

1955

Today's Climate of Opinion Order, the Philosophic Basis of Natural Law

Edward S. Dore

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Edward S. Dore, *Today's Climate of Opinion Order, the Philosophic Basis of Natural Law*, 24 Fordham L. Rev. 519 (1955).

Available at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol24/iss4/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in Fordham Law Review by an authorized editor of FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. For more information, please contact tmelnick@law.fordham.edu.

TODAY'S CLIMATE OF OPINION

ORDER, THE PHILOSOPHIC BASIS OF NATURAL LAW*

EDWARD S. DORE†

A LEARNED Scottish coroner, a doctor of medicine, held an inquest in a small sea girt town in Scotland on a man who had evidently shot himself. The body was found with a revolver in one hand and one chamber empty. The jury foreman urged that the man had plainly shot himself. But the learned doctor, a friend of the deceased, well known, and highly respected in the town for his great learning, assured and reassured the jury that the dead man had fallen into the sea. After three-quarters of an hour debate, the jury returned and solemnly handed up its verdict:—"Found drowned." Contrary to all the obvious factual evidence, that verdict was based upon a local climate of opinion created in the jury room that so learned a man as the doctor could not be wrong; it involved, too, a great deal of credulity on the jury's part.

In 1945 at Yalta, three men sat down around a table shortly before the end of the second World War with tens of millions in casualties and billions in treasure lost. In that war at the time of the meeting, the three were about to be militarily successful over their common enemy. The aim was to make agreements that would achieve lasting peace.

Today, ten years after Yalta with no peace, we know how disastrous were the decisions there made. The agreements inviting Stalin into West Europe and Manchuria were based, as was the coroner's jury's verdict on a false climate of opinion; viz., in the Yalta case, on the factually baseless opinion that Stalin could be appeased and could be trusted. Like the Scottish jury's verdict, that climate of opinion rested on a false assumption, accepted on the alleged learning of experts against overwhelming factual evidence to the contrary. It also involved an almost unbelievable credulity.

* Address delivered December 29, 1953, Los Angeles, California, under the auspices of His Eminence James Francis Cardinal McIntyre and Loyola University Law School at the Second Archdiocesan Natural Law Institute of Los Angeles, as revised for publication.

The address was secured at the request of the late Professor I. Maurice Wormser, who recommended it for publication in the Fordham Law Review.

† At the time of the address, Associate Justice, Appellate Division, Supreme Court, First Dept., New York, now retired.

I speak of another climate of opinion even more important for our lives, our liberties, our property, and our peace; and, if continually accepted, more disastrous to mankind than the climate of opinion that led to Yalta and Potsdam; indeed, it was a vital contributing factor in those ruinous decisions. What is it?

Gladstone, Prime Minister of England, writing in 1870 on the then mood of self-confidence arising from man's mantling pride in scientific achievement, perfecting life's material apparatus, said:

"I am convinced that the welfare of mankind does not now depend on the state and the world of politics: the real battle is being fought in the world of thought, where a deadly attack is being made with great tenacity of purpose over a wide field upon the greatest treasure of mankind, the belief in God and the Gospel of Christ."¹

Over eighty years ago, Gladstone thus saw the beginning of today's climate of opinion, an outcome of the doctrine that "science" and purely materialistic "evolution" explain all, that God, the soul, the moral law and natural law are no longer necessary.

The attack that Gladstone prophesied has been conducted with tremendous tenacity of purpose and energy. So effective has been this propaganda, spread by newspapers, magazines and books; and by Soviet atheistic Communism and its fellow travelers; and basically taught in many institutions of learning by those who have control of a great part of our educational system, that many average men, thinking of the benefits to mankind of material science and technology, accept the slogans and the assumptions of that propaganda without thought or examination, almost as axioms, on feeling and mood rather than on any real process of thought or reason.

Among these basic slogans are: believe what you see; the invisible is unreal; only facts ascertainable and measurable directly by the senses in laboratories are objectively true; therefore, abandon religious faith that still demands you believe what you do not see and asks that you accept the invisible as also real.

Let us study some of the ideas that influence modern man to accept this climate of opinion on issues that affect all our thinking and ultimately all our lives. Do not think it unimportant because it concerns mere ideas. Ideas rule mankind. An idea burning in the mind of a German corporal stampeded a great nation, among the foremost in modern educational and technological progress, into the tyranny called Nazism. An idea leaping from the minds of Kant and Hegel and landing in the minds of Marx, Lenin and Stalin created the modern intellectual mood that gave birth to the philosophy of Communism based on determinism. All our modern inventions were originally mere ideas in the minds of men. Ideas rule the world of men. And, basically, ideas widely accepted and preached

1. Magnus, Gladstone 229 (1954).

by modern positivists and materialists, move men to accept a whole world of unreality ultimately based on credulity that flies in the face of reason and experience.

At the outset, this climate of thought suggests to the modern man to look at what religion demands of men; namely acceptance of God, grace and the sacraments whose spiritual forces are invisible; whereas "science" and "evolution" teach one to accept what one sees. Let us test that slogan first in the physical order.

Science tells us that the earth is a ball about 25,000 miles in circumference moving around the sun in an elliptical orbit through space at an almost incredible speed, and, simultaneously, spinning on its axis at about a thousand miles an hour. Think of the power, the *physical* force necessary to start and keep moving a sphere of that size through space at such speed.* Is that tremendous force visible? Obviously not. Is it real? Obviously yes.

Think of the power, the *physical* power necessary to spin a ball of that magnitude on its axis at 1,000 miles an hour every hour. Is that force visible? It is as invisible as grace; but demonstrably it is most real.

That is but one example out of many of the tremendous invisible but real *physical* forces in the solar system alone. What is true of the earth is true of all the other planets and their satellites in that system. Each moves in an orbit around the sun, or, if a satellite around the planet it serves, as the moon does the earth. The physical forces that move each and all are utterly invisible, and indeed directly not reached by any of our five senses. Clearly they are nevertheless in the physical order, tremendously real,—more real and more powerful than any visible physical force we know on earth.

Consider the tides. Every six hours each drop of navigable water in the world receives a force that moves it, at first outward toward the ocean for six steady hours of continued and ever increasing power. Then the whole mass, millions of tons stop in the flow for about an hour and remain still. Then each particular drop receives another impulse, and answers it with feudal obedience, moving it, this time in the opposite direction, back into all the harbors, bays straits and navigable waters of the world, thus daily purifying the tarnished shores of men. Think of the power, the *physical* power, necessary to move such masses of matter. Think of the power necessary to stop such masses of moving liquid in their momentum, and then move them back again at the same speed for another six hours. Has anybody ever *seen* that force? Has anyone ever directly observed that tremendous power by any of the senses? Its *effects*, of course, are visible; the waters move; but in itself the power that moves them is as invisible as grace. But it is real.

* Italics supplied throughout.

One day a man was lying under an apple tree taking a light nap. One of the apples, having reached full maturity, fell from the tree, struck the man on the nose and awakened him to what had happened. Any number of apples had dropped on any number of human heads before that day, but nobody had asked why. Newton, however, did, and after long and painstaking thought and observation, Newton discovered the law of gravity, an utterly invisible but tremendously real force.

In my living room in New York about a month or so ago, I turned on the radio and I clearly heard an orchestra playing a magnificent aria from one of the great operas. It was so good I listened to the end to learn whence it came. That beautiful music, I found, came all the way from Los Angeles, California, 3,000 miles from where I dwell. Since it reached me there, the sound obviously had been transmitted across the whole United States; and, therefore, there was a physical medium between California and me, an utterly invisible medium, but obviously very real; for I heard the opera as clearly as if I were in Los Angeles, 3,000 miles away.

Think of what any exchange of ideas through oral utterance means between men. However close we are, you do not see my mind, or I yours. We do not communicate directly from mind to mind by some sort of mental telepathy; but only indirectly by outward signs or signals. One human being with utterly invisible ideas in his mind transmits them to other human beings by means of outward signs, in oral utterance by sounds produced through a marvelous mechanism in the throat, carried through an *invisible* medium in the atmosphere and caught by equally marvelous mechanisms in the recipients' ears, and thence transmitted to their minds. The sound is the outward and audible sign of an inward and invisible thought (*sema, sematos*, from the Greek, a sign, or a signal, hence *semantics*). I often wonder that we marvel so much at radio and television. The primordial mystery is that you hear me. Once we agree on the outward signs, it is only a matter of increasing the force of transmission at one end and the power of receptivity at the other, to produce wireless telegraphy or telephone across the ocean or around the earth. You and I in this room are now communicating by a form of wireless telegraphy. By outward and audible signs alone, I transmit to you the inward and always invisible idea.

What I say of oral utterance and radio and television is true of every communication between man and man. All are in a certain sense sacramental. All have an outward and visible sign for the inward and invisible thing; just as the sacrament consists of the outward and visible sign for the inner and invisible grace. The thought, the idea, the most important part of the whole process, is invisible and remains so always. Our lives in every order, political, economic, social, biological, technologi-

cal,—repose on and are chiefly directed ultimately by thought, which, in itself, is invisible. Is it real?

Such are but a few of numerous examples that demonstrate that the most real, the most tremendous forces, in the *physical* world, are utterly invisible. Is it then reasonable to suggest that in the higher spiritual order, realities to be real must be physically immediately tangible by the senses? Is it not on the contrary a form of unconscious arrogance that man, a creature who gets first impressions of reality through five senses should assert dogmatically that there are no realities in life or the universe that his five senses cannot directly touch, feel, see, hear or measure? Does not this dogma contradict rational human experience and observation? Is it not an unproved dogmatic assumption destroyed by experience and observation?

But let us look again at this popular slogan that serves today's climate of opinion: believe what you see. On the south shore of Long Island at dawn of a glorious summer's day, I went to the edge of the sea and saw the sun rise from the ocean. It was one of those halcyon days:—no wind, no sound, no blade of beach grass quivered; all was silent, quiet, expectant. And then the wonder that Milton describes revealed itself before me:

“Right against the eastern gate,
Where the great Sun begins his state,
Robed in flames and amber light,
The clouds in thousand liveries dight. . . .”

There before my eyes the great orb of the sun lifted itself laboriously out of the sea; it rose above the horizon into the sky; and, as I watched during that wondrous day, it moved to the zenith, and then gradually sank into the west where it disappeared, a gorgeous ball of fire, below the western horizon. That is what I “saw.”

But what does science tell me about what actually happened? Science says the sun didn't rise at all. It was the earth moving on its axis at 1,000 miles per hour *toward* the sun that made the sun *appear* to rise out of the sea before my eyes. If I believe only what I see I should immediately object and say: “I beg your pardon, the most motionless thing in sight was the earth; it didn't move at all; it was utterly stationary; I saw it; not even a zephyr disturbed its surface.” But science assures me, and I accept it, that it *was* the earth that moved on its axis at 1,000 miles an hour and not the sun that moved above the sea.

So with other examples in the physical universe.

I do not see the physical force that moves the earth, the planets, the tides, that causes things to fall; I do not see the medium that sends me the beautiful sounds of an opera from Los Angeles to New York; I do not see the medium that connects me and my voice with your minds.

But, though as invisible as sanctifying grace, these things are real; and I have certitude of them, as I do of grace, in part at least, from the effects produced. Though I can't see them with my physical eye, I have certitude of their existence and objective reality. How irrational then it is to declare that nothing exists but what can be immediately seen or felt by our five senses. How irrational to say when so many purely *physical* forces are utterly invisible but real, that in the higher spiritual and intellectual order, to be real, all must be immediately tangible to the physical senses.

Grace, it is true, as its name implies, is something *gratis data*; i.e., freely given by God in a higher and entirely different order, the supernatural order; it is as invisible as the power that moves the earth and the tides; but that does not demonstrate it is unreal.

But that is not all. Not only are the slogans of today's climate of opinion misleading, but the basic idea underlying its whole intellectual structure contradicts reason as we use reason in every other order of life, especially in the scientific order. One day fairly recently, a famous non-believing scientist visited the Hayden Planetarium in New York City in company with a friend who was both religious and astute. After a long inspection of the marvelous machinery of the Planetarium which can project on the vaulted ceiling images of all the planets and thousands of the stars, and which can be set to reproduce the position and the motions of the heavenly bodies as of any moment in recorded time, the eminent scientist remarked: "That's really a wonderful piece of machinery. Do you know who designed it?" His religious friend, with a gleam in his eye, answered: "Oh, nobody designed it. It just happened."

Yet with an apparently straight face, the modern "rationalists," as they call themselves, ask us to believe that the actual starry heavens above us, the planets and all the stars with all their order, law, design, motion, beauty and splendor, are the result of pure chance, a purely mechanistic, materialistic evolution with no Mind whatever behind it all; that all evolved mechanically from what they call a "primordial protoplasm" in plain language:—gas—into the "army of unalterable law" moving through the skies at night. Think what that actually means as a rational process of thought! Think of the credulity involved in its acceptance!

Think of it in the light of what we know from scientific observation about the earth and other planets and satellites. In New York City on January 29, 1953, there was plainly visible a total eclipse of the moon. It was forecast to a second, the beginning, the progress of the occultation and the end. Remember that the earth moves in an *elliptical* orbit with obviously no visible thing to guide it on its fixed path in the midst of wide open space and at an almost incredible speed, and the moon revolves

around the earth in its own proper orbit and speed. Yet both move with such order and precision and the earth revolves with such orderly speed that the exact day, hour and second the earth will come between the sun and the moon so as to cause, in its transit on certain parts of the earth's surface, a complete occultation or eclipse of the moon, can be predicted with certitude years, even centuries, in advance. Think of what that means as evidence of orderly but utterly invisible power and law. And then think of the credulity, the unreasonable willingness to believe that all such demonstrable order is the result of chaos and blind chance, and not one chance but millions of chances all fortuitously cooperating to produce this wondrous system with no Mind to order and guide it! The man who believes that is indeed gullible. But is he "rationalistic"?

The modern mood of unbelief, ostensibly in the name of rationalism and even skepticism, tells us that all just "happened"; like Topsy it just "grewed" or evolved with no Mind to plan it, or to guide its evolution and development. All the order of the cosmos and the solar system, all the numerous forms of being and of life on earth from the lowest insect to the most magnificent specimens of the human race, all—they tell us—evolved mechanically by pure accident. That is the *basic* idea underlying what is called modern "rationalism," accepted by so many in today's climate of opinion on God and religion. But what irrational acts of faith that climate of opinion requires: myriads of laws producing with regularity and certainty identical results from the same causes,—but no lawgiver; millions or billions of individual and wonderful designs, inanimate and animate,—but no designer; order unbelievable in its beauty—but no orderer; the wondrous coordination of part to part, and of part to whole, of purpose to specific ends, all working together to maintain living beings with marvelous interrelation of tissue, structure and organs to function and purpose,—but no Person to create or design them; purpose without a Person; mathematics without a mathematician; mechanisms by the billion but no maker of any of them; life from non-life; plus out of minus! And all this is urged on men in the name of "rationalism" and as a substitute for God and religion.

Whitehead in "Science and the Modern World" discussing causality, says:

"The major assumption of all science or the study of the laws of nature is that there is an 'order' and consistency in nature. Without that, the patient effort of the scientist is futile, so much incoherent nonsense. Science to have meaning must assume or believe that 'facts' are correlative."

Whitehead adds:

"I do not think, however, that I have even yet brought out the *greatest contribution of Mediaevalism to the formation of the scientific movement*. I mean the inexpugnable belief that every detailed occurrence can be correlated with its antecedents in a

perfectly definite manner, exemplifying general principles. Without this belief the incredible labours of scientists would be without hope. It is this instinctive conviction, vividly poised before the imagination, which is the motive power of research:—that there is a secret, a secret which can be unveiled. How has this conviction been so vividly implanted in the European mind? When we compare this tone of thought in Europe with the attitude of other civilizations when left to themselves, there seems but one source for its origin. *It must come from the mediaeval insistence on the rationality of God*, conceived as with the personal energy of Jehovah and with the rationality of a Greek philosopher. Every detail was supervised and ordered: the search into nature could only result in the vindication of the faith in rationality.”²

Experimental science was born of an intellectual assent to the first article of the Creed. So William Temple says:

“It may be too much to argue, as some students of the subject have done, that science is a fruit of Christianity, but it may safely be asserted that it can never spontaneously grow up in regions where the ruling principle of the Universe is believed to be either capricious or hostile.”

No wonder Dr. Le Comte de Nuöy, himself an able scientist and mathematician, in his book “Human Destiny” says:

“Scientists who spend their life with the purpose of proving that it is purposeless constitute an interesting subject of study. . . .”

“There is nothing more irrational than a man who is rationally irrational. Once more we repeat that there is not a single fact or a simple hypothesis, today, which gives an explanation of the birth of life or of natural evolution.”³

He adds:

“It is not we, but the convinced materialist who shows a powerful, even though negative, faith, when he obstinately continues to believe, without any proof, that the beginning of life, evolution, man’s brain, and the birth of moral ideas will some day be scientifically accounted for. He forgets that this would necessitate the complete transformation of modern science, and that, consequently, his conviction is based on purely sentimental reasons.”⁴

But hardly anyone is more dogmatic than the modern materialist. The doctrine that long ages, eons, passages of time can explain all is contrary to scientific and human observation and experience everywhere. Experience demonstrates that the longer chaos without Mind continues, the worse it becomes, the more chaotic and disorderly; never, the more and more orderly.

Darwin himself admitted:

“This grand sequence of events the mind refuses to accept as the result of blind chance.”⁵

But as Lunn has pointed out with luminous clarity in “The Revolt Against

-
2. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* 18 (1947).
 3. Le Comte de Nuöy, *Human Destiny* 43 (1947).
 4. *Id.* at 134.
 5. Lunn, *The Revolt Against Reason* 97 (1951).

Reason," Darwin was not a logical thinker. For example, Darwin confesses that he is:

"... impressed by the impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including man, with his capacity for looking far backwards and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity. Thus reflecting, I feel compelled to look to a first cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a theist."⁶

As the distinguished philosopher, the late Professor J. S. Haldane said: "The existence of God must be the central feature in future developments of philosophy."

The illustrations I have given of order and invisible law are of course but a very few of the myriad that could be given and each one dwelt upon with specific detail until the mind spontaneously would utter the immortal line of the psalmist: "Thy testimonies, oh Lord, are become exceedingly credible": "*Testimonia Tua credibilia facta sunt nimis Domine!*"⁷ I have often wished that someone would write an encyclopedia on "The Credulity of Unbelief" in fifteen folio volumes, unabridged, with numerous charts, supplements and graphic illustrations. It would be a fascinating study; the material is ample.

Part of today's erroneous but popular climate of opinion is that religion relies on "faith" while science reposes on "facts"; and religious "faith" is therefore irrational and unnecessary. Let us first clarify our minds by defining our terms. Knowledge means *inter alia* direct first hand experience of the senses, e.g., the knowledge I have of your presence here before me by observing you with my own eyes. But such direct knowledge is not the only means to facts and to certitude. I have certitude that Tokyo exists though I have never been there and have no direct knowledge whatever of the place. I have such certitude, I know the *fact* on faith, that is, on the testimony of others who have reliably reported it to me. Accordingly, I deny that the opposite is true, that Tokyo does not exist. That certitude is not mere opinion. An opinion is merely a view; e.g., that it may rain tomorrow; in that there is neither knowledge nor certitude. But on the testimony of others determined on reasonable grounds to be reliable, i.e., on *faith* I can have firm certitude. And most of the facts of life are so known and accepted.

Almost the whole of human life reposes on faith. Here is a man doubled up by a pain in the middle of the night. He calls a doctor who writes a prescription, in very bad Latin, that the man can't read or understand. His son takes it to a druggist, a sickly looking person standing in front of all the poisons known to modern man. The druggist takes a little from one bottle and another, puts the selections in a capsule marked

6. Id. at 150-51.

7. Douay Version, The Holy Bible, Psalm 92 Verse 5, at 616.

"One, three times a day with a little water." Does the patient test it chemically or otherwise? Not at all! He swallows it with the same confidence he would a drink of milk from his mother.

The whole of history and all of geography in every part of the world that we have not personally visited is necessarily taken on faith; "the evidence of things unseen." No one of us has seen George Washington. But through reasonable faith we have firm *certitude*, and rationally so, of his existence and of his exploits. Such intimate facts as who our own mother and father are, necessarily must be taken on faith alone. That Lindberg flew alone to Paris is of course an act of faith with certitude firmly held by rational persons all over the world; no one was there for all that journey but Lindberg alone; all men, except Lindberg himself who alone "knows" the fact by the direct experience of his senses, accept the fact on faith, with complete and rational certitude. Now if faith is so absolutely necessary to live human life in every other order of our being, why in the name of reason and common sense may men say that faith is not necessary in the higher orders of life, in religion, in morals, in the things that relate to man's spiritual life?

The whole of life is filled with mystery in every order of being: physical, chemical, social, psychological, biological. We know the facts, but we don't know the ultimate "how" of the facts. I know that at my own volition I can raise my arm. But *how* do I raise my arm? What sort of "thing" is the idea in my mind? How is that "idea" transmitted through my central nervous system to the particular nerves that move the particular muscles necessary to raise my arm? How, by what precise sort of force or power do these messages and the muscles move so that the arm goes up when I will it? The most profound student of human biology must admit that the ultimate answer is, even in so simple an act, a mystery.

We are daily transforming the food we eat into our living bodies. That is demonstrable; for, if we cease to eat, we get thinner and thinner and finally physically die. Of course an expert can explain the various marvellous mechanisms and things within the human body, the wonderful organs and the acids and non-acids that with amazing accuracy are used in changing the food in the stomach and intestines so that it becomes something that can be assimilated and become a part of ourselves. But that process doesn't answer the ultimate "how." At some point in that assimilation, the bacon and eggs I ate for breakfast becomes a part of my living body, so that it obeys my central nervous system; I *feel* with it, and it is in truth a *living* part of *me*. I know the result, but I do not know the *how* of that mystery, anymore than I know the ultimate of how the eyes see or the ears hear, anymore than I can explain how a tiny acorn can grow into a mighty oak.

There is real evolution; and, in the final analysis, it is on such analogies that the plea for mechanistic and materialistic evolution rests. Obviously from the flopping baby in the cradle to the distinguished senator, the judge on the bench, the bishop on his throne, man evolves and changes. But who in his rational senses will say that such an orderly development, such a purposeful result can be the result of blind chance with no Mind to design, to guide and direct it? The pagan poet was much closer to the truth when he wrote, "Every single blade of grass proclaims the presence of God":—"Praesentemque refert quaelibet herba Deum!"

But what has all this to do with natural law? It has to do with the basis of natural law. Order is the philosophic basis of natural law. And from order the inference of an Orderer, the Author of natural law, is rationally irresistible. The universe is full of order and full of law, physical, moral, spiritual. Like the greatest forces and laws in the physical order, the moral and spiritual forces are in their own higher order equally invisible, but equally real. And what is happening to man on their denial in the middle of the twentieth century is a terrifying illustration of that truth.

Modern materialistic secularism, today's climate of opinion, began with a great promise of freedom for man. Man in the moral order was to be free from "the superstitions" of religion; in the political order he was to become free by the widespread use of the ballot; in the economic order he was to be free under *laissez faire*. That is what the propagandists taught; that is what they promised. What has man received? After a century and more of this new enlightenment and emancipation, we see in the middle of the twentieth century in the political and economic order the re-emergence, not in one place only but in many, of the ancient pagan absolute state, running all the way from complete state dictatorship, ownership and tyranny over man to the bureaucratic regulation of life by the state reappearing everywhere. In the economic order after a century of the greatest scientific progress, the multiplication of machines and the production of goods, mankind feels less secure than it has in centuries. Men are full of fear and uncertainty.

These modern teachers forgot that the freedom they demanded and sought in the political, economic and social order had its basis cut from under it by what they taught of the nature of man in the intellectual and spiritual order. If, as they taught, man is a mere animal, essentially no different from the other animals, the result of a mindless materialistic evolution, what basis is there *in reason* for not treating him as such, and using him as men do other things for any purpose their owners see fit? And is not *that* the very thing the modern atheistic tyrants are doing to modern man today?

If as they taught, there is no God, no soul, no Mind, no Person, no *Logos* by whom man and all things were made and to whom man as a

moral agent is ultimately responsible; if there is no objective moral order or natural law imposed on man by God for whose service man was made, here and hereafter, what basis is there for any inherent rights in man that the state or any one in power need respect? And is not *that* the teaching and practice of all our twentieth century terror?

If man is mere matter in motion, organized by an accident into what you call your father, your employer, your friend, as by another accident equally fortuitous, he might have been the mud under your feet, but essentially no different; if man has no purpose or aim beyond this secular world, why should he not be forced to serve the ends the inhuman totality of the state imposes on him as on a meaningless atom in a pile? And, if he won't conform, why should he not be "liquidated" so that Society's purpose may be achieved, that is, the ends those who have seized power intend to achieve?

Applying logically the modern climate of opinion, the modern dictators have merged the state with the whole community. It is no longer a separate *limited* thing; it is as wide, as broad, as deep as human life itself. The state is made part of the whole community as class or race or blood; it becomes the supreme end and object of human existence. In that theory, there is no other objective or end.

The Christian code cannot survive the Christian creed. Our age has revealed to poor mid-twentieth century man, "the heir of all the ages, in the foremost files of time," what happens to man if the modern secularistic climate of opinion is fully accepted and acted on. Marx, Lenin and Stalin have shown the whole world, now on a stage as wide as almost half the earth itself, the results, the truly *awful* results, flowing from unflinching application of the basic doctrine of that climate of opinion. All of today's tyrants begin and end on complete denial of God, the Designer, the Creator, the Orderer of the universe and on a complete denial of the soul, of natural law, and of Christian faith. They have accepted today's secularist doctrine fully and they are applying it with unflinching logic. "By their fruits you shall know them."

The modern liberals say they are horrified at the results they see around them in the modern world when the whole of life is secularized, all human values denied and man finally treated as a mere *thing*, mere matter in motion. But if, as one of their intellectual leaders, Dr. John Dewey taught, the sole end of man is the service of society in this secular world, why are not the modern dictators right when they merge the state with the community destroying all lesser ends than Society itself? The modern liberals are horrified, as the followers of Rousseau were horrified 150 years ago when they saw his so-called humanitarian idealism, divorced from Christian dogma, go down to destruction in the wholesale

judicial murders of the Terror. But the Jacobins were more logical than Rousseau; and Lenin and Stalin are more logical than Dr. Dewey.

In the absence of God as man's creator and last end, and the rational sanctions of religion that flow therefrom, political authority reposing on mere force is necessarily boundless. "The mills of God grind slowly but they grind exceedingly small." The doctrine that set out to free man in the brave new world, that knows not God, the soul, or Christ, is succeeding in enslaving man to a new kind of totality that uses man no longer as a person but as a mere *thing*.

Ultimately there is no rational answer to Communism, Leninism or Stalinism, but acceptance of God as the origin and destiny of man. Rights ultimately have their origin in duties. And natural rights can only arise if there exist duties imposed on man by a natural law, as a participation in God's Eternal Law. And only if man, endowed with reason and free will, is destined as a free moral agent to happiness, here and hereafter, in union with God as his ultimate end, can man have rights that transcend the secular state, the "unalienable rights" given by the Creator that our founding fathers set forth in the great Declaration. The founding fathers only repeated the natural law doctrine that the greatest of the Greek and Latin thinkers, the canonists in all the chanceries of Europe and that Sir William Blackstone proclaimed: "the law of nature, coeval with mankind and dictated by God Himself."

Only because there are commands of God are there any *natural* rights in man. Only because man, a rational free being, is under the *duty* to worship God, has he any inherent natural right to freedom of worship. Only because the parent is under a *divine* command to educate the child, has the parent, even against the whole state, any inherent natural right to educate his own child. Only because man is a *person* created by a divine Person in His image and likeness (in the sense that man also has reason and free will), and is destined to God's service, has man any inherent rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" or personal dignity. Otherwise the state has absolute power not only over man's political and economic life but also over his moral life.

This is the light that shines from the religious, spiritual and intellectual order, and illumines all other orders, political, economic, social, international. This natural law in the moral order, the basis of any rational legal order, is based on reason and not on mere force or might. There is no other alternative.⁸

The verdict of the Scottish coroner's jury and the verdict of the men at Yalta are symbols of today's climate of opinion on God and the soul of man. Those verdicts were at variance with reason and known facts, and

8- -15 Fordham L. Rev. 3 (March 1946).

they imply enormous credulity mostly in unknown men, supposed to be learned. That climate of opinion follows without thought, merely through fashion, mood and feeling, a philosophy of life that destroys the concept of man as a rational responsible being and with it his dignity and destiny as a child of God.

The many today who have accepted almost unconsciously today's secularistic climate of opinion in spiritual matters have done so not by reasoned and well-grounded intellectual hostility to religion, but from mere drift; from fashion by absorbing from papers, magazines, books, Sunday supplements, the theatre, the radio and television programs, that climate of opinion, and under the pressure of an all too prevalent propaganda of unbelief from some professors in modern schools and universities who blandly pronounce their dogmatic assumptions that will not bear ultimate rational intellectual analysis. Unbelief is less a rooted rational conviction than a mood, the mood being a general *feeling* that scientific fact can fully explain all things without God or religion, revealed or otherwise.

But as in every other order of life, with all the reasonableness of its approach, real religious faith, that is, the acceptance of facts and truths on the authority of God, Himself, is rational and essential. It is indeed a reasonable following: as Saint Paul calls it "*rationable obsequium.*" But the unhesitating assent of Faith in the final analysis is not due to its reasonableness, though reason can bring us to its acceptance. Here as elsewhere, faith is still "the evidence of things that appear not." The unhesitating assent of religious faith is due to the fact that revealed truths, beyond the reach of reason, *but not opposed to reason*, come to us on divine and infallible testimony; on the testimony of God Himself, the Prime Truth. Of this religious faith, the great philosopher, Jacques Maritain, says:

"I am more certain of it than of my own existence, since the Prime Truth itself has told me through the intermediary of the Church, who here is but an instrumental cause, an instrument for the transmission of the revealed and is herself an object of faith: 'id quod et quo creditur.'"⁹

Evil does not destroy all the evidence of law, order, design and goodness that are still multiplied around us; evil is the abnormal (*ab norma*, away from the law or norm); and our Christian Faith offers the dark but luminous doctrine of the fall of man and the divine assurance that evil will not ultimately triumph. On the other hand, today's so-called "rationalistic" climate of opinion does not lessen evil in one single aspect of its impact. On the contrary, by final despair, it adds immeasurably to it. The apostles of nihilism prove that man's life is absurd, his suffering futile, his actions meaningless, if his origin and destiny be not in God.

9. Maritain, *The Range of Reason* 208 (1952).

In our history it was the apostasy of the intellectual classes that was the main cause for unbelief in the masses. The new factor was not misery, but the presence of an aggressive philosophy of human self-sufficiency. The primary and the greatest job of believers today is to be convinced and to convince others that instead of being opposed to reason, those who accept God and His law are the only remaining *worldwide* defenders of reason left to man in the twentieth century. It is also our business to realize and to cause others to understand how very flimsy the ultimate intellectual foundations of unbelief are when examined in the light of reason itself. I plead for a fuller understanding of the fact that today's climate of opinion in so far as it denies a personal God, the Orderer of the universe, is promulgated by slogans that mislead the unthinking, is irrational in its ultimate intellectual basis; and, in the name of skepticism, demands enormous amounts of unreasoned human credulity mostly in unknown men; and finally, it completely justifies everything that the Soviet tyrants are today doing to men. Isn't this alone enough to condemn it? "By their fruits, you shall know them."

No amount of mere mechanical changes, though we pile them as high as the Himalayas, will accomplish anything until we jettison the modern climate of opinion of which I have been speaking, and restore the primacy of the spiritual as the ultimate basis of human life.

I know that in some quarters today's climate of opinion is made to depend on some new and mysterious esoteric knowledge beyond the range of Newton or Kepler or even of Euclid and, of course, incapable of being understood by the average man. Forty years ago, Chesterton predicted the ultimate in unbelief in which even mathematical truths would be doubted and said: "We are on the road to produce a race of men too mentally modest to believe in the multiplication table." But in spite of the most modern relativists I am still convinced of objective truth, e.g., that two and two make four. I am also convinced that, if you distinguish between what they say and what they do, the relativists also have certitude of that fact and act accordingly. They, however, and all who follow them keep right on sawing off the branches on which they themselves are sitting. If thinking is mere physio-chemistry, a by-product of muscular activity, why accept as truth any conclusion that comes from such an irrational process? This is additional evidence that today's secularistic climate of opinion is a revolt *against reason* and *all truth*, all *objectivity*, in general; in *morals* also, as well as in thought. It leads to complete denial of truth, scientific and otherwise. Is that a rational philosophy of life for man?

What does it mean to me? Today's environment is in violent contrast with prior times when the assumptions of the whole of society were identical with the purpose and teaching of believers in God and Christ.

Therefore, today we must fortify our minds by keeping close to the Faith as the center of truth, the defender of our reason, and free will; and, hence, of our freedom. But we should not forget the millions around us living in darkness or semi-darkness. While we live we should do all in our power to help enlighten them. Each of us in our own sphere of influence should face and confront in thought, in utterance and act the "deadly attack" Gladstone wrote of in 1870 upon "the greatest treasure of mankind, the belief in God and the Gospel of Christ."

At all events we should not leave the gross materialistic superstition unanswered that "science" and materialistic "evolution" explain all without God; that religion demands we accept the unseen, whereas science gives us demonstration. The invisible is in every order a reality; and without faith it is impossible to live. Facing this ultimate choice in the presence of God, the source of all Goodness, Truth and Beauty, each of us with our whole minds and all our hearts and wills should re-echo the prayer that came from the great mind and heart of Augustine (after he had tried, and found useless for enduring human happiness all the world could offer):—

"Oh! Everlasting Beauty, ever ancient, ever new,
All too late have I known Thee;
All too late have I loved Thee."