

appearance, or even in fact, they will have to bring themselves into accord with the reactionary and most despotic and brutal government in Europe; and that will mean a great loss for France. While the alliance has already had a disintegrating influence on Russia, this influence will become even more powerful if the alliance endures. Since the conclusion of this unhappy treaty the Russian government, which formerly entertained a certain fear of European sentiment, and reckoned with it, no longer troubles about it. France claims to be the most civilized of peoples, yet inwardly she is rotten and disintegrated; and friendship with such a people must naturally lead to the Russian government becoming more and more reactionary and despotic. So the only possible result of this strange and unhappy alliance will be an unholy influence on the welfare of the two peoples as well as on civilization in general.<sup>7</sup>

"By a coincidence the famous Italian philosopher of law, Lombroso, has also recently discussed the Franco-Russian alliance with Tolstoy. Professor Lombroso writes as follows in *Das freie Wort* concerning his interview:

"Before taking leave I could not refrain from inquiring what his views were on the Franco-Russian alliance. And the answer he gave me was one of those utterances which seem paradoxical but are nevertheless eminently true: "It was the greatest misfortune that could have befallen the Russian people, for hitherto the government has at times been deterred from overtyrannical conduct, through fear of European public sentiment, whose great center lies in France; while now this fear will no longer exist." And the facts, especially the sad oppression of Finland, bear him out all too well."

---

#### MR. MANGASARIAN AGAIN.

Mr. Mangasarian prints an extract from my answer to him where I say that "if God stands for anything he means truth and justice, and the main thing in a war will ever be to have these on one's side." By this I mean that if people sincerely believe in God they will endeavor to purify their souls, and their belief will help them to think right and to do the right thing. As to my own conception of God, I will add that I define God as those factors in the world which constitute the world-order and find their clearest expression in what scientists call natural laws, including those highest laws which result in what has been called the moral world-order. In this sense I say that the laws of nature are the eternal thoughts of God.

In discussing the problem of God I have taken the course of inquiring what God meant to our ancestors in their experience, and in trying to understand their experience I have come to the conclusion that God meant to them truth, right and justice; that they personified their ideals in the belief of a supernatural personality.

Now to my mind the underlying idea of God contains a great truth, but it should be purified of errors and poetical imagery which can easily lead us into superstitions.

If I call God the All-Being I mean to say that he is not a concrete being that is in a definite place, but omnipresent; he is everywhere in the All. He is as omnipresent as is every law of nature which takes effect wherever conditions permit its application.

Mr. Mangasarian says: "If Carns makes God the 'determinant' then he must hold him responsible for the war and all the crimes and follies connected with it." I am not a quibbler so I will say: In a certain sense, yes; in another, no! God is the law of causation. He determines the results of conditions; therefore he is the blessing of good deeds and the curse of evil deeds. War is the result of egotism, ill will, greed, envy, hatred and other vices. In this sense war is a punishment sent by God, but in so far as the vices and the evil deeds that result from vices are men's own doings and not God's, God can not be blamed for them, unless we understand God in a pantheistic sense and identify the creator with his creation. But here I do not follow. I am opposed to pantheism. If I call God the All-Being, I do not identify him with the All, as Mr. Mangasarian assumes. It seems so hopeless to explain anything to Mr. Mangasarian. Nevertheless I would have patience enough to explain, if I had not the impression that he draws wrong conclusions intentionally, simply for the sake of argument.

Proper worship of God does not consist in ceremonies or prayer, but in knowing and appreciating the worth of this character of existence. In the course of evolution it has made man a moral being, and man must obey its rules for the sake of progress and general well-being. This God is the God of truth, the God of justice, the God of history.

Mr. Mangasarian has taken special offense at my saying that "God is neutral." He has misinterpreted and perhaps misunderstood me, but I mean what he says in his criticism, that the law of gravitation is neutral. Indeed all the laws of nature are neutral, but they serve him who adapts himself to them. In the same sense God is neutral, even as neutral as the sun that shines upon the evil as well as on the good and the rain that falls alike on the just and on the unjust. I still believe that God is neutral, and Mr. Mangasarian's sarcasm convinces me as little as it has convinced some members of his congregation who called at my office in search of further literature on the subject. One gentleman told me that he had been interested in Mr. Mangasarian's attack on me, but judging from his (Mr. Mangasarian's) statement alone, he thought that I had the better of him.

I grant, however, that others of Mr. Mangasarian's congregation agree with him. One of his admirers makes the following comment on the case:

"No one is so blind as he who *will not* see.

"No one is so deaf as he who *will not* hear.

"Also—any one with any 'sense of humor' and fair degree of knowledge, logic and FACTS surely must *smile* over your 'hypothesis of God' and 'God is Neutral' writings. Your *reasonings, statements, and conclusions* in them are ALL so absurd, and simply *creations of your own brain* and mere reflections of your *individual conceptions and wishes*."

In reply to this conception I will say that the formulations of all natural laws are the creations of the brains of naturalists, be they Galileos, Keplers or Newtons. There is no harm in that. But if their formulas are true, they possess a meaning beyond themselves and become very serviceable. My critic's view will please Mr. Mangasarian and I quote it because I do not begrudge him the satisfaction he will derive therefrom.

Mr. Mangasarian has continued his attacks on me but I do not understand what he is driving at, for he makes statements that are irrelevant. He says, for instance: "The name of God has fenced in all manner of crimes,

to use a thought of Shelley. Does a massacre become 'holy' because it was started with a shout of 'Allah is great!' or 'Glory be unto God!'?"

In trying to understand me, he continues: "Can the good doctor be serious with his suggestion that the Christian and 'heathen' belligerents in invoking the God of battles are only praying to truth and justice? Truth and justice are not existences or entities, they are qualities. It would be just as unmeaning to pray to *hardness* or *softness* as to pray to truth or justice."

I did not attribute my God-conception to others, not even by way of suggestion; nor did I speak of prayer, or have I ever advocated it. I remind my readers of Kant's attitude toward prayer, and he rejects it except for oratorical reasons. It is well known that the pious Buddhists replace prayer by vows, and Jesus prays to God, "Thy will be done." The Lord's Prayer is not an appeal to God to change His will, but a vow that we shall adapt ourselves to God's will.

These are only incidental remarks on a topic which does not properly belong here, but Mr. Mangasarian raises the question to attack me and for the sake of effect does not mind shooting into the empty air. It does not hit me. Truth and justice, he declares, are qualities, not existences or entities. Let them be qualities or whatever you may call them. So long as they possess objective significance we would better heed them as much as we heed the laws of nature.

Mr. Mangasarian winds up his attack on me with a tirade on war prayers and his notions of Allah. He says:

"The God of both Turk and Christian is a *person*. The prayer which is recited by order of the Kaiser in all the churches to-day reads: 'Almighty and merciful God! *God of the armies!*... Bless the entire German war force. Lead us to victory, etc.' That is a very different God from the attenuated divinity of Paul Carus. And the English God is as anthropomorphic as the German: 'Oh, Lord our God arise. Scatter his [the king's] enemies. And make them fall. Confound their politics. Frustrate their knavish tricks. On thee our trust we fix, etc.' And when the Moslem obeys God's command to put every unbeliever to the edge of the sword, but to save the young maidens for his harem, he is not thinking of the made-to-order God of Dr. Carus—who is a mere adjective—a sort of stage God who appears and disappears as his managers pull the strings, but of a personal Being seated on a throne—one who hates the *Giavour* and loves the Moslem."

I have read Mr. Mangasarian's exposition of the God of the German Kaiser and the English king, like all his other comments, with much edification but also with indifference and without profit, for I do not know what these opinions have to do with me or my views. I enjoy a good controversy, but I do not care to meet an antagonist who either does not want or does not care to understand the meaning of my statements. We might as well listen to the crowing of our neighbor's rooster or watch the artistic contortions of an acrobat on the trapeze.

The English national hymn is correctly quoted but I do not understand what it has to do with me or my conception of God. The main use which these arguments possess is that they have convinced some of Mr. Mangasarian's admirers (or as I positively know at least one of them) of the absurdity of my views of God. Very well! I am satisfied. p. c.