

Himself; first life was enjoyed by man as the result of a Divine Inbreathing. Gen. 2:7 again: "Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." How fitting that the very Name of our God is I AM, HE WHO IS, the Ever-Living One! Exo. 3:14—"And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." John 4:24, the words of Jesus: "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth."

The Breath of God is the outgoing of the Spirit of God, and it is the Spirit that giveth life. Our God IS a Spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and according to the Truth.

The Stream of Life flows ever onward and upward in this present world, from the lowliest plant form to the highest, thence upward through all creatures of water, air, and land, finally to attain its highest manifestation in human personality. The red River of Life has flown out from Someone, Somewhere, for ever! And it will continue to flow—even beyond the grave—where in the redeemed and immortalized saints, its red shall have been transformed into crystal purity and brightness. "And he [the angel] showed me," writes the Seer of the Apocalypse, enraptured, "a river of water of life, bright as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb" (Rev. 22:1). "Out of the throne of God and of the Lamb"—note it well!

Ah, sweet Mystery of Life, precious gift of the Spirit of my God. As Tennyson has expressed it, so exquisitely:

Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies,
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but *if* I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is.

5. The Mystery of Thought

Is there anything in the universe—any entity or activity—that is not matter or not material? Can everything that exists be reduced ultimately to matter in motion? Is thought, for example, but a manifestation of electronic, atomic, or some other—possibly as yet unknown—form of "physical" energy? There have been those in all ages who have stubbornly insisted

that our universe is ultimately a universe of matter and of matter only; there are those today who would so affirm; we call them "materialists." They insist that we have no knowledge of anything except by means of the senses, and that even we ourselves are constitutionally material; hence, that all our knowledge is simply knowledge of matter by matter. Obviously, however, in stating their position, materialists overlook the fact that they are talking about two separate things, namely, (1) about everything, including themselves, all of which they affirm to be matter, and (2) about their *belief* that everything is matter, which they affirm to be the *truth* about the world we live in. But any person of ordinary common sense should be able to see that by no stretch of the imagination can any *belief* or *theory* or alleged *truth* about matter be identified with matter itself. The arrangement of cells in the brain is one thing; a belief, theory, or alleged truth is quite another thing. It has been rightly said that the materialist can explain everything but his own theory: *that*, obviously, is not "material."

We recall the theory of the "conditioned reflex" developed by the Russian school and especially by Pavlov, soon after the turn of the present century. This came to be the basis of what was called "the dog-and-drool" psychology, and finally of what came to be elaborated as "behaviorism," first by Dr. John B. Watson of the University of Chicago and later of Johns Hopkins University. Watson repudiated the traditional conception of the mental processes and interpreted "thinking" as subvocal "conditioning." This caused Dr. Will Durant to quip that "Dr. Watson had made up his larynx that he did not have a mind." "Behaviorism" in its various forms ran rampant for half a century, until a measure of sanity began to assert itself in psychology departments of our universities. Behaviorism of our day and age is not that which was advocated by Watson. At any rate these facts serve to show how desperately men in psychology have tried to downgrade the human race into an animal species, disregarding altogether the essential facts of person and personality, and thus relieve themselves of all moral responsibility or at least to reduce what has been called morality to sheer meaningless relativism. Naturally this kind of propaganda became a bulwark of materialism. It is being kept alive to some extent in our day by the psychologist B. F. Skinner. Materialism, however, is so absurd, so contrary to the higher outreaches of man, that about all it is doing now is to drive them into the opposite extremes of orgiastic and ecstatic emotional outbursts, into vari-

ous diabolical cults such as fatalism, spiritualism, divination, witchcraft, black magic, libidivism, homosexuality, and even devil-worship itself. The following clear statement of fact is pertinent here (from Claude Tresmontant, French Professor of the Philosophy of Science in the Sorbonne, Paris):

The discoveries of modern science have made it easier to prove the existence of God than it used to be. Those who find no place for God in their philosophy must be prepared to affirm that mindless, inanimate matter has been able to organize itself, to become animated, and to endow itself with consciousness and thought. . . . If the material universe is to be regarded as the only reality, matter must be credited with all the attributes that theologians specify as belonging to God, including supreme intelligence, creative power, and eternal autonomous existence. [When asked if the emergence of life could not be attributed purely to the laws of chance over a very long period of time, this scientist said]: It may be theoretically possible, but mathematically it is so extremely improbable that only a very few scientists now seriously think that pure chance can be put forward as an explanation of the emergence of even the simplest living organism. [In Shar Salom Publication tract entitled "So You Are an Agnostic!" by Harry Bucalstein, 236 West 72nd Street, New York, N. Y., 10023].

These words remind us of the notion put forward in the heyday of Darwinism that if a monkey were placed at the keys of a typewriter, given a sufficient time, by just pounding the keys at random it could hammer out one of Plato's dialogues. Frankly, it takes more faith to accept this argument than to believe in a Creator-God.

The case against materialism is stated so clearly by Mr. A. Clutton-Brock that I feel justified in re-presenting his argument here at some length. He writes as follows:

We are aware of matter with our senses; and, if we are aware of spirit at all, it is not with our senses. The first question is, then, Are we aware of anything not with our senses? Of ourselves, perhaps; but those who believe that matter is the sole reality must believe also that self-consciousness is an illusion. For them there is no self but merely matter in certain formal arrangements functioning, they say; and self-consciousness is but an effect of that functioning. They insist that we have no knowledge of anything except with our senses, and that this knowledge is all knowledge by matter of matter.

Yet all the senses in combination applied to some one particular object could not produce any conclusion about that object, could not even tell us that it was an object. Smell by itself does not tell me that what I smell is also that which I touch and see; nor do simultaneous smell, sight, and touch tell me that. A creature with only sense-perceptions could not go beyond them; there would be nothing in it to conclude that it was smelling, touching and seeing the same object. It would in fact *consist* only of sense-perceptions and would have no notion of external reality at all; and it may be that there are creatures which do consist only of sense-perceptions and have no notion of external reality. But man is not one of them; he is aware of an

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT — HIS PERSON AND POWERS

object over and above his sense-perceptions of it; and he calls that which is aware the self.

But still the question remains whether this self can be aware of anything but matter. Assuming, as we must, that the self is not merely a combination of sense-perceptions, is it still only matter, by some means which we cannot yet understand, aware of the existence of other matter? Now the man who believes this believes also something more, namely, that it is the truth about matter. For him, therefore, besides matter there exists the truth about matter, which itself clearly is not matter and is not perceived with the senses. He may say that the truth about matter is a product of that matter which is his own mind, and exists only in his mind. But, if the truth is that and merely that, it is not the truth to him, and he cannot believe it. Truth means to us, not a product of our minds, but that which exists independently of them, that which would exist if we were not. The very word truth implies its independent existence; the value for truth, to which we all appeal when we use the word, implies its independent existence. If we could believe that we had made truth ourselves, we should no longer value it, and it would not be truth to us. [That is to say, Truth is *discovered*, not formulated, by man. It is essentially being, and the relations within the Totality of Being. The truth of electricity is cotemporaneous with the universe itself; it existed long, long before Benjamin Franklin flew his kite. The truth of the ingredients of the atom bomb has existed in the cosmos from the beginning, yet only recently has it been discovered and utilized by man. The quest of science is essentially the quest for truth—the truth of the relations which obtain within the cosmos]. When we speak of a bitter truth, an unwelcome truth, we imply that it exists independently of us and compels our recognition of its existence. If it did not, why should we not make for ourselves truths only comforting to ourselves? The answer is that we could not believe them. Belief implies that what we believe in exists independently of our minds. So the truth about external reality exists independently of our minds; it is not matter, though it be about matter, nor is it perceived by the senses. . . .

So, to one who says that he believes only in the existence of matter, one may put it that that belief is inconsistent with his other belief that he has attained to the truth about matter, is indeed inconsistent with belief of any kind, and so even with itself. For if only matter exists, the truth about matter does not exist for us; it is merely an effect produced by matter upon matter; belief is an effect produced by matter upon matter. But he who believes that cannot believe anything else, or even that.

Mr. Clutton-Brock goes on to show that the same reasoning applies to our perceptions of beauty and goodness:

Turn now from truth to something which can be much more easily confused with matter; something which most people suppose they perceive with their senses, namely beauty. To us the truth about objects is not the objects themselves; but we may suppose that the beauty of an object is the object itself, and that we perceive it with our sense of sight or hearing. The beauty of a tune is the tune; and we hear that beauty. Yet it is possible to hear the notes without hearing the tune and so the beauty. The beauty of the tune does not consist merely of the pleasant sound of the individual notes. Play the same notes in another order and there is no tune and no beauty of the tune. The tune is something we cannot perceive without the sense of hearing; but that which perceives it, and the beauty of it, is not the sense of hearing.

MATTER AND SPIRIT

And, though the notes themselves are merely sounds, and material, the tune is not material; it is something beyond matter and informing it. It is that relation of material things which we call beauty, and which, though it consists of material things, is itself not matter nor perceived with the senses.

And the perception of truth and beauty is a perception of—what? not particular objects perceived with the senses, but universal relations not perceived with the senses, although we can be aware of them only through the medium of the senses. And spirit is the name given to that in us which is aware of these universals; and they themselves, since they are not matter, though always perceived in or to matter, are said to be spiritual. The word spirit is an acknowledgment of their existence, and of the existence of something in ourselves, not sense, which perceives and values them.

And there is another universal, another relation, in our own actions, which is spiritual and perceived by spirit, not by sense—that relation which is called righteousness. We are aware of it only in men and in their conduct; yet it is also to us a universal relation like truth and beauty. It does not consist merely in particular thoughts of our own as we are aware of them. It consists in the relation of action, speech, or thoughts to circumstance. Righteousness, in fact, is a certain arrangement of actions, speech, or thought, though we cannot be aware of it apart from these. So we say that righteousness also is spiritual, and that spirit is aware of it. There is this difference between it and beauty or truth, that it is a universal we are aware of only in human beings, and perhaps sometimes in animals. We are not aware of it in mere phenomena or in inanimate objects. . . . So there seems to us to be two kinds of reality, a reality of matter, of particulars, perceived by the senses; and a reality of spirit, of universals, perceived through the senses but by spirit.¹

This author goes on to attribute this seeming duality of the Real to our inability to attain to any fulness of perception of it. He concludes:

So this fulness of perception is always a matter of degree for us, and always we fall short of completeness. That is why we make our division of spirit and matter, a division not in reality itself, but only in our fragmentary perception of it.²

That is to say, could we but look upon the Totality of Being *sub specie aeternitatis*—to use Spinoza's well-known phrase—no doubt it would manifest itself to us as one, as basically monistic. From such a point of view, however, finite beings are excluded, in their present state of existence.

That the individual human being as presently constituted is partly matter or "flesh," no sane person doubts. Correlation of brain and mind has never been seriously questioned, as far as we know. However, correlation is not *identity*, and the mind-body problem is still with us, despite the efforts of materialistic

1. A. Clutton-Brock, "Spirit and Matter," in a work entitled *The Spirit*, 309-316, edited by B. H. Streeter.

2. *Op. cit.*, 316.

psychologists to ignore or to deny the fact. The following statement, by W. R. Hess, of the University of Zurich, Nobel Prize-winner in Medicine in 1949, is pertinent:

From clinical experience as well as experiments on animals, we know that certain behavior patterns are associated with well-defined areas in the brain. Through electrical stimulation of the brainstem and contiguous areas we can elicit the reactions of defense, flight and hunger; through stimulation of higher levels, a compulsion to laugh; through stimulation of the cortex, visual and auditory reactions, among others. The results of this kind of research on the brain . . . are fascinating but we must realize that they are hardly even a beginning. The great gap to be bridged in our knowledge of the mind remains this: how are the actions of the nervous system translated into consciousness?¹

It can hardly be doubted that there is some subtle and impenetrable interaction of body and brain on the one hand, and of the mental processes on the other, taking place all the time in the human individual. It can hardly be doubted, moreover, that the penetration and description of this interaction lies forever beyond the ability of the intellect to fully comprehend it. Nor again—let me say parenthetically—does this obvious interaction of body and mind militate in any way against the belief that the mind or spirit of a human being will survive the death of his body. For the Christian doctrine is, clearly, in the words of St. Paul, that “if there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body,” and that as we—*i.e.*, the saints of God—“have borne the image of the earthy” here, “we shall also bear the image of the heavenly” hereafter (1 Cor. 15:44, 49). It is an undeniable fact of human experience that when the breath or spirit of life departs from the human body, the body dissolves, that is to say, it is resolved into its original elements. Undoubtedly this proves that *spirit* is the unifying principle of the organism, even in his present life; in other words, that the body is simply the tabernacle in which the real person, self, or spirit dwells for a brief time upon this earth. Hence if spirit can attract to itself and unify the constituent elements of the natural body, the body which is adapted to man’s needs in his present environment—much in the same manner, let us say, that a magnet attracts to itself and binds together a quantity of iron filings—certainly it follows logically that the same spirit, endowed additionally, as the spirit of every saint will be, with the regenerating and sanctifying graces of the Holy Spirit which are imparted in the Kingdom of Grace, will have abundant power to attract

1. From *The Mind*, A Life Science Library book, Introduction, 1964, 1971.

to itself and to bind together the constituent elements of a spiritual (ethereal?) body, a body constituted of a kind of matter more refined or attenuated in texture, a body that will be adapted to the needs of the redeemed person in the ages to come and on the next higher level of being, the Kingdom of Glory. "For we know," writes Paul, "that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens" (2 Cor. 5:1). It may well be that the constituent elements of the spiritual body are even now present in the natural body, and that they will need only to be sifted out and re-assembled in the processes of resurrection and glorification—that is, in the putting on of immortality. Certainly there is no indication in Scripture that the saints will be *bodiless* in eternity; the notion of "disembodied spirits" is an inheritance from Oriental and Platonic philosophies. Every human being in this present earthly state is, according to Scripture, a body-spirit unity, a living soul (Gen. 2:7). There is every reason for believing that every redeemed person will continue to be, in the heavenly state, a body-spirit unity, and a living soul, but of course with a body constituted of a more attenuated form of matter. "And I saw thrones," writes the Revelator, "and they sat upon them: and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God" (Rev. 20:4). It must be clearly understood, in this connection, however, that *interaction* does not indicate *identity* of body and mind, either in the here or in the hereafter. Man's higher thought processes simply cannot be reduced to purely physiochemical or physiological phenomena.

Therefore, while it can not be doubted that man, as he is presently constituted, is partly matter or "flesh," neither can it be doubted by any thinking person that he is *more than* matter or "flesh." Man is more than a brute animal; he is a *rational* animal. He is specified *as man*, that is, set apart from the lower orders as a separate and distinct species, as *homo sapiens* (to use a strictly scientific term), by his power of reason. His higher thought processes embrace (1) the power of thinking in abstract terms—in letters, words, and figures, all of which serve as symbols, and even in explicit terms that symbolize, not things, but relations, such as justice, love, freedom, and the like; (2) the power of creative imagination, which is the mainspring, not only of human art, but of all human science as well; and (3) the power of evaluation, or a sense of values, which lies at the root of all human society, morality, and law. There is no

evidence whatever that such exalted powers exist within or among the lower animals. Biologists who insist upon treating man as a mere animal are largely responsible for the present-day confusion in the realm of morals. For, even granting that creation was by a process of evolution of which man is the end product thus far, the fact still remains that, being man, he has evolved *from* or *beyond* the mere animal level: he is, to say the least, animal *plus*. And the *plus* is identical with his power of reasoning, the power which specifies him as man. This fact is proved every time a scientist theorizes about human nature and its origin; no matter how strenuously he may insist that man is animal and nothing more, he cannot presume to affirm that the process by which he has arrived at this conclusion is a process characteristic of a brute. The brute follows its instincts, but it gives no evidence of inherent power to think connectedly, from *this* to *that*, and so on. No man on earth would be so foolish as to try to teach his old dog Rover the Ten Commandments. Scientists would contribute greatly to general clarity of thought if they would eschew the use of such terms as "mind," "personality," "psychology," and the like, with reference to brute animals. These terms have legitimate reference only to human capacities and powers.

Every human being in this present earthly state is a body-spirit unity—a living soul. This is the teaching of the Bible. "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7). According to this Scripture, a living soul is a material body informed by the Breath of God. That is to say, the Breath of God infused into the material formed of the dust of the ground (the chemical elements, we would say) the added increment of *personal* life, or, strictly speaking, all the potentialities of a person. And the Breath of God, we must remember, is the outgoing of the Spirit of God. This is not only the teaching of the Bible; it is the conclusion as well of sound thinking and of plain common sense. Every sane man *knows* that he is infinitely more than mere physiochemical elements and processes.

"Man consists of all his actual and potential activities," writes Dr. Alexis Carrel.¹ This is a truism all too frequently ignored in our age of ultra-specialization in the physical and biological sciences. Man's history upon the earth shows that

1. Alexis Carrel, *Man the Unknown*, 119.

from the remotest times, simultaneously with the physio-chemical, biochemical, and general physiological activities carried on more or less automatically by the organism, he has manifested other and higher activities which are commonly designated mental and spiritual. These are essentially activities of the spirit which is in him, which was breathed into him in creation. These higher reaches—or perhaps it would be more correct to say *out-reaches*—of the human being are directed toward the attainment of the supreme values in life. These supreme values are generally conceded to be Truth, Beauty, Goodness, and Holiness; and the higher mental activities by which the quest for these values is pursued are designated, respectively, intellectual, esthetic, moral, and religious. The object of intellectual activity is Truth; that of esthetic activity is Beauty; that of moral activity, Goodness or Righteousness; and that of religious activity is Holiness. Holiness is, in essence, *Wholeness* (from the Greek *holon*, meaning “whole,” “entire,” “perfect,” “complete,”) and is to be equated therefore with Being, or fulness of Being. The ultimate intrinsic natural and proper end to which man is ordered by his Creator is Wholeness or real Being (entire sanctification) to be achieved ultimately in the putting on of immortality. Reality, in any case, is IS-ness; that which IS, and to the extent that IT IS, is real.

“There is a spirit in man, and the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding,” said Elihu to Job (Job 32:8). Man’s intellectual activity—thought—is empirical proof of this passage of Scripture. Thinking, according to John Dewey, is problem-solving. This is true no doubt, in so far as the function of thought is concerned,—but what is thought itself? What is this activity designated “thinking,” the activity by which man is specified as man? I quote again from Dr. Carrel:

What is thought, that strange being, which lives in the depth of ourselves without consuming a measurable quantity of chemical energy? Is it related to the known forms of energy? Could it be a constituent of our universe, ignored by the physicists, but infinitely more important than light? The mind is hidden within living matter, completely ignored by physiologists and economists, almost unnoticed by physicians. And yet it is the most colossal power of this world. Is it produced by the cerebral cells, like insulin by the pancreas and bile by the liver? From what substance is it elaborated? Does it come from a preexisting element, as glucose from glycogen, or fibrin from fibrinogen? Does it consist of a kind of energy differing from that studied by physics, expressing itself by other laws, and generated by the cells of the cerebral cortex? Or should it be considered as an immaterial being, located outside space and time, outside the dimensions of the cosmic universe, and inserting itself by an unknown procedure

into our brain, which would be the indispensable condition of its manifestations and the determining agent of its characteristics? At all times, and in all countries, great philosophers have devoted their lives to the investigation of these problems. They have not found their solution. We cannot refrain from asking the same questions. But those questions will remain unanswered until new methods for penetrating more deeply into the consciousness are discovered.¹

The basic thought processes—operations of the intellect—are three in number. The first is *simple apprehension*—the act by which the mind grasps or perceives something without affirming or denying anything about it. It is to conceive or form in the mind an idea in which one perceives or “apprehends” something. As explained heretofore in the present text, it is to think, e.g., “apple,” “man,” “chair,” “red,” “soft,” etc. Sensations, of course, provide the raw material for this kind of knowledge. It must be conceded, I think, that in the vast majority of instances our mental powers are awakened and excited, directly or indirectly, by sensation; and that our first acquired ideas have reference to sensible objects; and that, further, these primary ideas become the occasion for, and antecedents of, other ideas and emotions which derive from our higher rational and moral nature.² (By these statements I do not mean to deny *in toto* the possibility of intuition as a mode of receiving knowledge. It has been rightly said that suddenly seen facts are but discoveries of what has been there all the time. Man discovers truth; he does not create it or formulate it: physical truth is written into the structure of the cosmos, moral truth into the structure of human nature and human natural relationships. Intuition, in this sense, is not mysticism.) But sensations are, in themselves, distinct operations of the individual neurosensory system, separate impressions of different qualities in the thing producing them. For example, there is an apple on my desk.³ On looking at it, I experience a sensation of color (“redness”), another of configuration (“roundness”); if I touch the apple, I experience a third sensation, that of a certain quality of “hardness” or “softness”; and if I bite into the apple, I experience a fourth sensation, that of a certain pleasantness to the taste, a sensation probably difficult to name. But, obviously, in order to perceive the object *as an object*, some activity of my mind must unite these sensations into a whole. Aristotle called this power the active intellect; Kant called it the synthetic unity of

1. *Op. cit.*, 118-119.

2. *Vide* R. Milligan, *Scheme of Redemption*, 31.

3. I repeat here for emphasis.—C.

apperception, which is practically the same thing. At any rate, the result of this activity of some power within me, which from want of a better word must be designated "mental," in weaving these sensations into a unity, is my *perception* of the object—the apple—as a whole. Now the sensations of themselves may be explained as activities, or at least as the result of the activities of brain and nerve cells. But certainly the perception of the object, the perception in which these sensations are unified, cannot be explained, at least not exclusively, in terms of cellular processes. Nor can my attachment of the conventional word-symbol—in this case, "apple"—to the perceived object, the symbol established by social usage, be explained on the ground of any cellular or other physiological process, for the use of language involves memory and memory images, and in addition gives "meaning" to my perception. It is utterly inconceivable that cells should remain in juxtaposition over a period of years in such a manner as to reproduce memory image. As a matter of fact, as it has been stated heretofore, scientists now tell us that all the cells of the human body are replaced by new cells every four years or so. Hence, neither the retention of memory images nor their recall can be identified with any cellular process.

The second operation of the intellect is a *judgment*. A judgment is an act of the mind by which it unites two concepts by affirming or separates them by denying. In forming a judgment, as, *e.g.*, The apple is red, or, Man is mortal, I give assent mentally to what I believe to be an ontological relationship and thus declare myself in possession of the truth on this or that point. A judgment logically expressed is a *proposition*, and grammatically expressed, is a *sentence*.

The third operation of the intellect is *reasoning*, or thinking connectedly, that is, from *this* to *that*, and so on. Formal reasoning involves the syllogism, the classic example of which is the following:

All men are mortal. (Major Premise)
Socrates is a man. (Minor Premise)
Therefore, Socrates is mortal. (Conclusion).

Maritain writes:

Reasoning is the most complex operation of our mind; it is by reasoning that we go from what we know already to what we do not yet know, that we discover, that we demonstrate, that we make *progress in knowledge*.¹

1. Jacques Maritain, *An Introduction to Logic*, 2.

In inductive reasoning, the mind moves from the sensible to the intelligible level. In deductive reasoning, the mind moves purely on the intelligible plane. Incidentally, these mental processes are all implicit in the words of Jesus, quoted by Him from the prophet Isaiah (6:9-10):

By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand;
 And seeing ye shall see, and shall in no wise perceive;
 For this people's heart is waxed gross,
 And their ears are dull of hearing,
 And their eyes they have closed;
 Lest haply they should perceive with their eyes,
 And hear with their ears,
 And understand with their heart,
 And should turn again,
 And I should heal them.

(Matt. 13:14-15).

Sensations, I repeat, may be mere cellular processes. They may, and undoubtedly do, serve to awaken consciousness. But what is "consciousness"? Should anyone answer, Consciousness is *awareness*, I should reply that "awareness" is merely a synonym for, not a definition of, consciousness. What consciousness is in itself, no one knows, and there is no indication at present that any man will ever know. Sensations, however, do not provide meaning, understanding, belief or truth. These are facts and values characteristic of a higher level of being than the mere physiochemical or biological. By no stretch of the imagination is any unbiased person able to identify these higher thought processes—simple apprehension, judgment, retention and recall of memory images, and inductive and deductive reasoning—with the shuffling and re-shuffling of brain cells. These are activities of the spirit that is in man, powers that were originally imparted to him by the Breath of God.

Moral activity in man is also a historical fact. The fact that individuals and peoples, no matter how primitive their culture, have always been known to make distinctions of some sort between right and wrong, good and bad, in human conduct, can hardly be refuted. Even though anthropologists may designate such distinctions, in their most elementary form, as "customary" law, the fact remains nevertheless that the distinctions are made, and made universally. Moreover, although different reasons have been assigned for these distinctions, in diverse social structures, and by different systems of ethics, the fact of the universality of the distinction is historically established.

The distinction between right and wrong is a universal judgment of the race; as one author has put it: "The feeling of obligation is an ineradicable element of our being." This fundamental distinction between right and wrong, good and bad, has been found to be so general that by many philosophers it is designated the Ethical Fact. Moral activity—the quest for Goodness, for the answer to the question, What is the Good Man?—is another manifestation, obviously, of the *spirit* that is in man.

The same is true of the esthetic and religious activities which have characterized the life of man upon earth from the very earliest times. Esthetic activity manifests itself in the quest for Beauty, and in the creation and contemplation of Beauty; and the crude, but graphic, paintings on cave walls, uncovered by the archaeologists, prove that the esthetic sense existed in the most primitive human beings as well as in the most civilized. Religious activity too is just as real in human history as esthetic activity. The religious consciousness of man has manifested itself, in all ages, and among all tribes and peoples, in a great variety of forms, depending of course upon the standard of revelation by which it was guided, from the crudest animistic beliefs and the ritualistic worship of gods who were but personifications of the forces of Nature, up to that pure Love for God and man which fills the heart of the spiritually-minded person for whom true religion is the constant communion of the human spirit with the Divine Spirit. It is doubtful indeed that any people ever existed without some consciousness of their human frailty and need of strength to be gotten from a source or sources higher than themselves, and without a sense of sin, a sense of the need of salvation and of prayer, and a dim longing for an expectation of survival beyond the grave. It has been rightly said that man learns to pray before he learns to reason; that he feels the need of supplication long before he begins to argue from effects to causes. I am reminded here of Bergson's thrilling words:

1. George P. Fisher, *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, 19.

Beings have been called into existence who were destined to love and be loved, since creative energy is to be defined as love. Distinct from God, Who is this energy itself, they could spring into being only in a universe, and therefore the universe sprang into being. In that portion of the universe which is our planet—probably in our planetary system—such beings, in order to appear, have had to be wrought into a species, and this species involved a multitude of other species, which led up to it, or sustained it, or else formed a residue. It may be that in other systems there are only individuals radically differentiated—assuming them to be multifarious and moral—and maybe these creatures too were shaped at a single stroke, so as to be complete from the first.¹ On Earth, in any case, the species which accounts for the existence of all the others is only partially itself. It would never for an instant have thought of becoming completely itself, if certain representatives of it had not succeeded, by an individual effort added to the general work of life, in breaking through the resistance put up by the instrument, in triumphing over materiality—in a word in getting back to God. These men are the mystics. They have blazed a trail along which other men may pass. They have, by this very act, shown to the philosopher the whence and whither of life.²

The mystics see, says Bergson, that “the very essence of divinity can be both a person and a creative power.” That power is Love. “God is love, and the object of love: herein lies the whole contribution of mysticism.”³ (This does not mean, however, that feeling is an acceptable substitute for an intelligent faith.)

Let it never be forgotten that intellectual, moral, esthetic, and religious activities are facts of human experience and of human history from the most remote times. They are proofs conclusive that man is not *all* matter—that there is a spirit in him and that the Breath of the Almighty—the outgoing of the Divine Spirit—has given him understanding. They are proofs conclusive that man was created in the image of God.

Materialism is a faithless, hopeless, lifeless creed. To summarize in the words of C. E. M. Joad:

Inconsistent with ethics and esthetics, and owning an inadequate basis in physics, materialism is indefensible in logic. More precisely, in so far as it establishes the conclusions which it asserts, it robs these conclusions of any possibility of being true.⁴

In a purely material world there can never be such a thing as *oughtness* or *value*. Truth, Beauty, and Goodness simply do not exist for anyone in a world that is nothing more than an aggregation of atoms and cells.

1. Does Bergson have any reference here to *angels*?

2. Henri Bergson, *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, 245-246; translated by Audra and Brereton.

3. *Op. cit.*, 240, 241-242.

4. *Guide to Philosophy*, 539.