

coming century is scarcely more heartening. He sees no great promise in the newer socialistic ideals. "If it comes, the substitution of the State in the administration of capital for the Manchester gospel of individual self-help will mark an epoch as does the Reformation or the French Revolution—each of them associated with long, vehement, confused struggle, neither of them ending in unclouded blessings."

Morley none the less cannot be unaware that the Manchester school has lost its authority. We no longer look for guidance to the principles of *laissez faire* or of non-intervention, nor to the vague formula of the greatest good to the greatest number. What the world really needs is a new liberal vision, a new interpretation of social harmony. Morley apparently feels that the spirit of the old Liberalism is sound and vital enough to organize the new era; but he nowhere gives us any indication of how we can translate the precepts of Cobden and Gladstone into a program that will meet the needs of to-morrow. Possibly Morley in some later work will give us a program of this sort. We can, at any rate, say that the new society will be fortunate if it comes under the guidance of men of his mould.

## GOD AND SATAN.

BY F. W. ORDE WARD.

IT seems more than probable that the idea of a Devil is one aspect of God, chipt off, so to speak or abstracted from the totality. The vision arose from an unjustifiable separation between the two great constituents of love—namely justice and mercy, a foolish and fatal dichotomy, and from the innate tendency of the human mind (as psychology shows) to dualize things, instead of resting in opposites. Dichotomy is so easy and convenient though superficial, like the dilemma the joy of all feeble thinkers. So we gradually obtained two distinct and hostile deities confronting each other—God the true Infinite, and Satan the bad or false Infinite. But why this monstrous and unreasonable divorce?

"Finis nosse Deum, principiumque Deus."

"A Deo omnia incipiunt, in Deum omnia exeunt."

Yet we shall see presently, as we proceed in the course of our inquiry, that this divulsion of the two component factors was quite inevitable.

and if there had been no Devil, man would have found it necessary to invent one, as an explanation of whatever seemed imperfect, ugly, or wicked in the world, and to save his own face. Such a creation was obvious. It is the fashion now with many who like to be considered advanced in their opinions, to repudiate as an absurd lingering survival often with much indignation the fact of a Devil, and to set in his place a Principle of Evil, a singularly vague and vicious abstraction. This hardly appears to be a working hypothesis, it is rather an idle hypothesis, a bloodless bogey or phantasm. It is but a pitiful personification of a "pseudo-concept" which, while denying the personality of the Devil, practically confesses it. For the so-called "Principle of Evil" actually impersonates what it abhors. It meets us as a colorless ineptitude that bears no relation to any kind of thought which is dialectical or nothing.

We shall now first have to inquire into the meaning of God, and we shall discover in Him the *coincidentia omnium oppositorum*, or the sum of all contradictions. Were He not this, how could we possibly explain Evil? Let us begin with the assertion, which is Scripture as well as fundamental, that God is Love. Everyone seems from the beginning to have taken for granted that we instinctively understood the nature of what was termed Love, which they supposed to be a weak and washy benevolence toward all men and toward all things. But the least reflection will show the absurdity of this notion. We are by no means born into the world with a ready stock of cut and dried interpretations of facts. Instead of Love being a simple matter, it is the profoundest of all vital problems. To feel an emotional tenderness sometimes overflowing in tears, does not constitute such a sublime and complex subject. It embraces heights and depths beyond calculation, and far above the petty arithmetic of every-day chatter—it is a calculus of the Infinite. We must perceive at once, that, if God is Love, His title contains abysses and ranges of thought past all imaginings. The infinite and the infinitesimal must here unite. Love never was and never could be pure unmixed kindness. No doubt, God is merciful, but He is also and equally just. No doubt He is tender, but He is also and equally severe. No doubt, He is kind, but He is also and equally cruel. And still He remains Perfect Love. The so-called Evil in the world assuredly should convince any one accessible to reason that the namby-pambyism, the feeble forgiveness, the unjust and impossible amiability in these thoughtless days usually attributed to God, possess no foundation whatever. On the contrary, He is just because He is merciful, He is cruel because He is kind, He is severe

because he is tender. Were He otherwise He could not claim our worship, and it is certain that He would not receive it. "I know, O Lord, that Thy judgments are right, and that Thou in faithfulness hast afflicted me." The mawkish and maudlin sentimentalism of the twentieth century does not understand this. But the prolonged agony of the present terrible war, in our fight against beasts and devils, will teach us better, and should teach us the truth. That which we should immediately condemn as laxity of principle and practice in a neighbor, we should not expect or praise in God. Even the greatest gentleness, when the occasion arises, exhibits "the wrath of the lamb." And the Christ Himself, while meek and lowly in speech and in Spirit, could be sometimes, a "consuming fire." We are told expressly that He carried a rod as well as a staff, a sword as well as an olive branch, and He used the one no less than the other. For in the hour of need His *verba* were *verbera*. Jesus likewise armed Himself with a scourge and employed it ruthlessly at least on two occasions recorded in the Scriptures. We may choose to think differently, but however much we whine and whimper and appeal to a sickly compassionateness and a criminal leniency, we shall appeal in vain. God governs according to eternal laws, and if we violate His laws we must take the consequences. Causes work out their natural and inexorable effects, and our sorrows though genuine cannot avert the pains and penalties inextricably involved. God's tender mercies are over all His works, but if He were not sometimes pitiless, they would not and could not be so—universal and really kind.

Men have fancied they could mend matters and clear the subject, by attributing all the so-called Evil (of which very much indeed is far from Evil) to the Devil, and all the supposedly good things to God. The result has been a painful surprise, in this violent disruption of the Deity or the Divine<sup>s</sup> Conception. What does Benedetto Croce say in his last great book, *Logic as the Science of the Pure Concept*? His pronouncement is unequivocal and unambiguous. "Every one has in him evil, because he has good," p. 98; Satan is not a creation extraneous to God, nor the minister of God called Satan, but *God Himself*. If God had not Satan in Himself, He would be like food without salt. An abstract Ideal, a simple ought-to-be which is not and therefore impotent and useless. The Italian poet, who has sung of Satan as "rebellion," and "the avenging force of reason," had a profound meaning when he concluded by exalting God as "the most lofty vision to which peoples attain in the force of their youth," "the sun of sublime minds and of ardent

hearts." He corrected and integrated the one abstract with the other, and in this way unconsciously attained the fulness of truth. "Thought in so far as it is itself life. . . . and reality. . . . has in itself opposition; and for this reason it is also *affirmation* and *negation*; it does not affirm save by denying, and it does not deny save by affirming." We see now that it does not help us or simplify the question before us by dividing the Godhead and eliminating the disagreeable fact of Satan.

"Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret."

It is not by ignoring the tiniest constituent of any substance or fact that science can advance. It may be true, but we don't say it is, that *de minimis non curat lex*, but it is damnably false to maintain *de minimis non curat scientia*, or God.

This miserable partition of the two vital and necessary elements must be held responsible for the unquestioned fact that, neither the ordinary interpretation of God nor that of Satan has been acceptable to the vast majority of human beings in all times and throughout all civilized space. God has never been given as a Working Whole, as the complete Love whom we could all unanimously respect and reverence and adore. He has been a truncated deity, imperfect, indefinite, and impossible. To be robbed of his sterner attributes was to depreciate and degrade the remainder. And when He was left with the Staff alone, worshipers missed the supplementary Rod. The shepherd's crook, without the accompanying sword, left an emasculated, praeterhuman, and praeterdivine deity. If the present terrific war has taught us one thing it is that religion must be reconstructed from its very foundations. No more abject whimpering, wheedling devotion, no more spurious gratitude that is but a lively expectation of future favors, but a robust and strenuous faith in a perfect and uneviscerated God. The old theologians first disemboweled the Deity, and then offered the forlorn residuum for us to hold in honor. Our new thanksgiving must assume the virile form of thanks-living. Of course the present conception of the Devil to a great extent is a lineal descendant or derivative from the Puritan belief. We find now a natural reaction. But, as always, the recoil has gone much too far, and the pendulum of thought has swung round to the very opposite extreme. And, in the same way, the conception of God has reached to a violent antagonism of the Puritan idea, which was anything but weak. The Supreme Being has been watered down to the uttermost dregs of Deity, and turned into a nature absolutely feeble and contemptible. To call

such a God by the immeasurable name of Love, is a pure libel or indeed a plain contradiction in terms. He no longer works by laws or the uniformity of the cosmos, a measured and definite action and reaction, but by ill-regulated affections, by caprice and an arbitrary Providence. He denies in every manifestation by an unbalanced conduct, all the most vital essentials of His character. He ceases to respect justice, and obeys the whim of the moment, in conforming to certain pious shibboleths which have been christened orthodoxy. Thor and Odin would be far preferable to such an odious creation of modern religion, which puts in the bankruptcy court the Infinite and the Eternal, and liquidates His noblest attributes. Such a monstrosity is worse than any Devil, One who is at the mercy of any peddling prayer and foolish cant formula.

Accordingly, we have now to abolish the Devil as a personal being, and restore him to his proper place in the Godhead, whence he should never have been torn. In his ultimate nature, he merely represents the justice of God, as the complement of His mercy, which can never stand alone by itself. That is to say, we must whitewash the Devil, and show he is not as black as he has been painted. No logical mind can reasonably postulate two Gods, the one of light and the other of darkness, like Zoroaster, in spite of J. S. Mill. Were this really a philosophical truth and were Zoroaster a true prophet, there would be no cosmos but only an *acosmos*, a welter of hopeless and helpless confusion—everlasting and universal chaos. No doubt, Satan must be deified himself and proved to be no longer a Principle of Evil, but a worthy and worshipful component of the Godhead. He is Divine from one point of view and in a certain fundamental aspect, which cannot be separated from other aspects and elements. He is emphatically good, and necessary to the Supreme Totality. The human hunger for a cheap and easy way, as it was supposed, in religion, broke up the Deity into antagonistic parts, and then isolated one fraction as the Devil, and threw on his head the onus of all Evil, in order that men might think themselves better than they were. This appears to be a relic of polytheism, an outrageous superstition which has been imposed on us by the religionism of our obtuse ancestors. We have no Devil worse than ourselves, and our own aberrant hearts. *Pectus facit diabolum*. But “resist the Devil and he will flee from you.” Because he possesses no real existence, and only flourishes on idle fears and the sufferance of fools. He is clearly superfluous and as we know—*entia non multiplicanda præter necessitatem*. Face him boldly and he fades away immediately into the dim shadowland

of the ghosts, the blind phantasmagoria that shelters in suspended solution all the old and pitiful unrealities of religion. And then Satan remains far more magnificent than even Milton's sublime conception, the hero of *Paradise Lost*, as the true Rod of God, while His mercy continues to be the Staff. For they co-exist, they co-operate, and the one without the other has no meaning or value—just because God is Infinite Love.

---

### BOOK REVIEW.

THE BOOK OF THE OPENING OF THE RICE INSTITUTE. 3 vols. Houston, Texas. Pp. 1100.

The Rice Institute of Houston, Texas, has raised a stately and indeed a most worthy monument of its existence by publishing a three-volumed account of its opening ceremonies which constituted "an academic festival, held in celebration of the opening of the Rice Institute, a university of liberal and technical learning founded in the city of Houston, Texas, by William March Rice and dedicated by him to the advancement of letters, science and art." The first volume is adorned with two photogravure reproductions of portraits of the founder. The frontispiece is an ideal and sympathetic portrait of Mr. Rice when a young man, and the other shows the same features strengthened into maturity. Other inserts of this volume are facsimile engravings of the invitations issued and responses received from many universities and learned societies of Europe and America. It also contains a complete list of the delegates and the program of addresses, toasts and dedicatory exercises which constituted the opening exercises on October 10, 11 and 12, 1916. The other two volumes are devoted to the inaugural addresses on the fundamental sciences, the liberal humanities, and the advancement of modern learning presented at the Institute by its distinguished guests on the same occasion. These are accompanied by excellent photogravure portraits of Professors Altamiro y Crevea of Oviedo, Borel of Paris, De Vries of Amsterdam, Jones of Glasgow, Kikuchi of Tokyo, Mackail of Oxford, Ostwald of Leipsic, Ramsay of London, Störmer of Christiania, Volterra of Rome; also Benedetta Croce, editor of *La Critica*, and the late H. Poincaré of Paris. The volumes are crown octavo, buckram bound, and the composition and press-work by the De Vinne Press are almost perfect.