

# **THE RELIGION OF THE FUTURE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9781760573225

The Religion of the Future by Eduard von Hartmann & Ernest Dare

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**EDUARD VON HARTMANN & ERNEST DARE**

**THE RELIGION  
OF THE FUTURE**



---

THE  
RELIGION OF THE FUTURE.

BY  
EDWARD VON HARTMANN,  
AUTHOR OF 'THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE UNCONSCIOUS.'

Translated from the German,  
WITH THE AUTHOR'S PERMISSION,

BY  
ERNEST DARE.

LONDON:  
W. STEWART & CO., 41 FARRINGTON STREET, E.C.  
1886.

Phis 3415.63

F. v

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
GIFT OF THE  
MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Nov 10, 1938

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

---

THE following pages are reprinted here without material alterations from the First Edition. The time which has elapsed since their composition was too short for getting any fresh views about the questions considered in them. They evoked no criticisms worthy of notice, when first published singly in the Leipsic weekly Journal, *Literature*, edited by Paul Wislicenus; and the first collected publication of them, consisting of two thousand copies, was bought up within eight weeks. Accordingly, there has not been any interval long enough to enable me to give an answer to some of the more important rejoinders, by issuing a fresh Edition with elucidations and additions. Some political and ecclesiastical Journals hastened to criticise the First Edition, but failed to bring any weightier arguments forward. Most of my critics drew a close parallel between my little book and Strauss's *The Old Faith and the New*. I, for my part, cannot complain of this parallel which writers of the most various standpoints put into prominence, nor of the censure accruing to me from the comparison with Strauss.

Indeed, I have diligently refrained from strengthening, with my voice, the chorus of hostile critics and of pamphleteers who have attacked the farewell volume of Strauss. I have contented myself with pointing out that Strauss's fundamental principles must make us class him among Liberal Protestants.

For Strauss as a critic and as an author, my respect is so great that I could not join in the outcry evoked by his *Confession*, a book which showed most clearly to the world at large that Strauss was not a philosopher,—which fact was discovered long ago by all our profound thinkers,—although some Hegelians had once declared him to be such, because, in his youth, he had followed the flag of Hegelianism. But, by close study of Strauss's writings, it was easy to see that his adherence to Hegel was only a nominal discipleship imposed on him by the fashion of the time; and, accordingly, the striking proof of this fact which, in his old age, he afforded by his renunciation of Idealism, and by his warm partisanship with Darwinism in its latest form, was quite unnecessary. If Strauss had ever comprehended the full depth of the Hegelian Philosophy, he would necessarily have adopted a more spiritual conception of Darwin's newly-founded Doctrine of Descent, instead of enthusiastically accepting the mechanical conception of the Universe,—not, indeed, without quite inconsistently smuggling in some fragments of his former idealistic principles of Philosophy. Accordingly, it seemed superfluous to enter upon a philosophical discussion of Strauss's theories, and all the more so because he, on the one side, had shown the utter irreconcilableness of the earlier with the later elements of that cosmical conception which he put forth, and I, on the other side, had reserved my discussion of the Darwinians' mechanical theory of the Universe for a special exposition.<sup>1</sup> And equally well was I able to dispense with any account or defence of my own conception of the Universe, inasmuch as a full exposition of it is to be found in my philosophical writings. Accordingly, I have been able to avail myself of a greater concentration of subject-matter, and of a more concise handling of the religious questions belonging to the present time, all extraneous matter being excluded; but

<sup>1</sup> *Wahrheit und Irrthum im Darwinismus (Truth and Error in Darwinism)*. Berlin: C. Duncker.



no reader, who is of a reflecting turn of mind and is well acquainted with the systematic interdependence of all my opinions, will doubt that the following speculations are in essential harmony with my views, or that they are here put forward in order to furnish a new support for these views.

I do not disguise from myself the probability that my treatment of the subject will please nobody. In Germany a man who is an opponent of Christianity is generally also a bitter foe to Religion in any shape or form, and comes easily to regard with perfect contempt all persons supporting the interests of Religion as the highest interests of Humanity; in fact, he considers them to be mere dreamers or mystics. But, at this time of day, any one who still wishes to champion the cause of Religion will hardly dare to do so unless he stands upon the ground of Historical Christianity. But I, nevertheless, am attacking the orthodox, because they are Christian—that is, in our opinion, stupid; and I attack the radical opponents of Christianity,—such as Strauss,—because they are irreligious; and I attack Liberal Protestants, because they not only are irreligious, but also would still be Christians as well. That the traditional Religions are in any concrete form no longer retainable, I agree with Strauss in believing—that is, with the Strauss of *The Old Faith and the New*, not with the Strauss of *The Life of Jesus*. But I separate myself from him, by my contention that irreligious Secularism will not be permanent, and that, unless the whole of Modern Civilization is to become the prey of Ultramontaniam, something new must certainly make its appearance—not an unpractical, abstract religiousness, but a new concrete form of Religion, which is founded on rational, yet profoundly spiritual principles. These bases can be supplied only by a pessimistic Pantheism which teaches the immanence of the individual soul in the one Universal Spirit, and the substantial identity of the Universal Essence with its individual manifestation. The most suggestive hints about the psychological development of such a

Monistic Religion of immanence are to be found in Biedermann's *Christian Dogma*. Biedermann, however, is still too deeply immersed in Hegelian Optimism, and labours under a delusion about Free-will, and also is incapable of dismissing the idea that his psychologically developed Essence of Religion can be fully realized in History by some radical transformation of Christianity.<sup>1</sup>

I have not concealed my conviction that the new, much-needed Religion will not very speedily make its appearance, and that, consequently, a period of religious perplexity must intervene, bringing much mental anguish. Some persons, perhaps, may reproach me for not scrupling to publish my ideas, which will help to hasten on that perplexity, and to aggravate the mental anguish already existing. But I must avow that such scruples could never have deterred me from publishing any opinion which I, after mature reflection, had formed and had conscientiously felt to be true to the best of my knowledge. The unsatisfying nature of the old Faith is being felt on all sides; and people are also clearly discerning the direction in which the further development of religious thought must lead; nevertheless, we should remember that no great spiritual progress is ever accomplished without great struggles, general bewilderment and many exhibitions of deplorable excesses. Desire, if you will, to spare Mankind such struggles because of the painful convulsions which they involve, only let this forbearance mean that your condemnation of these struggles rests on the grounds of spiritual life. When, however, the proper time *has* come for throwing the firebrand

<sup>1</sup> As regards the Poets, Sallet, in his *Gospel of the Laity (Laien-evangelium)*, takes much the same view as mine. The Optimism still tolerated by Sallet becomes in Schäfer's only half pantheistic *Laien-brevier*, a repulsive, cringing humility, while in Rückert's *Wisdom of the Brahmans (Weisheit der Brahmanen)*, Pessimism is more faithfully represented, and the absence of arbitrary dependence on Christianity so utterly different in spirit, is pleasing to the reader.

under the stubble, and for preparing the field for next year's crop, cannot be determined by human calculation; we must continue to leave the determination of the time to a higher Power which guides the general destinies of Mankind. The individual, as soon as he has fulfilled his duties as an individual, can and should boldly transfer all responsibility for the consequences of his act, which are beyond his ken, to that higher Power. But the seeker after Truth may not do this before he has earnestly and honestly striven to acquire Knowledge, and submitted the results obtained to a scientific verification, and, lastly, refuse to conceal, on external grounds, from Mankind that which he holds to be true; he must, rather, without fear of men communicate all he discovers, being assured that the contribution furnished by him to Knowledge, even though it be mixed up with error, will, nevertheless, help on the development of the Truth, and by that means promote the progress of Humanity. Has a man fulfilled all these conditions? Then he need no more trouble about the reproach that he sows perplexity and inflames disputes.

Of all the various schools of Theology, the Evangelical is the least able to reject these contentions of mine, inasmuch as its own powers (and need) of development are dependent on similar arguments; therefore, to the Evangelicals every impulse—though coming from an enemy—which leads to deeper research into the essence of Religion and of Christianity, must be welcome. Indeed signs are increasing that even in orthodox-Evangelical quarters, wherever a deep and real religiousness is displayed, *two* things are being gradually comprehended which, but a few decades of years ago, scarcely any one had ventured to believe. The first is, that the old customary aversion to Pantheism conceived in a *spiritual* and not in a *naturalistic* sense, arose from a misapprehension on the part of its opponent as much as from its special contents, and that Pantheism is really a spiritual force with which,