From the online library at www.worldwisdom.com

THE FUNDAMENTAL NATURE OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN MODERN AND TRADITIONAL MAN — OFTEN CALLED THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SCIENCE AND FAITH

Rama Coomaraswamy, M.D.

"Science has remained an anti-intellectual movement based on naive faith".
— Alfred North Whitehead.

It is often said that there is an irreconcilable conflict between Religion and Science. Unfortunately, such a characterization falsifies the issues. The conflict is not between Religion and Science, but between the attitudes and beliefs of "traditional" man and his "modern" counterpart. The confusion arises because the latter, with little if any justification, like to consider himself "scientific".

In the following discussion I shall characterize "modern man", be he scientist, philosopher, politician or theologian, as holding to certain specific attitudes. Dominant among these is the idea that evolution is a law of nature, that man has "evolved" from some primitive state to his present advanced condition, and that this "progression" will continue indefinitely. Beyond this modern man's outlook can be characterized by such terms as "scienticist", "rationalistic", "liberal", "democratic", "humanistic", "relativistic", "egalitarian", and "self-determined". Despite the fact that these labels are subject to a variety of interpretations and may at times even be antagonistic to each other, they have a certain substratum in common. I shall summarize these for the sake of discussion as 1) Evolutionist and Progressive; 2) Anthropocentric, 3) Lacking any sense of or need for the sacred, and 4) ignorant of all metaphysical principles.

As opposed to these, the traditional viewpoint is Theocentric. It is based on the principle of a "fall" from a state of grace in which man directly communicated with God; the need and gift of a Revelation by which means man can return to his primordial and sacred condition, and a metaphysic which explains the nature of God, Truth, Reality and the very essence of man. The traditional position can be said to look back to a "Golden Age" when the gods and angels lived among us, while the Modern attitude necessarily looks ahead to a future and man-made Utopia. Not only our spiritual lives, but also our view of the world we live in, our politics and our sociology, will be influenced by which of these two sets of principles we adhere to.

It is impossible for these two attitudes not to find themselves in conflict. At stake are two radically different views of man, his nature and his destiny. It is this conflict which is at the heart of this symposium and in many ways at the heart of the problems faced by the Catholic Church since Vatican II.

Before proceeding it is essential that we define our frames of reference. Consider science. This is defined as "a branch of study concerned with the observation and classification of 'facts". Science deals with measurable phenomena. Its laws resume past experience and its closest approximation to truth is by means of statistical averages. Such a methodology can never establish absolute or objective certainties but only predict that what has happened in the past will probably occur in the future. When the scientist departs from the measurable, when he reasons or speculates about the facts he has gathered, he defines the results as a "working hypothesis" or a "theory". As more facts become known, theories are modified and even radically changed. The conclusions of science are never stable, but rather can be described as a constantly changing "consensus". They are "objective" only in so far as they can be quantitatively demonstrated, but they are never 'universal' in the sense that they are absolute or applicable throughout time and space. Those who doubt this have but to look at the innumerable and rapidly changing cosmological theories proposed for our consideration over the last 50 years. Needless to say, those who adhere to the traditional viewpoint can have no argument with measurable fact.

Faith, properly understood, also deals with facts, though not of a measurable or quantitative order. By Faith traditional man understands the conformity of the intelligence and the will to a body of Revealed truths given him as a deposit "*in principio*" and which are transmitted through the medium of TRADITION. His adherence to a given RELIGION "binds" him to them. Faith is belief when the volitive element predominates over the intellectual; it is knowledge when the intellectual element predominates over the volitive. This explains why it includes both the character of fervor and certitude. However strongly we may feel about what we believe — and feelings have their legitimate role to play — such truths are objective because they can neither change nor be contradicted by reason; they are universal because being true, they apply always and everywhere. They are not held "blindly"' for their acceptance or rejection depends, not on how we "feel", but on the use of our intellect and will.

Unfortunately, modern man sees science not as a specialized kind of knowledge about the material world we live in, but as an almost "mystical" concept encompassing his most cherished convictions; his belief in evolution, progress, and that all reality is subjective, measurable, and centered on man *qua* man. For him, what science cannot measure and explain with its limited methodology simply doesn't exist — all that is knowable is encompassed within its aegis. For modern man the scientist has replaced the priest, and when he speaks — even if it be outside the realm of his competence — his words are imbued with quasi-divine authority. Everything modern man believes in — be it hygiene, socialism or modern psychology, is described as "scientific", an adjective which seemingly endows its subject with the quality of truth and objectivity. It is to Science that we are directed in seeking a solution to our every problem. Modern man often proclaims his belief in science, and well he should, for science, or rather scienticism, has become his religion. He accepts its fuzzy "dogmas", not because they are rational or intellectually

compelling, but because he feels they are true. Such a faith is "visceral" and "blind". It defies definition and can be described as an "immenantist awareness finding its source in the subconscious".

For modern man, faith — be it in scienticism or religion — is always bears this character. It is never the acceptance of a given body of doctrine, bur rather a hazy "feeling" that is personal, individualistic and subjective. William, James well perceived this in describing religion as the "feelings, acts and experiences of individual men as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they consider the divine". "Experiential" is the popular phrase. Given this premise and our egalitarian prejudices, everybody's faith is considered personal, and of equal value. But if such is the case, how can one speak, of universal truths that we are free to accept or reject? Other problems follow: if our beliefs as to what is right and wrong, good and bad, just and unjust are also rooted in the subconscious, how can we speak in a rational manner of building a better world or of converting our concept of "justice" into social or economic practice? Such a view of Faith of course demands great tolerance and the only way to avoid chaos in the public domain, is to accept those elements of belief which the majority of individuals agree upon and to relegate everything else to the private realm.

Traditional man, placing science in a hierarchal relationship to the totality of truth, sees no conflict between what is demonstrable by measurement and what he knows from Revelation. His attitude towards the "modern scientistic outlook" with its claim to the totality of truth and its refusal to recognize any moral master is however quite another matter. In no way can he give his assent to irrational postulates such as progress, evolution and the perfectibility of man *qua* man — ideas which have their origin in man's collective subconscious rather than in God. If any conflict exists, it is not between science and faith properly understood, but between modern and traditional attitudes.

Many religious leaders would resolve this conflict by means of an "Aggiornamento" — that is, by blending the latest scientific ideas with religious values. Let us consider some of the consequences of such an attempt. The first step required for bringing religion "up to date" is the acceptance of the idea that our beliefs are subjective and have their origins in the subconscious. On the religious level this allows man to dream of uniting all the various "ecclesiastical communities" into a single body. Gone will be the conflicts based on man's adherence to strict doctrinal formulations. Everyone's faith becomes respected as equally valid, and once some common ground is found, mankind can get on with the task of building a better world. Modern-day Catholics are perfectly free to describe their faith as "experiential", or as a "dialogue with God". Indeed, as Andrew Greeley's study pointed out, "46% of bishops and 69% of priests hold that faith is "primarily an encounter with God RATHER than an assent to a coherent set of defined truths".

Far more illustrative of the search for an aggiornamento is the modern Church's Magisterial acceptance of evolution and progress. So pervasive are these concepts that many of us have been convinced that unless religion accepts them it cannot survive. Yet, as I hope to show, they are as unscientific as they are untheological. If we believe in them, it is not because they are demonstrable fact, not because they are Revelation, not because they are rational, not because one

iota of evidence has ever been presented in their favor, but because we feel they must be true. Their acceptance demands a visceral commitment, a blind and totally modernist faith. Let us examine them in greater detail.

The Transformist Illusion

Evolution and Progress are two sides of the same coin. According to these ideas not only is man at the apogee of a long evolutionary process, but evolution itself is a fundamental law of nature. By this I man that Evolution as a concept is not limited to the biological realm, but manifests itself in every aspect of life. After all, if man Himself is a product of evolution, if man's mind is but highly organized matter than all man is involved with, all that has resulted from his efforts, must reflect the evolutionary process. It follows that the "forces" of evolution — called "progress" and "historical determinism" by others — must play a dominant if not totally controlling role in our political, sociological, cultural and "spiritual" development Thus it is that mankind is still developing and advancing towards some higher condition wherein all men will be united ("globalization") and where strife and conflict will be eliminated and a "new humanism" achieved. If religion is to remain a relevant force (*quod absit*), it must also take cognizance of such advances and adapt itself to them. As Paul VI said, "if the world changes, should not religion also change… the order to which Christianity tends is not static, but an order in continual evolution towards a higher form". All this is a far cry from St. Albert the Great's dictum: "there is progress of the faithful in the faith, but never progress of the faith in the faithful".

I have tied the idea of "progress" to evolution. I assume we can all agree that by "progress" we are not talking about the development of better mouse-traps. Rather we are concerned with the "advancement" of mankind towards some higher state. In point of fact, the idea of "progress", used in this sense, pre-dated Darwin by decades if not by centuries. One finds it used during the English Reformation where the "Recussants" — those who refused to abandon the Catholic faith — were described as "backward", while those who accepted the "established" state-enforced religion — were 'progressive". The concept was further developed during the so-called "age of enlightenment" when people like Rousseau, Voltaire and Diderot dreamed of creating a perfect society without God. Kant embraced it in his "Idea of a Universal History on a Cosmopolitical Plan", a text in which he taught that history followed predetermined laws and revealed what be called "a regular stream or tendency" which demonstrated a "natural purpose" which would end in a "Universal civil society". Spencer spoke of the "law of progress" and defined evolution as "a change from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity through continuous differentiations and integrations". He went on to teach that "the operation of evolution is absolutely universal.…Whether it be in the development of the earth, in the development of life upon its surface, in the development of society, of government, of manufactures, of commerce, of language, of literature, science, art, this same advance from the simple to the complex, through successive differentiations, holds uniformly.…" Hegel taught that humanity was driven ceaselessly upwards by an all-powerful, all-rational "It", and that the path of the ascent was an eternal, immutable, predestined, zigzag — his thesis and antithesis — always resulting in a higher synthesis. Evolutionary theory developed as a result of applying these ideas to biology. It provided a "scientific" basis for man's belief in progress and found ready acceptance in a world that sought to free itself from all divine sanction. From, the time of Darwin progress and evolution have

become almost interchangeable terms that are mutually supportive and pervasive influences in our lives. As an editorial in the *L'Osservatore Romano* states: "no one today any longer believes in tradition, but rather in rational progress. Tradition today appears as something that has been bypassed by history. Progress, on the other hand, presents itself as an authentic promise inborn in the very soul of man" (Mar. 3, 1977).

Many of these ideas are incorporated into the documents of Vatican II. Consider such statements as "The human race has passed from a rather static concept of reality to a more dynamic evolutionary one.… To a certain extent the human intellect is also broadening its dominion over time…bringing men hope of improved self-knowledge.… Recent psychological research explains human activity more profoundly. Historical studies make a signal contribution to bringing men to see things in their changeable and evolutionary aspects.… Thanks to the experience of past ages, the progress of the sciences, and the treasures hidden in the various forms of human culture, the nature of man himself is more clearly revealed and new roads to truth are opened.… Thus we are witnesses to the birth of a new humanism, one in which man is defined first of all by his responsibility towards his brothers and towards history.… Little by little, a more universal form of human culture is developing, one which will promote and express the unity of the human race.…"

In a similar manner the Pontifical Academy of Science under the sponsorship of John Paul II informs us that "Masses of evidence render the application of the concept of evolution to man and the other primates beyond serious dispute", and he himself has stated that "all the observations concerning the development of life lead to a conclusion: the evolution of living beings, of which science seeks to determine the stages and to determine the mechanism, presents an internal finality…a finality which directs beings in a direction for which they are not responsible or in charge.…" (General Audience, July 10, 1985).

Just What Is Evolution?

Evolution holds that at a certain point in time disparate atoms combined to form complex molecules, and these in turn to form a living cell. Step wise, through a series of processes such as natural selection, the survival of the fittest, genetic alterations, sexual attraction, chance, or whatever, these developed into still higher forms of life to form the various phylogenetic strains and species. Algae became fishes, fishes crawled out of the sea to become lizards and eventually dinosaurs, these in turn climbed trees and became birds. Finally, one of these various evolutionary ancestors developed into apes, hominids and man. Implicit in this theory is that even human consciousness is derived from matter — indeed, that it is a particularly refined or "evolved" form of matter. You have all heard of the prince who kissed the frog and turned her into a fairy princess. Well, evolution tells us this is what happened.

Evolution is not science. Not one of its postulates have ever been observed, much less measured. Scientists have placed all the elements found in living matter into every conceivable solvent and subjected the resulting "soup" to every conceivable stimulus without creating, life. Hardly surprising, for as Professor Haldane has pointed out, "the simplest living cell contains between ten thousand and ten million distinct chemical substances, more than the number of biochemists in the world". Turning to the fossil record we find it demonstrates in an indisputable

manner that every species arose *de novo*, and those that are still surviving have in no way changed since their first appearance Not one transitional form — otherwise known as "missing links" — between two species has ever been found. No less a person than Thomas Huxley has admitted that the fossil record negates evolutionary theory because "it either shows no evidence for such modifications or demonstrates that such modifications have been very slight". Genetic theory confirms the fixity of species. Despite the fact that generations of flies and fleas have been subjected to radiation, ultra-violet light, and God knows what else, they have remained and still are flies and fleas. And so I repeat, Evolution is not scientific fact. It is only a "theory" which attempts to explain how certain measurable and observable facts — the fossil record and the wide variety of living forms — hang together. What is extraordinary is that so many scientists accept as fact a theory which violates the very foundations of their discipline. Science teaches us that what is greater cannot come out of what is less. Evolution teaches that the contrary has repeatedly occurred and is still occurring — indeed that what is mind and spirit comes out of matter. Science tells us the earth is running down, but evolution tells us it is running up. Science teaches us that nothing happens by chance. Evolution postulates a series of extraordinary chance events and ignores the fact that "chance", when used in this sense, is nothing but the expression of our ignorance of the causes involved. It goes even further and proclaims that an evolution based on chance events is the Ultimate Cause, the Alpha and the Omega of reality. Mathematical theory tells us that the possibility of one evolutionary step occurring is so remote as to be impossible — as Prof. Sir Frederick Hoyle, the Cambridge astrophysicist states, "the likelihood of the spontaneous formation of life from inanimate matter is one to a number with 40,000 naughts after it!…a number big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution.…" — but evolution tells us it has happened Yes, indeed, as Dr. W. R. Thompson, the director of the Institute of Scientific Research in Ottawa said, "the success of Darwinism is accompanied by a decline in scientific integrity…when men of science flock together to defend a doctrine which they are not even capable of scientifically defining, much less demonstrating…we find ourselves in a most abnormal and undesirable situation". I challenge anyone one of you to show me one piece of evidential proof in favor of evolution. As Yves Delage, Sorbonne Professor of Zoology states "I readily admit there is no absolutely definite evidence that such a thing as Evolution has ever taken place". It may surprise you to know that many eminent scientists who remain atheists have completely abandoned evolutionary theory because, as Jean Postand has said, "the world postulated by transformism is a fairy world, phantasmagoric and surrealistic". Others, of course, continue to believe in it with what is truly a blind and modernist faith. Yves Delage, quoted above, tells us that despite the lack of proof, "I believe evolution to be just as certain as if it had been objectively proved".

And so we see that Evolution is not scientific and has to be accepted with "faith". Perhaps, after all, its proper locus is theology. Let us then consider the stance of the Church. Prior to Vatican II, Evolution was discussed, but never officially sanctioned. The Fathers and Doctors of the Church, along with the majority of orthodox theologians like Billot and Garrigou-Lagrange clearly rejected it. Despite this, I readily concede that many Catholics were evolutionists. By and large these can be divided into two groups, those who believed evolution to be a fact and in order to save their belief in God, argued that He did His creating through the evolutionary process. Typical of such ideation is Teilhard de Chardin. The second group — typified by Mivart, Leroy, Duchesne,

Loisy and Bergert — all condemned Modernists — held that man's body was a product of evolution, and that God, at some point in history, infused this soul-less body with a soul.

Whatever view of theistic evolution one takes, one is faced with irresolvable dilemmas. Those who hold to the Tielhardian view tell us that at some point in time man made an "evolutionary jump" to consciousness and assure us that either matter is spirit or spirit is matter. Those that hold to the mitigated view must explain to us why God suddenly decided to work outside of the evolutionary process and what happened to the other "humans" who were not ensouled? Perhaps they are still wandering around in some undiscovered jungle. And why does the body not continue to live when we "die" and give up our souls? The absurdity of living "soulless" humans was clearly demonstrated by St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Albert the Great and innumerable other doctors of the Church. Other religions are equally clear on this issue. And so we see that belief in evolution requires not only a blind and modernist faith, but also the rejection of reason. As Karl Stern, a well-known psychiatrist tells us: "such a view of cosmogenesis is crazy. And I do not mean crazy in the sense of slangy invective but rather in the technical meaning of psychotic. Indeed such a view has much in common with certain aspects of schizophrenic thinking". Evolution is in fact pure and simple superstition. Consider the definition of this term: "an irrational abject state of mind proceeding from ignorance, unreasoning fear of the unknown or mysterious morbid scrupulosity, a belief in magic or chance, or the like; misdirected or unenlightened religion or interpretation of nature…a fixed irrational idea, a notion maintained in spite of evidence to the contrary.…"

The Background to Evolutionary Thought

Evolution was a "cockle" sowed on well prepared ground. A brief review will help to make this clear. While nothing under the sun is new, we shall initiate our sad tale with William of Ockham.

Born in 1290, Ockham is one of the earliest of those who misunderstood the nature of the soul. He not only denied free will, he also denied that the Intellect was capable of forming universal concepts. He and his followers — usually labeled "nominalists" — claimed that all ideas were really images, that is, impressions on the imagination originating in sensual perception. The error — it is one shared by virtually all modern "philosophers" and psychologists — is that nominalists confound the individualized image of the imagination with the concept or idea which resides in the Intellect. According to St. Thomas, the difference between images and ideas consists in the fact that images are representations of things in their singularity, particularity and concreteness, whereas ideas are representations of things in their universality. Despite his denial of "universals", Ockham continued to believe in God. But he held such belief to have no objective character and the nature of his faith was "blind". I would ask you to remember that Faith requires our assent to what the intellect tells us is Truth, and it is the nature of this faculty to "see". The acceptance of nominalism precludes such "vision" and inevitably results in a bifurcation between what can be observed and measured, and what is believed. It is but a short step to envisioning the measurable as the totality of reality, and the relegating of concepts such as the "good" and the "beautiful" — to say nothing of Revelation — concepts beyond measurement and hence seen as having no objective measurable reality — to the realm of private and subjective convictions where they become whatever we feel or want them to be. It is not surprising that Ockham lived his life in rebellion against the Church and died, as far as we know, without the consolation of her sacraments.

Man, by his very nature seeks to know the truth, the nature and purpose of his existence. Nominalism precludes this possibility. Denying the intellect, it denies that man can abstract from the things of this world and penetrate their underlying reality; being dependent upon phenomena, its only certainties are statistical approximations. Obviously experiential knowledge has its place and function, but once it is declared to be the only legitimate source of knowledge, man is deprived of the absolute and has no access to the nature of his being. Metaphysics is destroyed, sacred knowledge is nullified, and man is forced to turn from Revelation and Intellection to individualism and rationalism. Cut off from his "above", he must turn to what is "below". It was Descartes who epitomized this deviation in his *Cogito ergo sum*. The individual consciousness of the thinking subject (or more precisely, his ephemeral ego) was proclaimed to be the source of all reality and truth; the knowing subject — man — was henceforth bound to the realm of reason as applied to phenomena and separated from both Intellection and Revelation. It is a short step from this to the radical doubt of Hume and the agnosticism of Kant.

Having accepted the nominalist position, scientists soon began to consider the physical universe — the measurable world — as the totality of reality. All else was relegated to an ontological limbo. This, as Dr. Wolfgang Smith has pointed out, is not a scientific discovery, but a metaphysical assumption. Having taken this step, man increasingly saw the phenomenological world not as a reflection of God's beauty and goodness, but as a mechanical clock. As Kepler (1571-1630), speaking for his age, said, "just as the eye was made to see colors, and the ear to hear sounds, so the human mind was made to understand, not whatever you please, but quantity. René Descartes (1596-1650) gave this new vision articulated form. The mechanical world was made up entirely of "*res extensa*". He of course still admitted to the "*res cogitans*", but those who followed after him rapidly imprisoned this within a ventricle of the brain — the Newtonian sensorium — and then eliminated it *in toto*. In the modern world, the '*res extensa*" or to use the Newtonian phrase, 'matter", is all that is left.

The "age of enlightenment" sought to fit man within this schema. Man, cut off from Revelation and Intellection, was reduced to an autonomous entity — one ultimately "self-detemined" and independent of God. And so we have the Masonic-Rousseauan concept of man whose "dignity" lies in his "independence" — he is his own authority and he creates his own culture. *Pari-passu* with this we have a new concept of society, one based on "social contract" where the will of the majority "democratically" legislates morality. The "Rights of Man" are proclaimed to the exclusion of the "Rights of God". The world is promised a new Utopia in which everyone will be Free, Equal, and Brothers, a world which, thanks to science and progress, will be so perfect that no will any longer have any need to be good. Such a compendium of ill-thought-out ideas is often termed "humanism" — an absurd term for man "independent of his supernatural nature" which can never be integrally human. Needless to say, the Church opposed the deviations. One of her strongest arguments was that God created the world and entrusted her with its governance. And then what happened? Evolutionary theory came along as a "chance-sent" gift providing humanists and their ilk with the sanction of "science". If mankind accepted its postulates, who needed God and who needed the Church? It is not surprising that Masons, Marxists and Modernists did everything in their power to spread this new "devil's Gospel".

The Nominalist Basis of Rationalism and Scientific Methodology

Nominalism lays the ground for man's aberrant view of nature and science. Its denial of universals allows him, to deny specificity to nature's creation. There is no such thing as a given species conforming to an archetype in the mind of God; rather all creation is seen as a phenomenon where one species blends with another in an evolutionary continuum,.

Moderns consider reason to be the highest human faculty, but insist that reason can only be applied to measurable fact and so-called "experience". This is the essential nature of both scientific methodology and rationalism. As opposed to this, traditional teaching holds that Reason is a discursive faculty which requires both correct premises and proper logic to come to a valid conclusion. Truth does not depend on reason but rather, reveals itself and becomes explicit with the help of reason. Thus we do not say something is true because it is logical, but rather that it is logical because it is true. This presupposes a still higher faculty capable of judging whether the conclusions of reason are true. Modern "philosophers" attempt to get around this problem by speaking of "rational principles", but forget that principles can never be derived from discursive logic. Reason cannot prove its own validity, for principles must be grasped intuitively or supra rationally. As Aristotle said, "one does not demonstrate principles, but one perceives directly the truth thereof". To make use of scholastic terminology, it is the pure intellect which is the *habitus principorum*, while reason is only the *habitus conclusionum*. Man then possesses reason, and with it language, only because, unlike animals, he has access in principle to supra-rational vision. It is this supra-rational vision, Intellection or insight, that gives man, not only judgment, but certitude in his own existence as a being, and confidence in the functional capacity of reason. Intellection is a kind of "Seeing" and not a conclusion, and it is this that opens to man the possibility of metaphysical certitude. This is why Boethius said that a man who thinks he is an animal that reasons has forgotten who he is. Now reason, which is a reflection of this higher Intellect, can receive its content — that which it reasons about — from above and from below, from within and from without. It can receive its premises from Revelation or the senses, from intellection or the subconscious. These various sources, either individually or in combination provide the reason with its "food" and any attempt to exclude one or more of them is arbitrary and irrational.

Above all, Nominalism allows man to believe his higher faculties are given him for the study of phenomena and nothing else. He forgets that the wonders of nature are given him that by their study he can awaken his intellect and know his Creator. If the Nominalists are correct, man has no higher intellect; reason or logic are unexplainable and can only be applied to measurable phenomena and so-called "experience" — our emotions and feelings. The net result of such a limited viewpoint is a "scientific methodology" which promises, given time, to explain everything, and a truncated "rationalism", such as the French Revolution idolized. What does not fall within this aegis is declared to be either "unreal" or unknowable. Out goes Revelation, Intellection and, by definition, metaphysics. Man is reduced to a rational animal that can measure and feel, but never know. Ockham's much vaunted razor cut our metaphysical throats.

Modern man sees himself as made in the image of some primitive protozoa. In order to fit human intelligence into the evolutionary stream, the spirit is reduced to mind, the mind to brain, and the brain in turn to anatomical structures. Thinking is but a "neuro-chemical" process, or as the

evolutionist Wilson says, “an epiphenmenon of the neuronal machinery of the brain”, which man will be able to alter and/or improve as his understanding grows. The net result is that modern psychologists — Freud, Adler, Fromm, Maslow and Rogers are all evolutionists — tell us intelligence consists of reason, the ability to deal with abstractions, the capacity to learn and the ability to handle new situations. Now, reason apart, — and enormous amounts of energy are extended in an attempt to prove animals reason — all these are abilities are found in the lower forms of life. Hence it is not surprising to find Darwin telling us that “animals have an intellect of different proportions”, and that man’s “intellectual faculties have been mainly and gradually perfected through natural selection”. It is but a small step between the ability of a bird to build a nest or to follow the stars in his migratory flights, and that of man to hold a hammer. Similarly we are told that man’s motivations and beliefs have their origin in his “sub-conscious”, best defined as a cess-pool of evolutionary memory. Again we are told that man’s ultimate motives are a search for security, pleasure, or what they call “sell activation” through the meeting of “meta-needs”. Truth is what is true for the individual; beauty what gives us pleasure; and love the fulfilling of “biological urges”. At the cost of denying both logic and experience, all that is qualitative in man is declared to be genetically determined and is reduced to the measurable and thus to matter. Everything falls within this aegis. Rousseau held that savage man progressed to “civilized” man. Huxley gave this progression his scientific blessing. “Nature’s great progression is from the formless to the formed — from the inorganic to the organic — from blind force to conscious intellect and will”. If one can accept these premises then it is easy to be persuaded that man is but a higher form of matter and that Superman is on the way. Those who think otherwise are dismissed as dreamers — as if matter could dream — who for all their efforts produce nothing materially beneficial.

Implicit in evolutionary theory is that man has no free will. As Huxley says, “the fundamental proposition of Evolution is that the whole world, living and not living, is the result of the mutual interaction, according to definite laws, of the forces possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed”. After all, how can something — notice, I do not say “someone” — which is the product of rigid laws, laws which still control its future development, and which has no freedom to step outside the evolutionary process, how can this “something” be responsible? Here one comes upon another conundrum, and one interestingly enough shared by Socialists for whom evolution takes the form of “historical determinism”. If man’s life is determined by evolution or by history, how can he be “free”? Yet both evolutionists and historical determinists proclaim man free to help the process on its way towards perfection or utopia. And how can evolutionary/historically determined man sin? Again, he sins only in opposing these very forces. Consistency and rationality are not required of a blind modernist faith.

But it may be asked, do evolutionists live in the real world? Surely, in the practical order, every individual sees himself as a being who is responsible for his acts, who knows, wills and loves, not with the seeming obsequiousness of tame beasts, but with devotion and self-sacrifice; a rational creature who can conceptualize and discriminate between what is true and false, good and evil, right and wrong. To admit this is to say man has the certitude of his own consciousness and being and that he is more than matter. Certain consequences inevitably follow. To say love is to say knowledge for one cannot love what one does not know. To say know is to admit of truth, for

one cannot know what is false, but only that it is false. (Admittedly intelligence can be wrong by the falseness of its content, but then it is wrong as thought and not as knowledge; to speak of a false knowledge would be as absurd as to speak of a blind vision or an undark night.) And to say love, knowledge and truth is to say something immeasurable, something of the spirit. These faculties pertain to the "heart" — not the physiological organ which bears this name by analogy — but to the very core of our being — what theologians call the soul. Man who knows and loves, and has the certitude of his own consciousness and being, cannot be reduced to chemical and physical elements — elements which are in reality only concepts of his own mind imposed upon the natural domain. Either man loves the poor because he sees in them an *alter Christus*, or he loves the poor because the evolutionary course of his genetic development leaves him no alternative. If one chooses the latter, then one cannot criticize those who hate the poor, much less those who exploit them.

Mention must be made of man's evolutionary destiny, for as Huxley tells us, "the destiny of man has been made clear by evolutionary biology…man can now see himself as the sole agent of further evolutionary advance on this planet, and one of the few possible instruments of progress in the universe at large. Eventually with the help of evolutionary theory man will solve the problem of evil. Alfred Russel Wallace gives us further details. As a result of evolution "each one will work out his own happiness in relation to his fellows; a perfect freedom of action will be maintained; compulsory government will have died away as unnecessary,…mankind will have discovered that it was only required of them to develop the capacities of their higher nature in order to convert this earth…into as bright a paradise as ever haunted the dreams of seer or poet". And thus we see point "omega" on the way.

Ignored by evolutionary theory is the fact that the intellect and the will — what traditional theologians call the soul — is a non-material or spiritual substance, and that this intellect can remove itself from the evolutionary stream and reflect upon that stream. Ignored is the fact that the intellect can know its own being (self consciousness), can make judgements, can arrive at certitude, and can know God. Ignored is the fact that the body without the soul is no longer a living person and that man — both body and soul — is made in the image of God. Ignored is the doctrine of Synteresis and the fact that God can dwell within the human soul. Ignored is the fact that love resides in the will and that the will is free — free to reject the truth as well as accept it. Ignored is the fact that man voided of his intellectual functions — "independent of his supernatural character" — can never be integrally human. Ignored is the fact that man's rejection of the truth is a fall from his high estate, a "departure from order", and a sin. Evolution, like modern psychology, allows us the freedom to damn our souls with serenity.

The Religious Consequences of a Belief in Evolution

Professor Jastrow of Princeton University stated "either life was placed here by the Creator, or it evolved out of non-living molecules in accordance with the laws of chemistry and physics. There is no third way; it must have been one or another". Children brought up on an evolutionary diet from infancy almost invariably accept the first alternative. They are easily convinced — or should I say "brain washed into thinking" that, as the *Encyclopedia Britannica* says: "Darwin did two things: he showed that evolution was a fact contradicting scriptural legends of creation and that its

cause, natural selection, was automatic with no room for divine guidance or design". No wonder then that in a recent poll 46.9 % of the people queried stated that they did not go to Church because they believed in evolution.

Those that argue God works through evolution must tell us what kind of God would choose to work "by chance" to create man and or why God had at some point in history to go outside the evolutionary process to create a soul. Again what kind of God would use "natural selection" to achieve his ends. Natural selection — the law of the claw — proposes that the ill- or otherwise-unfit should be denied existence in favor of the stronger and perhaps more brutal forms of life. But if such is the case, how dare evolutionary man interfere to help the lame and the weak. Charity finds no place in such a scheme. An evolutionary God, a God who set the process going and then left it to work itself out, is not a personal God, nor one who can answer our prayers. As Julian Huxley said, "any view of God as a personal being is becoming frankly untenable.… Man's knowledge has left no room in the universe for such an idea. Creation of earth and stars, plants, animals and man — Darwin swept the last vestiges of that into the wastepaper-basket of outworn imaginations, already piled high with the debris of earlier ages".

Catholics have a particular problem with evolution, even in its mitigated or "theological" forms. They are obliged by faith to accept the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*. Listen to the statement of Vatican I:

> "If anyone does not admit that the world and everything in it, both spiritual and material, have been produced in their entire substance by God out of nothing, let him be anathema".

In a similar manner, evolutionary theory implicitly denies the doctrines of original sin, the fall of man, the need for a Redeemer and for our redemption, the Immaculate Conception, the function of reason and the possibility of man's sanctification.

Those who would blend their religious belief's faith with evolutionary theory must accept the consequences. A belief in evolution and progress inevitably carries in its train 1) a belief that man *qua* man is perfectible without reference to his supernatural nature; 2) that man has no higher nature or capability than that which has evolved from matter; 3) that man, having no intellect, can neither know himself nor his Creator, can make no valid judgments and can never accept the existence of absolute truths; 4) that man has no free will and hence can neither sin nor have a "fallen nature"; 5) that man has no need for a Redeemer and is the source of his own redemption; 6) given time, society will perfect itself to the point where man will no longer have to be good; 7) that all valid knowledge must be attained through the so-called scientific methodology, and that what cannot be measured has no reality; 8) that religion must constantly adapt itself to the latest stage of evolution and progress and that only by reading the "signs of the times" can man know what God wishes for us; and 9) that the main purpose of religion is to help man on his evolutionary way. If we accept the evolutionary hypothesis as true, the human phenomenon — man's ability to love, to know, to will and to be responsible — is inexplicable.

It is not traditional religion, but evolution and progress that are the opiates of modern man.

There is no real conflict between science and faith as such, but an irreconcilable conflict between those who accept traditional values and those who blindly believe in the “transformist illusion” on which the so-called “modern scienticist outlook” is built. Those who dream of helping mankind or building a better world would be well advised to reexamine their promises, for there can be no valid action outside of truth and no possible salvation — either worldly or other-worldly — apart from a return to traditional values.