions of corporation; one takes it as purely economic institutions, based on specific industries and trades.²¹⁰ The main section which discusses the role of corporations in civil society defines corporation in this narrow basis. Accordingly, Hegel asserts that;

A member of civil society is in virtue of his own particular skill becomes a member of a Corporation, whose universal purpose is thus wholly concrete and no wider in scope than the purpose involved in business, its proper task and interest. (PR, § 251)

In this understanding of corporation, church can not be involved and it would not be wrong to derive that Hegel does not see church as an institution of modern society. However, this would not be the case. Indeed, the wider conception of corporation emerges only when he discusses the role of corporations in state. In that conception church and local authorities are included.²¹¹ John Keane, on the basis of this wider reading of corporation emphasizes the plural nature of civil society in Hegel’s thought and affirms that;

The burgher class certainly depends on corporations – municipal, trade, educational, religious, professional and other state authorized forms of collective association – which function as its ‘second home’, as a shelter which protects it from the vicissitudes of life in civil society and familiarizes it with a higher level of ethical (or public spirited) form of life²¹²

²¹⁰ Dudley Knowles, *Routledge Philosophy Guide Book to Hegel and the Philosophy of Right* (Routledge: London, 2004), p. 292

²¹¹ Ibid, pp. 292- 293

²¹² John Keane, *Despotism and Democracy. The Origins and Development of the Distinction between Civil Society and the State 1750 -1850 in Civil society and the State*

Therefore, the real location of church is in civil society according to wider conception corporation. But the context, which Hegel discusses the nature of church is its relation with polity, will be the next topic of this chapter.

4. 2. Separation of Religion and State

The philosophical proof of the concept of the state starts from the immediate bond of family, which disintegrates into civil society and shows its limitedness and lastly proceeds to state and reveals that state is the ground of other phases. In Hegel's words; "It is within the state that family is first developed into civil society, and it is the idea of the state which disrupts itself into these two moments." (PR, § 256) State is defined as the actuality of ethical Idea. (PR, §257) It unifies the particular aims of individuals under a universal end. (PR, § 261) The universal aim can only be freedom; since he grounds his whole system of right on free will and will can only be free when it aims its own realization. Accordingly, state is the actuality of concrete freedom. For Hegel, state is the highest synthesis of universal will with subjective will and in that sense, it is reason on earth. Rationality consists in unity of universal with a single content, unity of objective freedom with subjective freedom. (PR, § 258). It is not the case that individual can become free without community becoming free. In that condition there will be an opposition between individual and community and this will bring alienation. On the other hand community can not be said to be free without having the component of subjective freedom, the same opposition and thus alienation will arise again. Moreover, it is important to note that Hegel's definition of state does not apply strictly to constitution. He distinguishes between strictly political state and state proper. State proper as Knox has rightly noted, does not refer only to political constitution, but includes the subjective side of whole community together with all moral, legal duties and rights. According to Knox; "State proper is the totality of human life, so far as it is the chief life of moral beings united in a community by tradition, religion and moral

: *New European Perspectives (ed)* Keane John (University of Westminster; London, 1998), p. 51

convictions.’’²¹³ State proper as community includes religion and there is church taken as a corporation, as previous analysis of corporation has asserted. Therefore, there is place for religion and church in Hegel’s system. It is in the long remark to paragraph 270 Hegel presents his ideas on the relation between the two, which is discussed below.

To start, Hegel begins by criticizing the romantic and particularly Schlegel’s tendency of taking religion to be the foundation of state, as the last word of political science on the issue.²¹⁴ It is metaphysical unity of religion and state that is emphasized in PR and argued for formal distinction between them should also be institutionalized as separation. Moreover, unity of religion and state is true but a one-sided understanding for Hegel. Indeed, what is asserted in the argument can imply that state is the realm of worldliness, whereas religion is the domain of infinite. State, as a finite institution, can not stand on its own basis but must subordinate itself to the realm of infinite. It is true, that state is essentially finite and worldly, but this does not mean that state is not capable of becoming ethical and spiritual. A bad state is a finite state and nothing else, but a rational state, says Hegel is infinite, and by being rational only, it is divine.(RP, § 270A) Viewing the state as the opposite of religion and elevating religion as authority above state will result in alienation. Religious subject either gets the attitude of indifference towards civic-political life which is inherently evil for him. On the other hand, he can consider it as a limit and adopt a hostile attitude towards state, a type of fanaticism. Dallmayr suggests that, in the political context of the Restoration period, fanaticism of this kind was an exception, but attitude of inward retreat from the world of politics was more prevalent.²¹⁵ Moreover, James Yerkes asserts that problem arises between religion and state since both claims itself to be the exclusive embodiment of truth and other as the enemy of truth.²¹⁶ Hegel, but sees both, as embodiments of truth in different forms.

²¹³ G. W. F. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right* (trans) T. M. Knox (Oxford University Press: London, Oxford, New York, 1976), p.364, footnote 9

²¹⁴ G. W. F. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right* (trans) T. M. Knox (Oxford University Press: London, Oxford, New York, 1976), p. 365, footnote 11

²¹⁵ R. Fred Dallmayr, *G.W.F. Hegel: Modernity and Politics. Modernity and Political Thought Volume 3* (Sage Publications: California, 1993), p. 141

²¹⁶ James Yerkes, *The Christology of Hegel* (State University of New York Pres: Albany, 1983),p 105

Religion is part of higher realm of Absolute Spirit and state is still finite and therefore part of Objective Spirit. Religion together with art and philosophy belongs to the higher sphere of Absolute Spirit and grounds the whole ethical realm. In this sense religion is ground of state. But this ground should not be made the principle of external political arrangement. In Hegel's words;

Now if religion is in this way the groundwork which includes ethical realm in general, and state's fundamental nature – divine will – in particular, it is at the same time only a groundwork, at this point that state and religion begins to diverge.(PR, § 270 R)

Moreover as a consciousness of Absolute, man can always find in religion freedom and satisfaction against the hard facts, disappointments and losses he experienced in real world. Religion takes the form of feeling, intuition and representative knowledge. It is concentrated on God as the unrestricted principle, and wants everything else to be seen in this light. This attitude of mind can generate a form of religious fanaticism. Accordingly, like fanaticism in politics, it can regard all governmental, legal orders as barriers to its inner life of hearth and as incompatible with infinity. Such a fanaticism may destroy all the ethical ties. Therefore, state can not recognize this subjective disposition of religion as its authority. If it does, it will acquire an unstable character and fall on weakness. Although the content of both religion and state is truth, they have different forms of expressing this truth. Religion has the form of feeling, whereas state has a universal form based on thought. These differences of forms should be externalized; church and state should be separated.

Church is a corporation located in civil society, as mentioned before. Individuals holding common religious views, by forming a church, come under the control of state. But there is a limit to state's intervention. Indeed the conscience and inner life could not be a matter of state regulation, for Hegel. But doctrine of church is not simply an inward matter; it prescribes parallel rules for ethical life. In that condition the paths of church and state will either coincide or diverge. (RP, § 270) Timothy Luther depending on this possibility of divergence, which will not be under the case of Protestantism as Hegel makes it clear, argues that Hegel's state is less tolerant and more Protestant.²¹⁷ Furthermore, Church may claim absolute authority over the whole ethical life. Depending in its absolute content of teaching, it can assume itself to be the sole

²¹⁷ Timothy Luther, *Hegel's Critique of Modernity. Reconciling Individual Freedom and Community* (Lexington Books: Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK, 2009), p. 124

representative of mind (*Geist*) Moreover, it may think of itself to be the sole actor and state as mere means of attainment non-mental ends. But science, says Hegel, similarly may claim for itself the whole intellectual sphere. Indeed, he upholds that;

The church bases this claim on the wide ground that the whole domain of mind (*Geist*) is its property. But science and all types of knowledge also have a footing in that domain and like a church, they build themselves into a whole with a guiding principle of its own, and even with better justification, may regard themselves as occupying the position which the church claims. (PR, § 270R)

State should not allow religion to possess the whole intellectual and ethical realm, for Hegel. But it should pay respect to its doctrines and should not attempt to determine them.

Secondly, since church owns a property, practices worship and have people in its service; it enters into the domain of state and comes under its laws. State should help church in these matters, and provide assistance. Hegel, asserting that religion nevertheless is an integrating factor in state, proposes that state should even require all its citizens to belong to a church. But state can not determine which church, since content of faith belongs to man's private ideas and state can not interfere with it. Moreover, Hegel's position towards religious minorities is quite tolerant as Dallmayr²¹⁸ Avineri²¹⁹ and Neuhauser²²⁰ have noticed. Hegel by supporting Quakers and Anabaptists right not to perform military duty approximates to the liberal position on religion which takes right of individual conscience to be decisive in these matters. Anabaptist and Quakers can perform their duties towards state in a passive way or provide some different service, suggests Hegel. (PR, §, 270) What else, as Avineri remarked, Hegel makes Jewish emancipation a criterion of whether a state is aware of its own universal nature or not.²²¹ In Hegel's words;

²¹⁸ R. Fred Dallmayr, *G.W.F. Hegel: Modernity and Politics. Modernity and Political Thought Volume 3* (Sage Publications: California, 1993), p. 142

²¹⁹ Avineri Sholomo, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1972), p. 169

²²⁰ Frederich Neuhauser, *Foundations of Hegel's Social Theory. Actualizing Freedom* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 2000), p. 262

²²¹ Avineri Sholomo, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1972), p. 170

To exclude the Jews from civil rights, on the other hand, would rather be to confirm the isolation with which they have been reproached – a result for which the state refusing them rights would be blamable and reproachable, because by refusing, it would have misunderstood its own basic principle, its nature as an objective and powerful institution. (PR, § 270R)

This point is significant because, other than Hegel's liberal attitude towards religious minorities, it reflects one of the points of Hegel's significant deviation from the actual politics of Prussia. It was not until 1848 that Jews in Prussia were granted civil emancipation and only after 1918, Jews were admitted into public service.²²²

Lastly, in spite of his distaste for Catholicism, Hegel does not mention Catholics to be excluded. Locke's vision of toleration on the other hand excludes Catholics. First because, they are bound to a foreign prince and second, they do not recognize toleration as a principle.²²³ However, both Hegel and Locke exclude atheists from their state. Locke excludes atheists because they can not be moral in his mind. Hegel's position on atheism is not clear, but not neutral either. Indeed, this is implicit in his claim that state should ask from citizens only to belong to a church, which he thinks as to be an advantage for the unity of state. Another comment put forwards that religion may be necessary within the state for uneducated population who can not rise to the level of philosophy. Genuine religion can provide an easier access for the truth and create an ethical disposition.²²⁴

To conclude, Hegel distinguishes church and religion. First, religion is a moment in absolute spirit, and absolute spirit is higher than objective spirit. Secondly, in Hegel's dialectic higher moments ground the previous ones. (For exp; state is the ground of civil society) Therefore religion grounds the state and appears higher than state. However, although both have the same content, practical religion in the form of feeling and representative knowledge is subordinate to the rational form of state. Religion in the form of feeling can bring alienation or/and fanaticism. State can not depend on this form of feeling thus can not take religion to be its higher authority. Religion and state differs in that sense. Their different forms are to be institutionalized; there should be a

²²² Ibid, pp. 170 -171

²²³ Emmet Kennedy, *Secularism and Its Opponents from Augustine to Solzhenitsyn* (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006), pp. 99 - 105

²²⁴ Dudley Knowles, *Routledge Philosophy Guide Book to Hegel and the Philosophy of Right* (Routledge: London, 2004), p. 320

separation between church and state. Otherwise, state will come close to oriental despotism. State should promote liberty of conscience within the limits that not let religion to appear as the monopoly of mind. Secondly state should treat churches equally. Except the neutrality criteria, Hegel's formula of relation between church and state satisfies the institutional requirements proposed by Audi which are to be accepted in a liberal polity.²²⁵

²²⁵ The first principle which Audi calls the libertarian principle says that the state must permit the practice of any religion, though within certain limits. This is a principle of tolerance. The second principle, the equalitarian principle says that the state may not give preference to one religion over other. The third principle; the neutrality refers not only neutrality among religions but between the religious and the non-religious. See. Audi Robert, Wolterstorff Nicholas, *Religion in Public Square. The Place of Religious Convictions in Public Debate* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers; New York, London, 1997), p. 4

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Firstly, the main concern of this study was to analyze the complex relation of state and religion in Hegel's thought. The scope of the study have been tried to be kept comprehensive by including Hegel's early manuscripts on religion. A comparative approach has been adopted in the analysis of Hegel's early and more mature works. It has been argued that Hegel in both his early manuscripts and later writings has always supported the separation of religion and state at institutional level. Indeed early Hegel draws a sharp line between legality and religion in terms of their distinctive purposes. Moreover in his early writings, Hegel establishes a negative relation between religion and state and, conceives them as opposites of each other. The principle of Christian religion has been taken as freedom either in the form of moral autonomy or in the spirit of reconciliation. State on the other hand, has been defined primarily as a coercive institution based on force. This opposition between religion and state has been identified as one of the sources of alienation by Hegel. Indeed, Christianity as the religion of freedom in its early inception, not being able to integrate itself to political legal structure of hostile Roman Empire, concentrated on the *Beyond* Kingdom of God and became a source of alienation. The history of Christianity presented by early Hegel is characterized by degeneration and loss of liberation potential. Late Hegel but sees this loss of freedom as a necessary moment in the progress of consciousness of freedom. It has been suggested that Hegel provided a secular solution for Christian alienation in his mature period. Indeed, late Hegel defines the principle of modern state to be based on subjective freedom which has its origin in Christianity. This thesis proposes that the main difference between early and late Hegel is to be found in their distinct conceptions of state. In his late writings both modern state and religion is based on freedom and thus there is no opposition between state and religion anymore. Late Hegel by propelling that

modern state is based on Christian principle of freedom; implies that the real salvation is in this actual world and consists in participation in the institutions of Ethical Life.

Secondly it has been argued that Hegel's assertion of unity of religion and state in his late Berlin years should not be understood as a political principle. It has been attempted to show that this assertion of Hegel does in no way entail establishment of theocratic form of polity or state religion. Hegel parallel to his earlier position affirms the separation of religion and state at institutional level as an indispensable part of free polity. Indeed, state and religion have the same content but their forms of expressing this content are distinct. Religion appears in the form of feeling and representation, whereas modern state has a rational form. Religion in the form of feeling can easily be transformed into a type of fanaticism and become fatal for the institutions of Ethical Life. On the other hand, religion can also declare the world of politics and state affairs as inherently evil, incapable of becoming moral and dictate retreat from world affairs. This will bring alienation as mentioned before. Hegel considering these risks, proposes that state should not let religion to establish an authority above it. Yet, state should provide religious liberty within certain limits. Furthermore church by having property of its own and people in its service falls under the jurisdiction of state. But on the internal matters of doctrine, state can not interfere with religion.

Moreover, Hegel's toleration towards religion minorities of Anabaptists, Quakers and Jews has been discussed in the present work. In his recognition of Anabaptists' and Quakers rejection to perform their military duty as acceptable, Hegel's closeness to liberal position which takes conscience to be decisive on these matters, have been highlighted. This point is critical since it constitutes a challenge for militarist charges against Hegel. What else, making the Jewish emancipation the criteria whether the state understands its real principle or not is a further challenge against the interpretations of Hegel's philosophy which tend to associate him with 20th century fascism. Further, it has been asserted that except the neutrality criteria, Hegel's state satisfies all the institutional requirements of separation of church and state which has been posited by Robert Audi as neutrality, equality and liberty. Indeed, Hegel's state satisfies liberty principle by not interfering in the internal affairs of church and by making the practice of and belief in a religion a matter of individual conscience. Second, Hegel's state does not prefer one religion over other but have an equal distance to all, in spite of his personal and theoretical commitment to Protestantism and distaste for Catholicism. Third, this thesis remarks that by having the requirement of belonging to a church,

Hegel's state prefers religion over non religion and thus fails to satisfy neutrality criteria.

Thirdly, this thesis claims that one of the unities of religion and state found in Hegel's philosophy is at the historical level. Indeed, Hegel sees history as the realization of Christian principle of subjective freedom, the excess point of which is the emergence of the idea of modern state, founded on freedom. Standard sociological interpretation reads history but just in the opposite way. In fact, secularization is described in terms of the growing division of labor which bring fragmentation of society into various spheres and institutions that no single idea or principle could unite all these institutions, people and ideas together anymore. Religious principles and values are distinguished from political ones and politics began to define its own immanent principles and values and acquire its own autonomous sphere of action.²²⁶ Whereas in Hegel's thought; secularization, contrary to conventional sense of the phenomenon, appears as a process towards more Christianization. According to Hegel there is one principle directing the history and that is freedom. Freedom first emerges in Christianity and after a long process became the basis of modern state. Hegel's institutions of modern society; bourgeois family, civil society and constitutional monarchy have their essence in this freedom and in that sense alone, they are also sacred institutions; expressing the real principle of Christianity. Moreover, the protestant reformation is key to modern secularism. Luther tied the personal salvation to scripture and faith and repudiated church authority and good works as means for salvation.²²⁷ Hegel appreciates protestant reformation as a world historical event but highlights its different aspects. For Hegel the real contribution of Luther lies in divinization of marriage against chastity, work against poverty and free allegiance to state against obedience to church authority. Conventionally conceived as secular, the modern institutions of Ethical Life are taken as sacred by Hegel. At this point, it is possible to observe clearly the working of Hegel's dialectic. Indeed, the dichotomies of secular / sacred, Christianization / secularization are collapsed into higher level unities and reconceived as identical in their difference. Further dialectical possibility of reconciliation appears if the etymological origin of the term secularism is considered. In fact, the term secular derives from the Latin *saeculum*

²²⁶ Kosmin Barry A, Keysar Ariela, *Secularism and Secularity. Contemporary International Perspective*. (Institute for the study of Secularism and Secularity in Culture), pp. 4 -5

²²⁷ Emmet Kennedy, *Secularism and Its Opponents from Augustine to Solzhenitsyn* (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006), p. 4

which means of this age and of this time, denoting a spatio-temporal reality. Absolute on the other means which does not change and which is beyond space and time. In Hegel's philosophy but God as Absolute Spirit enters into time and space and realizes itself in history. This in turn establishes an identity between the antithesis of *saeculum* and Absolute.

Fourthly, it has been argued that Hegel posits a unity of religion and state at metaphysical level. For Hegel, both religion and state have the same content of eternal truth and the same principle of freedom in their essence. Religion for Hegel is the knowledge of god and man in God. State on the other hand is the march of God on earth (PR, § 258A) Both have freedom and God (which is truth) in their content but their form of expressing this content is different. State has a rational form whereas religion takes the form of pictorial thinking. But pictorial form that religion takes, does not grab from it its true content. As Carl Butler has suggested, speculative philosophy of Hegel preserves faith and raises it to the level of knowledge.²²⁸ For Hegel, religion can find confirmation in philosophy and survive the critic of *philosophes*. Reason and faith can be reconciled in Hegel and this is one of the central projects of his speculative philosophy that constitutes an aspect of it which runs counter to the spirit of Enlightenment, according to Robert Stern.²²⁹ Indeed, according to Peter Gay the aim of enlightenment was absolute rejection of religious interpretation of life. For French *philosophes*, there was a life-death struggle between two irreconcilable patterns of life, thought and feeling; a struggle of scientific criticism against religious superstition, reason against unreason and anthropological view of life against a theological one. Moreover, the radicalization of religious beliefs by three generations of French *philosophes* is a reflection of a historical process leading away from Christianity to modernity for Gay. This process starts from Christian skepticism of Bayle, extends to the deism of Voltaire and English moral philosophers and finally culminates in atheism and materialism of Hume, Gibbon and Holbach.²³⁰ However, as Laurence Dickey remarks this characterization of Enlightenment applies only to French *philosophes*.

²²⁸ Ibid. p. 152

²²⁹ Robert Stern, *General Introduction* in *G. W. F. Hegel. Critical Assessments*. (ed) Robert Stern. Volume I (Routledge: London, New York, 1993), p. 2

²³⁰ in Laurence Dickey, *Hegel. Religion, Economics, and the Politics of Spirit* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1987), pp. 17 - 18

Aufklärung ; the German version of enlightenment, on the other hand did not embark anything like struggle against Christianity Their attempt was to integrate Protestantism with rationalistic humanism. This however, does not mean that Aufklärer did not engage in criticism against Christianity; i. e. Lutheran Orthodoxy. But the alternatives they offered were still Christian, says Dickey. Instead of a transcendent God, they offered a conception of God who was immanent to world and against the grace of god they posited a salvation process that requires civic participation.²³¹ Therefore, it can be argued that German version of Enlightenment was not a struggle against Christianity but a project of reconciliation modern interpretation of life with a Christian one. Hegel contributed to this project in his attempt of reconciling antitheses of faith/reason, secular/Christian. Yet, one of the most important contributions of Hegel, this thesis suggests to be lying in his tolerating multiple expression of the same truth. This is what Hegel can still offer to us in our era characterized by multiple expressive mediums but which can hardly offer a common ground that can constitute a basis for dialogue between these forms of expression.. In the absence of such a common ground, the different expressions and interpretations of life can easily be considered as sharing nothing in common. Indeed as Gehrig have observed;

... Sophisticated systems of legitimation arise in cases where “interpretations of reality” are disputed by alternative meaning systems. The separation of church and state, gods and government, creates intense competition between religious and political systems. Modern pluralistic societies, in fact, have to deal not only with the “erosion of traditional meaning systems,” but with different sources of competition: the competition of religious and political institutions, and the competition of different religious systems of legitimation.²³²

Hegel but establishes an identity between secular and religious meaning systems by simply claiming that both are true. Moreover Hegel also views all religions to have truth in their content. This study limits itself by concentrating largely on Hegel’s understanding of Christianity, but any future study can analyze Hegel’s ideas on other religions and investigate the implications of his proposed unity among all religions.

²³¹ Ibid. pp. 18, 23, 26

²³² in Marcella Cristi, *From Civil to Political Religion : The Intersection of Culture, Religion and Politics*. (Wilfrid Laurier University Press: Waterloo, 2001), p. 98

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY RESOURCES

Hegel G. W. F., *Address on the Tercentenary of the Submission of the Augsburg Confession (25 June 1839)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999)

Hegel G. W. F. , *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. [Third and final edition of 1830] (trans) William Wallace (1873) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/index.htm> (16.10.2009)

Hegel G. W. F., *German Constitution (1798- 1802)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999)

Hegel G. W. F., *Lectures on the Philosophy of History (1827 – 1831)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999)

Hegel G. W. F. , *Lectures On the Philosophy of Religion*. (ed) Peter C. Hodgson, (trans.) R.F. Brown, P.C. Hodgson, and J.M. Stewart, with the assistance of H.S. Harris. (University of California Press: Berkeley, 1988)

Hegel G. W. F., *The Positivity of Christian Religion* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961)

Hegel G. W. F., *The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate* in *On Christianity: Early Theological Writings* (trans) T. M. Knox (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1961)

Hegel G. W. F., *Philosophy of Right* (trans) T. M. Knox (Oxford University Press: London, Oxford, New York, 1976)

Hegel G. W. F., *Religion ist eine* [The Tübingen Essay of 1793] in *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (trans) H. S. Harris (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972)

Hegel G. W. F., *The Philosophy of History* (trans) J. Sibree (Batoche Books: Kitchener, 2001)

Hegel G. W. F., *The Relationship of Religion to the State (1831)* in *Hegel, Political Writings* (ed) Laurence Dickey, (ed) trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999)

Hegel G. W. F., *Unter objektiver Religion (The Berne Plan of 1794)*, in Harris H. S. , *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972)

SECONDARY RESOURCES

Audi Robert, Wolterstorff Nicholas, *Religion in Public Square. The Place of Religious Convictions in Public Debate* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers; New York, London, 1997)

Avineri Sholomo, *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1972)

Birchall B. C., *Hegel's Critique of Religion* in *G. W. F. Hegel. Critical Assessments.* (ed) Robert Sern. Volume IV (Routledge: London, New York, 1993)

Breckman, Warren, *Marx, the Young Hegelians, and the Origins of Radical Social Theory* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999)

Brooks Thom, *Hegel's Political Philosophy. A Systematic Reading of the Philosophy of Right* (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 2007)

Callinicos Alex, *Social Theory. A Historical Introduction* (New York University Press: New York, 1999)

Cristi, Marcella. *From Civil to Political Religion : The Intersection of Culture, Religion and Politics.* (Wilfrid Laurier University Press: Waterloo, 2001)

Dallmayr R. Fred, *G.W.F. Hegel: Modernity and Politics. Modernity and Political Thought Volume 3* (Sage Publications: California, 1993)

Desmond William, *Hegel's God, A Counterfeit Double?* (Ashgate: England, USA, 2003)

Dickey Laurence, *Hegel. Religion, Economics, and the Politics of Spirit* (Cambridge University Pres: Cambridge, New York, 1987)

Franco, Paul, *Hegel's Philosophy of Freedom* (Yale University Press: New Heaven and London, 1999)

Goldstein D. Joshua, *Hegel's Idea of the Good Life. From Virtue to Freedom, Early Writings and Mature Political Philosophy. Studies in German Idealism. Vol. 7* (Springer: Netherlands, 2006)

H. S. Harris, *Hegel's Development to 1807* in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed)

Harris H. S. , *Hegel's Development. Toward the Sunlight 1770 – 1801* (Oxford University Press: New York, 1972)

Hodgson C Peter, *Hegel and Christian Theology. A Reading of the Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion* (Oxford University Pres: Oxford, New York, 2005)

Houlgate S. , *An Introduction to Hegel: freedom, truth and history* (Blackwell Publishing; Malden, Oxford, Victoria, 2005),

Houlgate Stephen, *World History as the Progress of Consciousness: An Interpretation of Hegel's Philosophy of History in G. W. F. Hegel. Critical Assessments.* (ed) Robert Sern. Volume IV (Routledge: London, New York, 1993)

Inwood M. J., *Hegel* (Routledge & Kegan Paul: London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley, 2003)

Jackson F. L., "Hegel on Secularity and Consummated Religion," *Animus* 9 (2004) www.swgc.mun.ca/animus

Jaeschke Walter, "Christianity and Secularity in Hegel's Concept of the State," *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 61, No. 2 (Apr., 1981), pp. 127-145

Kant Immanuel, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (trans) H. J. Paton. (Harper Torchbooks: New York, 1964)

Kaufmann A Walter, "Hegel's Early Antitheological Phase" *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (Jan., 1954), pp. 3-18

Keane John, *Despotism and Democracy. The Origins and Development of the Distinction between Civil Society and the State 1750 -1850* in *Civil society and the State*

: *New European Perspectives* (ed) Keane John (University of Westminster; London, 1998)

Kennedy Emmet, *Secularism and Its Opponents from Augustine to Solzhenitsyn* (Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2006)

Knowles Dudley, *Routledge Philosophy Guide Book to Hegel and the Philosophy of Right* (Routledge: London, 2004)

Kojève Alexandre, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel. Lectures on the Phenomenology of Spirit*. (ed) Allan Bloom. (trans) James H. Nichols (Cornell University Press: Ithaca, London, 1980)

Kosmin Barry A, Keysar Ariela, *Secularism and Secularity. Contemporary International Perspective*. (Institute for the study of Secularism and Secularity in Culture)

Lakeland Paul, *The Politics of Salvation: The Hegelian Idea of the State* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1984)

Lewis Thomas, *Freedom and Tradition in Hegel. Reconsidering Anthropology, Ethics, Religion* (University of Notre Dame Press: Notre Dame, India, 2005)

Luther Timothy, *Hegel's Critique of Modernity. Reconciling Individual Freedom and Community* (Lexington Books: Lanham • Boulder • New York • Toronto • Plymouth, UK, 2009)

Marcuse Herbert, *Reason and Revolution. Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory* (Routledge & Kegan Paul: London, 1955)

Marx Karl, Supplement (*Rheinische Zeitung* No. 195, July 14, 1842), in *Marx and Engels on Religion*, (Progress Publishers: Moscow, 1957) Marxist Internet Archive <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1842/07/10.htm> (27. 06. 2010)

Neuhouser Frederick, *Foundations of Hegel's Social Theory. Actualizing Freedom* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 2000)

O'Regan Cyril, *The Heterodox Hegel* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1994)

Ormiston Alice, "The Spirit of Christianity and Its Fate": Towards a Reconsideration of the Role of Love in Hegel, *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue canadienne de science politique*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Sep., 2002), pp. 499-525

Patent Alan, *Hegel's Idea of Freedom*, (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2002)

Peddle David, "The Construction Of The Secular In Rawls And Hegel: Religion, Philosophy And Public Reason" *Animus* 9 (2004) www.swgc.mun.ca/animus

Pippin Robert, *Hegel's Practical Philosophy: the Realization of Freedom in The Cambridge Companion to German Idealism*. (ed) Karl Amerix (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 2000)

Plant Raymond, *Politics, Theology and History* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 2003)

Plant Raymond, *Hegel* (Routledge: New York, 1999)

Popper Karl P., *The Open Society and Its Enemies. Volume II, The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx and Aftermath* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey, 1966)

Rawls John, *Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy* (ed) Barbara Herman (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 2000)

Riedel Manfred, *Between Tradition and Revolution. The Hegelian Transformation of Political Philosophy* (trans) Walter Wright (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1984)

Ritter Joachim, *Hegel and the French Revolution. Essays on the Philosophy of Right* (trans) Richard Dien Winfield (the MIT press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 1982)

Rousseau Jean-Jacques, *The Social Contract and the First and Second Discourses*. (ed) Susan Dunn. (Yale University Press: New Heaven and London, 2000)

Shanks Andrew, *Civil Society, Civil Religion* (Blackwell: Oxford UK, Cambridge US, 1995)

Solomon Robert C. , *In the Spirit of Hegel. A Study of G.W.F. Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit* (Oxford University Press: Oxford New York, 1983)

Solomon Robert C., *Continental Philosophy since 1750. The Rise and Fall of the Self* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, New York, 1988)

Stern Robert, *General Introduction in G. W. F. Hegel. Critical Assessments.* (ed) Robert Stern. Volume I (Routledge: London, New York, 1993)

Sturma Dieter, *Politics and the New Mythology: the Turn to Late Romanticism in The Cambridge Companion to German Idealism.* (ed) Karl Amerix (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 2000)

Taylor Charles, *Hegel and Modern Society* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1979)

Taylor Charles, *Hegel* (Cambridge University Press: New York, 1977)

Weil Eric, *Hegel and The State* (The John Hopkins University Press : Baltimore and London: 1998)

Westphal Kenneth, *The Basic Context and Structure of Philosophy of Right*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993)

Westphal Merold, *Hegel, Freedom, and Modernity* ((State University of New York Press: Albany, 1992)

Williamson, Raymond Keith., *Introduction to Hegel's Philosophy of Religion* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1984)

Wood Allan, *Hegel's Ethics*, in *The Cambridge Companion to Hegel* (ed) Frederick C. Beiser, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, New York, 1993)

Yerkes James, *The Christology of Hegel* (State University of New York Press: Albany, 1983)