

*The Personal
Devil*

by

Amitakh Stanford

The Personal Devil

by

Amitakh Stanford

Dedication

This book is dedicated to those who love Jesus Christ

© 2002, 2008 Dr. Amitakh Stanford &
Alukar Heights Sanctuary Animal Foundation, Ltd.
3rd Revised Edition

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	<i>The Perceived Origin of the Devil</i>	6
2.	<i>The Concept of Satan in Ancient Jewish Tradition</i>	11
3.	<i>Satan in the Christian Tradition</i>	26
4.	<i>The Devil in the Early Church</i>	31
5.	<i>Traditional Muslim View of the Devil</i>	38
6.	<i>Early Christian Theology on Christ and Satan</i>	40
7.	<i>The Devil in Modern Christian Europe</i>	48
8.	<i>The Concept of Satan in the Nineteenth Century</i>	56
9.	<i>Previous Research on the Existence of the Devil</i>	74
10.	<i>The Probabilistic Arguments</i>	83
11.	<i>Arguments from the Christian Bible</i>	91
12.	<i>Satan and the Concept of Redemption</i>	105
13.	<i>Devil Exists as an Idea in the Minds of People</i>	108
14.	<i>Argument of the Devil as a Collective Mind</i>	121
15.	<i>The Reality of Evil</i>	131
16.	<i>Devil Exists in the Context of the Evil Principle</i>	141
17.	<i>Why Darkness Created the Devil</i>	157
18.	<i>Conclusion</i>	171
	<i>Bibliography</i>	174

Forward

The earlier chapters of *The Personal Devil* primarily discuss the traditional views regarding the origin, nature, development, and perception of the Devil (Satan).

In Chapter 17, “Why Darkness Created the Devil”, I take a radical stand, different from the traditional views, and discuss why the Force known as Darkness (Principle of Evil/Principle of Darkness) created the power known loosely as the Devil and infested the Earth with him. (Although the masculine gender is generally applied to pronouns throughout this book, all such pronouns can interchangeably apply to feminine and neuter objects or beings.)

A.S.

Chapter 1

The Perceived Origin of the Devil

Many wonder if there is really a Devil.

It is by design in the scheme of things that there is so much confusion about the figure known as the Devil.

The Devil has intrigued many over the centuries. Since the 1970s, there has been a resurgence of interest in the Devil and a great increase in occult activity in the New Age circles.

Many scientists and philosophers still scoff at the idea of a personal Devil. In the twenty-first century humankind, in spite of the advancement in science and technology, is perplexed by unexplained forces existent in the world and in the universe. However, many would agree with the argument that the perceptions of evil often generate a sense that there is a pattern, or unity, in evil, and this may give rise to a personification of evil.

In most societies the Devil is felt as coming from outside the conscious mind and not something inherent in humans. Superficially, the concept of the Devil, like other concepts that tend to be traditionally coloured by pre-conceived ideas, is perceived to be influenced by the basic concepts of evil as the suffering and misfortune of the individuals.

In the case of the concept of the Devil we can see that there was an immense combination of mythological, theological, and iconographical expression in the period before the New Testament. Many will explain that the concept of the Devil comes into being when individuals are confronted in their own lives with manifestations of powerful destructive forces, both outside and within themselves. Thus, they formed a perception of the Devil as something evil.

In this book I shall take you through several discussions about the existence of the Devil. We shall explore the history of the Devil for the purpose of drawing together the most helpful and relevant materials in the area of historical and biblical treatment of the concept of the Devil so that the discussions on the Devil will be better understood. The history of the Devil warrants particular attention because of its immense influence on the thought patterns and behaviour of people especially in terms of “the otherness”.

The Devil is synonymous with Satan. They are one in origin and concept. In this book I shall use ‘Devil’ and ‘Satan’ interchangeably. The Devil is also often referred to as Lucifer, the Prince of Darkness or Mephistopheles. The belief in Satan pre-supposes a belief in a Supreme Being. Often, it seems that in the face of intense theism, there is a tendency for people to conceptualise evil by personifying it. In this instance evil is personified as Satan in contrast to God. Nevertheless, many people view Satan not as a supernatural force of evil, but as a product of human imagination, fear, and superstition.

Many anthropologists and researchers are of the opinion that fundamentally the concept of Satan or the Devil is due to the merger of two ancient traditions – the tradition developed in the ancient pagan religions that flourished in early Europe before the introduction of Christianity, and the ancient Hebrew theology that became the basis for later Christian and Muslim thought (Schouweiler, 1992, 12-14)

There is a long tradition of belief in a horned, pitchfork-carrying Devil in Europe, a civilization that is believed to have started some sixteen thousand years ago. Primitive people who lacked the scientific knowledge we have today, tended to view suffering, diseases, death, the moon, the sun, the rain, forest fires, floods, earthquakes, predation of wild animals, and all those things which affect their lives as mysteries. Over time, however, they came to believe there was a link between their luck in hunting and various activities. It is likely that primitive, pre-historic

people conceived the existence of a malefic deity who was responsible for all the ills and catastrophes.

Many researchers suggest that it is probable that the primitive people associated their control over their environment and their world with animal fetishes. This was probably the earliest form of religion. We can still detect traces of these primitive ways of making sense of the universe in some religions of today. As animal fetishes gradually expanded into rituals, so too did the importance of the overseers of these rituals. Such ones were usually male and they were regarded as magicians or supernatural beings with extraordinary powers. These magicians often adorned themselves with animal teeth, bones and skins and wore horns on their heads. They believed by wearing animal parts on their bodies, they could attract good fortune and be empowered with the strength of the animals they looked upon as powerful. With the development of the idea of a supernatural being, and the depictions of an evil force, the concept of the half-man, half-beast figure of the horned god of the north gradually evolved. Thus, the emergence of the Teutonic, Norse, and Celtic deities and the Devil was imminent (Stanford, 1996, 7).

Probably the abstract notion of evil has always existed. Clearly, the notion of an evil force depicted in the form of animals in conflict with humankind is depicted by primitive people. It seems the object of primitive religion is to establish equilibrium among the various capricious supernatural powers that surround them, and this is accomplished through rituals – rituals intended to keep the terror away and/or to appease it. Therefore, primitive religion is a process of making sense of the universe through exorcising the supernatural, which is the exact opposite of what monotheists claim.

From the many paintings of ancient caves, scientists speculate that early human hunters drew pictures of their prey as part of a magical ritual to ensure a bountiful hunt. Cave paintings by primitive people show humankind in conflict

with horned animals demonstrating their struggle for survival in the face of what they perceived as hostile forces. Such paintings and jewellery made from body parts of animals by early people were found in areas we now call France, central Europe, and northern Spain.

A theory widely accepted by historians is that some four thousand years ago a group of primitive people from the south of present-day Russia descended through the passes of the Caucasus to settle on the fertile plains of Iran (Massalié, 1996, 72). Some of their tribes proceeded to Greece and Anatolia, while others headed toward southern Scandinavia and Finland and eventually, around 2000 B.C. reached the British Isles. These people were known as the Kurgan, and they were warriors and shepherds. In them were to be found the first known religion in the world with the concept of a unique Devil against an equally unique God (Gimbutas, 1963, 65). These people have come to be called the Indo-Europeans. Their belief system was responsible for shaping those of the Near and Middle-East as well as almost the whole of Europe.

Indo-Europeans influence can be found in Greek Orphism, post-exilic Judaism, Christian Gnosticism, Christianity, and Shiite Islam. It can be argued that much of the monotheistic theology that founded modern cultures was forged within the Iranian matrix; our Jewish, Christian, and Islamic angels and archangels, and consequently our Devil, were born there.

It appears that the ceremonial, horned, bestial supernatural figure of the pagan magician was adopted by later cultures for various purposes. Such practices appeared in various cultures such as Greece about twenty-five hundred years ago. While the pagan Europeans were developing their culture, the ancient people of Greece were forming their own beliefs. Undoubtedly, the Greek people inherited a pagan religion from their primitive ancestors, but by this time, however, primitive religion had expanded from a magic form to one with a pantheon of gods, each attributed with specific powers and functions. For example, Zeus was the ruler of

the ancient Greek pantheon; Artemis was the Greek goddess of the moon and the hunt; and Pan, the god of pastures, flocks, and shepherds.

It is important to mention that Ancient Greek religion contributed to Christian concepts of the Devil. Pan, the Greek god of pastures, flocks, and shepherds was an indirect descendant of the horned magician of pagan Europe who was revered as a supernatural being. Pan was half-human and half-goat, like the primitive overseer of pagan ritual who was dressed in animal skins and appeared to be half-human and half-animal. It is not uncommon for Pan to be depicted as hairy, with split hooves and enlarged sexual organs, reflecting his connection to fertility, sex, and nature. The Greek Titans' revolt against Zeus is identified with the War in Heaven by the early church fathers who corroborated that Satan and his angels were expelled from heaven by a war. Figures like the Titans or Phaeton or Ophioneus, who had revolted against Zeus, were taken by the Christian fathers as shadowy types of the original Satan (Book 6, Chapter 43 in *Ante-Nicene; Christian Fathers*, 4: 592).

Clearly, two elements of belief in the Devil began with the beliefs of these early, pagan peoples. These were the ideas of a horned magician and also the concept of a dark underworld which were further developed and expanded by the influential Greek culture. One important aspect of Greek religion is the belief that, except for a few souls of royalty and human relatives of the gods who went to a pleasant place called Elysium, all others went to Hades, a domain of a god of death named Hades. Hades, the place, was a dark, gloomy underworld which resembles the primitive underworld of the ancient Europeans (Schouweiler, 1992, 18-19). However, Pan is not associated with the Devil as it was later on, and Hades, which resembles the primitive underworld of the ancient Europeans is not hell as it later became. To understand how these ideas developed we need to look at the ancient Hebrew notion of the nature of God, of evil, and of the universe. These I shall discuss in the next chapter.

Chapter 2

The Concept of Satan in Ancient Jewish Tradition

Research shows that the cultures of Egypt, Mesopotamia and Canaan influenced the Greek and Hebrew traditions and so exercised at least an indirect influence upon the Judaeo-Christian concept of the Devil.

Ancient Hebrews, like the Greeks, believed in polytheism in which some individual deities may be considered good and others evil. The Iranian religion, which remained in existence until the third century A.D. and the Parthian conquest, greatly helped mould the Devil. The Iranian Zoroaster's dualist view of the God of goodness and light called Ahura Mazda or Ormazd, was in direct conflict with the god of evil and darkness called Angra Mainyu or Ahriman, the God of war. The dualist view of essences is in opposition to monism. However, the concept of sin, and the notion of metaphysical evil inherent to existence, and which was encapsulated in the notion of Original Sin originated in Mesopotamia. Such invention was to abase the individual so that the individual would justify his or her own abasement to himself/herself. This notion was later adopted by the Christians.

Generally, the Gnostic concept of the God of good is only a secondary deity on par with Evil or the Devil. However, in the Old Testament, the creator of this world is the primary deity of omnipotence and omni-benevolence. But the Devil is always considered the secondary deity. Though the Zoroastrian Satan was not taken over by the Old Testament writers, it did influence the later Jewish writings. In ancient Mesopotamia and Canaan and among the early Greeks and Hebrews,

evil is ascribed to demons and evil spirits, and to the ill choices of human freewill, or to the inscrutable will of the deity.

The word “devil” and “divinity” sprang from the same source – Indo-European *devi* (goddess) or *deva* (god), which became *daevas* (devil) in Persian (*Larousse*, 1968, 317). The meanings of “devil” come from the Hebrew satan, the Greek diabolos, and the Latin diabolus. So, the Hebrew satan became the Greek diabolos that became the Latin diabolus. The word “demon”, which is used synonymously with “devil”, derives from the Greek *daimon*, which did not necessarily mean an evil being. “Demon”, which means “replete with wisdom”, comes from the Greek daimon, “divine power,” or “god”. The Greek *daimon*, was used in reference to the souls of those who lived in the Golden Age (Hesiod, *Op.*, 122 ff, 251 ff) who were described as the guardians of human beings. The word “demon”, therefore, originally meant a good spirit, or soul. The word “demon” in the sense of an evil spirit is, in fact, of comparatively late date. Hence, the Greeks who regard daimons as intermediary spirits (often the spirits of dead heroes) between humankind and the gods believe they could be either good or evil.

Therefore, an evil daimon or daimonian is an evil, possessing spirit. This meaning was later developed in the New Testament and by many early Christian Fathers. The Hellenized Alexandrian Apologists of the second and third centuries, for example, interpreted Platonic demons – who were neither good nor bad – as evil demons – the devils. This term is subsequently used to condemn the pagan gods (Danielou, 1973, II, 429). Belief in possession and rites of exorcism was known as far back in time at least to the time of ancient Babylon. Some of the earliest documents dating perhaps to 650 B.C. recording a belief in spirit possession were found inscribed on the clay tablets in the palace of Assurbanipal, a ruler of ancient Assyria, at Nineveh.

The meanings of ‘devil’ overlapped and were inconsistently used as alternatives in the Scriptures and commentaries. Added to the confusion is the

different usage of different words for the Devil. For example, the Hebrew *satan* was sometimes translated in Greek as *diabolos* and sometimes as the Aramaic *satanas*. Later, *satan*, *satanas*, *diabolos*, and *diabolus* became interchangeable in meaning. Before long, *satan* became the *name* of the Devil instead of a *title*.

Until the third or second century B.C. the image of Satan as God's declared enemy does not exist in Judaism. In Zoroastrinism, the worshippers of Ahriman – Angra Manyu, are “followers of the lie,” who were led astray by untruth. The Zoroastrian reform was soon snapped up and used in politics and the Devil was born (Messadié, 1996, 83). Iran thus witnessed the first appearance of the Devil.

Research seems to indicate that the Devil was a politically motivated invention by the Iranian Indo-Europeans in Iran around the sixth century B.C. (ibid, 90) and it was employed to label those who oppose the political system in those days. Evidence seems to confirm that the dualism of Zoroastrianism (often called Mazdaism) of the sixth century B.C., which divides the world between God (Ahura Mazda) and the Devil (the evil Ahriman) has influenced Judaism despite the great humiliation of captivity (ibid, 235). Though Iranians indeed did create the Devil, they did not succeed in establishing him as a political opposition. This was left to the Christian church.

It is believed that devils infected Judaism between 150 B.C. and 300 A.D. (Trachtenberg, 1943, 11). There are for example Mevet, the demon of death, Reshev, the demon of plague, Belial, lieutenant of the demons, Azazel, demon of the deserts, and so on.

However, over time, Judaism evolved from polytheism, the belief in many gods, to henotheism, the worship of one god by a particular people, and finally to monotheism, the belief in one supreme God. The idea of Satan emerged as Hebrew ideas about the nature of God changed. In Egypt, for example, Seth and Horus were often worshipped and depicted together. In Egypt, Canaan and Mesopotamia, the deities were monist – there is one overall divine principle encompassed within

its pantheon both good and bad. Like the Hindus, all Egyptian deities are manifestations of the one God. Like their Hindu counterparts, they too are responsible for the good and bad things in the affairs of humans and reflect with constructive and destructive aspects of cosmic harmony. For example, their merciful god of life, Osiris, is sometimes an adversary of their sun god, Ra, who is noble and good, while Seth, a destructive god, can be very generous and gracious to those who are devoted to him.

Over the years, as Egyptian religion developed, Seth became the symbol of death and a constant adversary of Horus and Osiris. The Egyptians simultaneously regarded Horus and Seth as a doublet – representing two sides of a divine principle and worshipped them together as one god – and a rebel who seeks to resolve the cosmic unity by destroying his adversary. Here Seth has taken on a similar role as that of Satan. Clearly, underlying all these myths is the assumption of the monist view that consists of a single divine principle in the diversity of the cosmos.

Ancient civilizations tended to regard good and evil as two sides of the same coin. In Hinduism, Kali, Shiva, Shakti, and Durga represent aspects of God which manifest both benevolence and malice, creativity and destructiveness. The two faces of God are commonly depicted in myths – God has two faces, Good and Evil and is regarded as a coincidence of opposites. Darkness and blackness are almost always associated with negativity and evil while light and whiteness are associated with positivity, good, and divine. Blackness is linked with death, the underworld, and ghosts. It signifies despair, depression, hopelessness, and fearful uncontrollable depths of the unconscious. The concept of the Devil, when it finally emerged, bears resemblance to the mythologically constructed deities who often personify the malevolent aspect of God. In myth, nothingness, chaos, and the void symbolize the Devil.

There are few references concerning Satan and demons in the Old Testament, though older traditional theology would disagree (Chafer, 1947, II, 33).

The fragmentary concept of Satan in the Old Testament is probably partly due to the emergence of Hebrew monotheism, and partly due to the advanced theological ideas of the compilers of the Hebrew texts (Oesterley, 1907, III, 318).

The word “satan” existed before the word “devil”. “Satan” is a general term. In Hebrew, it simply means *adversary*. With the article, it means a definite adversary, the adversary *par excellence* and suggests a “personality” or “spirit” who in his own way is endless (Hayes, 1995, 300). Further, in Hebrew, Satan is used quite generally in the sense of a judge: one who tested the faith of another by asking tricky questions or posing problems to be solved, to oppose a movement or put obstacles in its way. However, the Satan of the Old Testament is quite different from the later Satan.

The original idea of Satan is in fact totally different from the one of later periods. Originally, Satan is perceived as one who is not evil himself though he engages in raising doubts and confusion about motives, and put inner attitudes to the test.

When the ambiguous figure of satan first appears in the Old Testament in the book of *Job* (2:3), he is one of the sons of God, a member of God’s Council, albeit with unusual tasks (Forsyth, 1987, 107). He was one of God’s faithful messengers or angels assigned by God to test Job’s faith.

Clearly, Job’s celestial council is an Eastern, specifically Iranian idea (Messadei, 1996, 257). As Heinisch (1955, 141) rightly observes, Satan in the Old Testament is a subject who appears only occasionally; he never has continued activity. There are only fragmentary concepts of Satan in the Old Testament, but why is this so? Some believe that basically, the answer lies in Hebrew monotheism – the Hebrew conviction that there was but one God (Baab, 1949, 48). Many accept that Moses’ thoughts are the influence and basic core of the Decalogue, which is ethically monotheistic (Rowley, 1953, 21-22). Some, like Oesterley (1907, 318) and Burrows (1946, 124), believe that there are traces of

animalism and fanciful demonology in the Old Testament because of the advanced theological ideas of the compilers of the text. Perhaps Hordern (1955, 104) is right when he says the scarcity of references to Satan was due to the belief that it was seen as preferable that way because of the argument that it gives a higher integrity to Scripture and less dependence on evolutionary growth of ethical ideas.

When we examine certain passages in the Old Testament, we can establish that the meaning of “satan” has a terrestrial referent within the context of examination. In the Old Testament, Satan is not the Devil. He represents the suffering that is desired by the will of God. God is thus at once good and evil; Satan is God’s servant carrying out God’s will.

We shall commence by examining *1 Samuel 29:4*, which describes events surrounding David. In this particular verse, the implied satan is an adversary. In this instance, the Philistine commanders are against David’s participation in the upcoming battle on the grounds that David would become an adversary (satan) to them in his effort to support and ingratiate himself to King Saul. Throughout the Old Testament, the concept of satan is used to imply an adversary.

Another context in which satan has a terrestrial referent is *Psalms 109*. In *Psalms 109: 6-7* it reads:

Set a wicked judge over him, I pray,
And let a perverse accuser [satan] stand at his right hand!
And when his case is tried, let him come off guilty,
And let his prayer pass for sin!

Some scholars like Birkeland (1933, 203) who insist that “satan” does not mean “accuser” in the above passage, assert that the context is set in the arena of war, and as such should not be interpreted in the judicial context where the psalmist’s enemy is brought to justice in court through the testimony of an accuser

(satan) standing at his right hand. However, the above passage clearly has the connotation that the psalmist intends his opponent to be brought to justice. This is supported by Roland de vaux (1961, 156) who asserts that the expression “stand at his right hand” indicates a forensic connotation of satan. Thus, “satan” can certainly be taken to mean “accuser”.

We have established that in the above two passages the word “satan” can both imply “adversary” and “accuser”. However, the term “accuser” does not designate an office. Evidence has shown that there was no office of accuser or public prosecutor in ancient Israel (Boecker, 1980, 38). It would appear that from the implied use of “satan” in *2 Samuel*, we can infer that any member of the royal court was able to assume the role of accuser though the inference is less clear in *Psalms* 109: 6. Still, the particular satan in verse 6 does not seem to have been a professional accuser, or a formal prosecutor.

In the book of *Job* 1 and 2, satan is a celestial accuser who challenges God. In *Job* 1: 9-10, satan claims that Job worships God because God ensures his material well being by encircling Job with a protective hedge. In one sense this challenges the traditional assumption that in this world the righteous inevitably prosper. Satan in this instance acts as a celestial accuser who turns on God for perpetrating a perverse world order and thereby challenges the traditional perception of world order. Thus, in a way God becomes the main target of satan’s accusation, and satan is not directly accusing Job. The belief in order is directly connected with the problem of theodicy, and the ‘good creation’ is perceived as functional, reliable, and moral at its most basic level (Knight, 1985, 145). Thus, just retribution and moral order are grounded in the orders of creation as Schmid (1984, 104-105) has rightly observed.

Satan’s accusation provokes God to rescind normal world order, and the accuser (satan) is sent forth to wreak havoc on Job. Though satan plays a role in the prologue, he appears in the guise of irony in many instances in the book of *Job*.

For example, it is because God has identified Job as an exemplary loyalist to Him that he [Job] has been singled out for the test which brought him misfortune and suffering when God removes all protection and blessings from him. Another example of irony is *Job* 9:2-3. Clearly, it is irony which has brought about *Job*'s prologue's satan.

Job 9:2-5 states:

Oh Yes! I know it is true; but how can a mortal be in the right before God? If one wished to dispute with Him, he could not answer Him once in a thousand. Wise in heart and mighty in strength, who could resist Him without harm?

From the above passage we see Job in his suffering asserts that there is no way that human being could bring God to trial, for God is both the maker and ruler of the Earth (v. 5-10). Since God is too powerful to challenge, there will always be an imbalance of power between human and God in the context of a fair trial. Hence, Job wishes there were an impartial arbiter (*Job* 9:33) who could exert power over both God and human beings. Job laments that no such being exists, but, ironically, satan is the very being who plays the role of the "impartial judge" and the one who got Job into his current predicament.

Furthermore, this same being has witnessed against him, claiming his piety could be motivated by rewards from God. Though all that satan does, he does with God's permission, there is an uneasy feeling that there is such a celestial being who delights in the trials and suffering of humans such as Job. There does indeed appear to be an element in the character of satan which is out of harmony with the divine nature (Langton, 1945, 9). As Knudson (1918, 211) rightly points out, the accuser is sceptical of human nature and believes every man has his price.

It would appear that satan is not merely carrying out God's will from a standpoint of moral indifference, but one gets the feeling that his personal will and wishes are on the side of evil. This sentiment is also echoed by Schultz (1892, II, 211). Though satan is restricted to the prologue, the undercurrent of the entire book of *Job* is indicative of his role as the taunting accuser.

Of interest is an account of the satan of Job's prologue in *Baba Bathra*, which regards satan, the evil prompter (vetzer hara), as synonymous to the angel of death. It is asserted that satan's motive in seeking to detract from Job's righteousness was that he might uphold the righteousness of Abraham. It is stated that God created the "evil inclination" and made the Torah its antidote (*Baba Bathra* 16a).

Let us now look at the angelic accuser (implied satan) in *Numbers 22: 21-35*. In *Numbers 22*, the angel acts as an agent sent by God to accuse Balaam, who had angered God by going against His will. Again, accuser's role in *Numbers* resembles that of the satan in *Job*.

The next context in which we find a celestial satan is in the *Chronicles* which dates from the beginning of the Hellenistic era, or the third century B.C., specifically in *1 Chronicles 21:1-22:1*. Again, in this instance satan is the accuser who stood up against Israel. When the word satan appears in these passages without the articles, it is generally taken to mean a person or a proper noun. Satan in *Zechariah 3:1-7* represents the mythological medium employed to express the conviction that the objections to Joshua's investiture had been expressed in the heavenly court. Once again, the satan of *Zechariah 3* is a celestial accuser. Yahweh's acquisition of a heavenly court, and the post of accuser, was a post-exilic phenomenon (Haag, 1974, 199).

From these passages of the Old Testament, it is obvious that the word "satan" is a position, that of a celestial accuser, and indirectly a tempter by God's order. **It is not a name; it is a title.** Clearly, the word "satan" is used to mean

“accuser”. Therefore, there can be two or more satans (accusers) acting on behalf of God at any one time. An example of this can be found in *1 Chronicles* 21 in which not one, but two celestial satans were involved. The meaning of satan in the Hebrew Bible shows that there is no evidence of a single concept of satan. While there is clearly an indication of a celestial satan, there is no such a thing as a ‘single’ celestial satan.

In the original wording, satan was one of the *bene ha-elohim*, **sons of “the gods”**; but *Bible* translators always singularised the plurals to conceal the fact that the biblical Jews worshipped a pantheon of multiple gods (Cavendish, 1975, 184). Thus, satan is not conceived as the ultimate evil one, the embodiment of evil, and not connected with the evil spirits referred to in *Deuteronomy* 32:17; nor with the pagan gods at the earliest instance in the Book of *Job* which attempts to answer the question of the existence of evil and its relationship to goodness. In fact, traditionally Jewish perception of satan from biblical sources is that he acts as God’s agent and assumes an adversarial role by God’s order to test humankind, but not to harm or corrupt them.

We have established the above about the express and implied “satan” in *Numbers*, *Chronicles*, *Job*, and *Zechariah* of the Old Testament, and now we shall return to our discussion on Satan as a spirit. For thousands of years, Satan has been characterized as a spirit. According to the Old Testament, Satan was originally one of God’s powerful angels called Lucifer. Lucifer – the light bringer – was the most powerful being next to God. He was a being of superior intelligence, glory, beauty, splendour, and one time had great favour with God. In his original state, Lucifer was sinless, but he became perverted; wrapped up in his own pride and power he led one third of the angels in the revolt against God his maker, but was repulsed, and cast from heaven to Earth by God.

Some are of the opinion that the identification of Lucifer with Satan comes from the Hebrew Old Testament *Isaiah* 14:12 “How art thou fallen from heaven, O

Lucifer, son of the morning!” Conversely, some researchers are of the opinion that Isaiah was not referring to the Devil. They believed that this passage was influenced by an old Canaanite myth, and Isaiah was describing the over-reaching of an ambitious Babylonian king who fell into the underworld (Kaiser, 1974). In the Talmudic period (from the third century to the fifth century A.D.), the Jews associated the Isaianic passage with immediate historical events in which king Nebuchadnezzar was identified as the “oppressor”. In this passage the king of Babylon had been like the morning star in anticipating his lordship over the sacred mountain of Israel (Cheyne, 1890, 1, 90-91). In the Midrash Rabbah this passage is applied to that same king.

Interestingly, the Satan of the Talmud and Midrash is never called the Evil One, Belial, Mastema, or Beelzebul, nor is he depicted as a rebel angel. He is essentially the Satan of the Hebrew *Bible*, the agent of God (Bamberger, 1952, 94).

It was in the seventh or sixth century B.C. when the authors of the Old Testament attempted to resolve the theological Problem of Evil by advocating that the God of good created the world on the principle of equilibrium, and the Adversary is one of its two terms (Messadié, 1996, 240).

Judaism, with its monist approach, made Yahweh responsible for all the good and bad things in the world, including the Adversary. Thus, both good and evil belonged to God; evil is but a negative aspect of God – His shadow or dark side which falls on the Hebrews when they offended Him. This view is clearly exemplified in the Old Testament as in the book of *Isaiah* 45:7:

I form the light and create darkness. I make peace and create evil. I
the Lord do these things.”

Thus, the Hebrews believed that all the things that happened in people’s lives occurred according to the will of their God Yahweh, the one and only all-

powerful creator of all things who represents both good and evil. Hence, some conclude that the Satan story started off as being the dark side of God. Can we then assume that perhaps the God-idea may well have been the idea of the “bright side” of Satan back in the days of primitive religions as William C. Tremmel (1987, 33) suggests? The idea that evil represents the shadow of God continues to influence many people today. Consequently, moral evil – that which occurs when a human being knowingly and deliberately inflicts suffering on another – is attributed to the dark side of humankind, which mirrors the dark side of God. There are many who resist the concept of absolute evil and claim that there is no evil.

Perhaps one of the reasons why the dualist concept of evil is rejected in favour of the monist notion is because the dualist idea of evil is too painful for those who cannot bear to think that one of their loved ones could, in fact, be a creature of the Evil Principle, the damned. For some, it is comforting to believe that there is only one creation and that there is good and evil in everyone, but the evil in us is only the shadow of the good.

As Hebrew theology continued to evolve, their omnipotent, omniscient God is seen not just as that. His attributes expanded to include his omni-benevolence. He is now an all-powerful, all-knowing, and all-good God. However, this monism began to be eroded in the book of *Job* when Satan makes his first appearance at the heavenly court at odds with Yahweh over the human capacity to embrace good for its own sake. Around 175 B.C., when the Greek ruler Antiochus IV Epiphanes – who is referred to as “the Beast” – came into power, he turned upon the Judeans in a fury. He sacked Jerusalem, pulling down part of the walls, and forbade the practice of Judaism, demanding the cessation of sacrifice and circumcision and ordered that the Torah (the “law”) be burned (Read, 1985, 19).

When the Jews suffered oppression under the foreign invasion, they began to question the fate that had befallen them in Babylon and since. They began to

question why God had allowed their capture and defeat and let them go through so much suffering and humiliation under the rule of their oppressors, King Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus IV. As often happens in such times, apocalyptic thought became pronounced. In the case with the Jews, a great apocalyptic book – the book of *Daniel* – was written and eventually included among the books of the Old Testament in the canon of the *Bible*.

The Hebrew concept of the Devil developed gradually, arising from certain tensions within the concept of Yahweh. In 587 B.C., after conquering Jerusalem, King Nebuchadnezzar transported the Judaites to Babylon, where they endured what came to be called the Babylon Exile (Tremmel, 1987, 47). In the years after the return from exile, Jewish thought and social behaviour came under the influence of Greece. Indeed, the period when Jewish texts first assumed a resolutely hostile attitude toward Satan coincided with the full bloom of Hellenistic Judaism. For the Jews, the existence of evil could not be reconciled with an omnipotent, omniscient, and omni-benevolent God. This dilemma called for a solution to the simultaneous existence of an omnipotent, and loving God and the existence of evil.

Hence, there was a need to find a scapegoat to take the blame from God for the existence of evil in the universe and the Devil represents the easy way of explaining evil. It is no wonder that during this critical time in Judaism, Satan came to be defined as God's sworn and eternal enemy. In one sense this resembles the two antagonist natures in dualism, though this dualism is not a Jewish conception. Thus, Satan lost the status as member of the heavenly council he held in the book of *Job*, and the Jewish faith became apocalyptic, and the break with the Old Testament occurred. The dragon and the old serpent were identified with the concept of Satan in the apocalypse.

The Concept of Satan in the Apocryphal and

Pseudepigrapha Writings

Indeed, it was in the apocryphal literature that started between the writing of the final books of the Old Testament and the time of Christ that a sustained challenge was mounted to official monism (Stanford, 1996, 8). From about 200 B.C. to 200 A.D., a body of literature emerged which is today called inter-testament literature or Pseudepigrapha (Tremmel, 1987, 55). Undoubtedly, the Apocryphal and Pseudepigrapha were influenced by Persia as well as sources which are not so clearly traced. In the Apocryphal and Pseudepigrapha, which significantly influenced New Testament writers, the figure of Satan gains more prominence and many of the fancies which are found even in current thought, such as the origin of evil, the continuation of evil, and the final end of evil are attributed to this period. Due to the influence of Greek rationalistic thought, there was a diminishing importance of the supernatural agencies of the earlier days (Barton, 1914, 598).

There does not seem to be a common link for the multi-faceted presentation of Satan in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal writings. Generally, the literature at the time presented Satan as the arch demon, and associated him with the serpent, and the fall of man. The concept of the origin of evil is also linked with Satan. Under the influence of Persian dualism and the then contemporary demonology, the idea of the rise of demons from the progeny of fallen angels is introduced. The dualist idea of the evil principle (Yetzer hara) is also assigned to Satan and Beliar is equated with Satan, and the lusts of men are personified.

Thus, the rabbinic portrayal of Satan is essentially that of the Old Testament. As Satan came more to life in the later Hebrew imagination, he became identified with one of the early Hebrew pantheon of gods that lived in the underworld of the dead, and Satan became synonymous with the Devil, and, hell

his abode – he is regarded as the angel of death. These ideas were generally the view of the Jews by the time Jesus was born.

Hence, in the Pseudepigrapha writings we can see a Satan composed of both Old Testament story elements and Zoroastrian story elements. We can see a Satan who: began as a high order angel in heaven but later fell from that lofty position through his own wilful pride; who became master of both fallen angels and demons; who was involved in the temptation and fall of the primal parents; who became the evil prince of this world – tempting, enticing, leading astray all persons he could possibly seduce; who is on a collision course with God; who is fated for defeat and final, permanent incarceration in the abyss, in the pit, in hell; and finally, we find a full-blown Satan who has graduated from Jewish thought into New Testament dimensions. By the time of the New Testament, Satan was finally and completely Satan, and evil is attributed to the Devil. The Yetzer hara, or evil principle is portrayed as a synonym for Satan, and also as the principle in human beings by which Satan acts.

By the time Jesus and other Essene predecessors came to the scene, Judaism was already influenced by such ideas as sin, penitence, misogyny, and the Devil. It will become obvious in the process of this investigation that Satan is part of the reality of Western civilization, and the myths created by early Europeans about unseen forces have contributed to modern conceptions of the Devil. I have shown that the concept of the Devil is a primitive idea, but the Church sees this as a fallacy. I shall take this further when I discuss, among other issues, how Satan evolved into a central figure in Judaeo-Christian tradition.

Chapter 3

Satan in the Christian Tradition

As expressed earlier, though Judaism did not adopt the Zoroastrian Satan, it did influence the later Jewish writings, but it was Christianity that took up the idea in its development of the Satan figure. Clearly, the Satan in the New Testament writings had all the earmarks of the Zoroastrian evil principle. Even if we were to believe that the notion of sin, evil, and the Devil are all human inventions, as many have claimed, the fact that people could invent these things in order to manipulate, oppress, control, and abuse another is itself evil. In a metaphysical sense, the concept of evil *per se* is NOT a human invention. How can human invent animal, natural, or galactic evil? Hence, evil *per se* cannot possibly be a human invention. On the subject of evil, by the time of the New Testament, Satan became a full-blown Devil and evil is attributed to him.

Traditionally, the origin of suffering, death, and sin is attributed to Lucifer's rebellion against God. Toward the end of the first century and particularly after the defeat of the Jews by the Romans in 70 A.D., there was a move away from the extreme political clericalism of the Sadducees in favour of a more philosophical approach in explaining suffering in the world (Stanford, 1996, 128). However, alongside this dominant trend is a parallel tendency among certain Jewish groups, including the Essenes, and later the followers of Jesus, to regard Satan as the source of evil (Ibid, 128). This tendency is clearly demonstrated in the New Testament. From then on till now Satan is invoked to express human conflict, and to characterize human enemies within our own religious traditions.

I have shown that the ideas of the New Testament derive in part from the Hellenistic thought and in part from that of contemporary Judaism, especially the Apocalyptic and Rabbinic traditions. Christianity posits a God who is One, omnipotent and wholly good. These attributes, derived in part from Hellenistic thought, assigned ontological and moral perfection to the One, and denied evil ontological existence or attributed it to the lowest level of being. They derive in part also from Judaism, which had separated the good from the evil element in their God, calling the good aspect the Lord and identifying it with Yahweh, and demoting the evil aspect, which it called the Devil, to the status of an inferior being or angel.

There are distinct similarities between the concept of Satan viewed in the inter-testamental writings and those in the New Testament. The Satan in the New Testament still retains the role of the Old Testament as accuser. Though the idea of Satan in the Old Testament, and the concepts found in the inter-testamental literature helped explain the belief and experience of the early Christians, it is the character of Jesus and his teachings, his activities and his experiences in dealing with the demonic which provided the solid teaching in the New Testament about Satan. Jesus' ministry in the area of demon possession seems to demonstrate the reality of the Devil, and the New Testament is full of accounts about demonic possession.

There have been various theories about demon possession, one of which is the mythical theory, which assumes that the demon possession recorded in the New Testament is symbolic. This view is untenable in the light of contemporary biblical criticism (McCasland, 1961, 54-64; *Lateline* September 10, 1997). The numerous accounts of demon possession in the New Testament are rather specific to be just symbolic. Thus, the demon possession recounted in the New Testament is not symbolic. Even to this present day, the experiences of Christian missionaries and priests in relation to demon possession tend strongly to support the view that

demon possession is a powerful, negative force. Though some of the manifestations of demon possession are due to psychological or mental disorders, or superstition and witchcraft in primitive cultures, there are cases where experiential evidence suggests that demonic possession is real.

Another view of demon possession is that it is a natural form of primitive religion (Haggard, 1953, 399). This view is now generally overshadowed by the view that demon possession is due to psychological or pathological disorders (Kelly, 1968, 42)

The references to Satan in the New Testament clearly show that the concept of Satan was an integral part of the belief amongst the early Christians. Indeed, the early Christians believed in a practical Devil who was capable of influencing the human personality and who was a formidable enemy to the early Church. Ironically, the New Testament contains the dualist element in Christianity when it says the powers of Darkness under the generalship of the Devil are at war with the power of Light. Clearly, the conflict between Good and Evil stands at the core of New Testament Christianity. Indeed, this poses a difficult situation for the Church, which proclaims that there is but one God and therefore, one principle, but Christianity, at the same time, takes the Problem of Evil very seriously.

Concepts of right or wrong and good or evil have always been expressed in some form of imagery or iconography. As mentioned earlier, in the case of the Devil, there was a plethora of mythological, theological, and iconographical expressions attributed to the Devil during the period preceding the New Testament. Later rational theology pared and planed the tradition.

Unlike the Satan of the earlier period, who is himself not evil, the Satan of later period is one who is always experienced as himself evil while he continues to be the Accuser *Revelation* 12:9. The Satan of the Old Testament is a servant or agent of God who is viewed as a necessary part of God's world. This aspect of the concept of Satan in the Old Testament does seem to differ from the Persian and

other Semitic ideas, though Persian influence is clearly behind the Jewish concepts of the Problem of Evil, of the nature of good, and the struggle between good and evil. Thus, we can say that the deepening concept of Satan was a result of foreign influence assimilated into Jewish thinking, and not just a totally borrowed foreign idea. As such it has distinctive Jewish traits.

However, in the New Testament Satan is always God's enemy. The serpent idea in the New Testament, unlike the idea in the Old Testament, which is a symbol for a force, is parallel to a fully developed view of Satan who is the independent head of a kingdom, the prince and god of this world, the principle of evil, and the direct enemy of Christ, which stands against the kingdom of heaven. But in the time of which the Apocalypse speaks, this principle of evil is believed to be broken through by Christ and destroyed (Hayes, 1995, 304).

The figure of Satan is basically a part of the reality of Western civilization. There was no mention of a Devil in Vedic Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhist India, Oceania, Asia, Greece or Egypt – not in the sense of the Christian concept of the Devil anyway. For example, in Hinduism Shiva and Kali are both the destroyer and restorer. Shiva, the god who brings happiness and the source of all life, is at the same time the god of destruction. There are demons in Shivaist theology, but they are secondary figures, and the concept of a supreme spirit of Evil (the Devil) does not exist since the god Shiva himself incarnates evil. Benevolent gods such as Agni, the fire that devours evil things, or Varuna, the god of balance, are transformed into vengeful gods until a new sacrifice or offering is made to propitiate them.

Research on the origin of Satan shows that Satan is indeed a central figure in Judaeo-Christian tradition. However, it appears that the Devil has forbearers in the ancient civilizations of the Near East and in Judaism. Satan also appears in Islam. Thus, it is relevant for us to explore the belief systems, particularly in the

Near East, that are thought to have most influenced the concept of the Christian Devil.

After the death of Jesus, his followers spread his teachings to Rome and throughout the Middle-East. Between the years 400 and 600 A.D., Christian missionaries from Rome brought their religion to the pagans of Europe, who were still worshipping earth gods and fertility gods in the tradition of Pan (Schouweiler, 1992, 21). As more and more people in pagan Europe were converted to Christianity, elements of the pagan religions were either eliminated or incorporated into Christianity in order to make the new religion more acceptable and attractive to the new converts. For example, the anniversary of Christ's birth was moved to the day of the pagan Mithras Sun Feast, the midwinter celebration of the god of light and truth.

However, the mixing of the two cultures was not without its problems. It certainly affected the way the Devil was perceived. One of the pagan gods, Pan, was a particular threat to Christianity. This was because he represented materialism, sensuality, and values that are contrary to Christian belief. Thus, Pan was identified by the Christians as a corrupting, evil being, an adversary. Eventually, Pan was associated with the image of the Devil they knew, and the Devil, which resembled Pan, was depicted as having animal-like characteristics of the Greek God Pan. At last, the traditions of the pagan horned god Pan, and that of Judaeo-Christianity finally met.

Chapter 4

The Devil in the Early Church

In the early centuries of the Church there were two streams of influence on the idea of Satan. One is based on biblical emphasis, the other is the stream of philosophy, which attempted logical and rational explanations of the existence and activity of Satan found in Patristic period. In the era called the Ante-Nicene period, which extends roughly from 90 to 325 A.D., both the biblical and philosophical emphasis are found. It is observed that part of the period closer to the New Testament was more biblical than the later part of the period, which was more philosophical. On the whole, the concept of Satan was basically biblical in the early part of the first six centuries.

The apostolic church fathers were compelled to address the Problem of Evil. They started by affirming that Satan was the leader of the powers of Darkness (evil). In the first three centuries, the apostolic fathers seemed to distinguish between Satan and demons – the Devil and his fallen angels. Various speculations were made about the nature of the Devil. Ignatius, for example, holds the Devil and the fallen angels to be “incorporeal”. The figure of Satan is held to be extremely important and relevant to the doctrine of sin and redemption. Without the Devil the doctrine of redemption, which is central to Christianity, will collapse. Although there had been various proposals, there was no general agreement of who Satan was and why he had been born.

The figure of Satan has attracted the attention of many important writers in Christianity’s development who base their emphasis on Satan as the key to understanding scriptural passages and the meaning of Christ and His people. There

is a wide spectrum of views about Satan or the Devil. Some say Satan is a fallen angel; others say that he is a negative force, a powerful evil entity. The Jewish and Christian theologians ascribed Satan as a ‘fallen angel’ – the arch-fiend who is the immortal antithesis of God and the enemy of God and humankind. Some people see this as a gross universal misapplication. If Satan had given in to the temptation of pride, and rebelled against his creator, then temptation must have pre-existed him, and, therefore, evil did too. This contradicts the assumption that Satan is the “inventor” of sin (evil). Another thing Christian theology appears to claim is that the Devil is not a free agent and that he is under the control of God, his creator. However, in practice, and in iconography of the churches found throughout the ages, the Devil and God are depicted as opposite ends representing the two principles of good and evil. This is similar to the dualism of Gnosticism such as found in Manichaeism.

According to the Jewish and Christian perceptions of invisible beings, the concept of angels and demons originated from the Hebrew Bible. But research shows that the ideas of angels and the God/Devil dualism were developed in ancient Persia, and was later absorbed into Judaism and Christianity (Meuleau & Pietri, 1987, 140). Although angels are mentioned more than three hundred times in the Christian Bible, there is no explanation for the origin of the angels. They seemed to simply assume their existence. The Old Testament writers simply assumed them to exist and to be involved with human beings at the directive of God. Angels are believed to be immortal beings who live in the spirit world and serve as intermediary between God and humanity. The word “angel” is derived from the Greek *angelos* and the Latin *angelus*, which means “messenger”. In most religions, angels belong to the class of beings known as demons; they may be either friendly or hostile to humankind.

There is no concept of fallen angels in the Talmud nor in the Midrash, works which represent genuine Jewish thought (Cohen, 1949, 54). According to

the Babylonian Talmud, all beings are led and protected by angels, who connect the Earth to God. The ancient Hebrews applied the term malakh (angel) to anyone who carried God's message in the world, including people. Later, angels became spirit beings, serving God in heaven and visiting Earth to carry out his commands. Such angels evolved into guardian angels, such as Michael, the guardian of Israel. Besides the Catholics and some Protestants, people of other cultures also believe that everyone has a guardian angel.

Angels are believed to be graded in hierarchies. The highest in Judaism and Christianity are the seven archangels, each of whom is assigned to one of the seven spheres of heaven: Gabriel, Raphael, Michael, Uriel, Jophiel, Zadkiel, and Samael (Satan). Islam has four archangels, Azrael, Israfil, Gabriel, and Michael. The Gnostics, who were influenced by Persian traditions, acknowledged angelic hierarchies also, and believed that angels lived in a world of mystical light between the mundane world and the high transcendent spiritual realm. (In the Unmanifest and the True-Light Creation, there are no hierarchies – there is no evolution – and all beings are fundamentally equal and one with the Unmanifest. Hierarchies only exist in the False-Light Creation of the Principle of Darkness. Therefore, what all these people are discussing is the False-Light Creation.)

In Judaism and Christianity, when the angel Lucifer was cast out of heaven by God, his angels were not demons, but spiritual beings who submitted to Lucifer and became his instruments, spreading vice, lies, heresy, and all sorts of ills and evilness throughout the world. It is believed that lesser-ranked angels are the cherubim, seraphim, and those that represent the various virtues, among many others. The ancient Hebrews also believed that an archangel is responsible for recording the good deeds of Israel (Scholem, 1974). In Hebrew theology angels were often not just messengers of God, but are aspects of God communicating and acting in Hebrew life and history.

The biblical concept of angels is that they are well ordered, and that they may be arranged in a hierarchy. Some are of the opinion that angels are not in a hierarchy to each other, but rather, all of them are directly under the control of God and that they are all equal. In the Old Testament angels were described as “sons of God” who came to Earth to beget children of mortal women (*Genesis* 6:4). Later these were called demons, or incubi, or “fallen angels”. Angels are often mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, but Satan, along with his fallen angels or demonic beings (the demons), is virtually non-existent. Of particular interest is the fact that there is no concept of fallen angels in the Talmud nor in the Midrash, works that supposedly represent the true vein of Jewish thought (Cohen, 1949, 54). However, the ambivalent Greco-Roman demons were identified by Christian tradition with the fallen angels.

Indeed, the idea of fallen angels is nowhere expressed in the Old Testament. **This is due to the fact that in the Old Testament, the word [satan] never appears as the name of the adversary.**

Revelation 12:4 figuratively describes the red dragon [Satan] as pulling down a third of the stars [angels] from heaven with his tail. This fate of Lucifer is reported in *Ezekiel* 28:15,17, as:

Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou was created, till iniquity was found in thee.

Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty; thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness; I will thrust thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee.

Henceforth, Lucifer, the fallen angel becomes the open “adversary “ of God and earned the name “Satan” – “one who obstructs”, and his angelic cohorts

become demons (*Luke* 10:18). The fall of Lucifer has made him an implacable enemy of God, a false accuser, a tempter, a liar whose every activity is marked by deceitfulness. Thus, the Devil was born and was ever eager for his due. But contrary to the claim that the Old Testament teaches explicitly of the origin and fall of Satan, there is no direct mention of such events at all. The *Bible* contains some materials of which the myth of the rebel angels was fashioned. But the story itself and the ideas it expresses are found neither in the *Bible* nor in the “heathen” sources which Scripture occasionally echoes (Bamberger, 1952, 12).

Going back to the notion of iniquity (*Ezekiel* 28) being found in a God-created entity begs the question of where the iniquity could have come. If it was not placed there by the creator of the entity, who placed it there? Again we would have to invoke a force equal to or greater, but outside of, God.

There is a theory respecting the “existence and fall of Satan and his angels”, which was clearly summed up by Rev. S. Comfort (1838, Vol 20, 306) as follows:

- 1) Their *place of residence* – “one or more of the many worlds which move in the regions of space, and compose the vast empire of God.”
- 2) As a rule of action, and as a test of their loyalty, “they were commanded by their Creator to *remain* a certain length of time in this ‘habitation’.”
- 3) Their *sin* consisted in “not keeping their first estate,” and in “*leaving* their own habitation.”

From the above features of the theory, the first two seem to involve mere *circumstances*, the truth of which can only be relied entirely upon faith and not on evidence or divine revelation. In regard to the fact which has been revealed, it

amounts substantially to this, that some angels have forfeited their original standing and character of holiness, and happiness, and have, ever since that event, been hostile to the virtue and happiness of humankind, against whom they are engaged in constant and inveterate warfare; and that, together with wicked humans, they shall be finally judged and punished (*ibid*, 307).

These principles seem to constitute some sensible deductions from the three following passages which seem to contain all that is written in the Scriptures on this subject:

- 1) He [the Devil] was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth; because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it (*John* 8:44).
- 2) God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgement (*2 Peter* 2:4).
- 3) The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgement of the great day (*Jude* 1:6).

From the expressions, it seems, “kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation”, the third distinctive feature in the theory in question has been deduced. By taking the expression literally, the sin of the fallen angels consists exclusively in “leaving their own habitation”.

Firstly, it is significant on the subject that the conclusion we can draw from the three quotations taken together to explain the moral fact of voluntary sin and fall of such of the angels as have forfeited their Creator’s favour, involves vastly

important moral consequences both to themselves and other moral beings. It marks the change of the angels' relationship to God as subjects of his moral government to that of disobedient, malicious, miserable beings held in isolation from the Divine until their final condemnation and eternal punishment. The fate of the angels therefore, serves as a warning to us not to entertain disobedience to, and unbelief in God in order to avoid the same fate as the fallen angels.

Secondly, the Scriptures clearly provide the distinct information pertaining to both classes of angels – the angels who remain faithful to God and those who rebel against Him. The theory under consideration necessarily involves the implication that there was a time since their creation when the holy angels were not denizens of the kingdom of heaven as they now are. But as Comfort (*ibid*, 308) says, “Where is the proof that this ever was the case? It cannot be produced.”

Chapter 5

Traditional Muslim View of the Devil

Traditional Muslim view of the Devil is closely related to that of Judaism and Christianity. In Islam, the Devil known as Shaytan and Iblis, does not have an independent existence. Iblis seems to have been a corruption of Greek *diabolos* (Jonas, 1963, 210). The Muslims believe that Iblis was originally an angel in heaven, similar to the Christian Devil, Lucifer. Iblis was born the spirit of fire and lived in heaven at the time Allah (God) created Adam, the first human. Allah commanded all the angels to bow down before Adam, but Iblis refused. For this, Iblis was expelled from heaven, but he was allowed by Allah to live on Earth until judgement day. Some Muslim scholars view Iblis' refusal to bow before Adam as an act of extreme piety; they say Iblis' devotion to God did not permit him to bow to anyone but God.

Like the Devil in Christian and Jewish belief, Iblis is allowed to tempt humans on God's behalf by urging them to go against the teachings of Islam, to quarrel, to gamble and to sin. As with the Devil in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, Iblis is the cause of all sorrows. Like the Christian Devil, he too can change shapes at will and has many disguises. Allah permitted Iblis to fall and to tempt humans, and tolerated him and his activities for his own purposes. One needs to ask why a God of great intelligence, wisdom, power, and love would permit evil, even if He does not will it. Why would God allow Iblis, the Devil, to urge humans to sin and then punish them? In response to these questions, Islam, like Christianity, has adopted the logical response that God, while He is omnipotent, allows humans to exercise freewill so as to produce the greater good of good freely chosen. On the

whole, the Devil in the Judaeo-Christian-Muslim idea represents the irreducible nature of evil that manifests itself as a real and deliberate force through the Devil.

According to the Muslim Qur'an (Koran) the refusal to bow before Adam resulted in Iblis' fall and rebellion against God, provoked by pride. Thus, Iblis was cast out of heaven by God. This account of Iblis' fall is similar to the view adopted by Irenaeus, who argued that the Devil had fallen out of envy for humanity, rather than the later Christian consensus that the fall occurred before creation of the material world and because of pride and envy of God. Like all monotheists, the Muslims allow Allah's perfection to be limited in order to preserve his goodness rather than to accept the dualist view of the two principles.

When we consider the possibility that even before God created man, He committed to Lucifer a position of authority in relation to the Earth and its surrounding planets, it is understandable why Satan is called the "God of this world" in the New Testament. The implication drawn from the *Bible* is that in order for Lucifer to rebel, and for other angels to join him in the rebellion, angels must have been capable of making decisions for or against God. It also seems to imply that they have freewill, at least to a degree. The fact that the angels were faced with the decision to obey God or to rebel against Him suggests that they have limited freewill for they had only one choice.

Chapter 6

Early Christian Theology on Christ and Satan

From the earliest time of Christianity, the first Christian theologians made a strong connection between the death of Christ and the overthrow of Satan.

These early Christian theologians held that Jesus was created as a ransom paid to Satan in order to liberate humanity from hell, thus securing salvation for humanity. Such a claim has a serious implication that humanity is doomed from the start and urgently in need of release from hell. It also gives the hint that without the problem associated with Satan, Jesus Christ would not have been created for He was believed to have been specifically created to counter Satan. Further, it was believed that in order to trick Satan, God concealed the divinity of Christ beneath his human flesh so that Christ could be the bait for Satan, and indeed was the bait for Satan, as far as the supporters of this theory are concerned.

If this notion is accepted, then Nestorianism, which explains the two natures in Jesus Christ, the higher divine and the lower human nature, is valid, and the charge of heresy by the Church, which accepts the Christ-ransom-notion, was badly flawed. This latter claim implies that God is not in control and that He is not all-powerful and all-perfect. It shows God has lost control of Satan and human beings so that he has to ransom part of Himself, and this would be a self-destructive process. Thus, this theory has too many contradictions and weaknesses to be taken seriously.

I shall now discuss “son of the morning star” in *Isaiah* 14:12-15 and *Ezekiel* 28:12-19 in the context of the controversy between good and evil. The theologian Origen (c.A.D. 185-c. 254) wrote “No one can know the origin of evil, who has not grasped the truth about the so-called Devil and his angels, and who he

was before he became a devil, and how he became a devil . . .” (Origen, 1953, IV, 65). He applied the passage to Satan, and connected *Luke* 10:18 with the Isaianic passage (*Origen De Principiis* 1.5.5 ; *Against Celsus* 6: 43; *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 4:593). Tertullian (c. A.D.160-c. 225) espoused the same view as Origen, and claimed that the text referred to the one “who has raised up children of disobedience against the Creator Himself” (Tertullian, 5.11, 17; *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 3: 454, 446).

From the beginning of the third century the Church Fathers, following the footsteps of Origen and Tertullian, interpreted these two biblical passages as depicting the fall of Satan, and the origin of sin (evil) in the universe. However, over the years, especially from the end of the nineteenth century on, most theologians and scholars, equipped with more comparative material with which to interpret the Old Testament, have affirmed that those passages in the form of mythological narratives are, in fact, reports of actual historical events, and therefore they are not related to the fall of Satan or the origin of sin.

As expressed earlier, traditionally the origin of suffering, death and sin is attributed to Lucifer’s rebellion against God. The tradition of the prideful spirit who refused to serve God has its first and fullest expression in the fourth century with the Nicene Fathers in general, and Augustine in particular (Revard, 1980). But, if all things (including the Devil), are created by God, and if the Devil is inherently evil, then God created evil. If, however, God did not create the Devil, then God is not omnipotent. In order to justify the assertion that God is omnipotent, the fifth century Christian Fathers offered the solution to the problem by asserting that God created the Devil, but the Devil was not created evil; rather, through misuse of freewill he chose to become evil. Therefore, God remains omnipotent, but He is not responsible for evil. Thus, the story of Lucifer’s fall lends support to the solution and Lucifer became a name for the Devil, and a figure whose existence is essentially necessary for theism.

Augustine (A.D. 354-430) – of the Nicene period – in *The City of God*, explains the origin of the two cities, the City of God, and the City of the Devil. If the Devil is a fallen angel, then he must have fallen. Yet the first *Epistle of John* tells us that “the Devil sinneth from the beginning.” This contradicts what is written in *Ezekiel* 28:15 which says that the Devil was created perfect (sinless) from the day he was created till the day he was found doing wrong.

In defending the statement “the Devil sinneth from the beginning”, Augustine claimed that this should be understood in the sense that the Devil sinned not from the beginning of his creation, but from the beginning of sin, because sin had its beginning in pride. Augustine argued that evil was the product of wilful deprivation. In Satan’s case, it was an attempt to be what he naturally was not – equal to God. But if Satan is evil by nature, he cannot have sinned for there can be no question of sin at all. It is only an act of faith to accept that Satan is a fallen angel. As an angel, he is pure spirit, much closer to God than human beings. But how can a pure spirit be contaminated? If Satan is a corruptor and this ability to corrupt was granted by the divine Creator because God wanted a world in which morality must be accompanied by freewill, then ultimately God’s whim is still the factor responsible for one’s potential to choose evil.

The concept of Satan as pure spirit is clearly shown in the *Bible* narrating angelic actions which demand this inference as to their nature, and explicitly describes angels as spiritual, intelligent substances superior to humankind. Hence, the theory regarding the origin of the demons as the offspring of the fallen angels *Genesis* 6:1-5, which appears in the *Book of Enoch* vi-viii, xv, and which belongs to the second century B.C., is misleading. However, the *Book of Enoch*, which was a relatively late work (Messadié, 1996, 240), is one of the first texts in which demons appear as completely malevolent enemies both of God and humanity in general.

Clearly, there are good reasons why Lucifer became the name of the Devil as part of the reasoning used to support the idea that the Devil was originally an angel, created perfect by God, but through pride and disobedience, he rebelled against God. We can see why all the so-called heretics of the early Church were called the followers of the Devil. In the annals of religion the Fourth Lateran Council (November, 1215), Pope Innocent III (1198-1215) stated:

. . . For the Devil and other demons were created by God; but they became evil of their own doing. But man sinned by the suggestion of the Devil (Campbell, 1974,491).

Clearly, Satan's fall is an indication that he was not created perfect. To define the Devil and to define him more clearly, the passage from *Isaiah* 13-39 became entwined with the fourth part of the book of *Revelation*, chapter twelve, where the Devil took on the form of a red dragon warring with the Archangel Michael and his angels. Though Lucifer was a name added to that of Satan, for the majority of Christians, Lucifer preceded Satan.

Until the fourth century, the *Book of Enoch* was part of the still loosely defined canon (Charlesworth, 1983; Charles, 1913, II) probably written in Hebrew or Aramaic. The first part of *Enoch* (Chapters 1-36) goes back to C.300 B.C., and is amongst the earliest books of the *Bible*. The *Book of Enoch* was a very influential book that was familiar to the Jews and early Christians, and even to the pagan critics. One of the ancient sources used by the final editors of *Genesis* was similar to a source more fully utilized in *Enoch* (Link, 1995, 27). Many Christian concepts first appear in *Enoch*. The Abyss of Fire, a kingdom of hell ruled by Satan and the rebel angels, first appear in *Enoch*. For hundreds of years *Enoch* was considered holy scripture by early leading theologians until some parts of it were

found unpalatable when the canon was strictly defined, and so *Enoch*, were removed from the *Bible*.

The origin of the fallen angels and Satan's sin is found in the opening verses of *Genesis*, chapter six:

And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they choose . . . There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came unto the daughters of men . . .

However, some Gnostics interpret the above as the mixing of the two creations – the divine creation with the evil creation. Some are of the opinion that chapter six of *Genesis* was probably a fragment added to give a moral motivation for the story of the Flood, which was originated from Mesopotamian versions that lack it. The interpretation of this chapter through *Enoch* has led many early Church Fathers to conclude the sin of the Devil as sexual union between the lustful angels and women. Hence, the sin of the Devil is not pride, but sexual lust. This unattractive bit is thought to be one reason why *Enoch* was removed from the canon. In the middle of the second century, an early Christian apologist known as Justin Martyr ascribed evil in the world to demons who were the offspring from the union between the lustful angels and human women (Justin's second *Apology*, v:2-6; Athenagoras, *Plea*, 24). Hence according to Justin these demons are believed to be responsible for all the evils in this world. He suggested that all pagans, all non-Christians, were Satan's children and demon worshippers.

But Augustine opposed the claim in *Enoch* and reinterpreted "sons of God" as angels only in spirit, and they allowed themselves to fall from grace, but before

their fall, they had children not as the result of sexual passion, but only in order “to people the city of God with citizens” (Augustine, XV, 23). However, this is not a convincing explanation. Recent findings and research have shown that some sections of *Enoch* dealing with the giants (believed to be evil by the early Church Fathers) had been appropriated by the same Manichees who had taught Augustine and whom Augustine later came to abhor (Henning, 1943-6, XI, 52-74). Augustine declared the *Book of Enoch* was too old and heretical, and so, *Enoch* was forgotten for a millennium.

It is no wonder some in the eleventh century rejected such interpretations of the earliest Christian theologians, arguing that Christ’s crucifixion was not a ransom paid to Satan, but rather made a debt due to God. This belief, known as the “satisfaction theory” and often associated with St. Anselm (as in *Christus Victor*) became orthodox. What it means in strict theological terms is that the role played by Satan in the grand drama of human salvation was significantly reduced – a *debt* to God replaced a *ransom* owed to Satan, significantly diminishing the Devil’s power. Nevertheless, the earlier idea of God creating Jesus Christ as a bait to Satan remains a dominant image in popular tradition of Christianity, even though it has been re-defined as a debt to God.

The opponents of mainstream Christians, the Gnostics, claimed that because the Old Testament ascribed the creation of the material universe to God, and because they believed the creator of the cosmos was Satan, it followed that the being that the Old Testament called God was really Satan (Russell, 1988, 58). This is the reason why the Gnostics rejected most of the Old Testament and those who believe in the God of the Old Testament are accused of worshipping the Devil. This explains the violent persecution of the Gnostics!

Since at least A.D. 100-400, demons in Western religion and lore have been classified into various systems. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Christian demonologists classified demons into various hierarchies of hell, and

ascribed various roles and attributes to them. However, in Christianity, demons are always associated with evil. Like their Eastern counterparts, Western lore concerns sexual intercourse between demons and humans. This appears for example, in the demonologies of the ancient Romans, Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks, Persians, and Assyrians.

Satan emerged from the first four centuries of Christianity. From then on, the Devil remains a familiar figure in the context of human history. One major concern of theologians surrounding Satan is the nature of God's creation. This was particularly so during the first five centuries of Christianity. There was much debate about the existence of Satan and evil. Some people might argue that if God made Satan, then, God made evil. Thus, God is responsible for evil. If God did not make the Devil, then there are other powers in the universe independent of God, and God is not all-powerful. A response to this problem is that God created Satan, but that Satan chose subsequent to his creation, to become evil. Such an explanation allows God to be able to be represented as all-good and all-powerful. Though theologically, the re-definition of the Devil's role is not related to a *ransom* owed to him, but a debt to God, however, the dominant image in the popular tradition is that the Devil has rights over human beings, and the right to punish them, thus participating in God's plan and justice.

There are fewer references of Satan in the Nicene period. Most of the speculation about Satan during the four or five centuries of tradition are now accepted as common fare. The Church Fathers, such as John of Damascus, Gregory of Nysan, Aquinas, and Gregory the Great all have their own interpretations about Satan. However, Satan was re-designed in the latter part of the first six centuries until he emerged as God's court jester, playing pranks with God's creation. Ironically, the common people believed the concept of the Devil constructed by the theologians. Hence, for the next several centuries, Satan became the figure intimately associated with diabolism.

Then came the reformation period that marked the religious upheaval. The three prominent reformers, Martin Luther (1483-1546), John Calvin (1509-1564), and John Wesley (1703-1791), held various views about the Devil that are still influential among the fundamental Christians today.

Luther, the earliest of the reformers, held the view that Satan is a personal force of evil. He also suggests that God has limited Satan's power (Woolf, 1952, I, 86). Calvin's treatment of the concept of Satan was as influential for his day as it is today among the Christians. Calvin (1948, 221) regards Satan as God's executioner to punish human beings' ingratitude and sins. Wesley attributed all quarrels, all evil, including natural evil, to the Devil (Emory, 1835, I, 376-84). Each of these reformers have their own views on various aspects about Satan, however, they all held Satan to be intensely personal and a fearsome enemy of the Christians.

Chapter 7

The Devil in Modern Christian Europe

The traditional Christian concept of Satan as the origin and embodiment of all evil finds expression in theology, rather than in the Christian Bible. Satan is pivotal in the development of Christian theology. Indeed, the Devil truly defines God as surely as God defines him! The relationship between God, humans and Satan can be identified as the central problem throughout much of Christian history, particularly throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

Although the image of the Devil is based on the teachings of Judaism, this image changed as the theological ideas evolved and new cultural forces appeared in Europe. Representations of the Devil, like those of Jesus, changed between the fifth and fifteenth centuries. Historically, the Devil is shown as black, as a sign of polluted filth, in contrast to the white representing pure angels. The Devil is depicted as naked, a gesture of degradation, and humiliation, a sign of being cast out in shame. This nakedness is vastly different from athletic nudity that was a symbol of status amongst the well-born in Rome in those days.

Arts and literature play a significant role in shaping and propagating the images and concepts of humanity's contemporaneous reality, and influencing people in ethics, morality, religion, and all other epistemological endeavours. This also embraces abstract concepts such as the existence of good and evil, their battle, and the existence of adversaries – God and the Devil. The Devil in medieval and Renaissance art, for the most part, remained a symbolic sign. The arts can be misused and abused to also blur the demarcation of concepts as the following anecdote amply demonstrates: An exhibition in Chicago (September, 1997) displayed a painting considered by some to be a work of art depicting Christ and

the Devil sharing a meal and devouring human body parts. This is sacrilege to any who view the Divine and the Devil as incompatible adversaries, cannibalism as untenable, or else believe in the sanctity of human life.

The above anecdote demonstrates that art in its depiction can unjustifiably and unreasonably distort. In this case, Christ is depicted as similar to the Devil. It can be interpreted as Christ and the Devil are like the two separate faces of the same coin. What is the point of having ethics and morals if we are going to blur light and darkness, good and evil, Christ and Anti-Christ (the Devil). Even if the Devil is perceived as the shadow of God, there is still the question of to which god that refers. The Gnostics, for example, regard Jehovah, the God of the Old Testament, as the Devil. Others believe that the Devil is the dark side of Yahweh (Jehovah), the God of Israel (Kluger, 1967, 68-69). Undoubtedly, Christians will call this an absurdity and a sacrilege. A popular belief from the Marcionites to the Thonraki and others in the Middle Ages is that Satan created the world (Ruciman, 1947, 10; 54).

Besides the various ways the Devil has been interpreted thus far in our discussion, the Devil is sometimes merely a rhetorical device. Insofar as the Devil does not refer to real evil and is a rhetorical device, the Devil becomes a justification for real evil by users of that device. Thus, for example, the genocide of about two million Cambodians by the former Khmer Rouge leader, Pol Pot, is justified as a real evil with no reference to a figure called the Devil behind it. In spite of so much evidence of senseless evil in the world, there are people who still insist that evil does not exist.

Devil costumes from the mystery theatres became the most important source for the face and form of Satan. The function and role of the Devil, and his names in art was greatly influenced by fifth century theology. His face and form come from Hellenistic sources (including adopted Osirian gods and Bes), and the liturgical drama. But there is no picture of the Devil before the sixth century

(Russell, 1984, 129). In the Middle Ages (the period between the fifth and the fifteenth centuries), the Christian concept of the Devil was influenced by folkloric elements from the Teutonic, Norse, Celtic, Mediterranean, and Slavic religions of the north. Although ideas about the Devil prevalent in the Middle Ages include the Eastern Orthodox and Islamic views, the emphasis is on Western Christian thought. By the sixth century, the Devil had taken on the characteristics of the earlier pagan thought and aspects of Greek religion which resulted in the Devil being associated with the underworld of the dead, presiding over souls in torment, and being depicted as part human and part animal, with horns, a tail, and cloven feet – one who cannot be trusted.

When Lucifer was cast out from Heaven as an angel, he is usually depicted as naked (signifying degradation), pathetic, and has flaming hair (indicating evil). During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Devil has horns and hooves (or talons), tail, and grapnel. Thus, the image of the Devil continues to change according to the imagination, interpretations and fancy of people.

Perhaps one of the most unjust applications of the Devil lies in the fact that it was used as the source of heresy. Heresy depends on an authority defining what is orthodox. By the sixth century, heresy was a dangerous devil-derived deviation from Christian doctrine. Thus, any who were perceived as opponents to the early Church, including the Manichees, were regarded as heretics, and some were put to death on account of that. According to the book of *John*, a Manichaean version of Scripture asserts that the Devil created the world (James, 1924, 187-189). The same idea is also found in *Acts of John* (KCViii) in E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* translated by R.M Wilson et al.

Historically, the Church was concerned with heresies from c. 1000, and even until the present day. Dualism has no place in mainstream Christianity because it jeopardized critical Church doctrine, from the Trinity to the very function of the Church itself. Dualism also raises the Problem of Evil. In regard to

the Problem of Evil, Cyril of Jerusalem remarked that “When the Devil sinned, it was not because he was naturally prone to sin, because if it was because he was naturally prone to sin, then the cause of that sin would be God himself”. (Tefler, 1955, II, 4).

Although the Christian image of the Evil One is based on the teachings of Judaism, this image changed as theological ideas developed and new cultural forces appeared in Europe. Poets, priests, and visionaries are equally responsible for shaping the idea and image of Satan accepted by people today. More than a thousand years after Cyril of Jerusalem made the above remark about the Devil’s sin, Shelley, in his prose on *Essay on the Devil and devils* pages 269-270 suggested something similar:

[The Devil] can have no tendency or disposition the seeds of which were not originally planted by his creator . . . It would be as unfair to complain of the Devil for acting ill, as of a watch for going badly; the defects are to be imputed as much to God in the former case, as to the watch maker in the latter.

Indeed, if the Devil’s activities are permitted by God, then Satan is not an adversary. He is, in fact, an instrument of God.

Beginning in the fifth century, poets, artists, and visionaries further defined the Devil’s image. They gave the Devil a personality in the mind of the common people. One of the most famous writings by an unknown author describing hell and Satan is an Irish work called *The Vision of Tundale*. Tundale’s Satan has a tail and spikes (instead of horns), and he is part human and part animal. He punishes those on Earth who refuse to honour God. In this respect he resembles the Judaic and pagan European traditions.

As time went by, however, the image of Satan in Christian Europe changed. In the fourteenth century, through the effects of Renaissance, the claims of the Church to authority over all areas of life was challenged. There was an enormous ecclesiastical hostility during the counter-reformation. The Renaissance was all but extinguished (Stanford, 1996, 184). The Renaissance did not reject the Devil, but tried to re-cast him and his role. In the later Middle Ages, poetry popularised the image of Satan. This is reflected in a well-known classic of literature known as *The Divine Comedy* written by Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) in the early part of the fourteenth century. Many of the writers, poets, and artists influenced by the spirit of the Renaissance produced some of the most compelling images of Satan and his hell. Dante, and later Milton, were two such poets who were greatly influenced by Renaissance spirit. Dante portrays the Devil as a pitiful figure, forever separated from the warming love of God. Satan is no longer an accuser or a punisher of humans. Instead, he represents hate, coldness, frigidity, and barrenness. He is portrayed as being like an animal, although he looks more like a dragon or a bat than the Greek god Pan or the Jewish Satan. He is a metaphor for nothingness. Dante's creation of the image of hell in all its labyrinthine remains with us today.

Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) and other Christian humanist thinkers did not deny Satan's existence, but relegated him to a metaphor for the vice and evil tendencies in human hearts (Stanford, 1996, 184). Later, materialists including Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), René Descartes (1596-1650), and John Locke (1632-1704) rejected the whole notion of incorporeal substances. They denied the existence of demons.

The Pilgrim's Progress (1678) and *The Holy War* by John Bunyan provide keen analysis of the conflict between Satan and God. Bunyan's Apollyon is a symbol of the fearsome presence of the personal force of evil (Bunyan, 1948, 35: 38). His representation of the Devil is the face of evil.

Milton's psychological portrait of the Devil had an extremely profound impact on people. In Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667), Satan is more fully developed as a character. He is presented as a complex personality, not as a blind, evil figure of a principle of wickedness. He is depicted as one agonizingly aware of what his rebellion against God has cost him. His fall is also a tragedy of intensely human dimensions. The reality of his fallen state is constructed in the poem as the human torment, and as such, evokes sympathy in those who can identify with his situation.

Clearly, Satan invokes a language of freedom in Milton, and the nineteenth-century Romantics perceived Satan as a reflection of their own struggles against political oppression. Byron and the Romantics made him their hero, the free spirit. Christianity has most often identified Lucifer's foolish pride as costing him his place in the heavenly spheres, but for the Romantics, it is Lucifer's heroic independence that brought down the wrath of God. For them, Milton's Satan is a prototype of a liberated individual, a figure who, like themselves, believed in freedom and liberty at any cost.

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) and his *Faust* dramas are indeed compelling. His Mephistopheles, like Milton's Satan, draws on sources other than the Christian tradition (Stanford, 1996, 202). Goethe's Mephistopheles is a trickster, a liar, the source of suffering and disorder, a being who can change form at will to beguile people.

The concept of Satan in these pieces of literature significantly influenced the course of theology, and the way many perceived Satan in the seventeenth century and even to the present day. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century the witch craze began to die down.

A sixteenth century illustration from a book about Dante's work shows Dante's three-faced Devil munching on Brutus, Cassius, and Judas Iscariot. The imagery of Satan was depicted by William Blake as a kindly old gentleman in one

of his engravings. Unlike Dante's Devil, the Devil appears in aristocratic garb of Faust's Mephistopheles in the form of a normal man, not a monster. But is Lucifer's freedom a freedom to conquer and usurp for his own personal gains, or is it a freedom from bondage? According to the Christian Bible, Lucifer was certainly not in bondage. On the contrary, he was held in high esteem in heaven as a high member of the angelic kingdom of God, one in God's favour. In fact, he was so well placed that he became over-confident and wanted to take over. This is hardly the picture of someone in bondage. But certainly, the Church was concerned with heresy from the very early times.

Contrary to what some people think, human beings are not essentially morally good. The brotherhood of man is mythical. Given half a chance, most would be inclined to cheat, exploit, and disadvantage others – due to greed, selfishness, jealousy, prejudice, hate, or spite – because they do not care about others. For example, looting almost always occurs whenever there is chaos or some sort of misfortune in the community. Looting in time of crisis has occurred in affluent societies as well as in less sophisticated societies.

It is also true that misfortune often brings out compassion, comradeship, self-sacrifice, and caring qualities in people. But, if people are essentially good, there would be more people who are caring, loving and honest towards one another in ordinary everyday life. We would not need to have laws to deter people from cheating others and laws to punish those who break the law. There is no restriction or law to prevent people from expressing honesty, fairness, sympathy, compassion, love, thoughtfulness, sincerity, and goodness towards one another, from race to race, nation to nation because there is no need to proscribe these types of behaviour. Instead, they do pass laws to encourage positive behaviour, which is a sign of the lack of good behaviour in society.

The majority of the people in this world do not display these qualities. Civil war and religious intolerance have continued to flourish since the dawn of history.

Racism is on the increase everywhere, and there are all forms of warfare throughout the world – trade wars, union wars, guerrilla wars, communist wars, wars against terrorists and drugs, and so the list continues. Clearly, it is because human beings are not essentially morally good that their less attractive traits need to be suppressed, and curtailed by the implementation of all types of laws – civil laws, criminal laws, commercial laws, union laws and so on.

Chapter 8

The Concept of Satan in the Nineteenth Century

The nineteenth century saw a radical change and evaluation of the concept of Satan. The Western civilization was greatly influenced by rationalism and scientific theories. This brought about the diminishing of Dante's Devil and witchcraft is seen as mere superstition. Not only were the personality and the image of the Devil with horns and tail removed, but any idea of an individual incarnating radical evil was eliminated as well.

Romanticism of the nineteenth century saw the expression of rebellion by writers and artists against both traditional Christian morality and science. Artist and poet William Blake (1757-1827) located evil not in the Devil but in the human psyche. The Romantic poet Lord Byron (1788-1824) portrays Lucifer as a complex character. Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822), like Byron, did not believe in the Devil. He saw the Devil as a symbol for anyone who wished to overthrow the established order.

The two trends of influence found in the Middle Ages are the same as those in the nineteenth century, but the emphasis in the nineteenth century is quite different. Instead of using logic and "fantasy" to construct an elaborate hierarchy of evil, the nineteenth century philosophers did away with the superstitions and fabrications of their predecessors. Thus, the biblical writers of the nineteenth century were forced to make changes to adopt a more acceptable biblical concept of the Devil in line with rationalism and scepticism.

The Devil was undoubtedly increasingly discredited at the end of the nineteenth century. His role as a metaphor for evil was overtaken by newer, more

abstract, philosophical and political explanations for the ills and dilemmas of the world at the dawn of the twentieth century. However, in times of trials, the Devil is still the convenient scapegoat for the evils and sufferings of this world.

Although Satan's presence has diminished in theology over the last century, he does remain an integral part of Christian orthodoxy. For the Christian believers, the Devil is a mysterious, but real, personal, and symbolic presence. There is no denying that Satan remains very real for many Christians. But looking at it critically, he is a figure that has a somewhat paradoxical position in Christian theology. The Satan of Milton's *Paradise Lost* reveals some of these tensions.

The essential question about the origin and nature of the evil that *Paradise Lost* and Christianity generally find difficult to reconcile is the image of a benevolent, omnipotent God. How did sin come to be born in heaven itself? If this is possible, then God's heaven cannot possibly be a perfectly good place, and evil must already exist in some form. We need to ask why did Satan, the most perfect divine archangel, come to choose sin? If he is a divinely perfect being, how can he turn to sin. Surely there cannot be any flaw for something to be absolutely perfect. Why did God not destroy Satan? Why did God permit Satan to carry out divine punishment? All these questions would make people heretics as the Church father Tertullian put it.

Satan, in his role as a tempter in the guise of the serpent who tempted Eve in the garden of Eden certainly raises many questions. Our ultimate progenitors, Adam and Eve were told "not to eat of the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge" otherwise they would get to know about good and evil. This indicates that evil must have been in existence before they were created. Some would disagree with this statement and would argue that they do not think there has to be evil to know about it, that it is enough that there be truths about what would be evil. However, to conceive the thought of evil and to protect others from the knowledge of evil signifies that evil on some level must exist, even if it is only an expressed thought

at that stage. The fact that there is a phase of ignorance in contrast to a state of knowledge, one would have to say that the ignorance springs from the untruth and not the truth. Therefore, the state can only come from evil, thus proving its existence.

But who would have created evil for Adam and Eve to discover? According to Christian scriptures, it had to be God, the creator of all things. So Satan must have done them a good deed waking them up to the ignorance of good and evil that God kept them in. He must have had some angle to exploit them, just like those deer and cattle farmers who breed beautiful animals, and then slaughter them for their meat and hides.

If we believe that Eve said she was tricked, then God was cruel and merciless for punishing them. If the serpent really did trick Eve, this God has made a defective Eve who could be tricked. Hence God is to be blamed for creating something that was flawed from the start. If Eve lied, then God had created a woman with evil in her already, otherwise she would not lie. If Eve lied as a result of eating the apple, again it shows that evil is already in existence and it was implanted in the serpent. This raises the notion of evil programming of humans and animals by corrupted energies in vectors, chemicals, and mediums such as food – the apple in this case – and also in thoughts, sex, drugs, and so on. This would prove God is not all-good, and evil must have been in existence before the fall of Lucifer, and Adam and Eve. Whether we take the story of Adam and Eve literally or otherwise, it does not diminish responsibility on God's part.

Why would God want to test Adam and Eve unless He is not confident about what He has created? Why would there be a need to test their obedience? If God has created a perfect prototype, no such test would be required. To test them, God must have known the odds of failure, and the failure would have come from the evil he had built into the system either before he created Adam and Eve, or contemporaneously. If God did not foresee the odds of failure, then God is not all-

knowing. If the Devil is responsible for tempting Adam and Eve, then God must Himself be blamed, for God permitted the Devil to tempt them when He could have made Adam and Eve stronger against temptation. Alternately, He could have abandoned the idea of tempting Adam and Eve.

Research on Satan ultimately reveals that Satan is a figure confined to the Western World. The figure of Satan cannot be considered as the universal symbol of evil, but rather, is particular to Christianity. While many other religious traditions possess demonic characters, and all religions or cultures recognize the existence of evil, Christian conception of the relationship between good and evil is largely unique. This does not necessarily mean that the claim that the belief in Satan as a symbol for evil is based on ignorance. On the contrary, there are good bases for arguing that Satan is, in fact, a symbol for evil and much more.

As indicated earlier, the New Testament ideas of the Devil derived primarily from Hebrew thought, especially the Apocalyptic tradition. The Christian Devil is associated with flesh, death and this world, and everything which obstructs the Kingdom of God. One of his evil tricks is to possess humans. It is believed that ordinarily the demons, Satan's servants, do the actual possessing. The Devil of the New Testament is a reality that is understood in terms of opposition by the Devil against the mission of Christ. It is also a testimony that this world is full of grief and suffering, and all sorts of evil. However, these days, most of the rabbis reject the concept of a personified being leading the forces of evil and prefer to regard the Devil only as a symbol of the tendency to evil within humans. They prefer to believe that humans are created with both the tendencies of good and evil and that evil is allowed in order that we might overcome the evil by following God's way. In this way, evil is ultimately deemed to be good.

Did religious belief perhaps mask a psychiatric phenomenon as some claimed? I think this is true in some cases of perceived possession. Satan is said to have many ways of spreading evil. Based on the concept of evil and Satan, the

usury system in this modern world is certainly one way in which the Devil spreads his evil. Possession is a common phenomenon in this day and age. It is reasonable to attribute the certain sudden human actions or thoughts inappropriate to the individual's normal behaviour to the hypothesis of an external evil force. As the poet Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867) once said, the sudden eruption into the mind of intensely destructive thoughts or feelings can be explained only by reference to a power beyond human consciousness. The majority of such people experience temporary partial possession at one time or another. This assertion is based on many years of psychic observation of the energy emanations that I have been able to perceive in the human auric field that many others have attested to as being a reality.

The report about incubus/succulus has been cited for hundreds of years. Some claim that incubus/succulus is a physiological response to sexually frustrated individuals. If this was true, then judging by the letters of complaint on the problem pages of women's magazines, there would be an epidemic! On the contrary, this is not the case at all. Therefore, the claim that incubus/succulus is a physiological response to sexually frustrated individuals does not really explain the phenomenon.

The *Bible* warns of Satan disguising as an "angel of light" to deceive people. Could it be that some of the mystical experiences and near-death experiences occurring in all religions and cultures through-out history, and which involve contacts with gods and demons, are in fact disguises of the Devil and demons to lead people astray and to possess them? Evidence of possession and claims made by those who have been deceived certainly points to the reality of such occurrences.

Many religious commentators have noted the Christian division of the non-human universe into absolute good opposing and triumphing over, absolute evil, stands in contrast to the more ambiguous mythologies of other cultures. From the

psychological perspective, the Christian popularity between absolute good and absolute evil is both false and harmful. Carl Jung argued that in setting up an opposition between Christ and Anti-Christ, Christian theology has attempted to split the archetypal forces present in the *self*, inadvertently doing Western civilization much damage.

Clearly, Christianity presents Satan as the enemy of humanity as well as of Christ. But there is a sense in which he is more closely aligned with the experience of being human than either God or Christ. Is it not a sin to defy humanity according to Christian framework? What fear could have a deeper experience of sin, of error, of regret, of failure, than the fear of Satan? This is certainly so of the Satan of *Paradise Lost* whose divided conscience embodied the lived experience of human psychology. It is indeed a paradox that in a poem relating the human experience, the most human character is Satan. His rage, sorrow, vanity, and his particular grandeur are all identifiably human.

If we look at Satan in a context broader than Christian theology, he becomes more and more a reflection of people as humans rather than some wholly evil “other”. In one sense Freud’s view that the Devil is the personification of the repressed unconscious instinctual life may have contributed to this “otherness”. In the Western tradition, the evil of sin and suffering is depicted as the enemy of God and humans, and evil doers are seen as inspired by Satan. Satan is used to represent one’s enemies, and to divide people into we, “God’s people”, and they, “God’s enemies”, [and thus our enemies also].

Traditionally, Christians regard the Jews, pagans, heretics, and Muslims as “the otherness” – the people of Satan. Ironically, Muslims often refer to Jews, and to Christians, as the people of Satan also. Thus, the figure of Satan becomes, among other things, a way of characterizing one’s actual enemies as the embodiment of transcendent forces (Pagels, 1996, 13). Consequently, the word “satan” became synonymous with the concept of “otherness” under the moral and

religious interpretation of conflict between people, groups, and nations for, in his frustrated rage, Satan mirrors aspects of human confrontations with “otherness”.

Robert Redfield (1953, 92), an anthropologist, observes that people all over the world often consider the division of people into two pairs of binary opposition of human/non human, and we/they. The profoundly human view is that “otherness” is evil, and the Devil is regarded as being the “other”. Jonathan Z. Smith (1985, 3-48) notes the correlation between the two pairs of binary opposition in societies as described by Redfield, and concedes that any group which differs from one’s own people is considered as non-human. Thus, the term “we” is associated with “good”, and the “otherness” is “bad” or “evil”. Such moral and religious interpretation of “otherness” is extremely dangerous as it instils distrust, suspicion, disharmony, hatred, fear, resentment, and fanaticism in people. Racism, religious biasness, and religious wars are examples of the products of “otherness”. What is even more frightening is the fact that it has been shown to foster hatred, and exploitation to justify genocide, and mass persecution of those who were considered as enemies.

If we were to agree with this concept of “otherness”, then the separation of the Jews and their *goyims* (the non-Jews); the “saved” and the “damned” in Augustine’s *City of God*; the war between the two natures in Manichaeism; and the agnostics and the Gnostics, who are irrationally called the agents of the Devil, are examples which demonstrate this concept of “otherness”. History has indeed shown that the idea of the Devil has serious harmful implications.

It is no wonder that over time, the Devil becomes the personification of evil as people increasingly demonise the Devil and consider the source of temptation, suffering, bad luck, death, and the source of evil as originating from him. Henceforth, the Devil represents something external to us, out there to be named and blamed. Since most people associate the Devil as the ultimate embodiment of evil, evil then, at its worst, seems to involve the supernatural – what we recognized

as the diabolic inverse of Martin Buber's characterization of God as "wholly other".

Interestingly, the Hebrew Bible, as mainstream Judaism to this very day, does not perceive Satan in the way Christians have come to know him. The Christians have come to refer to Satan as the prince of darkness and the leader of the forces of evil as part of the cosmic struggle between good and evil, and as a tender of an evil empire, an army of hostile spirits who are enemies of God and humankind alike. Thus, for some two thousand years Christians have identified their human antagonists with forces of evil, and so with Satan.

Historically, Satan has been represented as the antagonist of early Christians, but nevertheless the vision of a cosmic struggle – forces of good contending against the forces of evil – cannot have derived originally from Jewish apocalyptic sources as some, like Pagels claims. This cannot be so because the concept of cosmic struggle between the forces of good and evil have long existed in various early civilizations before the Hebrew Bible. The concept of cosmic struggle has been cited in the Chinese *Tao Te Ching* some twenty-six centuries ago (Wing, 1986, 10). Other ancient texts older than *Tao Te Ching* have mentioned the cosmic struggle in the form of mythology within the religious context.

Western civilization emerged through the blending of two cultural traditions – the Hebraic and the Hellenic. Historically, the Hebrew and the Greek traditions have understood humanity's relationship to divinity in very different ways. Some people label one religious, and the other one humanistic. In the Hebraic tradition, the individual renounces human judgement before the majesty of God as in the book of *Job*, while in Hellenic tradition human values are held as superior, and are used to judge the character of the gods. It has been suggested by some that it is the interplay of these two conflicting pieties that has given Western civilization much of its complexity and vitality. The traditions between these two certainly contribute to the power of *Paradise Lost*.

Christianity holds humility before God as an essential Christian quality. It is apparent in the figure of Christ. But for Greek culture, the essential concern is with hubris, which can be translated as an excessive pride, arrogance, or defiance before the gods, which then brings down their punishment. This is a definition that obviously fits Satan's lot in *Paradise Lost*.

The key example of hubris is Prometheus, the god who stole fire from Zeus to give to humankind and was consequently punished by being chained to a rock to be tortured by a vulture. The myth of Prometheus is double-natured. It represents individual self-assertion while simultaneously warning of its great risk. A central aspect of the Prometheus myth is trespass. Prometheus crossed the prescribed limits of action. He violated the order created by Zeus, and human life is the result. This is similar to the role that the character of Satan played as in the story of the Fall.

If we take the *Genesis* story, there is a sense that Satan, rather than God is responsible for this world. In fact, the Manichaeans believed that Satan is the God of the Old Testament. After all, God intended only the perfect but static Eden. According to the Old Testament it was through the transgression of Satan and then of Adam and Eve that life as we know it with a mixture of pain and joy, good and evil, struggle and loss, richness and poverty, and reward and punishment, came into being. Considered as such, Satan, like Prometheus, is a principle of dynamism. It is this notion of Satan as the embodiment of life-energy that is so appealing to the Romantics. For them nothing can exceed the energy and magnitude of the character of Satan as expressed in *Paradise Lost*. Thus, for them, Satan is a heroic figure, an aspiration, even a mentor for the oppressed, the alienated in society.

Clearly, the whole Western theology has worked out in terms of this Greek model with its notion of a divine realm as somehow primarily impassable – a kind of static eternity like the Platonic forms and certainly this is the kind of God we

find in *Paradise Lost*, a sort of deficiency when compared to this powerful, dynamic, rising energy. Energy first conceives of itself as some kind of deficient opponent of this static and repressive order, and in *Paradise Lost*, the figure who takes up the static order is God, and the figure which takes up the rising energy is Satan. Thus, those who identify themselves with Satan see him as the leader of rebellious force who has been misunderstood, and God as the oppressive order.

There is nothing radical in noting that Christianity, historically at least, has denied the value of this life. It could be that by affirming these historically satanic elements that they are, in fact, lending a new possibility. Sexuality, disorder, and irrationality have often been aligned in our civilization with Satan. Such things seem to be central to the experience of human life, and casting them out as evil seems in some way to diminish and deny life. It seems that this affirmation of life in its curious mix of joy and pain is present in Adam's decision to follow Eve in her fall.

To discuss Satan as a principle of life-energy is not to glorify evil nor to pretend that evil does not exist. On the contrary, it could be that an emphasis on an impersonal, external evil protects people from confronting the reality of humanness within them, on both the individual level, and on the scale of warfare, which disposes and inflicts genocide. Blaming the Devil means we do not have to accept the responsibility of examining each other or ourselves. The Satan of Milton's *Paradise Lost* is both larger and smaller than his representation in Christianity. It is obvious that Milton intends to encourage his readers to re-examine Satan's place in Western civilization. Though Satan is depicted as a malicious, vain, and bitter figure, Milton wanted us to view Satan also as one of dynamic energy who has both known love, and its loss, and, which many will find, as human. Milton's work and those of art illustrators helped shape a grotesque and fanciful image of the Devil that has persisted in popular thought even to this day.

It is interesting to re-iterate that Satan does not exist in the Eastern Civilization. Many other cultures and religions believe in supernatural demons but not a personal Devil, and their demons are much less powerful than the Christian Devil. The investigation into the Devil in Asia is more complex because there are so many aspects to it. Today, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam are the three major religions in Asia. Although Buddhism is essentially a philosophy, in practice it is a religion. Essentially, Asia's great religions originated from Vedism, which was introduced into the subcontinent around 1500 B.C. by Aryan invasions from Iran (Messadié, 1996, 37). Vedism was dualistic: the power of gods, or *daevas* was balanced by that of the counter gods, or *asuras*. The *asuras* are as multiform as the gods, representing in mythical form, the Aryan's adversaries (Eliade, 1955, Vol I). This duality is a symbolic opposition of being and non-being, of creation and chaos.

Throughout the history of Indian vedism, there has always been a fundamental doubt of the individual confronting the world. Toward the fifth century B.C., Vedism in India began to decline. The end of the Vedism era witnessed the first known expression of agnosticism. The more recent Vedas – *Upanishads*, or *Vedantas* – express that truth is unknowable and religion's purpose is to comfort the human mind. *Upanishads* rejects dualism. According to the *Upanishads*, Brahman is the only and total reality, the rest are all illusions. Therefore, it is concluded that dualism cannot exist, and *ananda* (bliss) cannot co-exist with evil.

Thus, the *Upanishads* insist that evil does not and cannot exist, and so how can either the Devil or demons since both are illusions. Thus, in every religion that derived from Vedism, (and since India disseminated its culture over the whole continent), it can be concluded that the Devil is unknown in Asia. Hence, there is no Devil in Jainism, which was developed by Vardhamanna – the inventor of philosophical relativism – around 570 B.C. There is no Devil in Buddhism,

however, it seems to provide a pre-figuration of the Christian devil similar to the Egyptian Seth. Legend has it that Gautama Buddha was confronted by Mara, the Evil One, the personification of death, when he was still a novice waiting for illumination. Mara teases Gautama by saying:

You are bound by earthly and heavenly binds . . . O ascetic, you cannot free yourself (Bareau, 1985).

What is obvious in this message is the conviction that evil really exists; it is not merely an illusion or an imagination of the human mind. Mara urged Gautama toward the earthly existence. It is in this that he is “evil”. But Mara is not a devil, at least not the Christian Devil; he is the god of death. The ferocious Naga of Uruvilva that confronts Buddha is not the Devil either. The God/devil antagonism is clearly non-existent in Buddhism.

The literature of demonology is full of the names and aspects of hundreds of demons – ghouls who originated in the Middle-East and Asia, and gargoyles in Europe are examples of aspects of demons.

China and Japan, which have both been influenced by Buddhism, do not have a Christian Devil. In China, evil in and of itself does not exist; only disorder does. Satan does not exist in China and Japan. Instead, there are demons that are associated with ghosts of the dead rather than with the concept of fallen angels. Hence, the practice of making offering to the spirits of the dead to appease the spirits became a common practice in such cultures. The Maori people in New Zealand believe that a person can be possessed by a makuta, an evil spirit.

Japanese and Chinese art have powerful commanding representations of devils and demons. The fanged Japanese Fudomyo-o, for example, is extremely fierce and threatening, but he is not evil. On the contrary, he fights evil and protects believers. He has no snares, and he does not tempt human beings. He is

what Roland Villeneuve, author of numerous books on demonology, believes to be human's eternal response to unknown forces (Link, 1995, 16).

The inhabitants of Mustang – Tibetan kingdom formally part of Nepal and shielded from China – are serious about the reality of demons. They believe demons are “as real as you and I”. Their most important religious festival, *Teeji*, “The Chasing of the Demons,” is celebrated with a mixture of fearfulness and hope for appeasement. Goat skulls stuck with paper strips painted with powerful charms are fixed above the doors of houses to ward off hungry ghosts and demons which are believed to be everywhere – in the streets, in the fields, in the air. Generally, the demons in Asia are merely phantasms, which can be exorcised via writing (particularly in China and Japan), rituals, offering, and sacrifice to appease the spirits. The Devil may not be real for many people, but as far as the Christians are concerned, he is real.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, materialists' assumptions include the serious belief in radical evil. Those like Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) and Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) were of the consensus that both God and the Devil were illusions. Freud developed a diabolology which attributed the Devil as nothing other than the personification of repressed, unconscious drives. For him the Devil represented the counter-will created by unconscious repression.

Contrary to Freud, Jung perceived God and the Devil as not inventions of the repressed unconscious but omnipresent psychological realities. Central to Jung's system is the process of integrating the power of the unconscious with that of the conscious. Jung believed that the repression by humans in which they unconsciously deny feelings and refuse to deal with them ultimately create forces in the unconscious that may burst out in destructive behaviour though the unconscious elements are not exclusively the product of repression. He argued that God and the Devil are two sides to the fullness of a single reality. He also

suggested that man's refusal to accept the reality of the Devil is the cause as well as a symptom of our impending ruin in the mythical, psychological sense.

Even today, the Devil is believed to express qualities that go beyond what we ordinarily recognize as human. He evokes more than just greed, dishonesty, lust, anger, selfishness, wickedness, envy, jealousy, cruelty, fear, and self-pity, which we identify with humanity's worst impulses. Many people in the Western culture have claimed to see Satan embodied at certain times in individuals and groups that seem possessed by an intense force which turns them toward destruction and destructive activities. The Devil has many disguises. What is so frightfully dangerous is that beneath the surface of what people perceive as love, charity, kindness, and purity may lie the evilness of the "Devil". It is dangerous because people cannot see through the deception. It is dangerous because it can promote terrible situations, like the "holy wars" or "wars against terrorists" where massacres and all sorts of evil are committed in the name of God – a licence to kill and destroy is created.

Judaeo-Christian tradition attributed many "diabolic" acts to God. He destroyed thousands of His own helpless worshippers for trivial offences *1 Samuel* 6:9. "I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things" *Isaiah* 45:7. Yet the Church is reluctant to accept the *Bible's* own presentation of God as the maker of evil. However, those who take this presentation seriously conclude that God had deliberately created the Devil before the beginning of the world, because a pre-existing evil principle was necessary to "test the faith" of the future human race (Russell, 1964, 121). This implies that God is not omniscient. He cannot know if the human race would be faithful to Him in the future.

Some people are adamant that the Devil can only be considered as an evil image for evil within the Christian context since he is a Christian creation whose role the Church defined, and who can only represent evil as defined by the Church.

Thus, the Devil can only represent evil when he is no longer strictly defined by his opposite, Jesus, and could then become a more general image of evil forces outside standard theological confinements.

Some people argue that it is not evil to create a Devil if God did it. But why should God be excused if He is the creator of a being who is responsible for many, if not all, the evils in the world? But diabolism was not under serious attacks until the sixteenth and seventeenth century when the witch hunts began. Those who were accused of being witches were burnt at the stake, hanged, or killed by other means for being agents of the Devil.

Horrendous evil acts were thus committed and justified by the belief in the Devil. No wonder it became an easy way to get rid of one's opponents by accusing them of practising witchcraft, and thus being in cahoots with the Devil and demons. But witchcraft is a primitive fertility religion going back to Neolithic times that predated Christianity in Europe, and it had stubbornly resisted the invasions of Christianity. In the conflict that developed between Christianity and this primitive fertility religion, Christians identified it as devil worship and moved to eradicate it. The ideas of Justin Martyr regarding devil worshipping unfortunately sowed the seed of persecution against those who were perceived as threats to the Church.

A fundamental notion in the heresy of Christian witchcraft was that human beings could make pacts or contracts with the Devil. Such an idea goes a long way back in the Christian tradition. Early Christian literature tells of stories about compacts having been made between human beings and Satan. In 1022 some of the canons of the Cathedral of Orleans who were accused of being devil worshippers were executed. Such horrific acts did not stop there. Between 1330 and 1350 in Toulouse and Carcassonne, France, people who were brought to trial and accused of witchcraft were mercilessly murdered. The most literary form of contracts with the Devil is to be seen in the Faust stories of Germany and England

that began to appear in the sixteenth century. The writings of Teresa of Avila (1515-1582) and John of the Cross (1542-1591) attest to the influence and powerful hold that traditional diabolology had upon the thoughts of sixteenth-century people (Russell, 1986, 53).

In the twentieth century, the Devil represents radical evil such as war crimes, genocide, terrorism, and world dominance. Many in the twentieth century were interested in the discussion of the Devil. Neil Forsyth has investigated much of the literature and cultural background of the figure of the Devil. Walter Wink and Carl Gustav Jung have studied the Devil's theological and psychological implications. Jeffrey Burton Russell and others have attempted to examine cross-cultural parallels between the being of Devil and the Egyptian God Set or the Zoroastrian evil power, Ahriman. Since Jewish and Christian perceptions of invisible beings seems to be associated primarily with moralising the natural universe, even to this day, Christian Baptism insists the person to be baptised solemnly renounces the Devil, and all his works.

Now, in the twenty-first century, we witness more and more of the force of evil at work in the affairs of the world in far more serious, ugly and horrible ways than we have ever known in modern times. This force many refer to as the work of the Devil.

It is believed that in the past we have created a myth of supernatural, personal darkness, but, today Satan is the dark side of ourselves. This may be true in one sense, but where did this darkness originate from before humans could tap into it? The fact that human beings can be influenced by it suggests that there is a force outside of humans.

Thus far we have attempted to trace the origin of the concept of Satan and his modification over a period of time in the Western world, and have come to the conclusion that the Devil exists only in the Western civilization, and particularly so as a being in the Christian belief. This does not mean that the belief or non-

belief in the existence of the Devil cannot be argued rationally. In fact this is what we will be doing later when we discuss the various arguments for and against the Devil's existence, and the various hypothesis of the Devil. Hopefully, everything considered, we shall arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

Summary of the Traditional Views of the Devil in the Western Civilization

The Devil is an extraordinary mixture of confusions. Satan is a figure of theology, of politics, of practical ideology, and of strangely associated pictorial traditions. He is real to the Christians, but to them, he is an abstraction, not a character. The Devil is referred to as one's opponent, and is often perceived as "the other". The Devil is rarely individualized. He is often a reflection of how we perceive ourselves and those we call "others".

There is no objective definition of the Devil. The Devil can be re-defined historically. The Devil's historical definition can be obtained with reference to definition of evils that are themselves existential. There is the notion that the Devil is the personification of whatever is perceived as evil in society. Thus, the concept of the Devil consists of the traditions of perceptions of this personification. Some languages have no word for the Devil because there is no concept of the Devil. The face and forms of the Devil change according to the imagination and fancy, and interpretation of people. The appearance of the Devil was largely determined by the costume used to impersonate him.

Although the Devil has no conventional ancestry, he does appear to have forebears in the ancient civilizations of the Near East and in Judaism. While every civilization seems to have had devils or demons, there are differences. Though other cultures and religions have toyed with maleficent gods and spirits, it is only in Christianity that there is a role, an actual figure who is the name and the face to

put to the abstract reality of evil. It is Christianity that gave it a face and name. There is no equivalent to Satan in China, Japan, ancient Greece or Rome. In Japan and China, the demons are not necessary evil. Satan is a Christian creation whose role the Church defined. He is defined evil by any Christian sect for its own self-interest. Once he is not strictly defined as the opposite of Jesus within the standard theological context, he could then be a more general image of evil forces.

Belief in the Devil serves as an easy way to explain evil. It is one way for people to avoid facing the responsibility of their evil acts. It is easier for people to excuse their evil action by saying “the Devil made me do it”, rather than “I am responsible for it”. It may be a case of using freewill to accept the temptation offered by the Devil. Whether the Devil actually exists or not, he is experienced as a phenomenon, as extant evil, in human experience, belief and behaviour as powerfully as people experience God, or a Divine Intelligence.

Belief in the existence of the Devil raises serious problems of consistency in Christian theism. In the twenty-first century the dimensions in philosophical theology on the Problem of Evil and the ontological argument for the existence of God raises the problem of the existence of the Devil and fallen angels.

Chapter 9

Previous Research on the Existence of the Devil

Debate on the Devil took a popular stand between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries, resulting in a tremendous amount of books being written on the subject, of which most are expositions of the doctrine of the Devil's existence. This period, which witnessed an enormous resurgence in the interest on the existence, personality and activities of the Devil, also marked the era of witch-hunting and the burning of witches associated with the work of the Devil.

The trend appears to decline a little in the nineteenth century and particularly from the start of the twentieth century, due mainly to the advancement of science and also the influence of demythologisation in Europe. Nevertheless, belief in evil forces is still strong, and prevalent, even in some technologically advanced, affluent nations. Christians in general continue to believe in the actual existence of Satan and fallen angels, though some have doubts about the Devil's existence. Questions about various Church teachings such as why the need for salvation if the Devil does not exist are vigorously debated. In fact, some theologians are asking similar questions (Guthrie, 1969, 14, 160-167).

In recent years, especially when the world's odometer approached a millennial milestone, there seemed to be an increase in the interest surrounding the end of the world associated with the appearance of the Anti-Christ (Satan), and a revival in the belief in evil forces. According to surveys, Devil worship is on the increase in United States and in many parts of the world. Some have argued that the emergence of New Age religions, growing interest in parapsychology, popularity of science fiction and the supernatural, particularly since the later part

of the twentieth-century, are examples of behaviour counteracting the rationalistic approach to the beliefs and practices in evil forces.

In the twentieth-century, some philosophers and theologians argued that theism could not survive without the Devil. This re-ignited the view of some seventeenth-century demonologists who fervently argued for the power and reality of the Devil in their effort to affirm the existence of God. The debate has resulted in some written arguments amongst philosophers and theologians for and against the reality of the Devil.

Though there have been many writings on the subject of the Devil and demons, these are primarily expositions of the dogma geared toward confirming the views of the believers in the existence of the Devil, and generally they do not subscribe to arguments against the doctrine of the Devil. These writings tend to be limited to dealings with only one type of argument and ignore other independent arguments. Most of the resources on the Devil are found in the discussions on the ontological argument and the Problem of Evil, which are often the bases used for and against the existence of God.

Theodicy attempts to explain why there is evil in a universe created by God who is all good. It is no wonder why the Devil is introduced in an attempt to resolve the Problem of Evil. Thus, for a theodicy, the hypothesis of the existence of the Devil and demons (Satan's cohorts) must be true and consistent with the rest of theistic claims, so that it will not contradict the belief in God.

However, there are critical differences between them. One of the main differences is that the existence of God seriously raises the epistemological questions, which does not occur in the examination of the existence of the Devil, for the Devil is not considered a necessary being, and is not equivalent in power or knowledge to God.

There are no major works in philosophical studies addressing this topic although there are a considerable number of articles written on the subject. Thus,

critical study of the major arguments for and against the existence of the Devil needs to be explored.

Since the article by Collin K. Grant in 1957 in his attempt to disprove the existence of the Devil, many articles have sprung up on the issue. However, most of these articles are not so much on the existence or non existence of the Devil as they are attempts to argue the soundness of the ontological argument for the existence of God.

One of the most comprehensive of these articles is Perry C. Mason's "The Devil and St. Anselm" (1978, 1-15). His critique covers the constituent parts of various arguments by both sides of the arguments and attempts to show what is and what is not implied about them by the assumptions upon which the ontological argument rests (Mason, 1978, 1-15). Mason's work is quite thorough, however, it is not without serious weaknesses. His most obvious weakness is probably in his objections to the argument for the worst possible conceivable being. His arguments simply fail to follow the argument to the logical conclusion.

Alvin Plantinga's work on the freewill defence as a response to the problem of natural evil is linked to the problem of the existence of the Devil. This seems to rekindle the debate on the various aspects of the Devil. The idea of the existence of Satan and fallen angels is an old Christian thought. The belief in an evil force has been with humankind for a long, long time. Theodicy has attempted to explain why there is evil in a world created by a good God. Basically, the freewill defence holds that the existence of moral evil is due to God, who had no choice but to create beings who are free to choose to do right or wrong. Further, from a theistic point of view, it is better for God to create beings with freewill than beings without it. One of the criticisms of the freewill defence is that it does not address the problem of natural evil such as floods, and earthquakes.

However, Plantinga defends his argument for the Devil's existence by arguing that the Devil and fallen angels exist and are responsible for natural evil.

He applied the freewill defence to demonstrate that there is no inconsistency between the assertion that God exists and there is moral evil. Therefore, the freewill defence can be used as an argument for the existence of the Devil and demons. According to him, it is possible that an omnipotent, omniscient and omnibenevolent being cannot create a world containing good but no evil.

There are so far two major sources on the Devil (Satan) hypothesis and these are by Wallace Murphree and Michael Martin. Murphree argues in defence of the reality of the Devil and concludes that the existence of a personal Devil is a moral necessity; that, without the Devil, humanity itself becomes God's main enemy. Murphree, in his article "Can Theism Survive Without the Devil?" (1985, 21, 231-244), supports St. Anselm's argument that the Devil and fallen angels exist and are responsible for natural evil. He has argued that theism cannot survive without the Devil. However, he has failed to establish the existence of evil entities. What he has succeeded in is, in fact, the demonstration that the Satan hypothesis is more convincing in a theistic solution to the problem of natural evil than other leading extant theodicies.

Most of the defenders of the doctrine of the Devil tend to depend almost entirely on the *Bible* in their arguments. Starting from Colin R. Grant's "The Ontological Disproof of the Devil" in 1957 in an attempt to disprove the existence of the Devil, there have been articles on both sides of the arguments on the Devil by various ones.

Most of the articles against the existence of the Devil are really responses to arguments for the existence of the Devil. Some of the well-known proponents of such works are John Hick, Michael Martin, Steven Cahn, Peter Hare, and Edward Madden, who argue against the existence of God and the Devil. Martin (1990, 393-400) has some very challenging arguments against the existence of the Devil. John King-Farlow (1978, 56-61) argues that these attempts are ludicrously irrelevant and fail to impugn the consistency and coherence of monotheism.

In the Christian Bible, the Devil is a real being. Without the Devil, explanation of the existence of evil in this world and the need for salvation would not have made much sense to the Christians. Besides, without the existence of a personal Devil, theists would have to argue that humanity itself becomes the main enemy of God. It is no surprise that most Christians who believe in the *Bible* teaching in regard to the Devil, hold that the phenomenon of possession demonstrates the reality of demons and the effectiveness of exorcism in the Name of Christ. Jesus' role as an exorcist demonstrates that Satan could possess a human being and that through the ritual of exorcism, Satan could be cast out of the victim. Exorcism was a common practice from the time of Jesus until well into the Middle Ages. Traditionally, the principal reason for believing in Satan is the overwhelming anecdotal evidence of possessions. Though many cases of possession can be explained away in medical terms as epilepsy, hysteria, and so on, there are cases that cannot be explained away by psychology or psychiatry.

There are various biblical references concerning Jesus' struggle with Satan. *Matthew* 4:1-11; *Mark* 1:12-13; *Luke* 4:1-13, and exorcisms performed by Jesus; *Matthew* 8: 28-34, 15: 21-28, *Mark* 1: 21-28, *Luke* 4: 31-37. Some argue that the misinterpretations of the written words and expressions of the evangelists were primarily responsible for the solemn belief of so many people concerning possession by demons and exorcism of demons. All Christianity, at one time, treated Satan as an actual being and believed that he had many powers, including the power to possess a human being. Christian clergies who have had experiences with exorcism do not hesitate to identify the destructive forces in the "supernatural" phenomena as satanic. Buddhist monks and priests of other religions will testify to the reality of possession of humans and animals by demonic spirits. However, with the advancement of science, diabolical possession is often considered as a superstition of primitives and apparent possession could be explained as a psychosomatic disorder and some kinesic action caused by mental

power. Science disregards the reality of possession, but science does not yet understand the forces associated with the inexplicable phenomena of possession.

Apart from the belief in satanic possession, the *Bible* also teaches that the Devil assumes many deceptive disguises to trap people. Even if the Devil's existence is only a myth, we must recognize that there is a reality behind the myth of the Devil.

While there are numerous arguments for and against the existence of the Devil, they will not be the subject of in depth discussion in this book. However, I shall briefly mention the major arguments for the existence of the Devil that are being debated.

1. Ontological arguments.

The *ontological arguments* concern the rationality of the existence of God or the Devil and seek to determine whether the being discussed is good or bad. The ontological argument is a paradigmatic *a priori* argument to prove the existence of God by analysing the concept of God.

2. Arguments from the Christian Bible.

This category of arguments affirms the validity of the *Bible* and therefore proposes that what it teaches about the God and the Devil is reliable. The Christian Scripture and tradition teach that the Devil exists as a being and that there is evidence to suggest that this belief is true. While the interpretation of the being of the Devil is not always consistent in the *Bible*, the New Testament clearly teaches that Jesus and the early Church believed in the existence of the Devil.

However, the non-biblical origins of this belief among other cultures certainly raise questions about its truth value and the need for the Church to

recognize the existence of the Devil. Some argue that the concept of the Devil was not a literal one as far as Jesus was concerned because if Jesus did, in fact, use the idea of the Devil literally, he would have been epistemically limited, and therefore, mistaken. Jesus sometimes used the idea of the Devil literally and sometimes metaphorically. Metaphysically, a force can manifest itself physically through a physical medium. Therefore, it is plausible that at times the Devil as a metaphysical energy/force could manifest through a human being or an animal.

3. Arguments from possession and exorcism.

These attempt to demonstrate that these phenomena, as recorded in the Christian Bible and in history all over the world, clearly support the theory of the existence of the Devil and demons. Graham G. Dow's (1980, 94, 199-208) article on "The Case for the Existence of Demons" is an example of such an attempt.

4. Arguments from disguises of the demonic.

This argument details the various deceptive disguises of the Devil and demons in their attempts to beguile, tempt, and entrap human beings.

5. Arguments from evil.

This involves the arguments that the Devil is responsible for all the suffering and bad things in this world.

6. Arguments from natural evil.

The argument from natural evil arises in the context of the freewill defence. This argument asserts that natural evil is caused by the Devil and demons. If this is true, then natural evil can be considered as moral evil.

7. The argument that there is a being behind the myth of the Devil.

This argument seeks to demonstrate that there is a reality behind the myth of the Devil, a reality equivalent to a meaning. The concept of myths has been used by critics against the Devil to discredit belief in the Devil's existence. The criticisms from proponents of the doctrine have been equally strong. They declare that the argument from myth is one of the most misguided arguments against the existence of the Devil.

8. Probabilistic arguments.

Most of these are found in the ontological argument for and against the existence of the Devil. This argument assumes several logical steps to reach a conclusion. It also contains hypothesis of the Devil.

Apart from discussing the arguments from the Christian Bible, I shall include the following:

9. The argument that the Devil exists only as a purely mental idea. This is the hypothesis that the Devil exists only as an idea in the mind of people, and so it is only a creation of the human mind. This discussion seeks to argue that even if the Devil exists as a mental idea, the fact that it affects the lives of people in such a powerful way, its mental reality is as valid as the physical reality.
10. The argument that the Devil is a collective evil mind. This hypothesis of the Devil argues that the collective wrong doing we perceive in this world is influenced or motivated by a collective evil mind.

11. The argument that the Devil is an evil principle. This is the argument that the evil in this universe originates from an evil principle. The Devil represents the evil principle as against the good principle. This touches on the theory of the two principles of dualism. There is the strong argument that there is evil, and that it is represented by the being known as the Devil, which is the manifestation of the principle of evil.

Chapter 10

The Probalistic Arguments

Experiences have shown the difficulties often encountered in demonstrating a logical inconsistency between the existence of God and the simultaneous existence of evil. It is no surprise that more writers have chosen to present their thoughts as probalistic arguments from evil. Some believe that this method of argument from evil is absolutely antagonistic towards theism, while others such as Plantinga (1979, 35, 1-53), argue that this version has as many (if not more) flaws as the logical version.

The arguments from evil inevitably lead to the argument on the Devil. On the subject of the existence of the Devil, Wallace A. Murphree is committed to the argument for the actual existence of the Devil. His argument is an example of probalistic argument, though it has generally been accepted as a deductive one. This is so because of the great explanatory power of the Satan hypothesis – which declares that the Devil and fallen angels exist and are responsible for natural evil – which he has employed in his reasoning. He has taken one step further than Plantinga's assertion that it is possible that the Devil and fallen angels exist and are responsible for natural evil.

Plantinga addresses the Problem of Evil by adopting the freewill defence. In his freewill defence, Plantinga proposes a world containing creatures who are significantly free is more valuable, all else being equal, than a world containing no free creatures at all. He also suggests that it was not within God's power to create a world containing moral good without creating one containing moral evil [and] God created a world containing moral good.

Plantinga attempts to solve the Problem of Evil under the condition that God is omniscient, omnipotent, and wholly good and the world contains natural evil by proposing that natural evil is due to the free actions of non-human persons. He concedes that there is a balance of good over evil with respect to the actions of these non-human persons; and it was not within the power of God to create a world that contains a more favourable balance of good over evil with respect to the actions of the non-human persons it contains (*ibid*, 58). He further argues that, on a libertarian account of freedom, the creator is not responsible for evil, for to do so, He would have to withdraw significant moral freedom.

On the subject of freewill, if God is omniscient and human beings have freewill, there is the problem of reconciling God's omniscience with human freewill and responsibility. Moreover, if God is all-knowing, he must know what choices a person will make in the foreseeable future. If God foreknows what a person will freely choose at some time in the future, that person's choice is pre-determined rather than free. If this be the case, that person cannot be held responsible for them.

To demonstrate the position of freewill, let us take the example of a man who is faced with having to make a decision to spend his last \$100 on buying food for his starving family or to use the money to pay for an operation to save his pet dog's life. Let us not forget that he has responsibility towards all members of his family, including the pet dog. Being a man who perceives his dog as a consciousness as special as that of humans, he is in a dilemma. Eventually, he decides to save the dog and his family is left without food. While he has the freewill to choose, it is not really such a free decision for it entails a lot of thinking, and has caused him a lot of conflict, guilt-feeling, confusion, frustration, and anger.

According to Plantinga's freewill defence, this poor man's decision was foreseen by God long before it actually occurred. We can say that God has the

power to know the future in His power to foresee the future He therefore foreknows the exact decision this man will be making eventually in the foreseeable future. On the other hand, we can argue that the man's decision was pre-determined by God, but then, God would be responsible for the consequences of this man's decision.

Let us look at another example: Modern biochemical and neurological physiology tells us that programming of humans, animals and plants, by various macromolecules and their effects, such as electrical discharges, dictate physical, emotional and mental behaviour to a great degree. And this is experimentally obvious even in plants (Tompkin & Bird, 1979, 17).

If man lacks freewill, there can be no moral evil but a more perplexing problem of physical evil, due to programming mechanisms which can exist. Equally, however, in such circumstances, there can be no moral good, and the physical shell called man would simply be a programmable automaton.

One can argue that evil stemming from freewill is incomprehensible since the movement of freewill cannot be analysed causally. If sin arises from a prior deficiency in the intellect, then God would be responsible for the deficiency and consequently be the ultimate cause of sin.

We may appeal to the ethical solution to the problem of the origin of evil or theodicy in the Christian view of human volition and freewill to explain the Problem of Evil. But this would only be a shifting of the problem, not a solution at all, for human's trespass evoked God's punishment. By expressing freewill to choose an evil, man incurs the wrath of God. Thus, he is in a no-win situation. Tertullian may have been quite right when he insisted that making choices is evil, since choice destroys group unity (*Prescription Against Heretics*, chap. 7).

Given that we accept that moral evil is due to human perversity and natural evil is any absolute, contingent evil which occurs while all human beings are morally innocent with respect to it, there still remains the question of why a good

God would allow evil in this world. Theists believe in the existence of evil. However, according to Leibniz's "best of all possible worlds", which allows the existence of some evil, but God allows some absolute evil to exist because absolute evil can be a necessary good. Leibniz's "best of all possible worlds" is satirized and taken to its logical and farcical conclusion by Voltaire in *Candide*. Voltaire destroys and makes a mockery of Leibniz's foolish hypothesis that if a little evil is good, then a lot of evil must be better.

If we were to accept Leibniz's explanation that because God is limited to what is logically possible, the existence of evil is necessary in this "best of all possible worlds" (Urmson & Ree, 1991). This would lend support to the argument that evil is in some respect a necessary good. The standard view is that God is restricted to the possible. If God is characterized by the traditionally but conceptually restrictive omni-predicates, evil should never be allowed to exist unless we are prepared to accept that a good God could allow the existence of both good and evil. Clearly, the privatory theory of evil is not convincing in explaining why God allows evil.

Clearly, the theory of pre-determination contradicts the theory of freewill. According to Augustine of Hippo, human action is purposely determined or compelled by God. Notoriously, the Christian doctrine of creation and divine knowledge raises problems about human responsibility for the theologian. The freewill defence, which attempts to show that God is omnipotent, omniscient, and wholly good, is inconsistent with the argument that there is evil in the world when the Manichaeon view of the mixture of good and evil is taken into consideration. It is possible to entertain the notion that God could have created a universe containing moral good without creating one containing moral evil.

Evil is usually associated with the Devil. If God did not create the Devil, then the latter must be self-creating. This could imply that God is not omnipotent. Can we then argue that evil must therefore be created by man's choice, by his

Original Sin, which Jesus Christ was meant to redeem? But the concept of Original Sin is absurd because it implies the Original Sin of each consciousness, when the consciousness had not yet done anything to deserve such a stain, which was explained away as collectively inherited sin, just as later the Church would irrationally argue a case for collectively inherited sin for the principle of Vicarious Satisfaction stemming from the murder of Jesus. Why would God stain His perfect creation just for one error supposedly committed by Adam? It is most unfair to blame everybody for the error of Adam.

The concept of Original Sin also implies that God would create each new being perfectly and then spoil each being with the taint of evil because of the error of Adam. Such a concept denies the essence of evil outside of man. It also implies that all humans are born with sin and all humans are born with Original Sin. Such a concept makes humans despair of perfection, for they can never eradicate their inborn fault. It also implies that non-Christians are doomed to end up in hell, as salvation, according to the Church, is only through Jesus Christ the redeemer.

One may argue that the incoherence lies only in combining the idea of sin as a separation from God with the idea of sin as wrong doing. But surely Original Sin is not our wrong doing. Besides, why should anyone be concerned with imperfection when God gives us what we cannot achieve for ourselves?

By asserting the existence of Original Sin, are we blaming Adam or Satan as the creator of all humans who were born? By denying that all sins are forgiven in baptism, the implication is that there remains in baptised parents the evil by which their children are born with Original Sin. This not only implies that God is imperfect, it also suggests that God continuously creates imperfection since all human beings have to pay for Adam's sin. In this light, the defence of Original Sin is unjust and weak.

Murphree proposes that if Plantinga's theistic claims – God is omniscient, omnipotent, and wholly good, and the world contains evil – are actually believed

to be true, rather than merely believed to be consistent, then “there inevitably emerges a problem of epistemic consistency so substantial as to be coextensive with common sense” (1985, 21,233). Thus, he proposes that the only available solution open to the theist is to accept Plantinga’s claim.

Basically, Plantinga’s general argument is that it is logically possible that God has good and sufficient reasons for allowing evil in the theistic universe. His specific argument is a defence of the freewill defence which proposes that a world created by God containing creatures who are significantly free is intrinsically more valuable, all things being equal, than a world containing no free creatures at all, and since beings created by God are free to choose to do good or evil, God is not responsible for the evil that results from the free choices of the beings. If God is omniscient, omnipotent and wholly good, and human beings have freewill, there is the serious problem of reconciling God’s omniscience with human freewill and responsibility. If God is all-knowing, he must know what choices a person will ultimately make in the foreseeable future. If God foreknows what a person will freely choose in the future, that person’s choice is pre-determined and therefore cannot be free. If this be the case, then the person cannot be responsible for his action.

It is totally irrational to claim that *all* evil is due to human’s freewill. If human’s evil is due to their freewill to choose evil, then the problem is to reconcile freewill with determination. The freewill defence demonstrates that the limits of God’s omnipotence may apply to nature and that human freewill imposes necessary limits on what God can do within the context of moral and natural realms. The Satan hypothesis in relation to natural evil implies the abuse of freewill and the limits of God’s omnipotence and perfection.

However, beings in this world often make morally evil choices whether due to circumstances or by choice. Can we not ask why an omnipotent, omniscient and omni-benevolent God would want to create a world containing creatures who only

and always make morally good choices? If God did in fact create beings who only and always make right choices, would those beings be really free? At least we can say that their freedom to choose is limited and is confined to freedom to make the right choice of their liking amongst all the possibilities of right choices, since all the choices at their disposal are ultimately good. No matter what choice they eventually prefer, it will always be the right one for it is a world where beings will only and always choose to make the right choice.

Perhaps there are no other possible worlds containing beings who would never choose to do what is morally evil. If there are such possible worlds, why did God not create our world as one where creatures will only and always choose to make morally right choices? Plantinga suggests that perhaps there are no such possible worlds, and perhaps it is possible that there are worlds in which the beings would only and always make the right moral choices. He argues that it is possible that some of the beings who freely choose moral evil in this world would also choose to make morally evil choices in whatever possible world there may be, and that it is also possible that all possible creatures suffer from “transworld depravity”. Therefore, whether these possible creatures freely choose to do good or evil depends on their own free choice and not on God. Hence, he argues that it is possible that it was not within God’s power to create a world containing free creatures who only and always choose to do good.

Thus, God can create beings who are not free and have them always avoid doing what is morally evil. Plantinga argues that if this is possible, then it is possible that it was not within God’s power to create a world containing free creatures but no evil. Hence, his argument, which assumes a libertarian account of freedom, concludes that the freewill defence is the answer to the logical problem of moral evil. However, not all theists believe that we have libertarian freedom.

Human beings assume that a moral being is a free being, and the act which is freely chosen by a moral being may be right or wrong. But moral evil destroys

the operation of free choosing. In a world containing a mixture of good and evil, an evil deity was necessary, otherwise God would be blamed for the evil in this world. But logically, God could not be both all-good and all-powerful. If God wanted to create a world without evil but is powerless to do so, then, he could not possibly be all-powerful. Conversely, if He could create a world without evil, and would not, He could not possibly be all-good. One way of getting out of this problem is to make someone responsible for evil, and that someone must be an evenly matched adversary – the Devil (though Lucifer or Satan was supposed to have been totally defeated by God during the war in heaven). If all the Devil's acts were permitted by God, as some theologians would argue, then God is to be blamed for all the evil carried out by the Devil.

If we were to take notice of Hick's suggestion that perhaps the sort of world in which we could have meaningful freewill is one in which there is pain (Hick, 1977, 236), then we have to concede that pain preceded freewill. If suffering appears to have existed in the world of nature long before the appearance of human beings and their freewill as Joad (1942, 24) suggests, then one needs to ask why was there pain in existence in the first place? Did not evil precede human beings and their freewill?

Chapter 11

Arguments from the Christian Bible

The Relevance of the Concept of Satan for Christianity

In this chapter it is hoped that from the accumulated research, a reconstruction of the doctrine of the Devil might be made which will defend the reality of the Devil for Christians. For this purpose we shall draw on the historical and biblical insights concerning Satan and discuss ideas which include the reality and nature of Satan, and his relevance to Christians.

Generally, Christians believe in the actual existence of Satan. Satan's existence was taken for granted as part and parcel of Christian faith until the time of the enlightenment when the "enlightened ones" rejected the idea of the existence of the Devil. However, some nineteenth century theologians took on the challenge to combine a rational idea of the Devil with a traditional idea in their attempt to make sense of the doctrine of the Devil. Unfortunately, the combination of naturalism and naïve acceptance of tradition proved to be unsatisfactory to all parties, including those making the attempt. Alas, the pure rationalism and evolutionary progress of the twentieth century have no answer for the doctrine of the Devil. The idea of a personal Devil is now no longer relegated to religious and philosophical debates. It is now a question faced by the average person.

One of the relevant questions in reference to this discussion is the question concerning the criterion for determining the reality of Satan. Reason may determine if such a concept as Satan is compatible with its laws, but reason cannot produce a picture of the Devil such as is found in the *Bible*. Rational arguments for

the existence of the Devil are even less conclusive than those for the existence of God. This is clearly demonstrated by the nineteenth century apologists who got nowhere in their attempt to bolster their satanology by appealing to reason. Even today, the existence of the Devil can be rationally argued only as convincingly as the arguments for the non-existence of the Devil.

Is Christian experience an adequate criterion to establish whether Satan is personal? Christian experience can certainly attest the truth of a personal force of Evil such as is presented in the *Bible*. However, it is doubtful that Christian experience could formulate the doctrine without the *Bible*. According to the story of Job, it would seem that Job had considerable experience with the work of Satan though he was not aware of the existence of the Satan, the celestial accuser (Robinson, 1955, 18).

The personality and reality of Satan can be argued solidly by the criterion of *revelation*. If there is a created malignant personal force of Evil in the world who operates in the subtle realm of the unseen and of the supernatural, he can be known to the masses only by revelation. Incidentally, the admission of a revelation approach by contemporary theology is one of the factors that has re-opened the question of Satan's existence. Some argue that if the revelation of the divine comes from beyond, it implies that the revelation of the demonic too must come from beyond. This is absurd! Revelation of the demonic by the demonic surely cannot have come from beyond. Those who seek to appeal to revelation may seek further into the problem of Satan's existence. For those who use other criteria to determine the reality of Satan, it must remain forever uncertain.

The crucial question then is whether the revelation of God asserts the reality of Satan. It must be noted at this point that revelation has its record in the *Bible*, and the *Bible* as a record of this revelation is authoritative to Christians in matters of the spirit (Conner, 1936, 77-101). Therefore, what is recorded in the *Bible* on the subject of Satan has significant implication on the reality of a personal Devil.

Thus, it is of great importance as a criterion for judging the nature of Satan. In fact, the biblical witness reflects a basic unity in its representation of Satan as a personal force of Evil. The fact of the Devil's importance to early Christians is obvious. Without him, there is no conflict, no salvation. As far as the New Testament is concerned, the Devil is very much in existence and Christian experiences, as Wadel (1953, Vol X, 738) remarks, must make the best of the paradox, and which still needs the symbols and the concept of the demonic. However much Satan is demythologised today, he was an accepted reality to the writers of the New Testament. As far as they and the early Christians are concerned, Christ was in conflict with evil cosmic forces that were external to the Godhead, and the battle was certainly one of cosmic dualism.

If Jesus' ministry was a struggle against the force of Evil (*1 John 3:8*) and Jesus was more than a man, then it must follow that he believed in a personal Satan. The Synoptic Gospels certainly do point to that. Some argue that Jesus was accommodating the beliefs of the day when he used the concept of the Devil and demons. It has been suggested that if this was not the case, perhaps Jesus' face-to-face confrontation with Satan was a hallucination on his part caused by his forty-day fast as Bishop James Pike (1968, 147) suggests. Others argued that although Jesus did believe in, and teach of a personal Satan, he was only using the terms "satan" and "demons" in a symbolic way, and therefore his idea is not binding on humankind today (King, 1952, 66).

In regard to Jesus' face-to-face confrontation with Satan, if we were to interpret Jesus' teachings symbolically, should we then *not* take the rest of the teaching in the New Testament literally? Even if the demonic is symbolic, this need not preclude its reality. Thus, it is wrong to infer that the Devil is a symbol and therefore he is not real. Something that is ineffable or cannot be grasped by our limited physical minds does not necessarily mean that it does not exist, as in the case of the Divine and the Devil. But perhaps it does imply that it is not

personal. Given that Jesus' use of the term "Satan" was often metaphorical, it can be argued that his metaphors were based on reality.

Willibald Beyschlag (1895, I, 95) develops the idea that Satan is not a person but rather a personification of the abstract idea of evil. He maintains that Jesus used the name of Satan to imply evil in the world of nature and of history as an actual, uniform, and fearful power – a power not to be traced back to God, but is the element in the world which apes God, and is opposed to God.

Another point which must be mentioned is the nineteenth century view by Friedrich Schleiermacher (1882, 163-169) that the idea of Satan was a late theological development which is an admixture of the angel of angels who serves God, a Jewish modification of Oriental (Persian) dualism, and the angel of death. His work is generally recognized as a landmark in theological studies. Schleiermacher attacks the idea of Satan as a convenient solution to the Problem of Evil. This view is still held by some today. Even if this view is correct, there is some justification and place for the idea of Satan because it serves to demonstrate the destructiveness of evil and to advise people that there is hope against evil through the power of the divine. However, one of the dangers is that the Devil may be used as an excuse for the wrong actions of individuals and thus avoid individual accountability and responsibility.

Contrary to Schleiermacher's view, Albert Reville maintains that the idea of Satan is a relic of primitive polytheism, that there are affinities between Satan and Ahriman of Persian dualism, although Satan was first, and not necessarily an outgrowth, of the Persian idea. He further insists that Jesus did neither accommodate himself to the ideas of the people nor believe in their concepts, but rather he merely used the image or form to find rapport with the people. Like Beyschlag and many today, Reville too believes that the concept of Satan is a convenient term for the personification of evil.

The above two positions held by Schleiermacher and Beyschlag are strenuously opposed by D. F. Strauss (1848, 259) who insisted that the idea of Satan is to be taken literally, for it is an idea borrowed from Persia. As such, Satan is viewed as the special adversary of the Jews, and, Jesus their Messiah would fight against Satan. However, as far as traditional Christianity is concerned Satan is a real person and he is to be taken literally though the Church has never made doctrinal use of the idea.

Having established that the reality of Satan can be known through the record of revelation, it is reasonable to accept that Satan's nature must also be known through the same channel. In the Christian Bible, Satan seems to be the negative backdrop against which the drama of redemption is enacted. When we examine the origin of the concept of Satan, we discover that the literature of the inter-biblical period contains angelology and demonology drawn from Persian sources, and Persia had its own dualism. Some of the biblical satanology was certainly the product of these influences though the basic concept of the doctrine was not determined by these sources.

Research shows that the concept of Satan is a primitive idea, but the Church sees this as a fallacy and insists that the New Testament says more about, and more clearly discusses Satan than does the Old Testament. Presumably, how we interpret scripture depends in part on what we take to be antecedently probable. One of the laws of physics states that for every action there is an opposite and equal reaction. Within the framework of a law of universal polarity, the stories of demonic and angelic entities are persuasive. People of different cultures and religions have reported seeing angels since ancient time.

People from diverse regions have claimed that they have had encounters with angels. Such ones ardently believe that angels exist. Western peoples in the last century have re-mythologized demons and angels into a trinity of superego, ego, and id. But even as a child of about nine, I saw angels and accepted the

experiences as natural. Once, at the age of nine, I saw a man accompanied by two angels soaring through the air and ascending higher and higher into the sky before they disappeared behind a huge cloud. Intuitively, I knew that someone from that house had just died and the angels had come to take the spiritual body of the deceased away. The incident was accompanied by the most beautiful and uplifting music I had ever heard. The music faded as the three figures disappeared. Later I found out that indeed a man had died in the house about the time I saw the three figures appear above the house. If there are good angels who warn people of dangers and assist people in various ways in time of need, it is possible that there are evil angels. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to interpret Scripture as showing that there is an evil angel.

Christians believe God Himself speaks most clearly through His son Jesus, warning human beings about the adversary. Thus the message about Satan has always been binding to Christians who take seriously what God says. Though there is a noticeable difference between the Satan in the Old Testament and that in the New Testament, the difference is reconcilable. The reconciliation does not lie in attempting to find more Satan in the Old Testament or less in the New. Rather, there needs to be a basic recognition of the underlying unity of the picture and an understanding as to why the emphasis is greater in one place than in another.

Undoubtedly, the Satan in both the Old and the New Testaments is understood to be performing his work by God's permission, and clearly, the function of Satan in the Old Testament is as devilish and stirring as in the New. Truly, Satan is more active and daring in the New Testament because the redemptive purpose of God is more pronounced than in the Old Testament and Satan is revealed as the enemy who opposes redemption.

The idea of Satan in the New Testament is built on the concept of Satan found in the Old Testament. The New Testament satanology is in some ways closer to the rabbinic idea than to the apocalyptic, which is influenced by the ideas

from Persia, Greece, Media (Simpson, 1913, I, 94) and other sources. Though the expressions of New Testament satanology were occasionally borrowed from apocalyptic literature, the basic monotheism underlying the Old Testament and the rabbinic literature formed its theological pre-suppositions.

The function of Satan in the Old Testament is basically that of an accuser – Satan accusing Job, David, and others or tempting them to do something for which he might accuse them. In the inter-biblical period the writings have two distinct trends, that of the rabbinic literature and that of the apocalyptic literature. The rabbinic writings added to the idea of accusation and temptation, the suggestion that Satan was particularly active in sexual temptation and that he was God’s angel of death. The apocalyptic literature contains mythological element of demonology, and places great emphasis on the work of Satan as the leader of rebel angels. In this literature, fallen angels appear for the first time. The serpent of *Genesis* is connected with Satan, and the fate of Satan and his minions is described. But the assumption that Satan is a fallen angel in the historical sense is only speculative, and must be recognized as such.

In the New Testament, the portrayal of Satan is more complete, and the concept of Satan as the evil one is intensified until it assumes a place so prominent, that it becomes the backdrop of redemption itself. The idea of Satan in the New Testament is to be interpreted by the teaching of Jesus. Satan is the being who plagued the continuing ministry of Jesus. The temptation narratives clearly demonstrate the reality of Satan more than any other passages in the New Testament. Jesus taught that Satan was the evil one who continually tempts humankind (see *Matthew* 5:37) and one from whom human beings must seek deliverance in their prayer to God. *Matthew* 6:13. Satan was the one who had to be bound before the goods were being spoiled so that the work of God could advance. *Mark* 3:27. Satan, the “prince of this world” was to be judged by the exaltation of Jesus on the cross *John* 12:31; 16:11; and Satan was a liar from the very

beginning. *John* 8:44. He is believed to be responsible for destroying the Truth. The punishment of Satan and his angels was a *fait accompli* (see *Matthew* 25:41), and his doom was sealed. *Revelation* 20:10. All in all, to the Christians, the revelation of Satan is significant to the redemption of humankind.

Thus, the biblical account of Satan is that he is the accuser of humankind, he is Christ's special enemy, and the number one enemy of Christ's followers. According to the orthodox explanation of mythology, Satan is "the prince of darkness", the chief among all evil, especially Paganism (Hayes, 1995, 300). His power is great, but not as great as that of God. Hence, people can overcome Satan's influence by the help of God through prayers and obedience to God. By now we have a good description of the nature of Satan. Clearly, the description does not concern itself with the speculation of historical interpretation.

We have established the reality of Satan on revelational grounds, and we have described the nature of Satan from biblical sources. We have also mentioned the connection between Satan and the redemptive nature of Jesus' ministry. Relevant to this subject is the fact that such redemptive activity is inseparably bound to the view of two warring kingdoms, that of God, and that of Satan – the war between the kingdom of Light, and the kingdom of Darkness. In discussing the war between the kingdom of Light, and the kingdom of Darkness, we are being warned by C. S. Lewis in *The Screwtape Letters* of the danger of two equally dangerous extremes. He warns that:

There are two equal and opposite errors into which our race can fall about the devils. One is not to believe in their existence. The other is to believe, and to feel an excessive and unhealthy interest in them. They themselves are equally pleased by both errors and hail a materialist or a magician with the same delight. (Lewis, 1950, 9)

William Robinson (1945, 63) cautions that there are two errors from which we need to be secured: being so obsessed with evil that we come to substitute the Devil for God, and being so unaware of the Devil and what he stands for, that we lose belief in God. Judging from the vast increase in diabolic activities and the widespread of pornography, paedophilia and all sorts of evil in our present world, Baudelaire's warning that "the Devil's cleverest wile is to convince us that he does not exist," (de Rougemont, 1952, 17) aptly rings true. How often are people deceived by appearance and the apparent good deeds of another who, in truth, is deceptive, selfish, and hypocritical?

The Devil has many disguises. He can appear extremely charitable, caring, and holy. Surely, "disguised charity" does not cancel evilness. Yet, again and again, most people are deceived by the guise of the Devil. This raises a version of Descartes' sceptical argument from the evil demon. To answer the various questions relevant to this argument would take up many pages. To apply with any relevance would require another and separate chapter itself. For good reasons we shall not go into it. However, a few points should be mentioned regarding the marks of evil and how far evil goes in seeming good. In all fairness, we can say that one cannot be far from the truth to state that the hallmarks of evil are: the lust for power, sex, and money (materialism). These go hand in hand with the traits of deception, hypocrisy, selfishness, wickedness, and destructiveness.

Throughout history, the greed for power has been the motivating force for one country or tribe to conquer another, to make war and destroy another. The lust for sex has urged individuals to commit evil against another; the lust for money has caused individuals, groups and nations to commit crimes and various evil acts in order to satisfy their selfish desires. Drug trafficking, paedophilia, the sponsoring of wars in order to boost a nation's economy by selling arms to those countries engaged in wars are just a few examples of what the lust for power, sex, and money can influence people to do.

Blatant and senseless evil is easy to discern. What is so dangerous about evil is the fact that it can hide behind the mask of goodness to further its evil end without being suspected or exposed. As a result, the unawares are deceived into supporting and sustaining evil without realizing they have been deceived and used by evil. Turning a blind eye to genocide and oppression of minority groups is evil. Exploitation of child labour in the name of providing jobs for the poor is a form of evil disguised in seeming good. Tolerating violence and injustice (so that one can make a lot of money) in the name of good will and good economy to boost a higher standard of living for the good of the nation is evil disguised as good. Indeed, there is no limit in how far evil can go in appearing to be good. It is precisely this that makes evil so dangerous. Unless people are aware of the culprit, they will be sitting ducks for evil. If we do not know who the enemy is, we cannot confront it, and we are likely to be guilty of unwittingly supporting the evil system.

We have just discussed some of the dangers of evil disguised as good. Now we shall explore the ways Satan works. The New Testament gives several insights as to the way Satan operates. Satan uses human beings as agents to tempt other human beings (see *Matthew* 16:23), and to bring about their fall. *John* 13:27. We can relate to this when we look at the bad influences and temptations surrounding the young and the not so young people. These days, teenagers and young men and women in their early twenties are being seduced by materialism and are offering themselves as toy boys and girls to men and women who are old enough to be their parents or grand parents.

The temptations of Jesus show that Satan appraises his victim and designs temptations that will be a real test to the subject involved. The method and manner is often diabolically sly and insidious. Satan is seen by the Christians as the enemy of God working especially against God's followers. This idea has significant implication for the Christians. Christians believe that the more obedient one is to

God, the greater the temptations. The Devil can masquerade as an “angel of light” (2 *Corinthians* 11:14) to defeat those who do the will of God.

One gets the feeling that, in one sense, Satan is forever challenging God as in *Job*, and the people are like pawns in the chess game between God and Satan. Satan uses every deceitful means known to accomplish his evil purpose. He provokes people to accuse one another and causes individuals to be tormented by the self-accusation of his/her sin (see *Romans* 7) and the torment of guilt by unclean thoughts implanted by the Devil.

Clearly, the *Bible* indicates that people are affected by Evil and are vitally concerned with the problem of a personal force of Evil. It is this personal force of Evil which Christians labelled “the Devil “ or Satan.

The Scripture claims the universality of sin (see *Romans* 3: 23) and sin is associated with Satan. But what does the word *sin* refer to in the biblical sense? Bishop Spong (1993, 57) claims that this word is so corrupted by misuse that it can never be resurrected. Glimpses from the biblical story suggest the vast complexity of the word *sin*. In some instances sin implies an overtly bad deed, and just as obviously there are other passages in the *Bible* where it refers to something entirely different. The emphasis on the biblical doctrine of Satan strongly focuses on Satan as the external motive or influence to sin. The idea of an external influence lays the foundation for a discussion on an external evil force, which I shall discuss later.

The tension caused by sin in humans is well put by Minear in his book *Satan Returns From Holiday*:

The biblical dualism springs from the tension arising within immediate personal experience when man meets God, senses His purpose, hears His demand for unconditional loyalty, and becomes aware of forces that impel him to deviate from the Creator’s purpose

for his life. And in the events which follow his divided loyalty, he experiences his futility and the failure of behaviour that cuts across the grain of the divine intention. Over and over again, he finds that his decision and destiny are compounded of the sin of serving two masters, both of whom will relinquish the claim to control his career. The omnipresent conflict assures him of the reality of a tempter, a deceiver and enemy, whose dynamical historical influence infects and aborts the fulfilment of human hopes. (Minear, 1950, 192).

Traditionally, Christians view the reality of Satan as a personal force of Evil. Those who have experienced the presence of a personal evil force, can attest to the trickery, the deception, and the evilness typically associated with this force. Christians genuinely experienced the constant struggle between good and evil in their lives, and affirm the Devil is a foe to be conquered. Unfortunately, this concept of the Devil has been misused and abused by people, including Christians themselves, so much so, that often the application of the word “satan” or “devil” is widely used to denote “otherness”.

Christians identify the adversary as Satan and recognize that the war between Christ and Belial must be fought individually within each Christian. It is a daily struggle between the warring inclinations of human nature and it is heightened by the conflicting demands of two opposing sides of Light and Darkness. In one sense, this is similar to the Gnostic concept of the struggle between Light and Darkness, Good and Evil. To the practising Christians the doctrine of Satan is not a convenient excuse for sin, and neither is Satan deliberately made a scapegoat. It is a genuine desire for Christians to remind themselves of the reality and intensity of their struggle, and the reality of temptation.

Satan, in biblical perspective, is neither a mere human's personified lust nor is he the equal power of God's omnipotence and omnipresence. But the intensity of the struggle within human beings is evidenced by the reality of two mutually exclusive forces which influence and shape their lives. However, members of humankind are believed to have freewill to choose which side each wishes. But how does one know which side is which? How does one discern the nature of the spirits to tell whether it is God or Satan who inspires? Unfortunately, the tendency is for people to *not* wholly co-operate with God. There is a tendency to sinning, for Satan is increasingly insistent, as human beings come closer to God.

Perhaps we can draw our guideline for the discernment of spirits from what Teresa of Avila said in her *Autobiography*, Chapter XXVIII:

Like imperfect sleep which, instead of giving more strength to the head, doth but leave it the more exhausted, the result of mere operations of the imagination is but to weaken the soul. Instead of nourishment and energy she reaps only lassitude and disgust: whereas a genuine heavenly vision yields to her a harvest of ineffable spiritual riches, and an admirable renewal of bodily strength. I alleged these reasons to those who so often accused my visions of being the work of the enemy of mankind and the sport of my imagination . . . All those who knew me saw that I was changed; my confessor bore witness to the fact; this improvement, palpable in all respects, far from being hidden, was brilliantly evident to all men. As for myself, it was impossible to believe that if the demon were its author, he could have used, in order to lose me and lead me to hell, an expedient so contrary to his own interests as that of uprooting my vices, and filling me with masculine courage and other virtues instead, for I saw

clearly that a single one of these visions was enough to enrich me with all that wealth.

Teresa of Avila was a champion of Light, who, too, was being tormented by Satan, but she stood firmly for the Light.

Chapter 12

Satan and the Concept of Redemption

The Synoptic Gospels presuppose a connection between Christ's death and the defeat of Satan. *1 John* 3:8 clearly defines Jesus' role in the destruction of the works of the Devil. Since Christ can defeat the Devil, it is thought that it is possible for us to resist the Devil through the victory of Christ. *1 Peter* 5:7-8. It is precisely because of Christ and his victory over the Devil that Christians are urged to maintain a steadfast faith. The idea of Christ's victory over Satan was particularly emphasized in the Patristic period. This contradicts the ransom theory of the atonement mentioned earlier on. It is more likely than not that the ransom theory arose from logical development and speculative fancy but has no basis in biblical thinking.

We shall present three passages from the Scripture to support the claim that Jesus' work was related to Satan. Firstly, as discussed earlier, in *1 John* 3:8 is a statement of Jesus' mission – he came to overcome Satan.

Secondly, *John* 19:30 contains utterance of Jesus on the cross, "It is finished." This expression is open to various interpretations. Some believe it meant the victory of Christ over Satan, and redemption was accomplished. Others, such as B. F. Westcott (1908, II, 316), interpret it as "every essential point in the prophetic portraiture of Messiah had been realized . . ." If Jesus' mission was so intensely associated with the defeat of the Devil, it is not unreasonable to assume that he has failed because evil continues to wreck the world even to the present day, and Satan (assuming it exists) is as active, if not more active, than ever. If we argue that victory over the Devil is on a personal level, and that individuals through the power of Christ can successfully resist Satan, it then follows that those

who do not believe in Christ are doomed. Should Christians then blame the increase in violence and all forms of evil on the non-acceptance of Christ's power?

Thirdly, in *1 John* 4:4 the triumph over Satan is realized "because greater is he [Christ] that is in you, than he [Satan] that is in the world." Some interpret this verse as the overcoming of the Gnostics by Christians. **This is totally an erroneous view.** The Gnostics were certainly not against Christ. On the contrary they embraced Christ. With the discovery of Gnostic scriptures near Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt in 1945, it is evident that far from being "heretics", the Gnostics were in fact the original Christians whose teachings were directly from the earliest disciples of Jesus. In fact, the Christianity of various denominations of today is a very degraded heresy of Gnosticism.

The misinformed Christians who perceived the Gnostics as rivals were quick to brand the Gnostics as demons – the "otherness". This has nothing to do with the will of God. History can attest to the many atrocities that have been committed in the name of Christ, and in the name of overcoming the Devil. Often those who were perceived as threats were labelled as the "devils". These are examples of abuse and misuse of the concept of Satan – very convenient and dangerous ones indeed!

According to Christians, Satan is indeed bound by the chain of love, and by the crucifixion of Jesus at Calvary. For them, it is a victory over sin. Christians truly believe that sin [Satan] has no power over us now except the power we give it. Thus, Satan is bound only to the extent that we will use and appropriate the power of the cross in our lives. Hence, against the historical cloven-hoofed Satan stands the revelation of Scripture. This revelation of Satan of Christ's wilderness is real to the Christians for he is the insidious Satan of personal experience. From the various discussions on the existence of the Devil within the context of biblical tradition, it would seem the teaching about the Devil in Christian theology cannot

be intellectually faulted. Therefore, there are good reasons for Christians to uphold the doctrine of the Devil.

However, these days not all Christians are prepared to accept the fundamentalist views of the *Bible*. A short interview with Rabbi Fox telecast on *Lateline* on September, 10th, 1997, shows him agreeing with Bishop John Shelby Spong that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures are written as meta-history – a mixture of legends, myths, and conjectures to convey the narratives. Rabbi Fox’s advice was that individuals had to decipher what was moral truth, and what was ethical truth.

Chapter 13

The Devil Exists as an Idea in the Minds of People

Historical scholarship cannot objectively determine whether the Devil exists. However, some people seem to act as if the Devil did exist. There are those who believe that the Devil exists only as an idea in the minds of people, that in reality the Devil does not exist and does not appear to human beings because there is no such a thing as the Devil.

What we have here are two claims made about the existence of the Devil. One is the claim that the Devil does not exist except in the minds of people as imagination. The other is the claim that the Devil cannot possibly exist because he does not appear to human beings.

Since the debate about the reality or non-reality of the Devil is intrinsically tied up with the notion of reality, it renders the need to clarify what we mean by “reality”. For more than two thousand years, Western culture has puzzled over the meaning of reality. This question has vexed and challenged the minds of philosophers for centuries and its answer is perhaps the cornerstone for judging what is real or more real in our human experiences. So what is reality?

According to those who believe that we create our own realities, our beliefs, fears and expectations create our lives, and our lives are illusional. Hence, we create our own beliefs, fears and disappointments, our belief in a battle between good and evil, our suffering, and so on because we create our own realities. Such an argument may appear to be true on a mundane physical world context, but it is false in a larger context.

Leibniz postulated that reality is a network of minds – there are many possible realities as there are many possible worlds. Thus, ontological questions probe the invisible background. We are perceptually aware of the phenomenal reality but we are aware of the physical reality indirectly through inferences and reasoning based on precepts. In effect, reality becomes a property of the phenomenological experience. When we talk of things that are real and things that are not real, we are asserting that realities can consist of either real or unreal *worlds*.

In the Renaissance, things were considered as real if they could be counted and observed repeatedly by the senses. The human mind infers a solid material substratum underlying sense data but the substratum proves less real because it is less quantifiable and observable. Finally, the modern period attributed reality to atomic matter that has internal dynamics or energy, but soon the reality question was doomed by the analytical drive of the sciences towards complexity and by the plurality of artistic styles.

A natural environment provides a blend of sensory information (sights, sounds, sensations, and so forth) from which we ordinarily infer the existence of an external world of objects in relation with each other, which objects are thought to be the ultimate causes of those sensations. It is that outside world of bedrock objects and facts about those objects which constitutes physical reality.

According to the theory of objects, external objects and facts about them define the realm of the real. It maintains that occurrence of sensation is the existence of a world of external things, like the tables and chairs, which are the ultimate causes of those sensations. Therefore, the external objects and facts about them define the realm of the real, and must be distinguished from pseudo objects to which we might (wrongly) impute real existence on the basis of machine, drug, or chemical generated sensory data provided by reality simulators. The latter may be illusory, the former are not.

In our human experience, the external, physical objects do not negate. They simply are: silent, stolid, and sufficient unto themselves. Take for example, the mountain does not disappear when we turn our backs on it; it exists whether or not we know it, or like it or believe it is there. Does this mean that for things to exist, they must be seen by human beings? Of course not.

The fact that some things do not appear to human beings does not necessarily mean they do not appear or that they do not exist. Indeed, they must appear if they are to remain self-identical with themselves. Things can, then, appear to each other, without them necessarily appearing to human beings (Seidel, 1995, 23-25). Each and every thing, insofar as it exists, represents an appearance of being. Being appears only as something. Nothing does not and cannot appear. For something that would cease to be would represent disappearance from the appearance of being, which disappearance does not appear. Therefore, only something of being appears.

Being is always the being of some thing. Since the thing represents an existential, as well as an essential relation between phenomenon and noumenon (as in Kantian philosophy), being or existence always represents the being of a thing that does, in fact, exist. An angel is a thing. It is not, however, a corporeal being. An angel is not a body. The Devil, as a fallen angel, is also not a body. This means that the properties of quantity, quality, space, time, and relation do not apply to angels. There are, after all, things that are not bodies. There are actions (*res delicta*) or events. A state of being is also a thing (*res publica*), though not a body. As a thing, as an appearance of being, the angel is nonetheless, a relation. In other words, the angel does not have the property of relation. This applies to the Devil (assuming he exists) also. As with anything that is a relation, an essential and existential relation between phenomenon and noumenon. It is because the Devil or the angel is not a body with the property of relation that the angel or the devil does

not necessarily appear to human beings. There are, after all, appearances of being that do not necessarily appear to humans.

When we say something is an imagination it immediately implies that it is a thing imagined in one's mind. But the fact that something can be imagined, it must first be a thing to be imagined, for one cannot conceive of Nothing. Given that people have not really physically seen the Devil, but that they have only imagined him, does not necessarily mean that he does not exist. Given the Devil is only an imagination, it still exists, even if only temporarily, as a mental reality.

A mental reality is like a virtual reality with its virtual presence indistinguishable from the real presence. Our inclination towards a theory of objects, in defence of a current world, fails in itself to give us any hints as to which side of the wall we might be on. Realism is a stubborn habit. A particular functional (and formidable) version of the theory of objects is held by scientific realists, who add that those objects out there, with which we sometimes collide, and at other times collude, are the objects described by physical science – tables, chairs, mountains, birds, and so forth. These things are ultimately protons, neutrons, and things of that sort.

If entities like the Devil and demons are very real to those who have experienced their presence, and their lives have been so affected by them, yet they are not to be considered real, are we then saying that they are illusions? Virtual reality is somehow imaginary. “Virtual” always carries the connotations of the unreal, or the imaginary. A virtual reality can pass for a reality but it is not to be considered with the real thing itself. Hallucination counts as an example of such a virtual reality. A mirage looks real and passes for real to those who see it. Yet, the road is in fact dry though it looks wet. Thus, what one sees is but an illusion. Virtual reality contains things which look real, feel real, pass for real, and confuse people, but which are not real.

If we imagine that the physical reality we know of is only virtually real, what would virtual reality mean in a world where it was the only reality? Virtual reality is an event or entity that is real in effect, but not in fact. Thus, the experiences of the Devil and demons in cases of possession, exorcisms and other incidences that are so very real to those involved, if they are in fact not real, must then be virtual experiences, and the Devil and demons are virtual entities – they are not real.

To limit oneself to the sensory world is to look for answers, not only in darkness, but in a state of psychic unconsciousness as well. No being can adequately function in this manner and he/she can certainly not expect to find answers within such a paradigm of restricted absurdity.

The ability of modern science to explain and predict natural events has led some “experts” to the view that the world can be understood only through the application of scientific ideas and methods. We all live with the rules and regulations imparted by science and technology in our daily lives and in our thinking. Indeed, the scientific attitude is pervasive and all-powerful in every technologically developed society.

In our world, the assumptions of science act as constraints that determine what aspects of reality can be investigated scientifically. Since the possibility for inter-subjective verification is a prerequisite to establishing truth in science, whatever cannot be verified inter-subjectively cannot be incorporated into the scientific domain. What this implies is that any observation that is not repeatable on demand and sharable with others, is not *scientific* or valid or true. So, the entire realm of spiritual experience, may it be a mystical experience or an encounter with an angel or a demon, is excluded from science’s narrow awareness of scientific observers. First, awareness is limited by gross perception and a closed mind; then, what is observed has to fit within this limited awareness.

Clearly, reality is far more than it appears, having multi-dimensional levels that are totally unknown to scientists. Metaphysicians and physicists believe there is infinitely more to reality than the physical body and the senses that scientists allow. How can scientists be so egotistical as to assume they know and understand what they cannot even imagine? We need to bear in mind that while science claims something to be absolutely true, and dismisses what it cannot verify, as false or unscientific, it continues to contradict itself as it changes and corrects its theories later when it discovers something else.

Atwater (1997, 59), in quoting Lawrence Leshan, says that a reality is real to us when we act in terms of it. It is a valid reality when, using it, we can accomplish the goals acceptable to it. According to this view, common sense rules every reality and ultimately decides on its validity. He concludes that reality, in the strictest sense, is a product of our own creation, and is maintained by our own perception (*Ibid*, 60). This view is flawed because one's common sense may not be another's idea of common sense. Therefore, one's reality may not be another's.

Scientific findings cannot be the only basis for any general view of reality, in view of their specific limited nature, and no scientific theory has been proven beyond possible doubt. As Nicholas Humphrey (1995, 50) remarks, scientific theories themselves undoubtedly do change and grow in response to new evidence and human insights. Why should issues that most matter to us be left to scientists alone to determine their existence or non-existence?

Science has neither been able to prove absolutely that the Devil does not exist, nor that it does. If the Devil only exists as thoughts and images within my brain, how can I ever know there is anything external to my organism that could be the source of these thoughts and images, and that this source is moreover, in any way similar? To convey a concept of anything, we need words. Even if I perceive a being called the Devil, I need words to describe it accurately, but the words I use always refer beyond my given experience. When I say what I am seeing now is a

kangaroo, I am merely using a *concept*. The concept implies an indefinite number of similarities between the kangaroo I am now seeing and other similarly labelled “things”. K.R. Popper (1957, 424-425) argues that all concepts imply certain expectations concerning the *disposition* of the objects they relate to, which transcend any given experience.

Thus, in using a word, I am already introducing a doubtful conjecture. But how could I ever have formed the concept of the Devil or the kangaroo if I did not search for similarities and differences between “things”? How did it occur to me to search for them? Clearly, similarities are not in the “things” because no two things are similar to anything nor are differences to things the same. Rather, in this instance, an act of comparison is called for, and such an act would involve an anticipation of similarity. However, such an anticipation presupposes the concept of similarity, and such a concept could only be formed through comparisons, hence, on the basis of possessing it already.

Supposing that I state that I am seeing the Devil now. How does my statement relate to my experience? Could I now be experiencing a hallucination? Perhaps I am deluding myself with regard to what I am seeing? Clearly, I cannot be certain whether I am experiencing a hallucination or whether I am really seeing the Devil. If I cannot be certain that I am not making an error in my judgement, can I still claim that it is rational in some sense? I believe I can maintain that I am rationally a materialist because I acknowledge as existing only what my senses reveal to me as existing, hence, then I am an empiricist. I can, in turn, defend the rationality of my empiricism by claiming that as I am merely a material object among material objects, and as all interactions between such objects are only possible through energy interactions, then I can only know the world through those energy interactions that I can internally register through my senses. What this means is that I can justify my empiricism by materialism. But such procedure is

irrational. It is simply stating my initial views as true without any conceivable grounds.

The essence of certainty is that which is beyond doubt. Descartes' *cogito ergo sum* (1968, 101), in its first aspect, provides me with initial certainty. For me to doubt if I had really seen the Devil, its object must first be given. I cannot doubt what is not. As regards my concrete experience of seeing the Devil, every single aspect of it must first be given to me as something, before I doubt it. I face now the insight of Parmenides: The Nothing cannot be thought of and cannot exist. But doubt is not what it seems to be upon superficial reflection. When I doubt the being of the Devil, this being must first be given to me in my experience. So, doubt becomes an absurd activity, as it destroys itself by the very act of doubting.

Clearly, when I doubt whether or not the Devil is real, I am making an assumption. The assumption is that a distinction can be drawn between *hallucination* and *reality*, between *illusion* and *reality*. Clearly, to doubt this presence, this presence (the Devil) must be given. But if it is given, then its being given is the condition for the possibility of the doubt, hence annihilating the doubt at its very root. In other words, the very essence of doubt is the belief in *objective reality*, one that exists, perhaps somehow outside my consciousness in its own space-time dimension, subject to its own laws of change, and so on. However, this assumption is not only unprovable, it is meaningless.

The idea that the world is purely phenomenal has been expressed by many philosophers who have seen through the absurdity of identifying the world of experiential objects as a world of *real* reality that transcends experience. Some people regard empiricism – the theory that all basic cognitive contact with reality is based on the senses – as absurd. Husserl (1977, 21) says, “Anything belonging to the world, any spatio temporal being, exists for me – that is to say, is accepted by me – in that I experience it, perceive it, remember it, think of it somehow, judge it, value it, desire it, or the like.” Descartes indicated all that by the name *cogito*.

By this term, all experiences are always absolutely valid. Thus, the experience is for me absolutely existing for, and accepted by me in such a consciousness – *cogito*.

Schopenhauer (1966, VI, 3) asserts:

. . . the world around him is there only as representation, that is, only in reference to another thing, namely, that which represents, and this is himself. If any truth can be expressed *a priori*, it is this: for it is the statement of that form of all possible and conceivable experience, a form more general than others, than time, space and causality, for all these presuppose it . . . There is no truth more certain, more independent of all others, and less in need of proof than this, namely, that everything that exists, and hence the whole world, is only object in relation to the subject, perception of the perceiver, in a word, representation.

But then, can I not imagine something that does not exist, such as the Devil? No, I cannot imagine something that is not, because the *nothing* cannot be imagined. I can imagine, of course, a creature with long tentacles and be confident not to see it when I open my eyes. But this only means that *its mode of givenness* is not the one correlated with the *open eyes* experience. It is, indeed, self evidently and directly given to me as I am imagining the creature that I will expect not to find it there when I open my eyes. But the experience is not less real than other physical experiences, as it can become as real as a dream. This is by no means distinct from physical reality. Both are total experiences. I believe that the difference in reality between what I imagined and *objective reality* is simply a difference in intensity and totality of experience.

So what could it mean to say that the Devil exists? Of course, I could understand if it meant that the Devil somehow existed at the margins of my consciousness. By this I mean I would not have noticed the Devil reflectively had I not been looking for an example of a *marginal occurrence*. By focusing on the Devil, I focus on him in the context of evilness. I cannot imagine the Devil without some context. What I am trying to explain is that we cannot ever draw our attention to something that is outside our field of consciousness. Objective reality makes sense only in so far as I allow that beyond the margins of my field of consciousness there are realities that exist independently of it.

Indeed, the idea of something (such as the Devil) that exists not within our field of consciousness is one that we cannot comprehend. To comprehend it, we would need a conceivable example. Such an example, once visualized, is already given focally within our field of consciousness, and such focal galvanisation presupposes that it was, before, at the margin of our field of consciousness. Thus, nothing cannot be, nor can it be imagined. Nothing is the limit of doubt. If the Devil does not exist, he cannot be imagined.

As I said earlier, one cannot possibly imagine something that has not already existed because the nothing cannot be imagined. I can imagine a demon in any form I choose and be absolutely sure that he would not be there when I open my eyes. But the experience is not *less real* than other physical experiences. The physical experience and the mental experience are both total experiences. Thus, if the mental experience is *less real*, this is only because when I imagine, only a part of me is involved; another part of me continues to be involved in something else such as washing the dishes. The difference in reality between imagination and *objective reality* is simply a difference in intensity and totality of experience.

When people claim they have seen the Devil, are they in fact seeing something that is not there? If so, is not the fact of their hallucination a proof of the objective status of the reality we all share? Consider this: I am a phenomenal

object. What I say I experience is part of the phenomenon. If I see a bull charging at me from nowhere and I proceed to relate my experience to you who are standing nearby, you would look at me with disbelief and proclaim that I am only joking for there was nothing there. There are two components involved in this experience. One is the bull charging at me, the other is you, rejecting my reality verbally – both experiences are phenomena on equal standing. Hence, we can assume that both experiences are valid.

To be an object in the world is to be a phenomenal object, is to be an object for me. This is true for all the worlds that I experience, may they be the worlds of joy, fear, sadness, evil, memories, plans, fairies, demons, or dreams. Each such world is a totality. All these worlds, anything conceivable, in fact, *exist* as possible objects of my experience and their respective backgrounds. Therefore, my experience of the reality of the Devil is the absolute reality, one on a par with that of the *cogito*, because I am within any experience of mine, and only there. Objects are within such experiences, too, and only within them. Nothing could conceivably exist outside them. Therefore, the certainty of the *cogito* as an absolute being *cum* consciousness, which does not depend on any other cognition but, rather, is the condition for their possibility, is augmented.

The *nothing* is not, and cannot be imagined. Being is, and can be, thought and imagined. The imagination is not a faculty of pure fancies of nothingness, because no such faculty is conceivable. To doubt an imaginary object is only to doubt its putative mode of being as something that can be given through the senses, not its being as such.

Given that each object is a phenomenal object, then all worlds are phenomenal. Hence, all have a relative being. Their being is therefore, to the being who is the experiencer. Thus, I am the absolute being which makes all phenomena possible relative to its being, and whose being has no phenomenal aspects, hence no describable aspect, because it is the being of the witness – I am the witness.

Realities are all realities for me. All the existence of objects of experience cannot be doubted in so far as it is realized to be purely phenomenal, namely, the existence of these objects within my field of consciousness. Hence, all meaning is grounded in experience. Therefore, the fact that I experienced evil in a presence which I identified as the Devil within the field of my consciousness, is a valid experience. In this sense, my experience of the presence of evil identified as the Devil is valid. Therefore, the Devil exists.

To imagine is not to create mental objects. Creation is producing something out of nothing. As there is no nothing, creation is impossible. Imagination is thus a mode of direct awareness of what is, though not necessarily given experientially in the context of the experiential reality of the physical plane. Therefore, imagination is simply a mode of awareness of phenomenal objects. Hence, imagination is valid, and even if the Devil exists only in the imagination of people, the fact that the experience has such a great adverse impact on people's lives deserves our serious attention. Traditionally, the Devil is associated with evil. Evil – the infliction of pain and suffering upon sentient beings – is one of the most longstanding and serious problems of human existence. Hence, its reality or non-reality deserves our attention.

Clearly, at least some of the experiences of those who claim they have come into contact with angels or demons, which seem to be adequately expressed, are real, even if their concepts of such beings are contradictory. The *nothing* is not and cannot masquerade. An illusion is not *nothing* masquerading as something. To say that the Devil exists only as an illusion is to acknowledge that to begin with, he has to be something, and illusion is not something *appearing* to be one thing, but being *another*. From this perspective, all experiences, all phenomena given in experiences are real as such. There is no reality, but the reality of phenomena and the reality of the witness consciousness experiencing them.

If the Devil exists only as an idea in the minds of people, then, by definition, thoughts outside one's mind are inaccessible to the person. Thus, I could not tell if your thoughts are *similar* to my own, nor could I make sense of your experiences outside the boundaries of my possible experiences. Under this circumstance, I cannot know if my experience is similar to yours unless you verbalise or otherwise communicate it to me. In the same way, anybody else's thoughts must be accessible to me through some form of expression, such as verbalising them. If by communication, thoughts are transferred from mind to mind, I must lose my thoughts once I have communicated them, but this does not happen.

Therefore, thoughts must be as inter-subjective, collective, or universal as colours and emotions, and can be visualized. Even with abstract thoughts that are more difficult to picture, still, we can picture them through equations and diagrams. From the above arguments we can conclude that it is highly plausible that all levels of experience are equally valid as imagination, illusion, or physical experience. If we accept the premise that God is the only reality, all else is illusion, then all things, including the Devil and demons, are illusions.

Given that the Devil exists as a mental reality, and thoughts are collective, our next question is: is it possible that the Devil exists as a collective mind? This I shall discuss in the next chapter.

Chapter 14

Argument of the Devil as a Collective Mind

Could it be that the responses to the Devil in other ages and imagery of the Devil have influenced and conditioned our individual and collective consciousness today?

There is an assumption that there is a collective mind. Clearly, human capacity for collective evil is becoming more and more pronounced. Often, national self-righteousness, prejudices, selfishness, ignorance, and patriotism blind people to their collective social injustice and indifference. We need to question why human beings behave in ways considered morally evil and wrong towards others. What is it in the human psyche that motivates individuals and groups to be hostile, cruel, or indifferent to other groups and individuals? What drives one race to prejudice or oppress another, inflicting undue suffering and fear, as in racism and slavery, separation of children from their parents by force, religious persecution of those whose religious belief is different from theirs? What caused the usury system, which aims at controlling the monetary system in this world, and exploitation of cheap labour and child labour? What prompts a race or people to feel they are superior and more entitled, and the right to dictate, suppress and oppress others in the name of superior values, heritage, advancement and wealth?

It is believed that a concept of something is related to an individual's perception of an individual event. Therefore, if I experience a supernatural force trying to influence me to do something that I perceive as bad or wrong, I would perceive this force as evil. This force of evil is represented in various forms as images.

Historical and mythological investigation shows that there are images of the satanic which have an underlying, universal character which the psychologist Jung referred to as *archetypal images* of evil in the human psyche. It appears that these archetypal images continue to present themselves in the dreams and fantasies and imagination of individuals across all cultures.

Frederic W.H. Myers (1954.Vols 1 & 2) hypothesized that a daimon was one's own inner voice, originating from the 'subliminal self,' or the unconscious self. This is similar to Carl G. Jung's archetypes of the unconscious in human. Jung and Lévi-Strauss attempted to elucidate the unconscious structure underlying conscious reality and Jung called these structures archetypes (Staude, 1976, 3, 303). He distinguished the archetypal image and suggested that the existence of the archetype itself can only be inferred, since it is by definition unconscious (Hyde & McGuiness, 1992, 60).

In Jung's earlier work he conceived of archetypes in terms of images; later he thought of them more in terms of structures. According to Jung, the archetypes have no natural existence and reveal themselves only as images. For example, in all cultures, mankind imagined itself endangered and influenced by an evil spirit. A most common form for this conception is the image of various myths, legends, and folklore. The recurrent images of the Devil are said to fulfil an unconscious reality for collective humanity.

Jung's archetypal images are believed to intrude into consciousness. It is also the way we perceive the archetype for ourselves. Thus, the archetypes which reveal themselves in images can be angels, demons, snakes and so on. Further, in Jung's archetypal figures, the *ego* and the shadow represent the conscious and the unconscious side of a person respectively. The ego is one's centre of consciousness and symbolises the *light* while the shadow is one's "dark side" – the unconscious, the repressed aspect of the human personality which is characterized

by animal qualities which the ego wishes to hide from others. Thus, the ego and shadow are personified as the “good and bad” split in all of us.

Jung also believed that the human psyche is not confined to individuals only, but has a collective nature as well. The collective unconsciousness, or archetypal psyche, is the central archetype, or archetype of wholeness – the Self. In this respect, an example of the *collective psyche's shadow* is any mass movement, trend or gathering. Hence, a crowd at a rock festival forms a collective ego that casts a shadow – rock madness. The Devil, as a key archetype of the collective unconscious generates tremendous concern and anxiety. Thus, it is less stressful and irrational to deal with the figure as archetype of “shadow”, which represents our most inferior, primitive personalities.

Humanistic psychologists such as Jung and Frankl argued that repression (as opposed to conscious suppression) of destructive feelings gradually create a “shadow,” a negative force in the personality that can burst out destructively without warning. The study of the Devil indicates that historically, he is a manifestation of the divine, a part of the deity. In this case the paradox can be resolved in only one way: evil will be absorbed and controlled when it is integrated, and it will be integrated when it is fully recognised and understood.

Jung, influenced by the positivism of Kant (who argued that an assertion does not necessarily posit its object), was led to believe that everything that is experienced within the psyche has its own psychic reality. For Kant, “human reason is by nature architectonic because it regards all our knowledge as belonging to a possible system”. Jung’s notion is also suggested by David Bakan who observes that an image which has played an important role over many centuries “must contain clues to the nature of the human mind which has created and been preoccupied with it” (Bakan, 1966, 38).

In the Christian tradition, Lucifer (the light bearer) captured that aspect of the image of evil simultaneously linked with the element of rebellion against God,

and the sins of pride, disobedience, and envy. Thus, the Lucifer image is one who had committed the sin of rebellion against authority (God), pride, disobedience, and envy. In the earlier chapters I mentioned how particular forms of the Devil in iconography have been influenced by pagan religion. Rudwin (1931, 38) notes that the medieval monster is an amalgamation of all the heathen divinities “from whom he derived, especially those gods or demons which, already in pagan days, were inimical to the benevolently ruling deities”. Russell (1977, 254) also observes the relation between the pagan religion and the Judaeo-Christian images of evil, and malevolent forces.

Anything which takes no particular form and which does not have a name creates great fear and difficulty. We need to know the demon’s name in order to have power over the demon. A doctor needs to know what sort of poison a child has swallowed in order to best save the child’s life. Could it be that for the same reason we give Evil – *the Devil* – its various forms and names? Hence, the forms of the Devil which represent evil are many – from the image of a goat, a dog, a cat, a serpent or a dragon to the form of a bird, a monk, or a beautiful woman –the list is long.

Apart from the many forms of the Devil, colours associated with evil have also converged with collective stereotypes. For example, black is generally associated with death, negativity and evil, and thus, Shiva and Kali being depicted in black represents the evil or dark side of their natures. Hence, it is of no surprise that the Devil, who is associated with evil, is commonly depicted in black also. Clearly, the stereotypical perception of the colour black has influenced the perception of dark-skinned races as inferior, and evil. Sadly, such archetypal negativity has caused untold suffering, humiliation, anger, frustration, alienation, persecution, resentment, and hatred to the dark-skinned races.

Other colours such as red, blue, and yellow are also associated with the Devil according to mythological beliefs. However, red and yellow are vibrant

colours of celebration, vitality and good luck to the Chinese and other Asian races. Many believe that the images of the Devil have come from a variety of archetypal sources, may they be cultural, religious or mythological. It appears that all cultures and traditions leave their own particular imprint upon the archetypal experience. However, all cultures and traditions also seem to share various universal features.

At the archetypal level, the Devil appears as the opposite to Light (God). The symbolic imagery and revelation of Light and Darkness, Good and Evil provide a revealing example of the evolutionary process throughout the biblical period that distinguishes God (goodness) from Satan (evilness).

Indeed, the Old Testament contains many examples which show a dark side to the activity and nature of God. The New Testament clearly reminds us of the necessity to confront the Devil in order to be transformed by the Light into warriors of the Light. For example, the story of Jacob wrestling with the stranger in *Genesis* 32 at the river may well symbolise the struggle of a man with a demon, and victory is achieved through confronting the demon. Even today, people are still responding to the images and experiences of the satanic from the biblical and early Church tradition by holding on to the value attitudes and perceptions of by-gone days. It can be argued that such attitudes and perceptions, being deeply imprinted in the collective psyche of contemporary people are the reasons why people respond to the experience of evil in a particular way. If this is true, a positive change in the perception and experience in the collective psyche may bring about a better world.

It is believed that during World War I in Mons, thousands of Allied soldiers during the brutal and bloody battle of Mons saw a host of angels in the sky and as a result were stirred on against terrible odds to win the battle. But in truth the Allied soldiers were defeated, and the German forces were much bigger. Unfortunately the story soon outgrew its fictional roots. The story of 'the angels of Mons' shows how often myths and reality can become so mixed that they become

almost indistinguishable. Perhaps the psychology and sociology of belief has a lot to do with interweaving of facts and fictions. Perhaps we need to pay more attention to the peculiar way in a collective belief can in some way turn something fictitious into a pseudo-reality. However, there are cases of encounters with angels, demons, or aliens which convince us that all such experiences are merely a psychological aberration and not real encounters with such beings. How does one share a hallucination with another without saying a word? How does a two year old child with her mother and pet dog become suddenly terrified all at the same time on seeing a horrible figure appearing suddenly amongst them? Surely this cannot be a hallucination.

According to one hypothesis, historical patterns of response to the Devil reveal our attitudes towards perceived evil. Consequently, these provide a context for understanding contemporary experience of evil for the individual and collective psyche. Perhaps how we relate and respond to what we see or experience as demonic may be significant and more important than how we define it.

Clearly, at the archetypal level, the Devil is always found to be paired with some representation of polarity or duality of the principle of light and goodness. The Chinese philosophy of the balance of the Yin and Yang principles reflects the notion of light and darkness. The theme of opposites can be seen in the mythology of Zeus and Prometheus. Prometheus, who assailed Zeus, was chained to a rock in the Caucasus. Such a theme is repeated in the Hindu mythology of Vrita to Indra and the Ahriman to Ormuzd in Persian mythology.

Psychologists who follow Jung's theory see demons in more clinical terms. They believe there is a realm which has a parallel with the subconscious known variously as 'the watery depth', the 'moon', and 'the shadow' (Randles & Hough, 1993, 41). They insist that there is ample evidence in mythology of people going into 'the underworld' to encounter things there. This is what Jung implies by

‘wrestling with our own shadow’, entering our own darkness (the underworld), suffering the alchemical nigredo, the blackening, if we are to find the “mystic centre” of our being.

In the Jungian Tarot, the card of the Devil portrays a Satyr, a creature which is half man and half goat dancing to the music of the pipes which he holds in his right hand. In his left, he grasps two lengths of chain, each attached to a collar around the neck of a naked human figure. The figures – a man and a woman – wear tiny horns like those of Satyr. Although their hands and feet are free to dance, they are held by their chains of fear and fascination for the music. Around them looms the dark walls of a cave.

Traditionally, the goat in myths was associated with lechery and dirtiness, and was considered an unclean and lustful animal. But the goat also symbolizes the scapegoat, the person or thing upon whom people project the inferior side of themselves in order to feel cleaner and more righteous.

Thus Pan, the Devil, is the scapegoat which we blame for our troubles in life. The dark and doorless cave implies that Pan dwells in the most inaccessible realm of the unconscious. Only crisis can break through the wall into his secret chamber. The dancing figures are free, if they so wish to remove their chains, for their hands are not bound. Bondage to the Devil is ultimately a voluntary matter which consciousness can release. Here in the tarot card of the Devil we meet the great god Pan, whom the ancient Greeks worshipped as the Great All. He personified the fertile, phallic spirit of wild untamed nature. He is the goatish, ugly and untamed god of nature but he could also occasionally be friendly to humans.

On an inner level, Pan, the Devil, is an image of bondage to the crudest, most instinctual aspect of human nature. Because the god was worshipped in caves and grottoes, attended by fear, his image within us suggests something that we both fear and are fascinated by – the raw, goatish, uncivilized sexual impulses which we experience as evil because of their compulsive nature.

Since the dawn of the Christian era, the god Pan has been appropriated into the figure of the Devil, complete with goat-horns and leering grin, and he is despised by ‘spiritual’ folk as Apollo once despised him in Greek myth. Thus, Pan, the Devil, has been relegated to the nethermost recesses of the unconscious, representing that which we fear, loathe and despise in ourselves, yet which holds us in bondage through our very fear and disgust. Though in myth, Pan was not evil, merely untamed, amoral and natural, but the paralysis of the humans who are held enthralled in terror and fascination which creates the problem.

In Tarot reading, the card of the Devil implies blocks and inhibitions (usually sexual), which arise from our lack of understanding of Pan. Although he is ugly, he is the Great All – the raw life of the bodily itself, amoral and crude, but nonetheless a god. The energy which is expended in keeping the Devil in his cave, shameful and hidden, is energy which is lost to the personality, but which can be released with immensely powerful effect if one is willing to look Pan in the face. Thus humans must learn to confront the basest and most shameful aspects of themselves, they must face their own darkness in order to become what they always were – merely natural and not remain forever in bondage to their own fear. Otherwise, in order to hide their shameful secret, they must pretend that they are superior and project their own bestiality on others, leading to prejudice, bigotry, and even persecution of individuals and races who seem to them ‘evil’.

Some believed that a collective mind could have dreams. Durkheim is cautious to evade difficulty by using the idea of ‘collective representations’, for, as E.E. Evans-Pritchard aptly puts it, “religious ideas are produced by a synthesis of individual minds in collective action, but once produced they have a life of their own” (Evans, 1965, 63). G. S. Kirk (1970, 274) is correct when he says that collective ritual behaviour, mass-hysteria or other kinds of emotive social action can impress their participants with new ideas that belong to the occasion, and that these ideas then persist, but only in the minds of individuals. Nevertheless, they are

in a sense collective. What the Freudians were hinting at, and what Jung eventually made explicit, was the different concept of a collective unconsciousness – a concept no doubt could not receive any support in logic from Durkheim's theory.

According to Jung's theory of *collective unconsciousness* which he termed *archetype*, all human beings possess similar inborn tendencies to form certain general symbols, and that these symbols manifest themselves through the unconscious mind in myths, dreams, delusions and folklore. General symbols such as the number four, the cross, the Mandela, the sun, the wise old man, the divine child, earth-mother, the self, god, devil, the animus and anima (idea of man in a woman and vice versa), and other symbols seem to recur constantly in myths and dreams, and therefore must have some general collective origin. **Jung has somehow succeeded in persuading many people that his general symbols are of universal occurrence, but the probability is that they are nothing of the sort.** Kirk (1970, 275-6) claims that analysis of any of the cultural sets of myths is sufficient to dispose of the idea. He also maintains that those general symbols such as the earth-mother, the divine child, the anima, and so on, simply do not occur often (or specifically) enough to make a general theory necessary or acceptable.

In so far as such ideas or images do occur, Kirk believes that they may just as probably, or more probably, arise out of the common experience of all humanity during the early years of life; the sun being a force that impresses every human being without the invocation of racial memory, and so forth. This explanation seems to be supported by Jean Piaget's theory that children progressively formulate the concepts of space, time, objective existence, causation, and the working of the outside world in general, from infancy upwards. Piaget's observations of infants and young children show how simple infantile imitation is gradually developed, first into the use of symbols, then into the capacity for generalization and abstraction. He is of the opinion that Jung's general symbols

could in theory be the result of common process of symbolic assimilation in childhood, and in practice will take a great deal of refuting (Piaget, 1951, 196-8).

It can be argued that nothing in Jung's arguments makes it probable that ideas or symbols actually are inherited. Yet the mind has a physiological basis, and there may be no obvious reason why modes of thinking should not be inherited just as much as modes of behaving. Professor M. Jacobson (1969, 7, 543-7) thinks that chromosomes can contain enough genetic information to determine the connexions of at least some nerve cells in the human brain. If some cells were genetically determined, might they not carry instructions leading to the information of mental concepts no less than of physical structure and instinctual behaviour? If this is possible, then certain of these concepts could be common to all or most human beings. That might conceivably explain how certain motifs (like the separation of earth and sky), not apparently explicable by similar environmental factors or common experiences in growing up, tend to recur in the myths and folklore of quite separate societies.

Our discussion thus far concerns the human responses to that which we perceive and experience as evil. The hypothesis that historical patterns of responses to evil and to the Devil reveal our Western perception, attitudes and mentality towards perceived evil. In this way it provides a context for making sense of the suffering, injustices, and the moral evil in our lives. It also provides a context for understanding the experience of evil for the individual and collective psyche.

However, the Devil is not just a collective-mind response to evil because babies have been known to be troubled and harmed by very nasty forces. Since a baby is not influenced by adults in the world around them to believe in a hostile force, it cannot be a case of collective mind influence in him to have caused the attack by such a hostile force.

Hence, the Devil is not merely a thing of the collective human mind.

Chapter 15

The Reality of Evil

Since the Devil is regarded by many thinkers as merely the humans' way of making sense of the suffering and evils in this world, it is important for us to take a serious look at the reality of evil.

While there are those who emphatically believe in the existence of evil, there are those who do not. Some believe there are some forms of imperfection but that there is no absolute evil.

Our world at present is riddled with great unrest, wars, famine, atrocities, injustices, incurable diseases, exploitation, and enormous destruction. We notice the diabolic forces that infuse nature, humans and animals. All around us, we observe that evil is an inherent element in the universe: in the horrible afflictions of enormous suffering on the innocent and in the helpless; in the devastations of nature against all forms of life; the senseless killings of humans and animals; the total disrespect for human, animal, and plant lives; the poverty, sickness, accidents, pollution and death; the uncertainty that makes hell of our lives; the exploitation, the misery, the falsehood, the injustices, the hypocrisy and violence in the world. The list on evil is seemingly endless.

However, the ultimate evil is far more profound than any specific evil, since it possesses an ontological character, lying in the very nature of this world and the nature of human kind. Everything entails loss and death. As Ruth Anshen says, it is the nature of evil that the character of things become mutually obstructive (Anshen 1972, xvii).

People tend to regard things that are not good as evil, but that which is not evil is not necessarily good. Things in themselves cannot be called good or evil without reference to their attendant circumstances or their origin. In many cultures, evil is frequently personified. But what is evil?

For many, evil is not an abstraction, but rather a reality. This reality we call the Devil. Perhaps evil is best understood in terms of the pain and suffering of an individual. The great difficulty in defining evil is the elusive, paradoxical nature of the relation between what is perceived and experienced as evil and as good. The shocking nature of evil is vividly portrayed in Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* as a description of the immediacy of evil:

Imagine a trembling mother with her baby in her arms, a circle of invading Turks around her. They've planned a diversion; they pet the baby, laugh to make it laugh. They succeed, the baby laughs. At that moment a Turk points a pistol four inches from the baby's face. The baby laughs with glee, holds out its little hands to the pistol, and he pulls the trigger in the baby's face and blows out its brains.

Clearly, the above story reminds us that evil is meaningless, senseless destruction. As Russell (1981, 17) succinctly puts it:

Evil destroys and does not build; it rips and it does not mend; it cuts and it does not bind. It strives always and everywhere to annihilate, to turn to nothing. To take all being and render it nothing is the heart of evil.

Indeed evil is an assertive, active force. Evil has a reality of its own – it seems to have an intelligence of its own. Evil is dangerous because it corrupts and

destroys. Some perceive evil as a destructive force that is nothingness. Pope Paul VI described evil as an effective agent, a living spiritual being, perverted, and perverting (Smith & Pager, 1980, ix). Truly, radical evil annihilates structures of meaningful existence. Indeed, evil is a terrible reality, a reality which must not be trivialized. It is a terrible mistake to ignore or dismiss evil.

It is felt as a purposeful force and perceived as personified. This personification is often associated with the Devil. If the Devil does not exist, but human kind has created him, it has created him in its own image and likeness. Dostoevsky, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, depicts evil as universally present in human experiences. It shows how evil has touched all places, all times, all races, and the life of every individual regardless of colour, social status or creed.

One often hears such claims as “something made me do it”, “something has come over me” or “the Devil made me do it” by offenders of crimes. Perhaps there is some element of truth in what they say. Evil destroys. It does not build. It is said that the path to hell is paved with good intentions.

Some, like Augustine of Hippo, argue that what appears to be evil is ultimately good. Therefore, there is no absolute evil. War, for example, is said to be good for the economy of the country who manufactured the weapons. It also promotes virtues of courage, co-operation, and a spirit of comradeship. But war negatively arouses, inflames and consumes human’s emotions, and most people would agree that war is evil.

Evil is regarded as having no essence because of the belief that it is a non-ontological being. This cannot be true when one considers that metaphysically, everything has a consciousness and hence an essence.

The faces of evil are many and its influence turns humans into creatures less than animals. Brutality, cannibalism, rape, and all forms of atrocities occurring in our world are godless evil. Alas, most people are no longer concerned with what is good or evil. Their concern is survival of the self in the rat-race.

Nature manifests evil, as does humanity, even though the evil of nature appears to be inherent in this world. Evil manifests under the form of senseless destruction, deformation, diseases of all types, apparently senseless accidents, mental and physical afflictions, cruel deaths, pain and suffering at every turn in life as well as in moral antagonism, in mental dysfunction due to guilt, fear of punishment, and in revenge, ignorance and so on.

Arbitrarily, the evils in this world can be classified as physical evil, mental evil, state evil, moral evil and natural evil. Much of the evil in the world consists of the evil actions of men and the passive evils brought by those actions. These include evils brought about intentionally by people and also the evils which result from long years of neglect and moral carelessness by antecedent generations.

Evil actions of humans include malicious lying, “holy” and unholy wars, the exploitation of others, the wilful infliction of pain and suffering on other beings, animals as well as humans; physically or spiritually endangering other beings; imposing injustices of all types, causing degeneration, diseases and injuries; inciting painful and draining emotional states in humans and animals which also lead to frustration, fear, failure, depression, anxiety, anger, doubt, uncertainty, hatred, jealousy, and so on.

It is evil which imposes the pain of loss of loved ones from this world, for it is evil which has imposed the ridiculous ritual of physical death and its incumbent fears. The evil of suffering and death have been and are an enigma for philosophers and commoners alike.

Moral evil results in the physical, emotional and mental pain and suffering and all other states of affairs which are caused by actions for which humans can be held morally responsible. It is because of this responsibility that Samuel Taylor Coleridge said “Moral evil is an evil that has its origin in the will”.

Consider the moral evil of paedophilia which affords pleasure and an outlet for the paedophile, but the evils of paedophilia are many. These include the sexual

abuse and exploitation of children, which creates social, moral and emotional problems in societies. Thus, the evilness of an object or an event seems to be dependent on its context.

It appears that morally, where there is good, there must at least be the possibility of evil, and vice versa.

Natural evil is that aspect of evil repercussions for which human agents generally appear not to be morally responsible. This includes the pain and suffering caused by beasts, natural forces (which cause geological and other disasters, diseases, congenital dysfunctions and death, premature or otherwise), and by naturally occurring organisms such as pathological microbes, radiation and poisons and by genetic defects or mutations.

If one observes a fly caught in spider's web, what one perceives are the frenzied attempts by it to escape and these demonstrate the fear the fly suffers as it realizes it is doomed and tries desperately to escape. This tends to negate some physiologists views that animals and insects do not have such realizations and Descartes' denial of their souls. Naturalists claim such preying and trapping is the natural order for one creature to be devoured by another. I call it the natural order of unnecessary evil.

There are also evils which are programmed mechanisms in our lives which result in further pain and suffering, both physical and emotional, to both the subject and those around him. These mechanisms lead to such things as insanity, imbecility, senility, degeneration, blindness and deafness. Related to these privations are the processes of degeneration and aging, parasitism, and diseases which often bring humiliation and greater suffering.

Some beings express their evil by preying and exploiting others in their efforts to survive. And diseases express evil by not only causing pain and suffering both to its victims and to their loved ones but also affecting nearly always adversely, the lives of dependents.

Natural evil in the form of floods, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and fires which create havoc and great suffering appear inevitable. But natural evil does not occur in an undistorted dimension. It does not occur where there is no evil, no food chain, no death. Hence, natural evil occurs solely to express evil. By causing the pain and suffering it manifests its evilness.

The suffering caused to human beings and animals by “accidents” is unnecessary. Suffering caused by religions and their wars, inquisitions, by pogroms, slavery, mass murders, persecutions, and so on are all manifestations of the evil essence working by its programming mechanisms.

Moral evil is associated with suffering, despair, guilt and punishment. The evil of ignorance manifests in the actions of people and causes great disharmony and antagonism in human affairs. It is evident in the animal kingdom also where murderous raids by groups have been observed, particularly in primates.

In humankind moral evils are often expressions of particular erroneous beliefs. Their resultant painful scarring, both mental and physical, is the cruellest and most tyrannical of realities affecting people’s lives. Examples are the psychopathies suffered by those tortured in wars.

Rational human search for the causes of evil has been relatively fruitless. One of the conclusions in the ensuing moral code is the belief that good is somehow connected with order, and evil with chaos, although romantics would deny this. This view is succinctly put by Hobbes in *Leviathan*. The belief that it is a part of the greater Order for physical perceived order to have come from celestial chaos is utter nonsense.

Many societies see a close link between the laws that govern the natural world and the basic principles which underpin their social code. The great disturbing forces such as hurricanes, fires and earthquakes which destroy man’s security in a not-so-regulated world, are themselves the manifestation of evil. But, because of the need for a dualistic metaphysical view of the cosmos, in human

struggles to preserve order in the face of perceived chaos, many falter and do not regard Evil as a spiritual force. Rather, evil is perceived by many, as a moral problem due the consequential activity of other consciousnesses who have been labelled as demons.

The existence of suffering in this world is undeniable. All beings who are here suffer in some way. In a narrow sense, evil is what is perceived as morally evil, that which is wicked and sinful. In a wider sense, evil can be said to be whatever is undesirable, censurable, mischievous, morally evil and destructive because such things are all various antithesis of the good. There is also the evil that occurs to people who are undeservedly harmed. There is also evil in the derivative sense as the pattern of primary evil that can be reasonably attributed to characteristic traits, people, practices, groups or institutions and etc.

According to **Hindu** and some **Buddhist** beliefs, all evil phenomena are mere appearances (**illusions**) and not realities. One only needs to perceive accurately to realize this argument is false. Contrary to argument that evil is only apparent and not real, we can see and feel the effects of evil everywhere around us.

According to Buddhist philosophy, pain and suffering are due to ignorance, which leads to physical desires. The only solution to all pain and suffering is to see through the illusions of this world and become desireless, and eventually disappearing into Nirvana. Such Buddhist thoughts for an answer to suffering are evading the issue. **Even if some evils are illusory, then the fact of illusion is itself an evil.** The mere fact that humans and animals are subjected to evil, and all its horrendous consequences, which invariably include pain and suffering, is evil.

The present Christian position is that moral evil is the consequence of spiritual evil and it is man's sinfulness that is the source of this spiritual evil. It appears that human error and weakness are the causes of the evil we perpetrate, and sometimes evil is due to our interference with the natural course of events. This might well be true of the evil humans do, which is often either due to

ignorance or weakness. If this is so, we would also have to explain away malice as due to lack of freedom (resulting from childhood traumas and so on). This argument is false because there are those who habitually choose to cause evil and actively perform their evil actions.

Many people assert that beliefs should only be based on observation. Hence, to their way of thinking, if evil cannot be scientifically observed and tested, it does not exist. Such argument is absurd when one considers the limitations of science's ability or desire to even try and define the macro reality in which we live, much less its ignorance of and resistance to exploring quantum levels of existence.

To say that there are no real evils and that what appears to be evil is really an essential part of good is a generalization which is evidently false when one considers how suffering, which comes from evil, can frustrate and destroy a person completely.

It is claimed by some that the value of freewill alone justifies the dilemma of moral evil and physical evil and the punishment that such evils may involve. This argument is deficient when critically considered. Do not newborns, infants and children who have never expressed freewill suffer and die? What has freewill to do with senility and insanity, which are also manifestations of physical evil?

Animals suffer and endure pain, and are supposedly deprived of freewill by those who think like Descartes. Suffering appears to have existed in the world of nature long before the appearance of man and his freewill. One needs to ask, therefore, why was there pain in existence in the first place? Did not the evil precede man and his freewill?

Evolutionists, including Darwin, claim that pain and suffering are mechanisms which allow entities to select an appropriate evolutionary path. This is untrue. Why should living things be subjected to unjust pain and suffering in order to progress along an evolutionary ladder? Why is suffering needed for lessons? It is not! **Progress is possible without evil and its sequelae.** All

experimental and anecdotal evidence supports the view that physical, neurological and psychic development is faster and more satisfactory without the disturbing factors which we could class as evil being present during the developmental stages.

Thus, we see that an embryo grows healthily without the effect of adverse drugs, radiation, disease in the mother, and so on. Plants thrive when evil effects are minimized in their environment. The neural tubes, brains and nerves of mammals develop best with the appropriate stimuli. With stimulus deprivation or abnormal stimuli the development is abnormal or halted (New Scientist).

From such evidence then it can be concluded that physical, mental and spiritual growth are better without the presence of evil. Many point to the great and accelerated technological and medical progress due to wars. But it is indisputable that wars are evil because of the disastrous effects they have on populations and the environment. Some point to such progress as a good coming from the evil of war. But is this necessarily so? How much greater progress would there be if the money and energy necessarily spent in war were to be spent in the more congenial peace time? Much more would be accomplished with peace. Evil is an obstruction to any development. To say it is a necessary item for progress is to fall into the evil trap of legitimising evil as a necessity for beingness, which it certainly is not!

If we assume humans truly have freewill, the Problem of Evil can be argued to be a problem of choice, if people know all the consequences of their choice. However, one does NOT always know the consequences.

People are always attempting to explain evil in order to expunge it by explaining it away. With rare exceptions, the contemporary views of evil are untenable. Evil is not merely a by-product of unfavourable circumstances.

Evil is not a temporary phenomenon due to inadequate social or incomplete psychological development which will disappear in some future progressive evolutionary phase. In fact, evil is a real and incorrigible factor in the world.

As far as we know, there has always been evil in the world, even though there are those who choose to deny its existence. The denial of the existence and the significance of evil are due to many factors. Some of the factors are: poverty of imagination, ignorance, fear of exposing evil, or simply because some people are themselves evil and therefore resist exposure of their own evil nature.

The assertion that evil is a product of human ignorance and misery is false. It is false because no matter how ignorant one is, unless one has a certain tool, a certain force to do something, one cannot perform a task. If one is totally ignorant, one cannot be evil unless shown how to be evil.

Some claim that evil promotes good virtues such as kindness and sharing in times of war and crisis. This claim is not always true; often there are those who take advantage of the opportunity that war and crisis present by looting, raping, murdering and destroying. Evil teaches one how to be evil. It makes everyone suffer. It makes us feel pain, sorrow, frustration, anger, depression, fear and other severe, debilitating emotions. But who wants to feel and experience those things? It is like saying that one would hit one's head with a hammer so that one can experience a headache and can then take a painkiller. What is the point of it? There is no point at all. If that is a learning experience, then there is something terribly wrong. Even if evil is a privation, what creates evil?

It is obvious that humans are capable of expressing evil and humans do express evil, but human beings are not the original cause of evil. If evil can exist without the presence of the Good, what would be the invisible consequence?

Chapter 16

The Devil Exists in the Context of the Evil Principle

Does the Devil really exist?

Although there is no absolute knowledge that anything at all exists, the only thing that is immediately experienced is thought, so that all that can be said with certainty is that thought exists. This lack of certainty does not mean that we must deny the existence of the Devil.

Although we cannot know things in themselves, we can know things as they are perceived and experienced. On this level we can choose a mythology, a choice that is partly a leap of faith and partly a considered judgement on the basis of experience. The history of concepts offers a way of understanding a concept that is not firmly rooted in physical nature and therefore not open to scientific method.

Based on the definition of the concept, I can ask myself the question, “What do I know about the Devil?” My answer can be: I have had a direct experience of a force that I perceive as evil, as having unity and purpose, and as coming from beyond myself. This experience is quite common among sane people in many cultures, so it cannot be dismissed as madness. The experience may appear to come from beyond myself because it arises from my unconscious, rather than because it objectively is beyond myself. But the beyondness is part of the perception itself. It is quite common in the perception of others, so it must be taken seriously. If the experience does come from beyond me, what precisely is the experience?

Each person interprets the experience in terms of his or her own personal and cultural predilections, so that considerable variety exists in the content of

reported perceptions. My personal and cultural predilections should be adjusted and corrected in terms of what I have learned from the mythology I have chosen. The methodology I have chosen shows a definable development of historical tradition, which asserts, at a minimum, the existence of a Principle of Evil.

One cannot physically prove that the Devil exists, much less what he/she/it is, if he/she/it does exist. However, there is a personification of evil and of the Principle of Evil. You may call it what you will. For me, it is the Devil.

The Devil, in its many forms and names, is a manifestation of the principle and power of evil in this world. This evil principle is akin to an evil mind which controls the minds and everything in this world and in this universe.

Good and evil are existential realities. Satan might be a misunderstood concept, but the essence of Satan or the Devil as evilness remains true. Thus, the concept of evil cannot possibly be a human invention since humans cannot invent natural evil, animal evil or galactic evil. Therefore, evil has to be an external entity/force. The existence of evil in this world can be established from all sorts of evil we can see around us daily. From on going observation and from history, it is very obvious that evil has an intelligence of its own, and this intelligence for want of a label, we call the Devil, Satan or any other name.

Thus:

1. Whether the Devil is a person is irrelevant, there is an evil force/principle.
2. We can still rationally believe in the existence of a devil in the context that the Devil is not the Devil of the *Bible*, myths, and folklore, but it is a manifestation of an evil principle/force.
3. The evil principle exists. Thus, within the context of the evil principle the Devil exists.

There are ample indications of the Devil in the context of the existence of an agent of the Principle of Evil, which is anthropomorphized as Satan, and is also given other names. There are two opposing principles, that of evil (darkness) and the Principle of Good (light). It is more plausible than not that an evil principle exists and is responsible for the evil in this universe. I have discussed the various ways in which the evil principle has been portrayed in our Western Judaeo-Christian culture in the preceding chapters. I have also discussed how this evil principle can manifest evilness via individuals at certain times.

The notion of the two principles is found in Zoroastrianism. The *Gathas* (evangelical hymns) of Zoroaster teach that, in the beginning, there were two spirits, and each made a choice. The first, Ahura Mazda, chose the good and became the God of Good; the second, Ahriman – Angra Manyu, the spirit of Evil – chose the bad and became the God of Evil, whose worshippers are “the followers of the lie,” *dregvant*, who are led astray by untruth or *druj*.

The Gnostics believe that the evil principle is contained in matter, which forms all bodies, including human bodies. As a result, there is inherent tendency in humans to do evil. The Rabbinic literature portrays an evil principle, the *yetzer hara* as the equal or synonym for Satan and also as the principle in humankind by which Satan acts. This has some resemblance to the Manichaeism belief. The Manichaeism position on evil states that evil is a principle in the universe. Further, this evil principle exists as an independent ontological principle and impinges on the divine nature. (In *Eliminating and Solving the Problem of Evil*, I rebutted the view of Manichaeism regarding the independence of the Principle of Evil, by demonstrating that the evil principle was an offshoot of the Principle of Light, which was created by the Unmanifest. That is both Principles have beginnings, hence, neither is eternal.)

Manichaeism – which is a form of Gnosticism – asserts that the “evil factor,” Satan, was created from a kingdom of darkness over which the God of light had no control. Satan thus was generated in evil from the beginning and exercised power over evil, in opposition to God. The Manichaean doctrine is that evil came into existence as evil and the New Testament verse – *1 John 3:8* – “the Devil sinned from the beginning” seems to support this contention. According to Manichaeism, evil is a real power, born of cosmic darkness and engaged in perpetual struggle with good or light. Similarly, in the Zoroastrian account, Ahriman, the evil principle of darkness is at war with Ormazd, the principle of light.

The Gnostic idea extending from Marcionites to others in the Middle Ages is that this world was created by Satan (Ruciman, 1947, 10, 54). This idea was developed from Persian dualism and Plato’s philosophical idea that evil is inherent in matter – hence matter is evil, and everything material is evil. Gnosis has appeared in various cultures. It is found within the mystical schools of various religions including Islam, Judaism, Zoroastrinism, etc. When that situation occurred, those who had the ‘nous’ were condemned and persecuted as heretics by the government and mainstream establishment within their own professed religion.

Gnosticism views this world as the creation of an evil god (the demiurge) who created material world as a prison for the divine sparks (the True-Light beings) that dwell in human bodies (trapped in matter). Thus, a human being is a spirit trapped in a gross body. Humankind is the “microcosm”: both this world and the greater world of the cosmos are battlegrounds in the war of essences between the good and evil.

The Gnostics identify the evil creator of this world to be the God of the Old Testament. As a result of the entrapment of light particles by darkness, the divine beings of light have lost their awareness and have forgotten their true divine identity, their real divine origin, and are ‘drunk’, ‘drugged’, or ‘asleep’. From time

to time, the God of light has sent his/her/its divine messengers to this world to help awaken and liberate the trapped true beings from the bondage of darkness.

One such Divine Messenger was Jesus. Jesus came to liberate the Divine beings from the dominion of evil by imparting divine secret wisdom to free them of human entrapments and overcome everything that binds them to this world of falsehood so that people can live a life in this world without being of the world. When a trapped being is awakened from its ‘slumber’ or ‘numbness’, he/she is transformed in the light and becomes an advocate of the light.

From the *Gospel of Thomas* (not to be confused with the Thomas in the Christian Scripture), Jesus said:

I took my place in the midst of the world, and I appeared to them in flesh (incarnated). I found all of them intoxicated. I found none of them thirsty. And my soul (spirit) became afflicted for the sons of men, because they are blind in their hearts and do not have sight; for empty they came into this world and empty too they seek to leave the world. But for the moment they are intoxicated.

Blinded by illusions and falsehoods, True-Light beings are persuaded, fooled, manipulated and blackmailed into conforming with the ways of this evil dimension. People are blackmailed and programmed by evil to accept a life of compromise and acceptance at the expense and detriment of the True-Light beings.

In this world, the adversarial force against the beings of light is the manifestation of the evil principle. This force can manifest as various forms at various times through people, animals and the whole system. This force can also “incarnate” or take over a human body by the method that is called “walk-in”. This means that the consciousness of this force occupies the body by moving in to take full possession of the body. This is not to be confused with possession.

Some books of the *Apocrypha* (the New Testament of the *Twelve Patriarchs*, the Book of *Jubilees*) and two key books of the *Pseudepigrapha* (*Enoch* and the *Secrets of Enoch*) refer to evil spirits devoted to the destruction of humankind. The Testament of the *Twelve Patriarchs* (137-107 B.C.) warns against the workings of Belial, the Spirit who leads human beings astray. In the Book of *Jubilees* (135-105 B.C.) we find a similar warning from Mâstêmâ, and the *Wisdom of Solomon* 2. 23-24 (ca. 50-10 B.C.) blames Satan and his temptation of Eve in the guise of the serpent for bringing evil into the world.

It is well established in the Christian Bible that there is a struggle between the forces of good and the forces of evil in the universe (*Genesis* 3:6; *Job* chapters 1, 2; and 26:12-13; *Psalms* 82), which transcends the affairs of human beings. This struggle is sometimes referred to as the conflict between cosmos and chaos and can be perceived from *Genesis* to *Revelation* of the Scriptures. The *Bible* reflects the existence of a kind of disorder, a friction or a disharmony, which is persistently resisted by God and his people.

It seems the seed of disorder was already present even before the fall of Adam and Eve to enable them to fall through disobedience. However, the Old Testament does not explicitly tell us why and how evil originated in God's creation, though a number of church fathers and theologians have attempted to explain the origin of evil in the universe by interpreting the passages in *Isaiah* 14:4-23 and *Ezekiel* 28:1-19. But most scholars believe that these two texts are influenced by the mythical material of the ancient Near East.

There seems to be two distinctly different natures in humans. People feel drawn in both directions, by a lower nature and a higher one. Metaphysically, humans are a mixture of the energies from the lower nature and the higher nature. The gross lower nature pulls people into the worldly direction, while the higher nature urges them toward attainment of their highest, most integrated higher human qualities such as goodness, truth, honesty, purity, and beauty. This has

nothing to do with Jung's idea of the duality of good and evil in the image of God in the psyche. We can postulate the existence of the Devil to explain the evil in this world; we can postulate that there is a non being who is responsible for the evils we see around us by deducing or explicating those characteristics that must belong to it in a purely rational process of reasoning, but we can also postulate that there is a force of evil that is not necessarily consolidated into a being called the Devil.

There is nowhere in the *Bible* which speaks of Satan as a created spirit. The idea that Satan is a spirit is only inferred from the idea that God created all things. It is further acknowledged that Satan is not an absolute independent principle, for such is inconsistent with biblical teaching and monotheism. Contrary to the Old Testament Satan who serves God, the New Testament Satan has tremendous power. He is the prince, the god of this world with power over humans. He is more independent and daring to the extent that he tried to tempt Jesus with the kingdoms of this world. He is clearly personified as the cosmic Principle of Evil.

Contrary to the view that the Devil is a threat to monotheism, the idea of the Devil as the idea of the evil principle is part of the Christian teachings, and must be recognized as being compatible with basic pre-suppositions. It is a principle striving to become a person by manifesting itself through a medium called a human being. Nevertheless, the Devil is not personal in the sense that he is a person. However, the evil principle can be personalized in an individual who allows it to use him or her. This individual is then identified as the Devil. If we reject the notion that human beings are fighting against a personal enemy, the alternative view is that we are battling against an impersonal force. The daily occurrences in the lives of people seem to attest to this.

Some may argue that the hypothesis of the evil principle is nothing more than a carry-over of liberal idealism and that the *Bible* regards nothing of cosmic principles. But many Christians would probably reject the notion of an impersonal or cosmic idea of evil. Ironically, the biblical events clearly reflect a basic unity in

their presentation of Satan as a personal force of evil. Indeed, Jesus' ministry is set against the Devil and his kingdom. This provides the setting for the biblical emphasis of a kingdom of darkness and a kingdom of light.

No doubt for most Christians who claim belief in the existence of the Devil through revelation, the idea of the evil principle is an unreal myth, an antiquated concept bound to an ancient world view. Conversely, the Gnostics, through *nous*, perceive the world as divided into light and darkness. As such they have no problem believing in the existence of two antagonistic principles, one as the Principle of Good, the other as the Principle of Evil. Generally, the Gnostic conception of the "God of good" is only a secondary deity on a par with evil or the Devil.

The idea of an evil principle may be objectionable to those who profess a monotheistic God. However, monotheism is not so much the doctrine of one God, but rather the doctrine of belief in only one valid manifestation of God even though in Christian doctrine, which is a subsequence of Judaism and its monotheism, that manifestation becomes tripartite, and is called trinity.

Polytheism has been both misunderstood and misinterpreted by those who wished to gain from their own doctrine of monotheism. The polytheists with their pantheon of gods, never for one moment believed that there was more than one ultimate level of consciousness at the Divine Godhead which could be classed as the level of consciousness called "God". Never did they suggest that all which was divine did not belong to the "One".

The polytheists saw the divine pantheon, not as a multiplicity of individual and independent gods, but rather as being made up of the legitimate manifestations of the same God consciousness in diverse characters. They understood that the level of God consciousness could not be reduced to one mere expression or manifestation. They believed that while manifestation of that God consciousness was possible, an unmanifested aspect of the level of God consciousness always

remained, for they believed that it would be incomprehensible to even suggest that the omniscient consciousness would limit itself to one level, or one manifestation or one character.

Jehovah declared:

I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt have no other gods before me . . . for I am a jealous God. (*Exodus* 20: 2-5).

Clearly, the above passage reveals that there were other gods in existence.

According to extant, corrupted Gnostic belief, the Divine Mother responded:

Thou art an evil fool Ildabaoth (Jehovah), and blind, for with this utterance thou hast offended the entire Divine Hierarchy. [There is no hierarchy in the Unmanifest or the True-Light Creation. The corruption could be due to mistranslation.]

Evil is unbelievably complex aberration. Evil is very much personalized and it is very much a personal thing. Any being, irrespective of its vastness, can be personalized. What this means is that the consciousness can be concentrated in a particular volume, of space. There is an evil pattern, which creates evil worlds, and after creating them, evil begins to personify itself to descend and rule the evil worlds.

The light, upon discovering this, sent itself by projecting itself in the form of the Christ to personally combat the personal Devil. Just as there was a personal Christ and a personal Devil in the days of Jesus Christ, so there are today.

This physical dimension we live in is part of the Virtual Reality of the Evil Principle/Darkness. At the human level, the Will produces energy with in-built

abilities which vary according to what one wills into the energy. The spiraloid motions of matter that have occurred in this universe are false motions.

There is a Devil that belongs to the Principle of Evil. The true God of love and light is not all good and evil at the same time for the purpose of balance, as some erroneously claim. The Devil is just one of the many names used to denote the Evil Force of the Evil Principle/Evil Mind – the irreducible Principle of Evil which manifests through the Devil.

For those who have personally encountered the Devil, they cannot be persuaded to deny its existence. Like those who have personally seen a spacecraft, no one can persuade them that it did not exist.

I have personally encountered the Devil. When I was in my early teens, I was often troubled by what I perceived as contradictions in some of the teachings of the church. However, I had no doubt about the existence of the force of good and the force of evil. I affirmed daily that I would serve the light and renounce evil.

One night, as I was in my room doing my school homework, I felt the temperature in my room had suddenly dropped tremendously. Although the night was warm I suddenly felt quite chilly. I also felt an eerie presence in my room. Although I did not see any being I could sense something in my midst. It was a very hostile presence. It intimidated me, mocked Jesus, and threatened me. Although I was really scared, I did not scream or call anyone for help. I just knew I had to face this presence on my own. I prayed hard for deliverance from this evil presence. After what seemed like five minutes, the presence left and the chill in the room disappeared. I kept this experience to myself.

The following night, the invisible being came again. I noted the time. The being taunted me again and I refused to give in. This time I called the entity Satan and it acknowledged that it was. The entity laughed and replied that it is known by many names, but that “the name will do”. I quoted a verse from the *Bible* and

Satan responded with a verse from the *Bible* also. It laughed mockingly and said he was not afraid of the *Bible*. Again I prayed very hard in the name of Christ. After what seemed like a long time, the Devil left. This unwelcome visitation continued nightly for seven nights.

On the seventh night of the Devil's visit, I was acutely aware of the difference in intensity and power of its threat. The Devil was getting very angry with me. The energy in the room was horribly thick. I could sense danger and something sinister was about to happen. It was like the silence before the storm. I could feel it coming and I prayed and prayed as I had never prayed to God with more focus and intensity than I had ever done before. I continued to renounce the Devil and affirm my allegiance to God. The Devil got angrier and angrier. I could feel the whole room getting hotter and hotter. I could smell the Devil's intense anger. For a moment, I felt the evil power in the room was getting too powerful for me. I felt I could not hold the Devil at bay for too long. I called out loud in the name of Christ at the moment when I thought I could not take it anymore. Then, suddenly, the atmosphere changed. I felt a sudden peace over my whole being. I no longer felt fearful. I was calm and strong. I felt in total control. Suddenly, the Devil left. The Devil never returned after that night. My faith in the Divine took a giant leap. Somehow, however, I knew that one day I would face the Devil again.

It was not until the spring of 2000 in Arizona, U.S.A., that I again "saw" the Devil. At the time I was resting and getting ready to meditate. All of a sudden, I saw a vision of an entity standing in a dark, dank, dreary, desolate depressing place. Immediately I felt I knew that entity. Within a moment, I remembered. I recognized the entity as the presence in my room many years ago. As I was staring into his face, it began to change. I saw the many faces of the Devil. I know the Devil is now in a human body. This time, I was no longer afraid.

Coming back to our discussion of the Principle of Evil, I must include Orphism and other topics. Orphism, which is probably an ancient mythological

tradition, speaks of the principles of antagonism between God and Evil and of Original Sin. According to Orphism, the fact that humans are made from the ashes of the Titans who are malevolent spirits, clearly indicates that there is a good deal of evil in humans. Yet, since the Titans partook of gods' flesh before they were struck down by lightning, their ashes, and thus human beings, also contain elements of the divine. Each human, therefore, must recover his or her position of divinity before being able to attain salvation – a foreshadowing of Christian eschatology.

There are those, including Tremmel (1987, 54), who accuse Zoroaster of inventing his cosmogony irrespective of historical fact. Such accusation was also laid on Mani by the early Church. The Western mind does not always understand the theism in Zoroastrianism and Manichaeism – hence, misunderstanding occurred. There is no evidence that they invented their own brand of cosmogony. It is most likely that they received their teachings via divine revelation as they claimed they had. The *Revelation* of John was accomplished through divine revelation and so were many others.

As mentioned in an earlier chapter, Satan is referred to as the Principle of Evil in the New Testament. As an evil principle, Satan is the principle on which the glory and sovereignty of God rests, for he is a great power who is necessary for the final glorification of God when Christians are liberated from every cosmic force. Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling (1775-1854), in his *Philosophy of Revelation* attempts to prove that Satan is fundamentally a cosmic Principle of Evil, and not just a creature or a fallen angel (Hayes, 1995, 304-7). His insight that humankind is determined not only by reason but also by dark impulses is certainly a positive attempt to understand the reality of humankind. It is generally understood that biblical thought is opposed to any suggestion that Satan is an eternal evil principle. It is also a fact that nowhere in the *Bible* does it mention that Satan is a created spirit. However, the serpent idea in the Old Testament is used to

symbolize or dictate a force of evil (Murison, 1905, XXI, 115-30). Perhaps the idea of a created being came from the idea that all things are created by God. Schelling argues that if Christ was *outside* God without being a creature, why could not Satan, as Christ's foremost enemy, be similarly outside God without being a creature? Further, if Satan is in fact a creature, he would not be a true power, and a worthy opponent for Christ. Such arguments are reasonable. Surely this could not be said of a mere creature or of an unconditionally evil principle, as Schelling suggests, but it could be said of a principle, which is necessary to the divine world-rule.

Hayes (1995, 301) in quoting Schelling, gives the following:

An evil principle would be one which is evil by nature, one which is opposed to God by nature, i.e. originally. Such a thing was assumed by the Manicheans and, at least according to the usual view, was also affirmed in the Persian system. An evil *principle* would be a principle which is *eternal* like God (Deo coaeternum). Now both Old and New Testaments most decidedly oppose this. (*Philosophy of Revelation* VI: 637, cf. 666).

Thus, Schelling sees Satan as an ever-present, constant, and direct influence on human beings, and as a universal, cosmic principle, Satan is able to constantly insinuate himself into man, indeed, he is "*in man*" (*ibid*, 305).

According to *Revelation* 12:7 – "Then war developed in heavens, Michael and his angels battling against the dragon [Satan] with his angels waging war . . ." – Satan can neither be a creature nor an eternal Principle of Evil. In the New Testament, Satan is the prince and ruler of this world. If he is a ruler of a kingdom (Earth) just as Christ is the ruler of heaven, we can argue that in this sense, his power equals that of Christ's, but as the Adversary. I agree with

Schelling, who argues that if Satan's power were a creaturely power, there is no reason for Christ, a decidedly supra-creaturely nature, to subject himself to suffering in order to conquer it (Hayes, 1995, 301). His suggestion of Satan as a presumptuous, rebellious and fallen Spirit, is out of harmony with the dignity and majesty of Satan "whose kingdom and whose works are come to destroy Christ"; and it is also out of harmony with *2 Corinthians* 4:4, where Satan is called the God of this world, and with *Hebrews* 2:14, where Satan is said to have the power of death for such things cannot be said of a mere creature, an individual and concrete spirit (*ibid*, 302).

Some people are of the opinion that the vision of the cosmic struggle between the forces of good against evil, derived originally from Jewish apocalyptic sources. However, this view is incorrect because Persian thoughts have influenced the Jews in the philosophical concepts of the Problem of Evil and the nature of good as discussed in previous chapters.

The Devil may not be a person, but it may be considered a principle seeking to become personified, to become a person. The process of seeking is realized through the personification of the cosmic evil principle in individuals. The idea of the Devil is certainly useful to help explain a necessary Principle of Evil. No one can credibly argue against the proposition that human beings are confronted by an impersonal evil force, and this force is constantly, experientially verified in their lives.

The teaching of Jesus and the story of his temptation by Satan do not indicate that Jesus believed in a personal evil being, but rather Satan is merely a name for the personification of evil. It came across strongly that Jesus was taking Satan seriously as the adversary to overcome. The synonyms, Beelzebub ("Lord of Flies") and the Evil One seem to support the reality with which Jesus and the synoptic writers viewed the personal force of evil.

God is not a physical person, and neither is the Evil Mind. However, Jesus has “incarnated” as a physical person and so has the Devil. The evil principle can be recognized for what it is under new names, and entirely altered appearances. “New Look” evil can be seen as good to those who are accustomed to brutal barbarities, and physical cruelties. These days, old-fashioned inquisitors hunting out heretics are being replaced by new-type “examiners” probing people in search of “deviance” and ways of relocating them (Gray, 1984,42). This brings home a very real issue in Australia and other countries.

It is common practice for the “secret service” of a government to keep secret files on a vast number of the population. Often false information is invented and filed on certain ones in order to have an excuse to eradicate or punish those the government dislikes even if their targets are harmless. In fact, the more intelligent and the more vocal ones against the system are often the targets by the “secret service” of the government. Thus, governments are expressing evil.

In much Christian and Buddhist thought, evil is nothingness, an absence of good. Another Christian explanation of evil is that it is the result of Original Sin and thus ultimately traceable to freewill. Yet another, monism, insists that apparent evil is part of a greater good that lies beyond the power of perception of poor mortals. Dualism posits two opposite principles of good and evil, attributing evil to the will of a malignant spirit.

How and why is evil personified? It is personified because we feel it as a deliberate malignancy that intrudes upon us from outside ourselves. In view of the horrors that the twenty-first century has produced, belief in the Devil, after a long lapse, as a supernatural being, or as an uncontrollable force arising in the unconscious, or as an absolute aspect of human nature is less important than the essence of the perception, which is that we are threatened by alien and hostile powers.

Perhaps one of the reasons why the dualist concept of evil is rejected in favour of the monist notion is because the dualist idea of evil is too painful for those who cannot bear to think that one of their loved ones could, in fact, be a creature of the evil principle, the damned. It is comforting to believe that there is only one creation and that there is good and evil in everyone, but the evil in us is only the shadow of the good.

Many theologies teach that a Supreme Being is opposed by an enemy – an opposing force. There seems to be an element of truth to this even if it has been distorted. Judging from existence in this world, there seems to exist a condition at every level of existence in which survival is challenged. Each individual's survival is threatened by disease, aging, starvation, financial problems, and other factors. In the animal kingdom, the survival game is played out in hunter-prey relationships with one species eating another. Spiritual beings appear to face survival challenges by being trapped in matter. Since this survival game seems to exist at every level of existence here, it is possible to argue that it also exists in regard to the Principle of Light and the Principle of Darkness.

C.S. Lewis (page 67 - Screw Tape letters) spoke of the error concerning demons is “to believe and to feel an excessive and unhealthy interest in them”. He conceived that it would represent the devil's most cunning attempt at self-camouflage to be demythologised and that camouflage would be a certain new proof of his existence.

Chapter 17

Why Darkness Created the Devil

The phenomenon of the existence of evil in the world encourages people to give that phenomenon a name or a label for ease of identification. Some of the names that have been assigned to this entity are: the Devil, Satan, Kui etc. These are all personal names for the Devil.

Those who hunger for mystical power often welcome the Devil and worship it. Those who abhor evil can point to the Devil for the bad things in the world, thus excusing God for the evil. Either way, it benefits Darkness.

“Saa” is the first manifestation of the Principle of Evil. “Saa” is the motion that permeates matter. It gives rise to thought forms, desires, emotions etc. that further draw people into deeper separation from the True Light. “Saa” eventually was given the name of Satan, the Prince of Darkness, the Devil and other names.

The Principle now known as the Principle of Evil was originally an aspect of the creative force of the Principle of Light, which went awry during the experimental process. This Error is called the Celestial Error. When the Celestial Error occurred, things became polarized against the Light. The Principle of Light started attempting to correct the Error, but the Error would not accept the Light’s correction, and instead, went on Its own way to form the Principle of Darkness, which is in absolute opposition to the True Light (the Principle of Light). Ultimately, the Unmanifest took over the correction process, and now we are at the stage of the final resolution of Evil.

Darkness has developed all the major religions in the world with the

purpose of worship and servitude to the Principle of Evil under the guise of a loving God. *Isaiah 45:7* shows that Judaism is stuck with a God who creates and does evil, hence, is evil. Christianity and Islam are offshoots of the Abrahamic following.

The Force of Evil has many tongues. Some appear benign, others appear obviously bad and wicked. Some seem to heal and rebuild, some appear loving, kind and positive, whilst others are defiantly destructive and evil.

The personification of evil comes in many forms at various times. Whilst one cannot underestimate the power of evil, one should not be consumed with fear about it. The Devil is in each mixture of good and evil. Darkness has a limited “use by” time. Since Its own entrapment of Itself in Its Virtual Reality, It is struggling to maintain Its illusions.

People have the tendency to reject concepts *a priori* based strictly upon the grounds that they fail to conform to their pre-conceived notions regarding God, the Devil or any other concepts. In Christianity is seen the elevation of failure, guilt and un-deservedness. This is by design. This is what Original Sin is founded upon. Those who feel unworthy are on a direct path to Evil.

Other religions have parallel beliefs of unworthiness which require their followers to do penance and to refine their spirits lifetime after lifetime until they can reach a state of purity sufficient for ascension to higher realms. These are false teachings designed to frighten people and make them feel unworthy. Hence, those who ignore the false teachings are in fear of their spirits ending up in a place of everlasting suffering. Those whose spirits are sufficiently refined through right living are falsely promised a blissful afterlife. Either way, they are on the path to destruction because both alternatives lead nowhere.

Satan is not capable of true love. The Devil is jealous and always puts conditions on love. The Devil is deceitful, insincere, hateful, vindictive, spiteful, malicious, merciless, and thrives on frightening and controlling people and

everything else within his reach. The Devil is a murderer, an extortionist, a great pretender, an abuser, a fraud, an incredible manipulator, a torturer who demands servitude and obedience. The Devil is punitive, vengeful, impatient, lustful, self-centred, misogynistic and untrustworthy. He is a liar, a seducer and a blood-thirsty warmonger. He is a slanderer who enjoys dividing people and causing disharmony. He hates peace and lusts for war. He is easily bored and needs to do mischievous things to amuse himself. The Devil is shrouded in secrecy. He hides knowledge and thrives on master-slave relationships. Satan demands servitude and expects obedience from those who serve him.

This order of servitude permeates the entire empire that the Prince of Darkness has been granted by his father (the Principle of Darkness – the King of Darkness). The order is seen at all levels. For example, electrons serve atomic nuclei, planets serve suns, moons serve planets, peasants serve rulers, the poor serve the rich, the weak serve the powerful, etc.

The Devil exists to create havoc in the human condition so that people are threatened into worshipping a “god” who is more powerful than the Devil. Hence, the Devil’s Father (Principle of Evil), is using Its “son” (the Devil) to cause the worship of the Father via threats, etc. The Father causes the Devil to be “crucified” everyday to enhance the position and power of the Father. In a horribly ironic twist, Darkness has manipulated the religion known as Christianity which uses the crucifixion of Jesus as a symbol of Christ’s purpose – the Father’s “firstborn son” descended into hell, which is the Earth. The satire was adroitly discussed by Thomas Paine when he identified Christianity as a parody on sun (Sol) worship.

All major religions in this world are sponsored by the Anunnaki. Religion is an extremely effective tool for keeping control of the people. A fundamental aspect of all these religions is that the central figure of worship is the sun, whether they called their sun god Ra, Apollo, Helios etc. This was true

in ancient Greek, Egyptian, Sumerian, Babylonian, Roman, English, Mayan, and Incan cultures, etc.

Sun worship is the basis for major religions today, even if it has been corrupted or its foundation has been obscured or lost. For instance, Jews have their ancient temples constructed to honour the sun and the Zodiac.

One characteristic of sun worship is that everything hinges on the resurrection of the rising sun. The sun gives warmth and life according to their beliefs. That is why there are so many legends of dying/rising gods. Candidates for the third degree of Freemasonry play the part of Hiram Abiff in a drama. The candidate, like Abiff, is raised from the grave, symbolizing the dying/rising god legends.

Christians honour Jesus, the Son of God, who takes the place of the physical sun. Even the name EAST-er SUN-day for Christianity gives away its basis. Thomas Paine noted that:

[T]he Christian religion is a parody on the worship of the Sun, in which they put a man whom they call Christ, in the place of the Sun, and pay him the same adoration which was originally paid to the Sun.

It should be stressed here that the Magi of Persia were also sun worshipers, which demonstrates that the invention of the story about the visit of the three Magi at the birth of Jesus was added to the account contained in the New Testament. This addition happened some time after Constantine made Christianity orthodox and included sun worship in the Christian religion. In Celtic tradition, the direction east is also very significant. Druids worship the sun; Native Americans place great significance on sun dances; Eastern religions

highly respect the sun. Often, emperors were compared to the rising sun in ancient days of the Eastern world.

The “fire and brimstone” religions were started on Earth by the Anunnaki to control people. The Anunnaki are one of the most favoured races of Darkness. They emulate many of the characteristics of Darkness, of which the Power “Saa”, known on Earth as the Devil, is the epitome of Darkness’ expression.

Much of the work of the Divine has been focused on trying to retrieve the Devil (which has a mixture of Light and Darkness) and return him to the Principle of Light. However, the more love was poured into the Devil, the more the Devil exploited the Light, all the time pretending to respond, and forever resisting the Correction and becoming more and more polarized against the Light.

All the time the Devil has been pretending to the Divine God that the Light in him wants to return to the Principle of Light, and he insincerely begs the Principle of Light to “save” him, but all the while he was trying to extend his Father’s Empire. Regardless of whatever explanations are put forward, the fact that the extant *Bible* exalts the patriarchs of the Old Testament for fornication, murder, fraud, wanton destruction, persecution, war and other crimes shows that the editors of the extant *Bible* were influenced by the Devil. One such editor was Francis Bacon (also known as Saint Germain).

Darkness takes the energy from the Light Messengers and mingles their words with Its false message to further entrap people who sincerely seek the truth. This is seen in the cases of Moses, Jesus and many others.

Without the resurrection of Christ and without the Devil and the doctrine of sin and redemption, which are central to Christianity, the Church would collapse. Christianity is the epitome of a religion that demands a devil to continue.

Therefore, the birth of the Devil is crucial to the Principle of Darkness, which, in reality, is the God of this world. The force that is identified as the Devil was created by the Principle of Darkness to infect the whole Universal Dodecahedron (the Virtual Reality), and, most importantly, to resist correction down to the lowest levels, especially the human level.

Regardless of whatever explanations the apologists use to try to convince people, the many atrocities in the *Bible* that have been committed and attributed to God show that the Devil has been extremely active and effective in influencing the writing and editing of the extant *Bible*. The Devil is still active today in influencing people to continue to justify the horrendous acts of the patriarchs and to try to prove that the GHOUL of the Old Testament is the True God – the Creator of the Principle of Light. The Jews and Christians are not alone in this. The Devil has been at work in many other religions for the same purpose. This is the fulfilment of one of the main purposes of the Devil, that is, to make Darkness look like the True Light. In other words, the majority of the people in this world have been fooled into worshipping the Father of the Devil.

The Church has erred, but the Church will not take Correction from the Principle of Light, nor even from the Unmanifest (True Divine God). It has listened to the Devil, which influenced the Church to implement the Crusades and the Inquisitions, among other atrocities. The Church should apologize for the persecution and murder of all the Church's innocent victims whose views of God differed from those sanctioned by the Church. The Church tries to act like God and dictates what is right and what is wrong – what constitutes heresy and what is holy. The Church is a usurper, just like its main influencer, the Devil, and, ultimately, the Principle of Darkness.

Alas, the Church will not apologize because it will not admit fault, which is typical of the Devil. The Church has housed the Devil. Its conquering and persecuting acts evidence this clearly.

Regardless of what explanations the Church gives about the Eucharist, the Church has erred and made a mockery of Christ and the True God. Jesus did not want anything resembling the Eucharist, symbolic or otherwise. The whole ritual of symbolically eating the flesh of Jesus is cannibalistic, and horribly offensive to the True Light. The vampiric ritual of drinking the blood of Jesus is repulsively demonic. Only a ghoul would favour such sickening rituals. Only the Anti-Christ would want others to mock Jesus in such a way, week-after-week in “holy” communion. Only the bloodthirsty ghoul who pretends to be a loving god would instigate and spread such gory rituals to contaminate the innocence of “children”, whilst simultaneously rewarding the overt demons with the putrid “pleasures” of the Eucharist. It is no wonder that some people express such love for the Eucharist because they feel empowered by devouring the flesh of Jesus and quaffing His blood.

The eating of flesh and drinking of blood of animals and humans who have been conquered is an ancient custom in many cultures. It is still done in many societies, whether overtly or discreetly, by those who worship the Devil. Many Christians are sickened by customs that require ritual drinking of animal blood, yet they have been so programmed by the Church that they accept the symbolic drinking of Jesus’ blood as a “holy” sacrament. In reality, the ritual of the Eucharist was implemented under the Devil’s influence to attempt to signify a supposed conquest over Christ by Darkness. It is a celebration of a victory that Darkness will never have. Those who sincerely love Jesus have been deceived into partaking in the Devil’s pleasure of mocking the Christ. The Church has become the Devil’s tool.

The Church has repeated the lie of the Eucharist so frequently and fervently that the followers are thoroughly desensitized to the point that such gory images and re-enactments do not even bother them. In fact, they have been brainwashed to believe that such sacrilege is in fact sacred. Here is another case

where the Devil has made demonic acts appear godly.

The Church also hangs crosses with an effigy of Jesus being crucified throughout cathedrals, and has encouraged people to wear jewellery with the cross displayed, often gruesomely containing the effigy of Jesus. The Church says this is to remind the followers that Jesus died on the cross for their sins. If Jesus had actually died for the sins of the world, there would not be any more sin in the world. But, the sins continue, irrespective of people's religious beliefs.

Hitler knew that when a lie is repeated often enough, it will soon be accepted as truth. He learned this from closely observing the world, especially the Church.

Just as the Australian Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, has apologized to the indigenous people of Australia for past atrocities of former governments, so too should Pope Benedict XVI (Ata-i-lek) apologize to all the descendants of innocent people who have been persecuted, tortured, and murdered by agents of the Church (sometimes on direct orders of past Popes) for heresy through the Inquisitions, and for many other atrocities committed by the Church in the name of God.

The Christ Energy has manifested on Earth many times and has kept close tabs on the Devil, in lifetime after lifetime. This has kept the Devil in check, and he is about to be checkmated!

The Devil, in exchange for being in close proximity to the Christ, derives energy that sustains him. The Christ Energy has learnt the Devil's inner-most, protected secrets, which has eased the Rescue Mission and made it less traumatic and as painless as possible for all concerned.

In many lifetimes, Christ (the Divine Mother) has poured love into the Devil knowing he would not change, but, all the while, hoping on the off chance that the Devil would respond to True Love. But the Devil only pretends to respond to the Light and is ultimately trying to use the Light for his own

nefarious purposes. It is clear, at this final stage of the Rescue Mission, that the Devil will not respond to the Christ Energy. He continues to lie, shirk responsibility, deny his own doings, and remains as defiant and irresponsible as he was from his beginning, when he was born of Darkness.

Human beings have given the Devil more power by giving him energy, which further energized him in the minds and expressions of humans in the Virtual Reality, where things are illusory and magical. That is, however unwittingly it might be occurring, humans have helped to energize the Devil. The main vehicle the Devil uses for sucking this energy is through fear.

The force of the Devil is not as strong on other planets, where the Devil is not such an issue. Humans have been created and developed to build up the force of the Devil on the Earth. The evil force is built up here by humans through wars, xenophobia, ignorance, cultural and religious divisions. It is also built up by geological and geographical separation so that connectivity is limited. Continental separation via water separates land masses and further deteriorates the human condition.

The Earth is the Devil's favourite "home", where the evil force has been built up over time. Venomous plants, insects, reptiles and other forms of poison permeate the Earth. Fierce carnivores also populate the planet. Dangerous weather conditions and natural disasters abound. All of these serve to threaten and harm people and all the inhabitants of the planet. The harsh conditions cause humans to turn to "god" for security and protection and to fear the Devil. The fear of the Devil's work often causes people to appease him by building temples dedicated to him (under whatever name the temples occur) and offering sacrifices, human and otherwise. Wars are, in fact, a form of mass sacrifice and offerings of blood to the ghoul who fathered the Devil. That is why there will always be war as long as the Devil and his Father are in control of their Virtual Reality. This is why the whole Virtual Reality has to be completely dismantled.

The Devil seeks order and obedience through death, which is in absolute opposition to life and openness. The food chain assures that every living thing must prey on other living things for survival. This is a way of ensuring suffering and death. This is why the Light cannot work with what is in this realm of Darkness. That is, the very foundation of biological life and all other matter is so corrupted and saturated with evil that it cannot be sustained in the True-Light Creation.

Religions and other philosophies have no real answer to the reality of suffering in this world. Therefore, they have come up with various explanations such as the explanation that people suffer in order to learn lessons, to strengthen themselves, to learn to appreciate good things etc. Another fraudulent explanation is that suffering is due to karma. All these are lies created by the Devil. Those who have taken the bait, and those who are agents of Darkness, spread these lies and ignorance to make sure that others who do not know any better will repeat them to others so that the lies will become accepted as truth. (Contrary to popular belief that karma is just and fair, it was created by the evil Lords of Karma under the direction of Darkness to be a biased and unfair system of rewards and punishments. This unjust system is no longer being administered by the Lords of Karma and it is now operating irrationally).

It is the Principle of Darkness who declares Itself to be the people's "god" and has spawned this scheme of deception through the Devil. The scheme is to get people to repeat and maintain the lies by unending repetition of them, so that Its deception can be concealed, and Its evil system maintained and sustained as people accept their lot in life and strive to reach the falsely promised land. Their ignorance leads them on the wide path of destruction as they unwittingly follow Darkness.

The Devil was created to bring about the worship of the Demiurge, the Principle of Darkness. This is in contradiction to the Unmanifest, the True

Divine God, who does not seek worship, control or servitude.

Without all of the lies and deception about suffering and death, the Devil could not convince anyone that a hateful, war-mongering, lustful, ghoul is loving. Without the Devil's activities, most people would eventually come to the conclusion that the "god" in control of this world is actually a ghoul. Thus, the Devil has taken the heat off "god" so that the Principle of Evil can look relatively good, when compared to the straw man It constructed (the Devil).

The idea of a celestial rebellion in heaven is an attempt to try to mould "god" into an authoritarian figure. This is another example of Darkness trying to make the Principle of Light look dark, whilst all the while it is the Principle of Darkness who favours authoritarian rule.

The Devil has influenced humans into believing that they were created in the image of God, with emotions and other godly traits. This is false teaching designed to make the ghoul in charge of this world appear loving in human eyes.

Darkness has given out many false messages on the planet through Its agents, and deceived many into thinking It is the True-Light God. It has moulded the image of God.

Gnostic thoughts are so corrupted now because they have been infiltrated and influenced by beings of Darkness. Philosophies, too, have been infiltrated by Darkness.

The Devil is constantly tempting and taunting True-Light beings to weaken their Will in the hope that they will succumb to Darkness. Ironically, the Devil's hidden secrets have weakened his "troops" because distrust has become the norm of his own operation. The "otherness" that I have earlier discussed has developed into full-blown xenophobia.

The Devil jealously guards his power, and will not risk a true alliance with anyone. Hence, the Devil's agents are secretive and distrusting of others.

The Devil belongs to the Principle of Darkness (Evil). His personal will, wishes and intents are on the side of Evil. Satan occupies the position of a celestial accuser and tempter by “god’s” order. Indeed, “satan”, which means “accuser”, is a title, which has aptly become a name fit for the Devil.

The Devil is everything that evil expresses in nature and human events. It plays both sides, usually expressing misogynistic tendencies, but it can also be misanthropic. He favours patriarchal societies, but allows some matriarchal ones. He prefers polygamy, but allows polyandry when it suits him. He is cavalier, opportunistic, ruthless, angry, belligerent, bellicose, vindictive and untrusting of everyone. When the Devil is on his own, he becomes confused, depressed and filled with self-pity. The Devil is a miserable, suicidal, murderous, mentally unstable being. He is out to get everyone and everything in his way. He blames everyone and everything for his predicament and takes no responsibility for his own actions.

Satan, who was later defined as “god’s” sworn arch enemy, is a true statement only when considering he is the enemy of the Christ Energy. In other words, the ghoul who bore the Devil pretends to be the True God and pretends to fight with Its chosen One, the Devil. Thus, the Son of God that the Church often refers to is not Christ, but, in fact, it is the Devil. The Church has tricked people into worshipping the Devil by manipulating the image of Christ, and has usurped the name of “Christ” to honour the Devil’s Father as the True God. That is why the Church jealously attacks and sponsors murder of those who are awakening to the truth of this world. Sadly, so many sincere people have been deceived by this evil trap.

The Devil, far from being the personification of repressed, unconscious drives as Freud proposed, that is, inventions of the repressed unconscious, is in fact a real being.

The Evil Principle suspected that the True God is not omniscient, so It

kept doing what It could and wanted to do. Contrary to common belief, the True God, the Unmanifest, is Absolute Good, but God is not strictly perfect, not strictly omnipotent, and certainly not omniscient.

God is perfectly good, but certainly not perfect in the unrealistic sense that humans have perceived that It ought to be. Humans have constructed an all-powerful, all-knowing, morally good God, which is totally absurd.

If God were omnipotent, It could eliminate all traces of evil and put things back as if evil had never occurred (however, Evil has set up such a situation that to do this would jeopardize even more Light particles than are currently at risk – such is the putrid scheme of Evil). For the above stated reasons, this cannot be done by an Absolute Good God, which therefore renders God, in this unique situation, not strictly omnipotent. God is the highest power there is and has the power to eradicate evil forever, which It is doing in a way consistent with a loving, good God.

If God were omniscient, then everything would be known before anything occurred. If that were the case, then God would have known that evil was being facilitated and that evil would flourish, which would in turn cause tremendous suffering to beings who were in no way responsible for the evil, but were innocent victims of it. The only type of God who could be omniscient in a world where there is evil is an evil God.

An omniscient God would really have no purpose because if everything were known, there would be no point in doing anything, nor would there be anything to do. In effect, God would only be able to do things to occupy Itself. It would be like playing solitaire with a stacked deck, going through the motions just to have something to do. For everything to be predestined as Augustine proposes, the realm would have to be governed by an omniscient being – an evil being.

That is why the Rescue Mission was implemented – to retrieve every True-Light particle that desires to return to the Principle of Light.

Chapter 18

Conclusion

The Devil is real. It is more than just the most powerful symbol of evil known to the Western world.

The Devil is the most powerful manifestation of the Evil Principle/Evil Mind. It is the personification of the abstract idea of evil. It is the projection of the Evil Mind which controls this dimension, this universe, and the entire Universal Dodecahedron known as the Virtual Reality. The Devil is the Anti-Christ.

Russell aptly pointed out that the Devil is the hypostasis, the apotheosis, the objectification of a hostile force or hostile forces perceived as external to our conscious.

Even if theism cannot survive without the Devil, the proof of the existence of the Devil need not rest solely on the proof of the existence of God and vice versa.

Any world view that ignores or denies the existential horror of evil is false, and anyone who believes in such doctrines is deluded and deceived. The view itself is evil. Anyone who continuously and deliberately denies the reality of evil amid the unceasing suffering in the world is in denial due to ignorance, fear or for other reasons. Denying the existence of evil will not eradicate it. Instead, denial of evil will strengthen evil and allow it unrestrained expression. Those who deny evil actually become accomplices to evil.

The Devil can take on different physical forms at any time and it can also “incarnate” as a human being or possess a human being. The Devil has “incarnated” in the physical many times, and he is now in a physical body in a relatively insignificant position by worldly standards. Sometimes, he/she/it takes

on the appearance of being a benevolent ruler, sometimes he appears to produce beautiful art, while other times his true self expresses total brutality. The Devil intentionally confuses the issue of his existence so that most people will not take him seriously. Those who are fooled by his deception as to his existence are in the same category as those who deny evil. Those who cannot conceive of the reality of absolute evil, or Its representative – the Devil – cannot resist either!

The Devil has tried to take on the cloak of Christ to pretend to be divine. He can pretend to be loving, but he cannot truly love because he is the embodiment of evil. Love is an expression of the Divine Essence. The Devil is opposed to all Divine Essences.

Another thing Christian theology appears to claim is that the Devil is not a free agent and that he is under the control of God, his creator. This makes sense when one accepts that the Principle of Evil is the “God” of this Virtual Reality and the creator of the Devil. With this in mind, the book of *Job* makes a lot of sense. That is, Job is being tested by his “God” of Evil, and his “God’s” agent, the Devil (Satan). Neither the Unmanifest (the True God of Light) nor the Principle of Light puts people through tests or suffering. Only a jealous, insecure ghoulish will test for or demand blind loyalty, obedience and servitude.

Commentators have wondered where the iniquity in Satan came from. There is little to wonder about once it is realized that the creator of Satan is the Principle of Evil, who has made the Devil in Its image. That is, full of bias and iniquity. Once the real “parent” of Satan is identified, the “holy” trinity is understood. That is, the “father” is the Demiurge (the Principle of Evil), the “son” is the Devil (the most favoured agent of the Demiurge), and the “holy ghost” is the illusory force the Principle of Evil puts on by pretending to be the Divine Force of the Unmanifest.

The Devil has been referred to by many as the “prince of darkness”, which is an aptly applied title. That is, the Devil is the heir apparent of the Principle of

Darkness (the King of Darkness). The “father” must now be very concerned because It has taught Satan so well that he could well attempt to usurp Darkness and ascend the Evil Throne.

This dimension is run by Evil’s controller – the Devil. There will be a rectification of the Problem of Evil. Light will soon triumph over Darkness. The beings of Light will be separated from the beings of Darkness once the rectification is completed. The rectification is now in its final stages.

The Divine Correction, which entails the removal of the polarity against the Light, has been offered repeatedly to the Error (Darkness/the Principle of Evil), but the Principle of Darkness has steadfastly refused Correction. Instead, the Error went on Its own and created Its own Virtual Reality, the material world and the Devil, among other things.

The Unmanifest knew that the Devil most probably would not take correction of the polarity, but in the hopes that the Light within the Devil might respond to love, It has poured an enormous amount of love into the Devil. Unfortunately, the Devil has only pretended to respond to love and will have to be left behind when the Rescue Mission is completed.

Those left behind are following Darkness’ resistance to Divine Correction of the Error. Everyone and everything, including the Devil and Darkness Itself, are given the opportunity to accept the Correction. Unfortunately, Darkness and Its Devil have repeatedly rejected the Correction and have lured many to follow them. Many have chosen Darkness as their God. Regrettably, most people have done just that.

The Light will triumph. The viable beings of Light will be liberated from Darkness and they will be returned to the Kingdom of Light, where they will finally be re-connected with their True Divine Source.

I Shall Soon Gather All That Are Mine

Bibliography

- Anshen, R. N. *The Reality of the Devil: Evil In Man*, Harper & Row Publications, New York, 1972.
- Atwater, P.M.H. "Illusions of Perceptions," *New Dawn*, Nov-Dec 1997.
- Augustin *City of God* trans, Henry Bettenson, Penguin Books, New York, 1972.
- Baab, O. *The Theology of the Old Testament* Abingden Press, New York, 1949.
- Bakan, D. *The Duality of Human Existence*, Rand McNally & Co., Chicago, 1966.
- Bamberger, B. J. *Fallen Angels*, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1952.
- Bareau, A. *En Suivant Bouddha* Phillippe. Leband, Paris, 1985.
- Beyschlag, W. *New Testament Theology* trans. Neil Buchanan T & T Clark, Edinburgh, I, 95, 1995.
- Birkeland, H. *Die Feinde des Individuums in der israelitischen Psalm enliteratur*, Grndahl & Sons, 1933.
- Boecker, H. J. *Law and the Administratyion of Justice in the Old Testament and Ancient Near East*, Angsbury, Minneapolis, 1980.
- Bunyon, J. *The Holy War*, Wm. M. Smith ed., Moody press, Chicago, 1948.
- Burrows, M. *An Outline of Biblical Theology*, Westminister Press, Philadelphia, 1946.
- Calvin, J. *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians* trans. William Pringle, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1948.
- Campbell, J. *The Masks of God*, Souvenir Press, London, 1974.
- Cavindish, R. *The Power of Evil*, G.P. Putnams's & Son, New York, 1975.
- Chafer, L. S. *Sytemic Theology*, Dallas Seminary Press, Dallas, 1947.
- Charlesworth, J.H. ed., *The Old Testament*, trans. E. Isaac, Pseudepigrapha: Enoch, New York, 1983.
- Cheyne, A. *Every Man's Talmud*, E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York, 1949.
- Comfort, S. *The Methodist Review* in "Existence and Fallen Satan," Vol, 1838, T. Mason

& C. Lane, New York.

Conner, W. T. *Revelation and God*, Broadman Press, Nashville, 1936.

Daniélou, J. *A History of early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea*, London, 1973.

Descartes, S.R. *The Philosophical Works of Descartes*, trans. eds, Haldane ES. & Ross GRT, Cambridge University Press, 1968.

De Rougemont, D. *The Devil's Share*, trans. Hoakon Chevalier, Bellington, Washington, D.C., 1952.

Dostoevsky, F. *The Brothers Karamazovi*, New York, 1936.

Eliade, M. *A History of beliefs and Religious Ideas Vol I*, University of Chicago press, Chicago, 1955.

Emory, T. *The Works of the Reverend John Wesley*, B. Waugh & T. Mason, New York, 1835.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E. *Theories of primitive Religions*, University press, Oxford, 1965.

Forsyth, N. *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1987.

Gimbutas, M. The Indo-Europeans: Archaeological problems, *American Anthropologist*, 1965.

Gray, W.G. *The Tree of Evil*, Samuel Weiser, Inc., Me. USA, 1984.

Haag, H. *Teulelsplanbe*, Katzmann, Tübingen, 1974.

Hayes, V. C. *Schelling's Philosophy of Mythology and Revelation*, The Australian Association for the Study of Religions, University of New England, Armadale, N.S.W. 1995.

Heinisch, P. *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans, Wm. G. heidt, The North Central Publishing Company, Minniapolis, 1955.

Henning, W. B. 'The Book of Giants', *Bulletin of oriental and African Studies* XI, 1943-6.

Hordern, W. *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology*, The Macmillian Co., New York, 1955.

Humphrey, H. *Soul Searching*, Chatto & Windas, London, 1995.

Husserl, E. *Cartesian Meditations*, Martinus Nijhoff, 1977.

- Hyde, M. & McGuinness, M. *Jung*, London Books, Cambridge, 1992.
- Joad, G. E. M. *Good and Evil*, Faber & Faber Ltd., London, 1942.
- Jacobson, M. *Science*, 7. February, 1969.
- Jonas, H. *The Gnostic Religion*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1963.
- Kaiser, O. *Isaiah 13-39: A Commentar 13-39: A Commentary*, London, 1974.
- Kelly, H. A. *The Devil, Demonology and Witchcraft*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1968.
- King, A.R. *The Problem of Evil*, The Ronald Press Co., New York, 1952.
- Knight, D.A. "Cosmogony and order in the Hebrew Tradition" Robin W. Lovinled's *Cosmogony and Ethical order*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1985.
- Knudson, A. C. *The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament*, Abingdon Press, New York, 1918.
- Langton, E. *Sataan : A Portrait*, Skeffington & Son, London, 1945.
- Larousse, *Encyclopedia of Mythology*, Hamlyn Publishing Group Ltd., London, 1968.
- Lewis, C. S. *The Screwtape Letters*, The Mcmillen Co., New York, 1950.
- Link, L. *The Devil: A Mask Without a face*, Reaktin Books, London, 1995.
- Martin, M. *Atheism: A Philosophical Justification*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1990.
- Mason, P. C. "Devil and St. Anselm" *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, 9, 1978.
- Massaliè, G. *A History of the Devil*, Rodansha International, New York, 1996.
- McCasland, S. V. *By the Finger of God*, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1961.
- Meuleau, M. & Pietri, L. "Le Morde et son histoire," Vol 1: le Monde antiq et les débuts du Moyen Age Robert Laffont, Paris, 1987.
- Minear, P. *The Kingdom and the Power*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia Press, 1950.
- Murison, R. G. "The Serpent in the Old testament," *American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature*, xxi, Jan, 1905.
- Murphree, W. "Can Theism Survive Without the Devil?" *Religious Studies* 21, 1985.

- Myers, F. W. H. *Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death*. Vol 1&2, Langmans Green & Co., New York, 1954.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Demonology of the Old Testament," *The Expositor*, Seventh Series, III, 318, 1907.
- Origen, *Contra Celsum*, trans. H. Chadwick, Cambridge, 1953.
- Paine, T. *The Age of Reason*, Doubleday, New York.
- Pagels, E. *The Origin of Satan*, Vintage Books, New York, 1996.
- Piaget, J. *Play, Dreams and Imitation in Childhood*, Eng.tr. New York & London, 1951.
- Pike, J. *The other Side*, Doubleday Co. Inc., New York, 1968.
- Plantinga, A. C. *The Ontological Argument*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1965.
- Plantinga, A. C. "The Probabilistic Problem From Evil," *Philosophical Studies* 35: 1-53, 1979.
- Popper, K. R. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Harper Torch Books, 1957.
- Randles J. & Hough, P. *The Afterlife*, Berkley Books, New York, 1993.
- Read, L. H. *How We Get the Bible*, Deseret Book Co., Salt Lake City, Utah, 1985.
- Redfield, R. "Primitive World View," in Redfield, ed., *The Primitive World and Its Transformations*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1953.
- Revard, S. P. *The War In Heaven*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca & London, 1980.
- Robinson, W. *The Devil and God*, Abingdon Press, 1945.
- Robinson, W. *The Cross in the Old Testament*, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1955.
- Rucimen, S. *The Medieval Manichees*, At the University Press, Cambridge, 1947.
- Rudwin, M. *The Devil in Legion and Literature*, Open Court Publishing Co., 1931.
- Russell, B. *A History of Western Philosophy*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1964.
- Russell, J. B. *The Devil: Principle of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 1977.
- Russell, J. B. *The Prince of Darkness*, Cornell University Press, 1988.

- Rowley, H. H. *The Unity of the Bible*, The Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., London, 1953.
- Schieiermacher, F. *The Christian Faith*, trans.by H.R. Mackintosh & James Stewart, 2nd ed., T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1882.
- Schmid, H. H. "Creation, Righteousness and Salvation," B.W. Anderson ed., *Creation in the Old Testament*, Fortress, Philadelphia, 1984.
- Scholem, G. *Kabbalah*, New American Library, New York, 1974.
- Schopenhauer, A. *The World As Will and Representations*, Dover, 1966.
- Schouweiler, T. *The Devil*, Greenhaven press, Inc., San Diego, California, 1992.
- Schultz, H. *Old Testament Theology*, trans, J. A. Patterson, T. & T. Clark, 1892.
- Seidel, G. *Angels*, Peter Lang Publishing Inc., New York, 1995.
- Simpson, D. C. "Tobit," *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* Ed. by H. Charles, Clarendon press, Oxford, 1913.
- Smith, J. Z. "What a Difference a Difference Make," in Jacob Nensner and Earnest S. Frerich, eds. *To see Ourselves as Others see us*, Christian Jews, "others" in Late Antiquity Scholars Press, Chico, California, 1985.
- Smith M. & Pager,L. *Michael Remembers*, Letters Inc., London, 1980.
- Spong, J. S. *The Hebrew Lord*, Harper, San Francisco, 1993.
- Stanford, A. *Eliminating and Solving the Problem of Evil*, Xeeatwelve, Stanthorpe, 2008.
- Stanford, P. *The Devil: A Biograph*, Henry Holy & Co., New York, 1996.
- Stauder, T. R. "Psyche and Society: Freud, Jung and Levi-Strauss from Depth Psychology to Depth Sociology," *Theory and Society*, 1976.
- Strauss, D. F. *The Life of Jesus*, trans. By George Eliot, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London, 1848.
- Tefler, W. *Cyril of Jerusalem and nemesius of Emesa*, Lecture II, 4, London, 1955.
- Tompkin, P. & Bird, C. *Secret Life of Plants*, Penguin Ltd., Middlesex, England, 1979.
- Trachtenberg, J. *The Devil and the Jews*, Philadelphia, 1953.
- Tremmel, W. C. *Dark Side*, CBP Press, St. Louis, Missouri, 1987.

Urmson, J. O. & Ree, J. *The Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophies*, Routledge, New York, 1991.

Wadel, T. O. The Epistle to the Ephesians. *The Interpreter's Bible*, Abingdon Press, New York, 1953.

Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel according to St. John II*, John Murray, London, 1908.

Wing, R. L. *The Tao of Power*, Doubleday, London, 1986.

Woolf, L. B. *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther*, Lutterworth Press, London, 1952.