

To the Readers of 'Embers'

The gift of Faith is given only to those in whom there is a predisposition toward acquiring it.

And there is an objective test of whether we have the disposition and capacity for Faith. It can best be formulated negatively. Our deliberate decision NOT to accept as an hypothesis, a spiritual concept such as Embers of the Faith, which is not contrary to reason and not inconsistent with and irreconcilable to the Deposit of Faith, is an act of the will for which we are responsible.

Such a negative decision should confront us with the realization that we do NOT have the disposition and capacity to make a real act of faith, which requires precisely such acceptance.

Therefore we shall never acquire the 'instinct' of Faith, and without Faith we shall not understand the message of 'Embers'.

EMBERS of THE FAITH

The Cosmic Significance of Christianity:
A Modern Formula for Unity



RAY SCOTT

Published by Ray Scott • 1963
33-38 165th Street, Flushing 58, N. Y.

Contents

Preface	5
Introduction	9
1. Why You Should Read Embers of the Faith . .	13
2. How To Read Embers of the Faith	16
3. Embers of the Faith	18
4. The Vulnerable Area	22
5. Peter and Paul. The Means and the End . . .	27
6. Knowing and Being. The Letter and the Spirit .	32
7. The Old Problem on a New Level	39
8. Being, As It Should Be	41
9. The Satanic Strategy against the New Man . .	44
10. Penetrating Satan's 'Defense in Depth' . . .	46
11. We Begin to Distinguish the New Man	48
12. Mary, Full of Grace	51
13. The Cult of Mary	56
14. The Sacraments and the New Man	62
15. The Priest and the Monk	65
16. Marriage, in the Old Testament and the New . .	69
17. Marriage and the Theologians	72
18. Marriage and the New Man	74
19. The Contemporary Scene	80
20. The Last Days	83
21. The End	85

170104

Preface

Life is, or should be, for every man, a spiritual adventure of discovery, exploration, growth and change. But our individual spiritual adventures are part of the destiny of our species, and the destiny of our species is, in turn, part of a cosmic plan. The unfolding of this plan has thus far involved the appearance of *Homo Sapiens* and, according to Christian tradition and belief, his original failure to fulfill his destiny (the 'fall' of Adam), his subsequent reinstatement on the path to his original destiny (the Redemption), and the next stage in the progressive fulfilment of that destiny, the coming of the Holy Spirit to earth. As Christians we are now called to a creative participation in the plan and the understanding of our individual destinies will of course be more enlightened and their achievement more likely, if they are seen in this cosmic frame of reference. This is our heritage and our trust and Embers of the Faith had its genesis many years ago in a few rather simple, random thoughts based on what the author then had of a Christian philosophy of life and jotted down for the benefit of his young children that their several adventures might yield them the richest reward. Having broadened in scope and developed in detail in the course of the author's own adventure, the now considerable collection demanded some sort of ordered arrangement and thus there emerged an essay. Over the years the fabric of ideas seemed to wear well and it appeared that the thoughts, if available in pamphlet form, might be of value to other Catholic parents. But if to Catholics as Christians then why not to Christians generally or, for that matter, why not to 'all people' for whom the Gospel message was in fact intended? However, when the manuscript was routinely submitted to the Censor Librorum for an eventual Imprimature (a guarantee that it contained no formal heresy), it was rejected as 'contrary to Faith'!

In his opinion the Rev. Censor seemed to reveal, and years of subsequent exploration confirmed that, at least among Catholics both clerical and lay, there was a wide gap between standard religious teaching and the essential concept of human destiny proposed in this essay, and little or no understanding of what Christian Revelation and Tradition offer as a clue and a guide to that destiny. The destiny of *Homo Sapiens* is herein conceived as evolutionary in character, and though the Rev. Censor's reaction was at first disconcerting, upon reflection it be-

came clear that it merely demonstrated a universal characteristic of evolution, to wit, that very, very few of any established species exhibit signs of the 'mutation' from which a new species eventually emerges. And among Homo Sapiens it can be only those 'mutants' who have, to some degree, become aware of their new atypical characteristic who will be able to recognize it, or any manifestation of it. To others, even though they be theologians, the New Man's point of view will not be understandable, hence will elicit a negative reaction. This problem will be explored in detail later.

Meanwhile, that a person in or outside of the Catholic Church to whom the concepts herein appeal might not, under such influence, be baffled and possibly misled in his search for the highest conceivable philosophy of life, the most organic, sublime and personally most valuable he can find anywhere regardless of how it is labelled, it seemed necessary to provide him with some basis for an independent judgement on the intrinsic validity of the point of view developed in this essay and thus with criteria by which to evaluate the problems set in his path by Catholics, Churchmen or otherwise. He might then be able to decide, in a reasonable and responsible way, whether controversial points which may appeal to and inspire him really are contrary to Christian Faith (in which case he would of course look elsewhere, and in vain, for the fullness of a philosophy of life,) or else that the 'road-blocks' merely reflect a limitation of Catholic popular understanding or even 'official' (note 'quotes') teaching, i.e. by professional churchmen. Accordingly, as a preliminary, every prospective reader of this essay is invited to keep in mind several questions.

If Roman Catholic Christianity is said to stand for something *different* from the concept of human destiny herein ascribed to it:

- a) Is the concept of human destiny herein offered contrary to reason, over all or in any detail?
- b) Is Christianity of *less* significance or content, over all or in any detail, than it is herein conceived to be?
- c) Could Christianity imply *more*, over all or in any detail, than the concept of human destiny herein ascribed to it?

To say *merely* that it is *different* means nothing.

This approach is not to be confused with advocating the heresy of 'private interpretation'. Obviously there must inevitably be differences in individual capacities to understand the same doctrine, and the distinction between the two circumstances, one not permissible within the Faith and the other inevitable among members of any group, in-

cluding the Twelve Apostles, will be indicated early in this essay. But the responsibility for the choice must in every case be a personal one.

Clearly then, if the Judeo-Christian Revelation of man's cosmic destiny is true, as this essay assumes, it must be understandable to modern man, and the more so as man's knowledge of himself, his history and his cosmic environment increases. The understanding of the material aspect of the cosmos is the province of Science. The understanding (and expression) of spiritual factors in the cosmic plan is the province of Religion. Since man is both material and spiritual, an understanding of his part in the cosmic plan, which includes his own destiny, must enlist both Science and Religion. This necessarily implies that true Science, however modern, should illuminate true Religion, however ancient (and vice versa!) and this essay, being addressed to modern man relies heavily upon this principle. It was, for instance, the scientific thesis developed in Lecompt duNuoy's *Human Destiny* which suggested how a speculatively minded person might be provided with a reasonable secular approach to the peculiarly Christian concepts of that destiny explored in this essay. Following that excellent pattern, the next few pages will, it is hoped, provide a general orientation to the thesis of Embers of the Faith.

Introduction

Few well informed persons today have any difficulty understanding the cosmos, including man, in terms of progressive change, or 'evolution'; the unfolding, as it were, of a great thought in the mind of the Creator. We know by observation that the *physical* aspect of the cosmos is still undergoing progressive change, and no thoughtful person is likely to seriously maintain that the evolution of the *spiritual* factors, or at least the manifestation of them, has necessarily come to an end with the emergence of the rational animal *Homo Sapiens* (though change in physical form has probably ceased with respect to this line). With the advent of *Homo Sapiens*, bearing this new essential characteristic of rationality, evolutionary change, which always develops beyond the highest characteristic already attained (see *Problem of Species* by Mortimer Adler) would henceforth be in the spiritual realm, involving man's spiritual characteristics (intellect and will), but the manner of change will in all respects be consistent with the evolutionary pattern already clearly established.

For instance: reason and scientific evidence alike indicate that the physical evolution of species is never a mass movement, but takes place individual by individual until a sufficient (though always very small) number of the atypical members or 'mutants' of an existing species have appeared to procreate their kind in quantity, establish their new essential characteristic and thus found a new species. All of the elements of which any new essential characteristic are constituted had, of course, already existed. But, at a critical moment, some mysterious influence or circumstance caused them to manifest for the first time in an established species in such a way as to initiate a mutation. As to *Homo Sapiens*, whether he evolved physically from a previous species or had been physically created directly and immediately by God, what distinguished him as a new species was the infusion into his soul of a new life principle bearing the new essential characteristic of rationality. This established the pattern of future change, and the evolution from *Homo Sapiens* to the New Man would also come about on a spiritual level, again by the infusion of a new life principle. Also, since the New Species has not yet been established on earth (and will not be till after the general resurrection,) this is still the time of individual 'mutations', and here we edge into religion.

In all species below man these mutations, the development of a

new essential characteristic, came solely from or were permitted by, a change in environment, to which each succeeding species in time adapted itself and thereby survived. With the emergence of Homo Sapiens however, evolutionary development for the first time involves a creature with an intellect and a will, and further evolution of this species must involve the characteristic operation of these faculties. Man is thus the only creature to take a creative part in his own evolution, since if any new essential change is to occur in him it must be with the assent of his intellect and the movement of his will. This confronts each prospective 'mutant' with a new and peculiar problem which each must solve for himself.

The problem stems from the fact that NO lower species is capable of conceiving the nature of the new essential characteristic of a species immediately above it. How then is Homo Sapiens to know the essential characteristic of the New Man and how, therefore, can he know the direction in which to guide his will toward the development of the characteristic distinguishing a typical member of the New Species? There is but one possible answer; he must be TOLD. Just as, for the evolutionary development of an aquatic into a higher species it was necessary to have land, an environmental factor, so for the evolutionary development of a creature with intellect and will it is necessary to have *information*, a spiritual factor. It is the acceptance of and conformation to this *spiritual* territory that transforms Homo Sapiens into a higher species, just as adaptation to material surroundings transformed the lower species. No species is ever *required* to accept and conform to new territory however, and with man acceptance may be withheld without him thereby either doing violence to his rational nature or wilfully failing to do God's will. In fact *all* of a species *never* evolves.

If, however, an evolutionary change IS to develop on the basis of the new spiritual territory now provided, a key factor must come into play, one of those extremely subtle influences which mysteriously induce and support mutations. Having been attracted to the new territory, the gap between the point at which our investigation of the information and our ability to understand it BY reason must end and our intuitive evaluation and acceptance of the information with the *consent* of reason begins, must be bridged by an *act of faith*.

This is a characteristically human and perfectly sound and accepted scientific procedure. A scientist attempting to explore a phenomenon beyond direct observation often erects an hypothesis, that is, a concept which, if true, will provide him with his answer. He makes an act of faith in this concept as being AN answer and then proceeds to test, by reason and experiment, if it is THE answer. As long as he is not *compelled* to *reject* the hypothesis and its implications, the truly

scientific investigator will follow all clues, no matter where they lead. The investigation into the nature of the evolution beyond Homo Sapiens should conform to this practice.

The 'hypothesis' in this case is proposed in what is called Judeo-Christian Revelation, to be accepted on faith. We may note here, incidentally, that this is the sole and only purpose of the Bible. It is intended to serve no historical, scientific or other secular purpose whatsoever, though it is often a great help in archeological research. Even as a guide to human destiny it is fully useful and reliable only in the hands of those for whose guidance it was given and who are prepared to use it properly, to wit the consciously evolving New Man. The acceptance of the hypothesis as reasonable may, after investigation, be followed by the conviction that it is true, but mere conviction is not enough to initiate the evolutionary process. This does not begin until there develops in the seeker a degree of practical conformity to the teaching thus evaluated; until, in other words, there is a 'conversion'.

According to Old Testament Revelation, understood in modern terms, the evolution of the human species was interrupted precisely because at this point in the emergence of Homo Sapiens, the first full-fledged and potentially procreative members of that species who, by virtue of possessing intellects and wills, could consciously promote or retard their evolution, this original pair refused to accept and conform to the information and guidance, the spiritual environment in which they originally found themselves, and in which their full development and subsequent evolution could have taken place. It was as if a formerly aquatic creature, having begun to live on land, had refused to develop lungs, hence was compelled to return to the water. In the case of Homo Sapiens it could rather be said that the environment rejected him, because he became not suited to it through his own wilfulness and he was prevented from returning to it for the same reason. This aborted his development, so that the species failed to attain its place in the evolutionary scheme. The parent members thus destroyed for themselves and their posterity the conditions necessary for further evolution. This defection by the parent members is what is called 'original sin' and in the nature of the case the break was irreparable. That is why a new start, by virtue of the Redemption promised in the Old Testament had to be made, and the redemptive process would exhibit the characteristic of all cosmic change, that is, it would be evolutionary. The first evolutionary move made by Homo Sapiens in this new beginning was the acceptance of and attempt to conform to, information proposing an essential spiritual concept not then possessed by the human species as such, namely a belief in one God and faith in the coming of a Redeemer. It was the Jews as a nation (the spiritual equivalent of

species) who first adopted and became indented with this revealed concept, along with belief in the coming of a king who would reestablish the Jewish nation in its former glory. With the coming of the Redeemer the faith of the Jews was vindicated and man was reinstated on the path to his ultimate destiny. The Old Law was thus fulfilled, and with it the purpose of the Jewish nation as a phase of man's spiritual evolution.

However, the concept of the Jews was of a redeemer who would also be an earthly king, and the next 'evolvment' would be with respect to that concept. Following the well established pattern of evolution, this would call for a new species distinguished by all the essential spiritual characteristics, or concepts, of the old, plus one *new* essential spiritual concept. This essential spiritual characteristic not possessed by the parent species was the concept of a king and a kingdom NOT of this world. The Redemption having removed the chief obstacle to man's further evolutionary progress, the path of future development was then indicated to him, again in what we call Revelation, now according to the New Testament. If he accepted and conformed to this new spiritual territory, the further evolution of Homo Sapiens was to come about, individual by individual as usual, through the termination of the functioning of the old life principle in the soul of the now redeemed children of Adam and the substitution therefor of the life principle of the New Man, sent to earth at Pentecost. This new life principle is not another 'creation' in the sense that the life principle it replaces was a creation (though a creation 'after the image' of God), but something on a higher level. It is a sharing in the Creator's own nature, a sharing in the eternal Spirit of God, even to the extent of being co-creators of a New Species. This is the meaning and effect of Christian baptism. It is the start of the great adventure of this life, the ultimate human destiny, for which the next chapters of Embers of the Faith offer a preparation.

1. *Why You Should Read Embers of the Faith*

The principal thesis of *Embers* is that the Christian is a new species of man, evolved from *Homo Sapiens* (or 'man born of woman' to use the Biblical term,) and as distinct from the parent species as any two related species could be from each other. With this thought in mind look all about you, in your neighborhood and in the world. How many specimens of the parent species do you see who have to any notable degree fulfilled the potentialities of mind and heart with which human nature is endowed? Mysterious as it seems, there are very few, and we have no reason to expect that the individual differences which exist within our own species do not also exist within the species New Man. In fact we may assume that what we are to be in the next life, the life of the New Man, depends on what we have in this present life acquired the capacity to become. Thus we Christians are at each moment living in embryo, or as 'mutants', the life we shall live for eternity and, as we shall see, there is within that life an even more striking disparity and general poverty of embryonic development than we see on the merely human level all around us. Yet our time on earth is our only opportunity to acquire to our predestined capacity those 'seed characteristics' which, carried into and reaching their full satisfaction only in eternal life, fulfill the nature and destiny of the New Man.

We realize, of course, that material circumstances affect our opportunity to learn and to grow. A life dominated by the sheer struggle for existence, grave physical discomfort, or even pre-occupation with the legitimate 'cares and worries of our state of life' leaves little time for the reading, discussion and meditation necessary for growth in the Spirit. We must recognize also that growth in the New Man, like any mutation in the natural order, is a mysterious *individual* gift, and that while many may be 'called' by Baptism to a significant degree of development in the New Life as by natural birth they are to life on earth, relatively few are 'chosen' to fulfill their potentialities in either life. Our interest is merely to be what we are called to be. But movement in that direction depends upon the extent to which we learn *what* manner of man we are to be, so that by corresponding acts of the intellect and will we may attain to our predestined capacity in either life. Learning, however, depends on teaching and specifically, in the New Life, of teach-

ing the doctrine of the New Man in Christ. Of course, even if we are told about it we may never understand or accept it (and in fact evolutionary mutations in any order are extremely rare), but if we never hear of it, all hope of its attainment is obviously lost. The time is short, the goal is eternal. Embers of the Faith undertakes to set forth and explain the nature of the New Man and the point of view and criteria to be cultivated if we are to use our intellects and wills to understand and acquire the 'seed characteristics' of that life. This, it may be repeated, is the principal purpose of the essay. But, secondarily, it also undertakes to show where we Catholics now stand in this respect and why we are where we are, so that whatever scandal we may give to non-Catholics by our limited popular comprehension and conduct, at least the message itself will not be obscured, suppressed or discredited by our example or our ignorance.

To understand this danger it is necessary to make two related distinctions; one between an organization and an organism, the other between churchmen and the Church. While all organisms exhibit organization, not all organizations are organisms. The visible Church is an organization, and from the choosing of the Twelve until Pentecost it was *only* an organization, much like the body of Adam before it received the breath of life. But since Pentecost the Church has exhibited organization because it is an organism, the life principle of which is the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Spirit.

This distinction underlies and illuminates the dichotomy which runs through the whole of this essay and has its counterpart in the difference between the nature, point of view and general functioning of man born of woman, the mere Church organization man, as against the mores and other characteristics of the man 'born of the Spirit,' the New Man, Churchman or otherwise. It is the difference, if you will, between a bouquet of beautiful flowers and the Vine and the Branches. This dichotomy was plainly evident among the disciples at the First Church Council, as we shall presently see. The adverse criticism in this essay is directed against the 'organization man', that is, against mere clerical leadership, not against the organism. (Even a pope can be criticised on this basis without thereby implying criticism of the Church.) And to establish this negative thesis it is, of course, necessary to quote an official spokesman for the Church, that is, one who speaks with the formal authority of a bishop, directly or by delegation. But it would be unfortunate if the reader, Catholic or otherwise, viewed this all too human aspect of the matter as comparable in importance to the positive thesis advanced in these pages. To bog down in dismay and resentment at the writer's lack of awe of professional churchmen merely as such, and regardless of rank or author-

ity, would be a sign of intellectual immaturity, and a person in whose mind this reaction looms large should perhaps stop reading at once, for **the chances are that he does not have the capacity to profit from the positive and constructive thesis which is the principal content of this essay.** The alternative to plain speaking on incompetent leadership is to suppress the fact altogether, than which nothing could better aid Satanic strategy. Moreover, the test of official attitude is inevitable by Church law, in that anything of a doctrinal nature written by a Catholic for publication is expected to be submitted to Church censorship. Thus, in the decision of the censor librorum of a diocese we have, for practical purposes, one formal demonstration of the official judgement of the Church as to what may or may not be offered to the faithful and the world concerning the Faith.

As has been indicated, the organization exhibited by the Church today is the external manifestation of an inner vitality and character. But as we are well aware, an organism may retain its visible organization for some time after its life principle has left it. And we know also that a lifeless reproduction of a living organism may be so skilfully 'organized' as to deceive the eye. (Satan, a master illusionist, understands this point very well.) There is, however, one infallible test of whether an organization embodies a life principle, and that is its ability not only to exist and grow but to maintain its health by throwing off or developing immunity to, debilitating influences. Conversely, where that inner vitality is weak or lacking it seems divinely ordained, in the spiritual as in the plant and animal world, that the weakness or lack always invites decay and dissolution. It is with the loss and restoration of this inner strength that we are here concerned. The spirit of the New Man has been allowed to atrophy, has been shrunk, undernourished and all but buried, with the worst perhaps yet to come. We are, in fact, divinely warned that at some time the Faith may become so cold as to be hard to find on earth.

True, Omniscience has also assured us that the Faith will not perish, but if the embers are to be rekindled, even in individual souls, it must be by the efforts of those in whom the spark survives. Theirs is the mission to discover the weakness upon which Satan works, to grasp and counter the tactics by which he exploits that weakness, and to bring to the dormant embers a refreshing breath of the life of the Spirit. If the embers come alive, their rekindled light may once again draw the eyes of man and their heat warm his heart and perhaps bring into play in more individuals those extremely subtle forces which influence mutations. This essay is an humble attempt in that direction, not by a scholarly professional guide but by one who is himself a lonely adventurer in a vast and largely unknown territory. He can only

leave ajar the door by which he entered so that through it those who seek a meaning to life can get a glimpse of their eternal destiny, invite the individual adventurer to enter and indicate some of the factors which could make the exploration fruitful. If you are moved to undertake this spiritual adventure, you should read *Embers of the Faith*, for awareness of and attraction to this new spiritual territory is one of the necessary, though extremely subtle, factors which may be a prelude to individual mutation.

2. *How To Read Embers of the Faith*

No infant, whether of man born of woman or of man reborn by the Spirit, knows what it is. When man born of woman arrives at that stage of growth where it can say "I am a little boy (or girl) and *that* is a baby", in other words at that point where it has become aware of what it is as against what it was, it has become a child. But while man born of woman arrives at childhood without any act of will or conscious effort, with man born of the Spirit, the New Man, it is different. The New Man is a man of faith, and his transition from infancy to childhood requires an act of faith, and a conversion. The process begins subtly with an awareness of and attraction toward certain new spiritual values which, when they are consciously examined, inspire the approval and active support of the intellect and will. When this support and co-operation are forthcoming we have an act of faith, made consciously and deliberately because the New Man wants to grow in that direction, and this is the beginning of 'conversion of mores'. The active support of the intellect can be won, however, only when what is newly proposed *is not inconsistent with and irreconcilable to the deposit of Faith* (for the Catholic) *and in no case may it be contrary to reason*, though it may be strange or even startling.

The first practical move, then, is to decide, courageously and with confidence in Divine Providence, if these New Ideas are *INconsistent with and irreconcilable to the deposit of Faith, or inferior in concept to another idea a person may already hold* on any point. If the person cannot decide *at once* that the new idea is clearly and hopelessly inconsistent with and irreconcilable to the Faith or inferior to a concept already held, then, as a matter of prudence he *must* give the ideas the benefit of the doubt and go on from there. He cannot in good faith do otherwise. In other words, having gone as far as his intellect can take

him, the infant New Man must now go one step further, a step which marks the difference between infancy and childhood. "Unless we become as little children" in the New Man we shall never find maturity in that life. But having taken that step, we acquire the use of a new faculty peculiar to the New Man, to wit Faith, described by St. Paul as "a sure insight into things unseen", and this again parallels the natural progression.

The lower order of animals have only instinct to guide them in what to accept or reject for their own good, and the instinct is trustworthy. (Of course man baits traps with food, but that is another story.) In Homo Sapiens, the rational animal, there are of course the animal instincts, but there is in addition an analogue to instinct, peculiar to man, which guides him in conduct appropriate to *his* species and which is as trustworthy as the animal instinct. It is called 'conscience'. In the good specimen of Homo Sapiens enlightened conscience dominates the animal instinct and it is also practically impossible that any decision made on the basis of conscience will be rejected by man's rational faculty. (Prudence is another matter.) In the New Man there are both animal instincts and conscience, but he has also another analogue, in a still higher order, to guide him in matters peculiar to *his* species. This is what is called 'Faith', and what is accepted on faith must of course also accord with conscience and with reason. Faith is not just a pious but blind belief in something we are told upon authority. It has this aspect only among infant New Men and can lead to superstition. Faith means that 'by instinct' we have a sure guide to what cannot be discovered by the mind's eye. It is Faith, as thus understood, which separates the species New Man from Homo Sapiens. Conscience, the instinct of Homo Sapiens, distinguishes between right and wrong; Faith, the instinct of the New Man, distinguishes between a lower and a higher good.

There is one other point to be remembered in reading Embers. Truth is all of one piece. If by faith, (or even reason) we grasp one thread of the fabric we have the whole, potentially. What point we first grasp makes little difference. We may ignore any number of the threads offered, but if we come to one upon which we feel we can lay hold, and we do so, we have embarked on our adventure. Proceeding carefully and following the 'weave', that is the thread in hand and those closely associated, we will gradually discern the whole pattern. By the same token, however, if we find a point we *can* accept we are, to a degree, required to presume that all the rest of the thesis also makes sense, and we are therefore challenged to push on. This is where intellectual integrity and the spirit of scientific adventure take over, and we should be intrepid enough to keep going until we are con-

fronted with a contradiction or a non-sequitur. At that point, but not until then, may we in good faith abandon the quest. All we must be sure of is that the thread upon which we first lay hold is not inconsistent with and irreconcilable to the deposit of Faith. This, in brief, gives us the spirit in which Embers should be read.

Having thus, it is hoped, provided an orientation to the subject and indicated how it is to be approached and examined, we shall now attempt to set forth the practical aspects of the problem; the nature of the territory to be explored, the conditions which make the exploration difficult and the objective which, if attained, will have made the effort worth while.

3. *Embers of the Faith*

The 'fire' that Christ came to cast upon the earth and which blazed with such intensity during the early ages of the Faith, no longer burns so brightly nor with so much warmth. To be sure, there were visible signs of cooling even in apostolic times. For instance, the outright 'communism', the community of property—that marked some early Christian communities (Acts 2:44-45) was short-lived as a popular phenomenon, though like many another characteristic of those communities it is still preserved in monasteries and among religious orders. Indeed much of the modern world is still bathed superficially in something like an afterglow of that early conflagration, but over the centuries the fire itself has been greatly subdued by the wily and unrelenting warfare of Satan, and the measure of his success is that we have today what amounts to hardly more than embers of that once blazing fire of the Faith. Evidence of the deterioration we find all around us, and we shall see later how great it is. But the process has been so subtle as to have incited little awareness from one generation to the next. Each generation has tended to take for granted the institutions and the mores into which it was born, or, if criticism of the deterioration emerged, it was discouraged or suppressed by professional churchmen or else resulted in a heresy, and thus, in one way or another, each generation passed on to the next just a little less of the vitality.

It was inevitable, however, that the cumulative result of this decline in spiritual values should sooner or later register upon some Christian consciousness, and it is in fact clearly discernible in the kind of spirituality we have today. While retaining most of the externals, we

shall see that Christianity today has become more or less dessicated and formalized and that its basic principles have been obscured by a multiplication of pious practices, especially among Catholics. Examples of this tell-tale characteristic are cited throughout this essay, and in one recent instance, described in detail later, pious practice had actually reversed basic values (of the Immaculate Conception vs the Assumption) to such an extent as to have generated an almost violent reaction of the Spirit. Such instances show, on one hand, that there has in fact been serious deterioration, promoted or condoned by the 'organization man', and on the other hand that the Spirit has the mysterious power to save the organism from the negligence, ignorance or 'practical outlook' of its official leaders. Since this deterioration is constant, it follows that with the passage of time the evidence should become more plentiful and pronounced. Actually, in recent years this has been true to a disconcerting extent. The material in Embers has been reworked many times to bring it up to date in the light of new developments, but the profusion and variety of recent examples has outstripped the effort to maintain the once fairly well-ordered composition of this essay.

This deterioration is not the fault of the Church as such. The power by which she was established and lives, the content and efficacy of the Sacraments by which she creates and cares for her children, and the deposit of Faith which she preserves whole and uncorrupted and from which her children can learn the meaning and purpose of their Christ-life, all these are by divine decree beyond the reach of Satan's tampering. Nor can the blame be laid altogether on the faithful, for there still is in the heart of man a God-given hunger for things of the Spirit. In man born of woman this is a hunger for truth, justice and a meaning to life. In the New Man it is all of these, but it is also a hunger for things of the New Life, the 'things of God' that only life in Christ can satisfy. It is in this latter area that Satan's characteristic strategy is permitted to operate. Since he cannot altogether eradicate this hunger, he does the next best thing for his purpose, namely to downgrade the appetite or instinct one subtle step. His aim is to train it to be satisfied with just a little bit less than would permit it to grow to effective maturity. Thus in man born of woman the appetite for spiritual values has been overshadowed by preoccupation with the good material life, and in the New Man the concepts and values peculiar to his species have been obscured by directing attention to the virtues and mores, the spiritual concepts and values, of man born of woman, chief of which is his concern with Redemption. It is with the deterioration in this latter case that we are specifically concerned for it indicates another loss similar to that which befell the first Homo Sapiens, namely

the unawareness, neglect or rejection of the spiritual environment in which, following the full development of his redeemed nature, his subsequent evolution into a new species could take place. How has it come about?

It is true that the teaching of Christ in the New Testament is available to us today as yesterday and as in former ages, through the Teaching Church. But the Church is not a disembodied voice. Primarily she speaks through the popes and bishops (though for many practical and official purposes she speaks quite effectively through lesser clergy by delegated authority) and, in practice, this has always meant that popular familiarity with the Gospels, and the extent to which the meaning and significance of Christ's teaching has reached the faithful, has depended on human beings. But these human beings in turn do not speak as ventriloquist's dummies nor in a trance like the ancient oracles, but according to their natures as men, and this is the area Satan has successfully infiltrated.

For the fact of the matter is that there are two orders or classes of men, those wise and learned in the natural order and those mature and wise in the New Order, the New Men. The two categories are not mutually exclusive, of course. The former is represented chiefly by exegetes and theologians who function primarily as technicians, or administrative parts of an organization, while the latter are primarily members, or 'cells' of an organism, who may not be professional churchmen at all, though among them will also be found those versed in theology, including popes and bishops. But it is almost exclusively through the former class, the professional exegetes and theologians, because of their formal status, that the deposit of Faith is taught, or permitted to be taught, to the people. The teaching is no better than the teachers, and the fruit of their work has been appraised by the noted editor and author, the Rev. James F. Gillis C.S.P. in the *Tablet* of Aug. 14 1951:

"Speaking of the Gospels", he wrote, "I consider them to be in general masterpieces of simplification. But the exegetes have got busy on them. Professors of Scripture and of dogmatic theology have piled up massive commentaries on them, have expounded, argued, debated and in the end have buried the simple parables of Jesus under a mountainous mass of erudition". And Fr. Gillis draws a parallel with what happened among the Jews before Christ, when "the scholars caused so much confusion in the minds of readers that the only way to find out what Moses or Isaiah had said was to go back to the originals".

But the parallel is much broader and deeper than that, with much more profound significance and implications. When we compare the tragic results which followed upon the obfuscation of the exegetes

of the Old Testament with the effects manifest today because of the obfuscation of the exegetes of the New Testament, we will have a clue as to where we are heading. All, of course, in the mysterious working out of God's will, under the well recognized influences of popular mores and public 'organizational' problems which at one time or another have affected the people, particularly the churchmen.

God inspired the Old Testament so as to prepare man for the coming of a Redeemer, and to enable man to identify the Redeemer when he came. The teaching was preserved by Jewish scholars for many centuries until the actual coming of the Redeemer, and it was used by Christ as proof of His identity and His mission. Yet the religious leaders of the true faith, who certainly knew at least the letter of these Scriptures, caused Him to be put to death. Even after these Scriptures had been fulfilled, His own disciples on the road to Emmaus did not recognize Him despite His review of those Scriptures, beginning with Moses and all the prophets, relating to Himself. Yet the message of the Old Testament was relatively simple compared with that of the New, because the Old Testament was for the guidance of man born of woman and dealt for the most part with a concept not beyond the grasp of human understanding, an atonement commensurate with an offence and with the coming of a king, though here too there was a meaning beyond the grasp of even the just and believing of the Old Law. While for us the meanings implicit in the Old Testament have become explicit in the New, the New is in its way as mysterious as was the Old, or even more so. If Christ was not the king of the nation which had for centuries looked forward to His coming, of what people could he be king? Christ's answer to that was that His kingdom was not of this world. So we must conclude that the 'subjects' over whom He is to rule are not of this world either, though, like their King, they must for a time be in it. But if the Jews in their time could not comprehend the nature of the king and the kingdom, we in our time have likewise dismally failed to comprehend the nature of the people of that kingdom, the New Man in Christ.

What complicates things in these our own times is that the field and nature of the struggle with Satan have changed. From Adam to the time of Christ the warfare on earth was between Satan and the seed of Adam, the men born of women. It was the Old Adam, in the true manhood of Christ, that was put to death by the religious leaders of the Chosen People. Because He was also true God, in His death was also Christ's victory for us over Satan in so far as redeeming mankind from the fatal effects of its fall was concerned. But after His ascension Christ sent to earth His Spirit, to beget a New Race, a race that would be, among other things, the master of Satan on the New Earth.

Thus the main struggle is now waged on a new level, an 'otherworldly' level, between Principalities and Powers and the man born of the seed (the Word) of God, as distinguished from the now redeemed 'Old' man. Since we can be perfectly sure that Satan will attempt to operate against Christ on this level also, we should learn to recognize his characteristic strategy and, if possible, not be fooled again.

Satan tricked Adam by offering something that in itself was attractive, immediate and tangible. It was precisely Eve's preoccupation with this obvious natural good *offered as having some mysterious spiritual value* that led to Satan's triumph over Adam. While Satan is not apt to use an apple again today, the principle of his strategy is still to offer something attractive to the mind and heart of Homo Sapiens and, by inducing preoccupation with this lesser good, to divert man's attention from a higher good, namely man's awareness of and potential maturity in, his New Nature.

Like any good strategist, Satan uses for his diversionary purpose the most attractive lures available. In the present instance they are things that appeal to the loftiest *human* reason and the deepest *human* piety. The more completely Satan, by means of reason or pious sentiment, can focus attention on things secondary (because they are human) the easier it is for him to execute his prime purpose. And that prime objective is still to overcome, if possible, the good work of Christ on earth, or at least to reduce its value by weakening the New Man, the instrument of Christ's loving creation of a new heaven and a new earth.

4. *The Vulnerable Area*

The power of Christ on earth is by His will the power of His Spirit in the Church. But the Church is a body, with members as well as a spirit, and the practical *socially effective* power of the Spirit operates through the members. The Apostles were *sent* to give practical effect to the power of the Spirit. Thus the power of the Spirit in the Church is manifested through the power of the Spirit in each New Man born in baptism.

While baptism rescues the soul from Satan's original betrayal, the New Life infused into the soul at the time of baptism creates only an infant New Man. The infant may never again come under the influence of Satan, but infants do not wage successful warfare in

the New Life any more than they do in the natural. Not as an infant will the New Man be able to expose and outmaneuver the Old Adversary. And, as we shall see, Satan has been shockingly successful in minimizing the power of Christ by keeping in infancy and thus enfeebling the New Man. He has in fact led us into another and in a way a more tragic 'children's crusade'. This is the key to his strategy for, practically, infancy equals impotence.

(Infancy in the life of man born of woman, of course, involves no particular conflict with the life of the New Man. The real problem arises when the natural (though redeemed) man reaches maturity and begins to exhibit a full fledged dichotomy, if not outright opposition, between his secular life and the life of the New Man.)

God's plan and purpose concerning the New Creation is revealed to us in the New Testament. To the maturing New Man the Gospels, Epistles etc. become increasingly clearer and instructive as he grows up, just as accounts in secular history become more meaningful to the maturing, socially conscious adult. But those who are not more or less mature in the New Man cannot understand the significance of the Gospels in the way the New Man does. What is worse, and in the long run almost fatally so as far as evolutionary effect is concerned, is that understanding on the part of the less mature in the New Life is of necessity attempted through the merely intellectual capacity of *Homo Sapiens*, that is, by the mere exegetes and theologians who are the intellectual experts of that species. Since the elaboration of the theologians is based on good human reasoning, it satisfies the demands of merely human nature. By the same token—and this is what pleases Satan—it also *limits* the understanding and significance of Christ's teaching *to the capacity of human reasoning*, with the net result that it obscures the meaning and use of the New Life, a meaning that requires the faculty peculiar to the mature New Man, to wit Faith, to understand and explain adequately.

Ironically enough, this limitation is the more serious the more proficient one is in the human science, for the reason that *on its own level* theology has most of the answers. Of course even theology must leave some matters unclear—a deficiency often glossed over by resolving troublesome questions almost, but not quite, to the vanishing point, couching the conclusions in mystifying and equivocal terms such as 'grace' and finally explaining that full elucidation of the Gospel message still awaits further human effort. According to that view no one up to this time has known 'what it is all about' and the human race will have to wait an indefinite time before it can be sure just what Christ taught—after the theologians themselves have found out. (When

St. Thomas Aquinas finally did find out he stopped writing theology.) What this augurs for the future is reflected in Christ's question: "When the Son of Man cometh, think you he will find faith on earth?" That is both a warning and a prophecy. Churchmen will probably not cease to teach as they do now, for they will still be led by the theologians, nor will they cease to be as sure of themselves as they are now, (which is even more sure than were the Pharisees of old, for is not Christ with His Church?) But, though the true word of God is today preserved among us by the Church, as it was of old preserved by the Jews, this in itself is no guarantee that the New Testament will be understood among the people any better than was the Old, no matter how sure of themselves the leaders are. So the mere fact that Church leaders today are sure of themselves is no evidence that the Faith is not *already* cold. The question is: precisely *what* are our leaders sure of?

Judging by the official reaction to the doctrine of the New Man as it appears in this essay, they are certainly not sure of that doctrine. Are they sure of more? Or are they already sure only of less? And of how much will they be sure at the second coming of Christ? The Church certainly will be present, at least organizationally, at Christ's second coming, just as the true Faith of old was present at His first. And so also will the Pharisees. But how much will there be of the soul of the Church, represented by men of the New Race, the New Man? Certainly there will again be those through whom the triumph of Christ will be exemplified. However, His first triumph, the Redemption, was worked out in spite of, indeed precisely because of, the *mis*-leading of the religious leaders of the true Faith. Will His second triumph be attended by similar circumstances? So it would seem.

The Church remains the true Church, just as the faith of the Jews remained momentarily the true Faith: but humans are still humans, Satan is still Satan, and the Pharisees are still with us. Those who will seek to kill the New Man 'thinking they thereby render a service to God' will not be the current bugaboo, the atheistic Communist who would scarcely think in terms of 'a service to God'. Those who would be guilty are much more likely to be the new Pharisees.

When these thoughts were first jotted down ten or twelve years ago, (an instinctive reaction to experience with the Rev. Censor), it was impossible to conceive how such a betrayal could be effected. While logical in the context, the idea seemed extremely far-fetched. It was obvious that the New Man could not be 'liquidated' physically, nor could the New Life principle, having once been infused into the soul, be attacked from without. But what at that time did not occur to the author was that, since the New Life was created and existed

on a mystical level, any attack upon it must be of necessity be made on that level. How this could be done was demonstrated when, in 1961, lost in the darkness they had themselves created, the Pharisees blindly struck the fatal blow. This they did simply by suppressing the New Life at its very source, namely the power to generate the New Life which is conferred on the 'womb of the Church', the baptismal font, at the time of the coming of the New Life to earth, the Feast of Pentecost. Beyond any doubt it was considered 'a service to God' and we will return to this subject later.

To overcome Satan and promote the evolution of the New Man, Christ must depend, not on mere human beings, brimful though they be with learning and piety, but on men reborn by, and mature according to the life principle of, His Spirit, the New Man himself. By the subtle exegetical debilitation and obscuring of the New Man the warfare against Satan is softened, to the advantage of Satan and (apparently) the corresponding betrayal of Christ.

There is a vast and profound difference between preserving the teaching of Christ whole and uncorrupted, and understanding the real significance of that teaching. The murky human intellect of the wisest philosopher, even taking into account Revelation, is incapable of fully comprehending the things of the Spirit which are stored in the deposit of Faith. That is because such things are of an entirely different order, a higher order pertaining to the New Man. Even the exegetical writings of Thomas of Aquin are in that respect 'mere straw', as St. Thomas himself was the first to recognize. We ourselves need be granted no 'visions' nor indeed even be theologians, to see how his limited concepts were responsible for his difficulty with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, a very elementary notion from the viewpoint of the New Man. And certainly far from the spirit of Christ was St. Thomas' advocacy of the death penalty for heresy. In this he was influenced by the mores of his time hence is clearly shown to be more the 'old' man than the New. But as regards such limitations he had illustrious predecessors. The earliest demonstration of the inability of Church leaders to see the woods for the trees is to be found in the proceedings of the First Church Council.

That Council had been convened to decide a question concerning circumcision; specifically, whether it was necessary *for the gentile converts*. But, unless there were to be two kinds of Christians, the only significant question was whether circumcision was necessary *for Christians*. If it was, then it was of course necessary for the gentile converts. But if it was not necessary, then it was not necessary even for Jews. Peter and the Council missed the point. Even after hearing Paul they never decided upon it, or even considered it, though it

went to the essence of the Faith and called for a decision based on principle. As finally handed down the decision was based purely on expediency, influenced by the contemporary Jewish mores and tradition. The original sentiment of the Council, led by the theological elite, the new Pharisees, was that the gentiles must be circumcised. Peter, in his argument, did not question the significance of circumcision as such, or even in relation to baptism. He spoke only in terms of practical Church policy on the narrow and strictly practical problem, to wit 'should the gentiles be required to be circumcised'. It is true that in his argument he did not fall into the error of saying that the gentiles *must* be circumcised; but neither did he maintain, as Paul consistently did and as we now know is strictly according to Faith, that circumcision or no circumcision made no difference one way or the other so far as Christianity was concerned. Peter, the executive and administrator, saw only the human problem of how to keep things going with a minimum of friction. So he chose a middle course—not saying that circumcision was necessary for gentiles, but also NOT saying that it was *unnecessary* for the Jews. His argument to the Council was merely that the Jews ought not to burden the gentiles with the observance of this rite. Even this compromise did not set well with the membership. Then the Council listened to Paul.

Paul's words to the Council have not come down to us. It may be that they were not considered worth reporting at the time. But it may be also that by the time the account of the proceedings was written in the Acts it had become evident that he had been right all along, and that the story was piously suppressed because it put Peter and the rest of the Council in an unfavorable light. Paul's Epistles, however (Gal. 5:2-6 for example) leave no room for doubt as to his views on circumcision and what, therefore, he must have said. So far as we know Paul stood alone in this matter, and it is interesting, though not particularly edifying, to note that his clear and correct stand failed to register on the Council. After Paul had spoken, James addressed the Council. He didn't even mention Paul's point of view, but supported Peter with a plea based on the minimal consideration of the need 'not to disquiet the gentiles'. Then the First Church Council issued the first infallible decree of the Catholic Church. And in doing so it gave the first demonstration of clerical minimalism and poverty of understanding of Christ's message. It merely left the matter of circumcision with relation to Christianity unmentioned and, by stressing other requirements, permitted the *inference* that circumcision was not necessary for gentiles.

The decision of the Council cannot be called *error*. Like all the other orthodox theological pronouncements, it was right *as far as*

it went. What is significant for the present thesis is that even after a mature New Man had undertaken to give the Prince of the Apostles and the Official Church Leaders an adequate concept of the Faith as a basis for their judgement, they still failed to see the point. If they had, their judgement and pronouncement would not, or at least should not have been couched in the narrow and equivocal terms in which it was officially expressed. Had they known what they were about they would not merely have *inferred* that circumcision was unnecessary for the gentiles—which involved the possible implication that it *might* be necessary for the new-born of the Jewish converts. They would have declared forthrightly that circumcision was unnecessary, period. The pattern of unawareness set at the Council hasn't changed over the centuries, except that the deterioration of understanding has now reached a point where Catholics are *compelled* to accept minimalism and mediocrity because nothing that questions it is allowed to be mentioned to the Faithful. This point will presently be dealt with in detail. Here we merely indicate the dichotomy, and we will now explore its implications.

5. *Peter and Paul. The Means and the End*

The factors involved in the strength of the Faith are: 1) the official authority of the popes and the hierarchy upon whom depends the existence of the Church as an organized body and divinely guaranteed depository of the Faith; 2) maturity in the New Man, upon which depends the dynamic social effectiveness of the Spirit and the propagation of a strong Faith. In other words the evolutionary potential. Both these factors must be present if the Church is to exist, the Faith to flourish and the cosmic plan to be carried out. But they need not co-exist in any one person, not even in a pope.

Correlated to factor 1) are the highest concepts and point of view of which the human mind is capable, specifically, theology in the light of Revelation, with competence in which Church leaders are chargeable. Correlated to factor 2) are the concepts and point of view natural to the mature New Man, which takes in all that is essential in factor 1) but does not stop there. It is in these last two points that we come to the essence of the present problem, namely the difference between a theological concept that is technically safe but may be inadequate,

and a thoroughly comprehensive grasp of the inner significance of the Gospel message.

This was the situation as between Peter and Paul at the First Church Council. There was no outright dispute as to the right or wrong of circumcision. That question never arose. The question was as to the relation of the rite to the members of the New Community. In Peter's mind that relation was not clear, but it seemed safe to say that it might not be necessary within the community for those of whom it had not been required before they joined the community. After all, there was no sign that it had been specifically enjoined upon the followers of Christ. But in the minds of the Church leaders this was a rather thin line. After all, Christ had been circumcised, and it was by the barest margin that they were saved from the error of requiring circumcision for the gentile members of the Community which followed Christ. For Paul, however, there was no such uncertainty and narrow escape. His understanding of the New Life was clear, and the irrelevancy of the old rite to the new Gospel was as certain to his mind as it was cloudy and uncertain in Peter's.

The dichotomy here indicated seems to be in the nature of things, and the Church seems to recognize, and in fact to warn us of, that circumstance. Thus, as if emphatically directing attention to the complementary nature of formally delegated authority in one member of the Body and a more mature understanding of the Faith in another member, the Church unfailingly brackets together St. Peter and St. Paul. One is never mentioned without the other even on their individual feasts. This situation offers a typical example of the way in which something that the Church proposes for our enlightenment has been quietly ignored and buried by our clerical leaders, largely because they are incapable of seeing what is there, or because the mysterious implications baffle and disquiet them. They are content to let the faithful see in it only that 'St. Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles'.

But anyone really interested in the significance of the consistent coupling of Peter and Paul will have no difficulty learning the lesson if he merely takes the trouble to note one fairly obvious fact, the unique position of Peter as head of the visible Church. For the Church would not irresponsibly couple the name of a person of his unique and eminent position with that of a nobody, especially a nobody who had not hesitated to challenge the pope to his face (Gal. 2:11) on his immature grasp of, and formation by, the Faith of which he was the leader. (And then boast about it!) Clearly the consistent coupling of Peter and Paul can be justified only on the basis of Paul possessing a comparable importance. But this importance certainly had no

basis in the Church's organization, since the Church had but one Head. On what basis then do we justify the parity?"

As has been indicated, it is the 'organized' Church—that is, the popes and bishops—which is the official and impersonal channel of the life of the Holy Spirit and the way through which the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Sacraments and the Liturgy, in their full validity and effectiveness come to the faithful. But all of these things are sent through this channel for a purpose. It is the purpose for which they are sent, and the results which are expected to flow from them, that are of paramount significance, the real 'end' toward which everything is directed. And what is this end and purpose?

The end and purpose of all the power God gives His Church is the development of the strength and maturity of the New Man. And therein lies the significance of the coupling of Paul's name with Peter's. Paul was the product *par excellence* of the life principle of the Church, the Holy Spirit. He was the mature and representative New Man, the exemplar of the result of the operation of the power God sends the faithful through His Church. That is why he is equally honored. The lesson illuminates the dichotomy apparent at the First Church Council and it has been immortalized and handed down to us as a warning; that we may not be scandalized at the very real possibility (if not inevitability, over the centuries) of conflict between the mere ecclesiastic, even a pope, and a man mature in the Faith, the New Man.

Paul, like all 'mutants' was an 'odd-ball' among the parent species. His New Life activity was always within and parallel to Church organization. That is it was orthodox. But his direct 'organizational association' with the Church leaders was limited to what was necessary to formally establish and maintain his credentials as a 'member in good standing'. On the spiritual side he was not limited to their common 'organizational' level of understanding of the Gospel of Christ and, in fact, developed his New Life quite apart from and sometimes at odds with officialdom. The pattern was set from the moment of his conversion, but it had its roots even earlier.

In contrast to Peter's conversion which, being pre-New Man, was of necessity based on visible material evidence—a miraculous draft of fish—Paul's conversion was throughout on a spiritual level. Pursuing a spiritual ideal with fanatical though misguided zeal, he was suddenly confronted by the Light, which was Christ himself. Though the light blinded him physically, he was at the same time enlightened spiritually with the realization that his zeal had been misdirected. But Paul did not instantly receive the New Life. This always requires an act of the will. Thus it was necessary that Paul, of his own free will

and in obedience to the guidance given him by Christ, should in helplessness and humility go to a certain place and there await the coming of the Holy Spirit, who would not only restore the physical sight he had lost but, by baptism, give him to see with the eyes of the New Man. But at this important juncture Christ did not send Peter, or any of the other official leaders, to bring the Holy Spirit to Paul. Nor did Paul, on realizing that he had entered upon a new life (for he suddenly saw all things from a different point of view,) run to Peter or any of the other official leaders to find out what it was all about, though he knew full well that they were the official teachers of the Faith.

For Paul it was not a question of knowing, but of becoming, and he went alone to grow up in solitude and meditation so that the New Life principle could form him and bring him to maturity in the New Man. When he finally appeared among the Apostles, their understanding of what he was talking about was so slight and his point of view so unfamiliar, that they were afraid of him. What he had been, which they could understand, loomed larger in their judgement of him than what he said to them, though what he said could have come only from the Spirit and should have shown them what he had become. But this was beyond their capacities to understand. Yet, as was clearly shown at the First Church Council, it was Paul, and apparently only Paul, who understood what manner of man a Christian was, a New Man who was still a stranger to the rest of the Church leaders.

Paul knew his theology before he was reborn of the Spirit, but it was not his theological erudition that converted him, (although it might have been one of those subtle factors which influenced his mutation,) nor was it the theology of the Apostles that taught him what he was. Actually, their theology, and all theology before and since, was and is unable to provide adequate understanding of the life of the New Man. Such understanding comes in but one way—through a degree of maturity in the New Life. That is why Paul is unique among the Apostles, and that is why Church leaders who rely solely upon theology to know what they are and to inform others, have so dismally failed in their task. Paul's whole career is in fact an object lesson to us. He was uniquely set apart by the Spirit for a special purpose, and we can realize in our time the significance of that purpose. His service to Christ in the New Life obviously did not end with his earthly existence. He was needed by the Spirit not merely where he taught in his lifetime, but throughout the world and for all time. If it were not for Paul no one today would be able to understand what Christianity is, for no one but Paul so clearly gives us the picture of the New Man. But just as Christ foretold him, that, for one reason or another, his testimony would not be accepted among the chosen people,

so today we have proportionately even fewer who understand, follow and are guided by Paul. The division in the Church between the 'Pauls' and those who have less to give than the Pauls, including often the 'Peters' is as pronounced today as it was in Apostolic times.

Alerted by the history of the First Church Council, we cannot ignore the possibility that any other pope or bishops, to say nothing of the lesser clergy, may also have a limited view of Christianity. The authority and, possibly but not necessarily, maturity in the New Man is in the Peters. But maturity in the New Man, though not necessarily any official status, is in the Pauls. To illustrate: While it is true that 'where the bishops are, there is the Church', it is true regardless of whether the bishops are, say, simoniacal, (which at times was not uncommon in certain countries,) and therefore hardly suspect of being mature New Men, or are in fact more or less mature in the New Life. The former might even be experts in the letter of the Law (which 'killeth') but only the latter, with some degree of maturity in the life of the New Man, can understand and transmit the Spirit, (which 'quickeneth' i.e. gives life). To attempt to explain and transmit an understanding of the Faith solely through the Peters, that is, through the exegetes and theologians who, though vested with formal organizational authority may nevertheless be infants in the New Life, can result only in a desiccation of the deposit of Faith as brought to the Faithful. This is exactly what has happened and we shall see up-to-date examples later in this essay. The fruit of Church leadership today may be compared to the accomplishment of scientists who have synthesized an egg, the shell and all, so perfectly that chemical analysis will show no trace of difference between the synthetic and the natural product. But there is bound to be one difference; the synthetic egg will not hatch. Life comes only from life. In the rational creature its characteristic life begins only with an inner awareness of what it is, and of the powers and potentialities, both spiritual and material, of its nature. This is as true in the life of the New Man as it is in the life of man-born-of-woman. Both have to 'discover themselves'. But mere theology, though it contains all learning, will be as sterile as the synthetic egg if it is merely a synthesis, however minutely detailed, of the characteristics of the New Life but lacks an inner awareness of the nature of that life.

6. *Knowing and Being. The Letter and the Spirit*

To preserve the Words of Life whole and uncorrupted, it is not necessary for Church Authority to be mature in the New Man. Matters of even the deepest significance to the life of the New Man can easily be shown to inhere in, or be consistent with, the mere letter of ecclesiastical pronouncements as, indeed, they inhere in the simple statements of the Gospels and Epistles. Thus the Gospel message can be preserved whole and uncorrupted on a simple, literal level by ordinary scholarship. But even this ordinary scholarship is sometimes lacking in what is given to the faithful. They are usually informed through translations, or translations of translations, with a revision or two thrown in, with the result that some Church approved translations inadequately, or even misleadingly, transmit the significance of the teaching, an example of which we shall see later in connection with Marriage and the Theologians.

But, granting that the deposit of Faith *can* be preserved whole and uncorrupted on the level of ordinary scholarship, it can be so preserved without any particular individual, even a pope, necessarily grasping its deepest spiritual significance. Involved in this is more than a grasp of what is present literally in the simple dogmatic teaching. To get the deepest spiritual value from a literally accurate preservation of the precise letter of the Faith is possible only to the mature New Man, be he pope or layman. To attempt to grasp it by merely philosophical or technical processes, no matter how erudite, is bound to obscure the most significant meaning as the exegetes have so often done.

So, while the Faith is one, there are two levels on which it can be understood and taught; by the letter of conformity (theological exactitude) and by its significance according to the Spirit, reflecting respectively the point of view of Peter, the mere administrator, and Paul, the man mature in the New Life. This applies also to the official judgements of *Censores Librorum*. Among Churchmen, including St. Thomas Aquinas, the pre-New Man 'intellectual' point of view has almost invariably predominated in such teaching and judgements, in that for centuries most matters of Faith have been stated, and thereafter taught, on the minimal, i.e. intellectually acceptable level. Propositions like the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of the B.V.M. cannot be denied because they are in conformity with

Christian tradition. But neither, unfortunately, can these propositions be understood in their deepest implications except according to the capacity of each individual New Man. (This, to repeat, does not mean 'private interpretation'.) Thus St. Thomas, for instance, did not understand and consequently never accepted the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which presents no problem at all to the New Man. But, since maturity in the New Man is a relatively rare thing, most of the deposit of Faith has been, and continues to be, taught on a level that from the point of view of the New Man is more or less infantile. But if this inadequacy of understanding is a fact, what is to prevent the deterioration from reaching the level where it becomes misleading?

In the version of Embers originally submitted to the Censor the author's answer was simply that for protection against 'ex cathedra' (the term is newly used here to forestall further confusion) teaching which, through its inadequacy or error, endangers the life of the New Man or betrays the means by which he is guided and nourished to maturity, Christ cannot, and does not, rely upon theologians or Churchmen, but upon His own power. This is an absolute, restrictive and preventive power, exercised invariably, arbitrarily, directly and unilaterally, to forestall the emasculation of doctrine and to prevent the teaching of anything *contrary to Faith*. It is clearly distinguishable from any other kind of spiritual guidance or influence on the simple, obvious basis that all other operations of the Spirit on behalf of the Church invariably require some degree of cooperation on the part of man (the New Man). As to how this preventive power would be manifested Father F.P. LeBuffe, first moderator of the New York Catholic Evidence Guild said: "I don't know. Maybe the pope would drop dead!", and indeed no human being knows the answer.

Papal infallibility does not automatically confer New Man wisdom on the Pope, nor compel him to it regardless of his own will and understanding. But the protection against error in *ex cathedra* pronouncements operates regardless of his own will or learning. The significance of this absolute protection is lost upon the mere theologians because they cannot see or understand the dichotomy which makes it necessary. It is necessary because it is the *only* way to protect the New Man against betrayal due to merely intellectual attempts to supply him with the information he needs to attain maturity in his New Life. Mere theological guidance must at best be relatively limited (and thus limit him) because in teaching the Faith in its fulness and depth the intellect has only a secondary role. The real meaning of Revelation, which guides the New Man, is understood adequately only by the instinct of Faith, and precisely in those matters which are beyond the reach of reason in the first place. It is only when such matters are seen with the 'eye' of

Faith that they can be proposed to reason, i.e. 'taught'. Realizing that the deepest meaning of Revelation may not be fathomable by any particular man, (even a pope) while the danger of relying on mere theological understanding is present in every man (including a pope) Christ puts the 'Stop' sign where mere theological understanding becomes inadequate and the misunderstanding amounts to heresy. It is clear, then, that Christ's unilateral reliance upon His own power to prevent misleading the New Man in this way conflicts not at all with the power of His Spirit to inform and guide His Church through the teaching of those who are mature products of the operation of that Spirit, that is, the mature New Men, who may or may not be popes. To anyone with the capacity to understand the thesis of Embers, the following comments by the Rev. Censor on these points will be significant.

3: As for statements not reconcilable with the Faith, the following examples should suffice:

b) On page 3 the Author says: "the purpose of infallibility is to stop the downward progress characteristic of all merely intellectual attempts to comprehend the faith etc."

This is a statement which is gratuitously asserted by the Author. Perhaps it is due to a faulty understanding of the *theological* explanation of the way in which the Holy Spirit keeps the Church infallible. Certainly Sacred Scripture, upon which the Author seems to rely often, does not give this description of infallibility. Pope Leo XIII, in the Encyclical 'Satis cognitum' of June 29, 1896, states that Christ instituted in the Church a living, authoritative and perpetual teaching authority . . . and he wished and commanded that its precepts and its doctrine be received as His own. . . . This therefore is without any doubt the function of the Church, to *guard* His doctrine and to *propagate* it whole and uncorrupted." This can hardly be reconciled with the Author's statement of the function of Papal infallibility, viz., "Christ puts the stop sign at that point where minimalism ends and downright heresy begins." (Page 3). The Author's views on the infallibility of the Church and the Pope seem to savor of that "theological minimalism" which he so rightly deplores. (All emphases are the Censor's.)

The author protested as follows:

In par. 3 b) the Rev. Censor objects to the statement in Embers that:

"The purpose of infallibility is to stop the downward progress characteristic of all merely intellectual attempts to comprehend the Faith. The stated objection is that: "it is the function of the Church to guard the deposit and to propagate Christian doctrine whole and uncorrupted". Embers had already explicitly stated that, see page 18 of the MSS. Kindly note that in the paragraph objected to reference is made solely and specifically to 'intellectual attempts to *comprehend* the Faith. It is of course relative to the *lessened* understanding of the Faith by Churchmen, including popes, that Christ sets the 'stop sign', namely at the point where understanding is lacking to the point of heresy. The Rev. Censor confused *protection* and *propagation* of the deposit with UNDERSTANDING of the deposit. The objection should be withdrawn."

To which the Rev. Censor replied:

- 2: Secondly the Author remarks that the Censor should withdraw his objection to the Author's statement on the purpose of infallibility.

The Censor remarks first of all that the Author refers the Censor to the manuscript of Embers of the Faith. The Censor points out that he does not have a copy of this manuscript, so cannot examine the point in reference to the exact text.

The Censor, bearing this in mind, will hazard the remark that he believes the objection still holds, for two reasons:

- a) The Author's objection still seems to limit the purpose of Infallibility to stopping "the downward progress of all merely intellectual attempts to comprehend the faith". The point of the censor's remarks is that the purpose of infallibility is wider than that. It is positive, not merely a negative purpose; infallibility is concerned not only with attempts to comprehend the Faith on the part of the Pope, but especially with his duty "to guard and to propagate Christian doctrine whole and uncorrupted". The Censor does not confuse protection and propagation of the Faith with the understanding of the Faith. He only insists that infallibility is concerned with guarding and propagating the deposit of Faith. Hence what the pope

teaches *infallibly* is not to be regarded as 'minimal' but as real, true Christian Faith.

- b) Secondly, if the Censor's recollection of the manuscript is to be trusted, although the Author may be speaking in the paragraph in question only of the comprehension of the Faith, the Censor seems to remember that in the general context (i.e. the paragraphs preceding and following) in which this paragraph appears, there is question of the inability (sic) of the theologians and the Pope to keep the Faith in its maximal meaning before the people, and in the succeeding paragraph on page 4 the Author seems to conclude that "it is uniquely the business of the New Man to understand and *explain*", the propositions of the Faith. It is the Censor's contention that if the general context be as he remembers it, then the Author's statement is not only too limited as an explanation of Papal infallibility, but will mislead his readers. It is the Censor's experience that one can never be too careful in published writings about the Faith."

Without the slightest intention or desire to merely quibble, but precisely because the Rev. Censor's remarks are so typical of the kind of 'leadership' criticized in Embers, it may be observed that, taken on his own terms, the Rev. Censor's opinion is itself not very 'careful' in that (in (a)) it almost necessarily implies that the decision of the Pope and the First Church Council was NOT infallible. Clearly it DID NOT teach (or even imply an awareness of) the 'real true Christian Faith' even on the minimal matter of sanctifying grace. Clearly, if Christian Baptism conferred sanctifying grace (i.e. to the remission of original sin) then there was no sense in even talking about circumcision. It could do nothing baptism had not already done. (Of course the Council may not have understood the effect of circumcision either, hence was not aware of its relation to baptism.)

But the basic confusion in the Rev. Censor's opinion arises from his failure to distinguish the FACT of the guidance of the Spirit from the MEANS through which the Spirit gives that guidance. This is because the means is the mature New Man (as Paul) and he is a total stranger to Church Authority. But while the New Man, be he pope or layman, is the active agent of the Spirit in enlightening the Church, he is entirely without power to *prevent* clerical misunderstanding, minimalism and mediocrity, except, possibly, if he be both New Man and Pope. Therefore these two functions, the positive operation of the Spirit on behalf of the Church and the absolute prevention from teach-

ing error ordinarily CANNOT be performed BY THE SAME AGENT, though the power to do both comes from the same source. By concentrating his remarks on the SOURCE of the power the Rev. Censor can, and does, obliquely bury the idea of the New Man, who is the *instrument* of the (positive) power.

But how can Church Authority otherwise account for the practical operation of this positive power, which is undoubtedly present? By eliminating the factor of the New Man as described in this essay, Church Authority is necessarily reduced to the implication that, so far as capacity to understand the most *profound* significance of truths of Faith is concerned, this is automatically conferred on every cleric merely by his ordination, to a greater degree on every bishop merely by his consecration and to the point of infallibility on every pope merely by his election to that office and thus to the Church merely by some psychic phenomenon tacked on to clericalism. This is a dubious proposition. There is no possibility of reconciliation, or even compromise, between the position of the Rev. Censor, either stated or implied, and the thesis of Embers. Either the personal, responsible New Man point of view IS a factor in the *understanding* and teaching of the Faith or it is NOT. And if it is a factor *it is the most important factor*, being nothing less than the means by which the Spirit guides the Church. But the Rev. Censor, who exhibits no comprehension of the notion of the New Man, does not consider it as a factor at all. Thus Church Authority is absolutely intolerant of the concept offered in Embers.

So much for Church Authority's official 'guarding' of the deposit. It is alarmingly like the guarding of the Master's potentially fruitful deposit in Luke 19:20. This kind of guarding so displeased the Master that the guardian lost even the very thing he was *so* prudently protecting. On the positive side, exemplified by the servants who were rewarded, the test of the *competence* of a churchman to pass favorably upon and permit the useful employment of a potentially fruitful deposit does not lie merely in his official position as a 'trustee' nor even in his proficiency in theology, but precisely in the extent to which he is able to see, in concepts which *are* reconcilable to the deposit of Faith, their fullest and deepest significance with respect to the Faith. He should be able to sense the potential value in their circulation, but this requires that the Churchman possess some degree of maturity in the New Man, hence be aware of the values by the instinct of faith. Thus the fullest and deepest significance of the Faith it is the unique ability of the New Man, be he cleric or layman, to explore and explain. In the version of Embers originally submitted to the Rev. Censor this statement was rejected

as 'contrary to Faith'. The objection as stated was: "It is uniquely the ability of the Teaching Church to explain infallibly the fullest significance of the truths of Faith." Which is another illustration of the proclivity of Churchmen in authority to use a vague, but 'safe' truth, with which they are comfortable, to obscure and suppress a greater truth of which they are afraid because it is unfamiliar. Thus the 'Peters' override the 'Pauls'.

While to the theologians the Christian is identified chiefly by his conformation to a conglomeration of technicalities, regulations and disciplines, the New Man himself need hold no Church office to know what manner of man he is by virtue of his New Life and be able to describe his nature and the mores of his kind. But it is reserved for Churchmen, in the last analysis the Pope, to affirm or deny that what the Christian says about himself for publication is consistent with the deposit of Faith. The authority is absolute, but the comprehension of the cleric exercising the authority may be as limited as that of St. Peter (or the Rev. Censor) seems to have been. Where such limitation exists we have results of the kind that are evident in the present instance, namely the use of authority to suppress a concept simply because the cleric exercising the authority is incapable of comprehending that particular expression of the truth. All this in spite of the fact that when St. Paul exhorted his listeners to "pray for spiritual gifts, but most of all that you may teach", he was speaking to laymen, not to people in Holy Orders.

The unfortunate thing about the 'guarding' of Christ's doctrine on the clerical, theological level, is that in practice it is thereby guarded *against* understanding and propagation on the distinctively Christian (New Man) level. The Fire of the Faith has burned low because the professionals in general have not only themselves failed to bring simple truths to the people in a simple way—to be grasped by each individual according to the degree of maturity that the Spirit has developed in him, but because professionals in authority, separated by a sort of 'theological curtain' from more than mere infancy in the New Man, have prevented these truths from being brought to the faithful at large. They have, so to speak 'secularized' Christianity.

The atrophy of the Spirit resulting from the theological desiccation of the deposit of Faith (in a process sometimes euphemistically referred to as 'development of doctrine') has permitted Satan to move in and satisfy man's hunger for things of the Spirit with a lesser good than that ultimate Good which alone makes man a threat to Satan's domain on earth. As a result of a long diet of this secularized Christianity the Christian has gradually lost his taste for the better things of the Spirit, and over the centuries many distractions and di-

versions have been introduced of the kind that create confusion as to what manner of man a Christian is, and what his frame of reference, his center of interest and his source of Spiritual life should be. This state of affairs we shall now examine in detail.

7. *The Old Problem on a New Level*

We know from the Old Testament how difficult it was to transmit from age to age even the good natural life. The Chosen People themselves, though they had constant visible and unmistakable signs from God Himself to guide them to the Promised Land, all too often wandered off the path God had prescribed for them. They also disregarded and invariably killed God's messengers, the prophets, who spoke of things they did not properly understand; and of the many who started out with Moses, only a few reached the Promised Land. In fact, from Adam to the time of Christ Satan had demonstrated his power to deceive and mislead man. How then could God expect man, even freed from the penalty of his first defection in Adam, to be the successful adversary of Satan, especially when, as we are explicitly told, man's enemies are Principalities and Powers, superior beings? This calls for a kind of warfare far beyond the capacity of mere man, however wise and prudent. In following God's plan in this warfare, Christians are at a disadvantage compared to the Jews, from a human point of view. The pilgrimage of the Jews was toward a material goal (a prefiguration of the Christian goal, of course), and they were not yet New Men. They could see, and were held responsible for seeing, only with the eyes of the 'old' man; and they were given assistance and guidance appropriate to the senses by which they could recognize and use this help; the pillar of fire, the cloud, the manna etc. The pilgrimage of the New Man is toward a different objective, an objective not material, and the circumstances of the pilgrimage are different. It is a spiritual pilgrimage. The New Man is therefore given guidance and help by God according to his spiritual nature, the nature of the New Man.

This requires, for the independent growth of each man according to his individual predestined capacity, that the New Man should see and comprehend the goal, the guidance and the help with the vision and comprehension of the New Man. This in turn calls for a definite degree of maturity in the New Life as was required of the Jews in

their natural life. "Do not be children in intelligence" says St. Paul, "but in intelligence be full-grown men." In such growth the Christian expects, and in fact must have, the help of the Church—not the mere mechanical help of the professional churchmen going through their appointed rounds and duties and leaving the development of the Christian to the effects of the various Sacraments (without being told their use and purpose in the life of the New Man) and an endless repetition of the primary articles of Faith, but the help of real 'fathers', that is, fosterers of the New Man, who may not even be professional churchmen. As St. Paul put it, the Corinthians had ten thousand instructors; but very few fathers.

The power to make the Christian pilgrimage successfully and to repel the attacks of the supernatural enemies of the New Man is said by theologians to be given the Christian by some vague 'superabundance of grace', in other words by some vague 'unmerited gift' which doesn't mean a thing unless we understand the specific nature of the unmerited gift. It is of course in this particular instance the life of the New Man and especially maturity in that life. It can be nothing else.

In passing, let us for a moment take note of two factors which can help offset the deterioration due to ineptness in the spiritual order. One is that the Word of God is a seed that bears within itself the perfectibility of its own life. While the quality of the seed sown by the Christian (that is his teaching and example) depend, as Chautard points out in his 'Soul of the Apostolate', on the level of the sower's own development, its degree of fruitfulness is not necessarily limited by that level. The nature of the ground on which the seed falls is so important that if poor seed falls upon good ground the fruit it yields may be better than that of the parent. The other possibility is the direct coming down of the Spirit to supply for its lack of propagation on earth. Such descent may be upon people who are not members of the visible Church but who constitute what is so beautifully and accurately described as the 'the soul of the Church', those who share her life principle and are therefore truly New Men.

While these two factors may contribute to the solution of the problem, their intervention must be recognized as out of the ordinary and it would be presumptuous to rely upon them for the survival of the Church. Toward that survival ground—good ground—should be prepared and seed, good seed should be sown and the art of spiritual husbandry, using the Sacraments and the deposit of Faith, must be employed to maintain the growth in vigor from generation to generation. The husbandman of the Spirit is the New Man whose nature this essay attempts to describe.

8. *Being, As It Should Be*

✓ Keel

Corresponding to the double fruitfulness of the womb from which he is born, the Christian is a 'twofold' product, though actually the two characteristics go together. He is both a redeemed man and a New Man. The Redemption, to accomplish which Christ united Himself with fallen man, was completed on Good Friday and proved on Easter Sunday. On the day between, on Holy Saturday, the water in the baptismal font receives the power of redemption. But the New Man is born of the Spirit, the life principle which came to earth at Pentecost. That in effect unites man with God. Thus it was on the eve of Pentecost that the 'womb of the Church', the baptismal font, traditionally from earliest times, received the fruitful power to generate the New Man.

The association of acts of generation with religious rites appears in the oldest 'mystery religions' and in some of them the rites are said to have become sexual orgies. In Christianity the symbolism of generation was retained in the blessing of the baptismal font because from this 'womb of the Church' was to be the actual begetting of a New Life by the power conferred on the font at the feast of the coming of the New Life, Pentecost. As in Holy Mass, what is represented symbolically is actually done, mystically. But since the nature, or purpose, of the generative process in this respect was understood by Church leaders only on the 'old' man level (or, if understood otherwise was never told to the faithful), the meaning of the 'mystery' was suppressed because of its pagan associations. It should have been explained on the New Man level, but Church leaders were, and apparently still are, incapable of doing this. How it ever got started is a mystery. But the same lack of understanding evident at the First Church Council had already begun to obscure the New Man.

Nevertheless we still have in the Church today the generative symbolism of the three successively deeper plunges of the Paschal candle into the water of the baptismal font and the mingling in the womb of the Church of two different oils poured from two separate vessels at the same time, symbolic of the mingling of the male and female elements in the human womb. In the blessing of the font the Redemptive power is conferred first, then the generative power. It is only the

redemptive water (the familiar 'holy water') that is distributed to the faithful for various pious purposes.

Timing is one of the elements of symbolism, and the mere fact that the Church prescribed two separate blessings of the font at two widely separated and independently significant times should indicate that they serve two different purposes according to the significance of the times, and are intended for two different timely effects, redemption and rebirth. In solemn essentials of this kind it is not wise to presume that the ancient Church would do anything superfluous. On the contrary, every symbolic act should be accorded its greatest significance. Unfortunately, in this respect the life of the New Man has been further obscured, if not completely obliterated by modern churchmen, in that the blessing of the 'fruitful womb' at Pentecost, never having been adequately understood, has recently been suppressed.

There seems to be no official reason for this, but two speculative reasons are suggested by churchmen:

1. To 'highlight' the importance of the Easter Vigil (long neglected in the Roman Church and only lately revived) and the special (redemptive) significance of the blessing of the font at that time. (This will be further commented upon later.)

2. "Respect for the holy womb of the Church" which denied immersion in its waters at Easter to those suffering from disease or in the menstrual period. They were baptised at Pentecost, (presumably if not still diseased or again in the menstrual period). When baptism was no longer by immersion, no one would for these reasons be denied baptism at Easter. Baptism at Pentecost was therefore no longer necessary because of being missed at Easter. Hence the font is no longer blessed at Pentecost. But, taking this for granted with all its awkward and dubious implications, one fact cannot be obscured and confused; the *blessing* was the important thing. And there were TWO blessings. The significance of the blessing at Easter, being on the 'old' man level was understood, with help from the Old Testament. The blessing was still the important thing at Pentecost, but its significance then had to do with the New Man, a concept which seems to have been lost by the Church leaders as early as the First Church Council. Thus Church leaders today have come to understand the blessing on the feast of the New Life as only a repetition of the blessing on the feast of the Redemption, and important at Pentecost only as being necessary for the convenience of those who missed it at Easter.

It is fundamental that the *intention* to do the thing symbolized is essential to the actualization of the symbolism. If the intention is

lacking the symbolism has no significance or effect. Whatever intention could heretofore have been ascribed to the traditional blessing of the font at Pentecost, the complete unawareness of the New Man indicated among Church leaders today offers no assurance that the intention of the blessing at Easter is now equivalent to what might have been that of the former blessing at Pentecost. The break has now been formalized.

Now, obviously, it may be asked: If the suppression of the blessing of the font at Pentecost is such a grievous error, how could it have been permitted to happen in view of the Divine assurance against teaching or sanctioning error by the Church? In reply it might be argued, technically, that absolute protection against error is guaranteed only with respect to 'ex cathedra' pronouncements, which this ruling was not. But there is another possibility. Maybe this suppression was not 'error' at all. Maybe, precisely because of its effect of preventing further generation of the life of the New Man it is actually another instance of where God's plan is being worked out now, as it was in the time of Christ on earth, precisely because of, or through, the *misleading* of the leaders of the True Faith. The first misleading brought us the Redemption. This one could bring us the consummation of the world. We will deal with this again, (in chap.21) but here we will not fail to note that IT WAS DONE AS A SERVICE TO GOD.

The distinction between redemption and rebirth is carried out in the church's Liturgical year, which is divided principally into 'time after Epiphany' the time the Redeemer manifested Himself to mankind, and 'time after Pentecost' the time after the coming of the New Life, the time of the New Man.

All men are potentially redeemed, and those who, to the best of their knowledge and ability try to do what is right in the sight of God are considered by the Church to be baptised, at least to salvation, i.e. Redemption, even though they never heard of Christian Revelation. However, it makes no sense to assume that those so baptised can live a specifically Christian life (i.e. become mature New Men) because to live such a life the nature of the life must first be revealed to them, either directly by God or by the teaching of the Gospel. But in this respect the Christian who barely understands a minimum of the message of the Gospels and of Catholic tradition is hardly better off than the pagan who seeks to do God's will. Today the difference between the 'cradle Catholic' and the good pagan is almost at the vanishing point. So much so that for all practical purposes the distinction between the 'cradle Catholic' and the New Man is almost on the same level as the distinction between the God-loving pagan and the New Man. And if there is a difference between the mere infant and the

mature adult, especially the adult who has for years absorbed and been formed by the best culture and tradition of his time, there is an infinitely greater difference between the mere baptised man and the man who, by access to the deposit of Faith has discovered and with the help of the Sacraments has attained, a degree of maturity in the New Life. This practical difference we will now explore.

9. *The Satanic Strategy against the New Man*

After Christ had joined Himself to humanity for the redemption of mankind, He joined man to His divinity so as to make possible man's rebirth in the New Man. Thus every Christian now lives one life within the shell of another, the New Life within the shell of the old somewhat like the butterfly within the cocoon of the worm. The 'shell' in which the New Man develops is made up of the darkened intellect, the enfeebled will and, of course, the flesh of our human nature, all of them subject to the attacks of Satan. His temptation of Christ were on this level. Consequently the enemies of the New Man are the world, the flesh (including the intellect) and Satan, who works upon them.

Satan does not fear the 'old' man merely because he has been redeemed, for he had accomplished the downfall of the human race when its intellect was more alert and its will less feeble than it is now. It is in the *nature* of the *New Man* that Satan discerns his mortal foe, a foe capable of vanquishing the dark Principalities and Powers. In the New Man Satan recognizes a higher species of being, conforming to the test that always distinguishes a higher order from a lower; the possession of all the essential characteristics of the species immediately below it plus one essential characteristic that the lower species lacks.

Under these circumstances the nature of Satanic strategy is not difficult to imagine. Since he cannot prevent the effects of Redemption or the existence of the life principle of the New Man, the only defense left to him is to see that the New Life principle has as little practical effect as possible, in other words that as few as possible of the New Species mature. Specifically, what he does is lead the 'cradle Catholic' to become so wrapped up in the minimal aspects and requirements of his redeemed life as to lose sight of the nature,

significance and criteria of the New Life he has received. As a result the infant will fail to develop and mature in the species he has become. Remaining on the infant level he will be as powerless as any infant and thus will be no threat to Satan on earth. And as a final Satanic touch, he will forever be limited to an infantile capacity for enjoying the New Life hereafter.

One sign of the success of this Satanic strategy is seen in the relative popularity accorded the three great Feasts of the Church. They occur in a chronological order which has as its climax Pentecost, the time of the coming of the life principle of the New Man. Prior to that is the feast of the proof of the Redemption, on which in turn depends the significance of the first great feast, that of the birth at Bethlehem. But instead of building to a climax, the three feasts actually enjoy a reverse order of popular observance. Christmas, the first feast in the cycle, is the time of greatest Christian demonstration, far overshadowing Easter in popular observance, notwithstanding that it is the Resurrection, the second feast, that proves the significance of Christmas. And both of these feasts overshadow the third, Pentecost, in popular observance, notwithstanding that this latter event marks the advent of the life principle of a noble race. The creation of the New Man is the final fruit made possible by the Incarnation, Redemption and Ascension, and it is what gives all the other feasts their real significance. But while the first two feasts are highly 'personalized': Our Savior is born; Our Redeemer lives; the third and most intimately personal of all, OUR NEW LIFE PRINCIPLE is sent to us, is buried under the purely organizational description 'the birthday of the Catholic Church'. The advent of the New Life principle and the evolutionary aspect of the New Man is ignored.

In line with this 'minimizing' strategy, Satan sees to it that the good things in human life itself also conduce to the obscuring rather than the revealing of the New Man. It is obvious, then, that these 'good things' need to be examined as to their effect on the life of the New Man against which they are set by way of competition or opposition. The 'good things' are, of course, the Redemption and family life. In the first of these, as with the three feasts, there is a subtle confusion, almost inversion, of relative values, in this case of redemption and rebirth. It is the overemphasis on the minimal concept of 'being saved' as against the maximal concept of evolution and growth in a New Life that paves the way for Satan's most effective strategy. For that confusion directly affects the attitude toward the state of life (i.e. married or single) in which peculiarly Christian life is best lived; that is, the state in which the New Man can best evolve and grow to maturity.

10. *Penetrating Satan's 'Defense in Depth'*

So far as 'being saved' (i.e. receiving sanctifying grace) is concerned, that pertained to man even before the coming of the Redeemer, though by virtue of faith in His coming. The Jews received sanctifying grace under the Old Law, to the remission of original sin and also actual sin if any, by circumcision. However, upon dying, even in that state of innocence, they did not go to Heaven. But a baptised person, dying in baptismal innocence, may go directly to Heaven. Theologians attribute this effect to a 'super-abundance of grace', which is another example of theological obscurantism. The result of baptism is correctly seen as eligibility for Heaven, but the understanding (and teaching) of the reason is limited by the familiar use of the handy 'shot-gun' term 'grace'. Once again we must be explicit as to the nature of the 'unmerited gift' of which there is given this 'superabundance', because as the term is used in this formula it cannot but further obscure the New Life concept as elucidated in this essay. 'Superabundance' means 'MUCH MORE OF THE SAME THING OF WHICH THERE ALREADY WAS AN ABUNDANCE'. It is true that there might have been an abundance of unmerited gifts (grace) in general before baptism, but before the coming of the Holy Spirit to earth at Pentecost and thence to each individual soul at baptism, THERE WAS NOTHING AT ALL OF THE UNMERITED GIFT (GRACE) OF THE NEW LIFE. Hence the use of the term 'superabundance of grace,' in the theologians' formula cannot have any reference to the specific unmerited gift of the New Life because that specific 'grace' (unmerited gift) was not there at all in the first place. In fact the term 'superabundance' almost necessarily *excludes* the concept of anything *new*, hence no New Life Principle and no New Man.

What there was before was the life of Adam, the 'old' man, or Homo Sapiens. But when Christ said He came that we might have life and have it more abundantly, notice He said 'life' first. Not merely that we would have what we had, but more abundantly. He obviously could not have meant a greater abundance in the life of Adam, for we see that this is just not so, even though the sin of Adam has been atoned for. In any event, this would still leave us with the life of homo sapiens before the fall. Furthermore, when Christ said "He

that loseth his life shall find it" He could not have been referring to finding the *same thing* (i.e. the life of homo sapiens as created) only after it has again been lost., This proposes an endless circle of losing and regaining the *same thing*, a concept which reason must reject. The only concept which makes sense and therefore can be accepted on faith, is that Christ sent us a New Life, more abounding than the life of homo sapiens could ever have been, but that only he who loses his 'old' life, the life of Adam as created, shall find the New Life, and this is the quite obvious explanation of the difference between going to Heaven in baptismal innocence and not going to Heaven in the innocence of circumcision. Rebirth in the Spirit sent to earth by Christ after His ascension confers a new life, creates a New Race, whose 'natural habitat' is Heaven. Involved here is something more than the mere forgiveness of original sin. The water in the font also receives the power to 'bring forth a heavenly offspring' as the words of the blessing of the font put it. There was no such implication in circumcision.

Another confusing use of the term 'grace' is found in the standard theological teaching that 'grace perfects nature', and this is a double-barrelled problem: what grace and what nature? Christ said "I make all things New". If both of these statements are true, the only way in which they can be reconciled is if the reference is to the perfecting of the New Nature. That grace applies to the perfecting of the nature of the New Man and not to the perfecting of the nature of man born of woman, is proved by the fact that in the course of its operation this grace actually destroys and replaces much of the nature into which all human beings are born, somewhat as the life of the butterfly replaces the life of the worm.

Furthermore, the characteristics of the mature specimens of the respective lives are virtually antagonistic and irreconcilable, as we have seen, thus confirming the view that there are *two* lives involved, the one that terminates and the one that emerges. Those inclined to shrink from the idea of the destruction of the old nature should bear in mind that everything which evolves from a lesser to a higher nature is destroyed in the process. Grass is destroyed in becoming cattle and cattle are destroyed in becoming part of man. Since we have no reason to believe that man born of woman is the final product of cosmic evolution, it would be foolish to assume that the familiar characteristics of the evolutionary process came to an end with the emergence of Homo Sapiens. Even the purely spiritual evolutionary process was signalized by a most dramatic demonstration of this principle. Christ came to fulfill the law, that is, to consummate the evolutionary end for which the Old Law had been a preparation. And one of the visible manifestations of the culmination of that evolutionary

process was that the Veil of the Temple was rent and the Holy of Holies destroyed!

The point in history at which the life of the just man of the Old Law is superseded by the life of the New Man is marked in the persons of John the Baptist and Our Lady. Concerning John, Christ said "Of man born of woman none is greater". Yet John died. Our Lady, having been of the New Race from the moment of Her conception and always full to her predestined capacity in the New Life (a statement the Censor called "Contrary to Faith") did not die in the sense that John and all other humans died, in the death due to original sin. After a brief period officially known as the Dormition, during which there was no evidence of the one sure sign of death—decay—her body was taken to Heaven. There, reunited with her soul, in her reconstituted person is anticipated the general resurrection of all men, an event for which even the uncorrupt bodies of many saints will have to wait because they had been born 'old' men.

11. *We Begin to Distinguish the New Man*

The contrast between the mores (standards and point of view) of the mature New Man and those of the merely 'good' man, are as striking as they are mysterious and unappreciated. What the New Man takes for granted and accepts as a matter of course because it corresponds with his nature, will be utterly incomprehensible or considered completely impractical from the point of view of the 'good' man. For instance the natural virtues, which are the highest norms of conduct of man born of woman, actually become the *enemies* of the virtues of the New Man *when they can be chosen in preference*.

St. Peter, whom God the Father had singled out to head His Church, was certainly a loyal and loving follower of Christ. Surely no Christian, clerical or lay, could approximate Peter's devotion to Christ on the 'old' man level of comprehension. Yet such was the inadequacy of that level that a pious expression prompted by it branded Peter as the *enemy* of Christ on the divine (i.e. peculiarly New Man) level. His devotion to Christ prompted Peter to reject emotionally the unpleasant prospect that Christ foresaw, of His suffering and death. For which beautiful *human* sentiment Peter was called a devil by Christ "because he minded the things of men and not the things of God". Her concern with the serving of refreshments to an honored

guest, a distinctly 'proper thing' on the human level, won Martha a rebuke by Christ when she chided her sister Mary for neglecting to help her because Mary was so absorbed in chatting with Him, which was 'the better part'. Elsewhere in the Gospels we find clearly indicated that such humanly important things as the burial of one's father, all family ties, all the urgent cares and worries of life, even concern for food and shelter, all these are shown to be enemies of the New Man if they distract him from, or stand in the way of his growth in, the New Life.

On the positive side there is a distinct set of virtues attributed exclusively to the New Man, a fact responsible for a display of confusion among theologians who, merely as theologians, are unable to think in terms of a New Species. These virtues are called 'gifts of the Holy Spirit'—a confusing description. Actually, since the life principle of the New Man IS the Holy Spirit, these so-called 'gifts' would be more correctly described as attributes or characteristics of the New Man, rather than something added to and not necessarily of, the essence. (We could, for instance, properly speak of the 'gift' of prophecy.) These so-called 'gifts' are akin to the virtues of the natural (old) man, which are not ordinarily thought of as 'gifts' but precisely as something *natural* to Homo Sapiens, though these new attributes are in a higher order, pertaining to a New Species to which *they* are natural. It is because the theologians are unable to think in terms of the New Man as a species that they have such great difficulty, demonstrated in the Catholic Encyclopedia article on the subject, in figuring out just what *is* the relation between the natural virtues and those 'gifts' of the Holy Spirit, the virtues natural to the New Man.

The difference in the mores of the two species is in fact so profound as to actually reach the point of antagonism. That is why maturity in the New Man can create division to the point of hostility among those bound by the closest natural ties; why a son will find himself arrayed against his father, a daughter against her mother, and why the New Man's foes 'shall be members of his own natural family'. Indeed, we have here a most 'unnatural' being, one who through his essential attributes clearly reveals the sense in which Christ brought 'Not peace, but the sword'. When Christ spoke of hating the world, He did not mean hating only the bad things that the just 'old' man hated, but precisely the 'good' things, such as prudence and human wisdom, when they stand in the way of growth and activity according to the Spirit. When Peter 'imprudently' stepped overboard at Christ's call he walked on the water. The moment his human prudence asserted itself, he sank. According to St. John of the Cross, even the slightest attachment to the use of man's highest facul-

ty, reason, indicates a lack of maturity in the New Man, a point of view which seems echoed in St. Bonaventure's dictum that "To descend to the level of the philosopher is, for the Christian, the most dangerous of all dangers." (As has been said, reason is competent for 'checking up' but not for 'finding out'.) All this is, of course, in line with Christ's teaching that the things which the wise and prudent of the 'old' man are not able to see are freely revealed to and understood by, even the 'little ones' in the New Man. They come by them 'naturally' by the instinct of faith. The birth and growth of the New Man is more important than natural birth and growth. When the pious woman called out "Blessed is the womb that bore thee and the breasts that nursed thee", Christ promptly answered: "Blessed rather are they who hear the word of God and keep it."

In the decisive battle of man's destiny, the reasonable and prudent man born of woman is little likely to be an effective element. His preoccupation with the immediate and close by, no matter how pious, virtually incapacitates him for so much as a glimpse of the distant terrain in which the conflict between Satan and the New Man is joined. Only the mature New Man has some perception of the outposts in the warfare against Satan, and only he can break through Satan's 'elastic defense' and get a clear view of the realm from which Satan strives to bar the New Race. To prevent as much as a 'Pisgah view' of that promised land, Satan employs a strategy which, innocently and piously promoted by professional churchmen, results in keeping most Christians preoccupied with the minimalist notion that the main consideration is to 'save his soul', to do which he must strive for a 'state of grace'. But this, of course, is all we can expect of the virtuous pagan never reached by the Gospel message. Focusing the Christian's attention on saving his soul is like advising the natural man on the importance of keeping alive by eating well so as to stay healthy. Such advice would fall short of the strictly human and social considerations, namely striving for perfection according to the gifts of human nature and the use of one's talents for his own good and the good of neighbor and mankind, in other words to develop the social character of the species. Furthermore, we must here distinguish between the individual member of a species and the species itself. Each individual member of any species is important because without individual members there would be no species. In *Homo Sapiens* the individual is important also because of his personal essential characteristic, his immortal soul with its individual eternal destiny. But viewing nature as reflecting the mind of God, we see that it is the species which is the enduring seed of the evolutionary process, and the fate of any individual member of any species how-

ever important in itself, is only incidental to, and certainly should never obscure, the destiny of the species. It is the species, rather than the individual members which comprise each species, with which the evolution from *Homo Sapiens* to the New Man is concerned. It is in the New Man *as a species*, and not necessarily in any individual member that we see Christ in man.

One thing the individual natural man obviously does *not* need to be told is what he is, whereas this is preceisely what **MUST** be done in the case of the New Man. It is absolutely necessary that each one be told what manner of man he is by virtue of his re-birth, the purpose and destiny of his New Life, the means whereby he is to reach maturity in that life and the signs of such maturity.

These concepts cannot be generated by human reason however loftily developed. They must be *revealed*. The failure to instruct him in these things while concentrating his attention on the keep-out-of-hell doctrine and various pieties, merely aids Satanic strategy. For if he cannot ruin a soul altogether, Satan will obviously try the next best thing and that is to keep it so preoccupied with its own defense on a minimal level that it is led to neglect and stunt its evolutionary development. This will at least rob the infant New Man of his opportunity to develop to his predestined degree of maturity in eternal life. Infants have life. But if they live only in the infant state, e.g. just to 'save their souls' they lack life in the really meaningful sense of the word and they certainly do not have a full life, no matter what their chronological age. If few Christians ever become conscious of childhood in the New Man it is only because their Church leaders, on whom they must depend for the information, do not know enough to tell them what they are. The Satanic strategy of promoting minimalism and mediocrity is successful in other ways too, and these we shall now examine.

12. *Mary, Full of Grace*

The inability of the mere theologian to comprehend the nature of the New Life and the deplorable result of such lack when it occurs in Church Authority—both are illustrated by the Rev. Censor's treatment of the concept of the New Life in the Blessed Virgin.

When in his examination of this essay he came upon a description of Our Lady as 'always full of the New Life to the limit of her pre-

destined capacity', the Rev. Censor objected to the statement as "not reconcilable with the deposit of Faith". He based his objection, not on a denial of the New Life which, as it is presented in Embers is to him an unknown quantity, but on the teaching of theologians who speak of 'grace'. He said: (the statement) "is counter to the common teaching of theologians that Our Lady always increased in grace during her earthly life", and then he 'clinched' his opinion with the typical 'philosophical' argument that: "Since this" (the author's statement) "is asserted without any proof at all, the opinion can only be characterized as rash and dangerous."

The basis of the author's statement is, of course, the concept of the New Man as it appears in this essay. This concept is of an organic life, and it can easily be shown that the author's statement on Our Lady is consistent with, in fact is demanded by, such a concept. The basic question, therefore, is the orthodoxy of the doctrine of the New Man, upon which the entire thesis stands or falls. But evaluation of the concept of the New Man as set forth in this essay is obviously beyond the capacity of mere theologians who, whatever they may mean by 'grace', clearly have no concept of the New Life as herein described. However, the incompetence of the Censor's observation can be demonstrated even on the mere intellectual level on which it is offered.

The author took exception to the Censor's judgement and requested that the objection be withdrawn. Under date of April 8, 1951 he wrote:

"It is also objected that the statement in Embers that 'Our Lady was always full of the New Life to the limit of her predestined capacity' is contrary to the common teaching of theologians. Obviously, (too obviously to be thought necessary to mention in Embers) her capacity as a child was not the same as her capacity as a bereaved mother. Her capacity of course increased. But was she not at all times full to her (then) capacity?"

To which the Rev. Censor replied (in part):

"In the letter of 4/8/51 the author states that he agrees with the teaching of the theologians on Our Blessed Mother's power to increase in grace. The Censor then cannot object to the safety of the author's position in this matter."

And as simply as that a proposition condemned as 'not reconcilable with the Faith' suddenly becomes unobjectionable. But that is only the beginning of curiosities. In the first place the author never referred to or cited or in anyway implied a theological opinion in defense or support of his original opinion or subsequent protest. In the second place, from his reading of the essay the Rev. Censor could

hardly fail to be aware that the author does not regard the theologians' opinions very highly in many things, including this. Under the circumstances the device of putting words in the author's mouth only compounds the absurdity of the objection. If the author's statement actually *was* counter to the deposit of Faith, as the Rev. Censor originally charged, how could it later have turned out to be in agreement with the common teaching of theologians?

To anyone in the least familiar with the concept of the New Man as a species, the 'organic' nature of life would as a matter of course include the detail mentioned by the author, namely that it extends to all parts of the body it animates, even though they grow, and this brings us to the question of why this concept was not only rejected by the Rev. Censor but was considered counter to the common teaching of theologians. The specific question it raises is not so much whether the author agrees with the theologians as whether the theologians, when they use the term 'grace', mean what the author means by the New Life. The hard fact is that the teaching of the theologians on grace, on which Church Authority is presumably well versed, did not lead the Rev. Censor to perceive that there was no conflict between the author's statement and orthodox Catholicism, nor even that there is no contradiction between 'always growing' and 'always being full'. The reason the Rev. Censor had trouble with this simple idea is that he is suffering from the same limitation as St. Thomas of Aquin. He is a mere theologian and just simply cannot see the New Man.

If, for instance, the author had stated, without offering proof, that 'Our Lady was always full of blood to the limit of her predestined capacity', the Rev. Censor would hardly have objected. And if he did, it would hardly have been on the grounds that it was not stated that Our Lady's blood capacity had increased during her lifetime. Knowing the elementary facts of life, he would have had no difficulty with the statement. But suppose the theologians had taught that Our Lady's blood capacity had increased during her lifetime? In that case the Rev. Censor, *if all he knew was to follow blindly the theologians' teachings*, using his present logic could reject the author's statement about her always being full of blood to the limit of her predestined capacity on the ground that it was counter to the common teaching of theologians and that, since it was made without proof the statement was rash and dangerous.

The concept of an organic life necessarily takes in all the minute details elaborated by the theologians. But according to Diocesan Authority the pronouncements of the theologians, notwithstanding their elaboration of detail, apparently fail to take in the simple concept

of an organic life. Thus the synthetic and obscurantist teaching of the theologians is held by Church Authority to be counter to the simple, organic concept advanced in this essay. Consequently this essay is deemed counter to the deposit of Faith and thus refused a *nihil obstat*. Such is the influence of the exegetes and theologians upon the teaching of the deepest significance of the Faith to the people at large.

On the other hand, the evolutionary concept of Christianity not only makes the dogma 'Mary full of grace' easier to understand by itself, but, thus understood, the dogma illuminates the whole evolutionary process by showing the logically acceptable, or even necessary role which Mary, with the characteristics attributed to her, plays in the organic beginning of the New Life on earth.

In the evolutionary development the New Life principle, the word of God, if it falls upon good 'soil' proceeds (as do all life principles) to create form according to its nature or species. In the New Man this life principle affects primarily the mind and the will, on which basis the 'conversion of mores' takes place. But it may sometimes extend to the flesh, in which case, as might be expected, part or even all of the earthly body takes on, prematurely so to speak, some of the characteristics it will have after the general resurrection, when it will live in union with its life principle. Many saints have manifested at least one of the unique bodily characteristics of the complete New Man, namely incorruptibility of the flesh. In the case of the Blessed Virgin, the life principle infused into her physical being at the moment of its existence was the life principle of Christ, the Holy Spirit. That is why she, of all mankind, is the only one conceived free of the life principle of the 'old' man, the spirit of Adam with its burden of original sin, and why, of all New Men she alone was always full of the New Life to the limit of her predestined capacity. Thus she alone can be depicted as the human who tramples Satan underfoot.

The life principle infused into Christians at baptism is the same as that infused into Mary. In the baptismal rite the old life principle of Adam, which could at best create but another Adam, withdraws from the soul and is replaced by the life principle of Christ, the Holy Spirit, which can create another Christ. At the moment of baptism, since the baptised has just been reborn by and according to the Spirit of Christ, a person dying in baptismal innocence may go directly to Heaven. All except Mary were conceived in the life principle shared with Adam, and the penalty of the sin of Adam is the death of the 'shell'. But obviously, never having been under the disability of the life principle of Adam, the Blessed Virgin was not subject to that

penalty, so that at the end of her life on earth she was assumed into Heaven, body and soul.

The recent clerical re-evaluation of the relative significance of the feasts celebrating these two phenomena, the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption, provides a splendid demonstration, on the one hand of the effectiveness of Satanic strategy of using the second best to obscure the best, and on the other hand of the power of the Spirit to stop and repel the advance Satan had made and to restore things to their proper relation. The Immaculate Conception can be understood by man-born-of-woman only as 'freedom from sin'. Any more significant concept of the doctrine is completely beyond his grasp. Even the giant 'old' man intellect of St. Thomas Aquinas bogged down on the subject because, limited to his 'old' man theological level, he was baffled by a kind of 'hen or egg' dilemma involving original sin, redemption etc., and it was precisely this intellectual approach to the idea that kept him from accepting it. The faithful at large of the time, not being overburdened with theological erudition, accepted the Immaculate Conception without question, but merely as 'freedom from sin'. It is doubtful if they understood its real significance any more than St. Thomas did. Considering the Immaculate Conception merely as freedom from sin, the Assumption follows logically, on the same level, as the 'going to Heaven' which is the reward of a sinless life. The tradition of going to Heaven *body and soul* is even to this day explained as a privilege accorded Mary because she was the mother of God. To the 'old' man there is no tangible evidence of the New Man as such, while there is at least circumstantial evidence of Assumption in the disappearance of Mary's body. So there is nothing to hinder the latter fact from being accepted on the old man level as a going to Heaven with a special privilege due to her divine maternity.

However, the inner significance of the Assumption is based upon the inner significance of the Immaculate Conception and is properly understood only in this relation. But this inner significance and relation is discernable only to the New Man. If St. Thomas did not grasp the inner significance of the Immaculate Conception, he could not have understood the deeper significance of the Assumption, and it is doubtful if the Assumption is understood by the faithful any better than it was by St. Thomas. But the privileged sublimation, in Mary's case, of the familiar concept of going to Heaven caught the imagination and won the popular devotion of the faithful. So much so that over the centuries its unique character gained for it a pious observance beyond that of her 'sinless life' to which, after all, the faithful themselves are also called. Churchmen, under the influence

of the popular mores and without the protection of the New Man point of view, pandered to this unenlightened state of affairs and encouraged and blessed it by according to the Feast of the Assumption a degree of solemnity far greater than that allowed the Feast of the Immaculate Conception. The former was preceded by a fast and a vigil, while the latter had neither. In the light of the relative significance of the two events as they are understood by the New Man and as set forth in this essay, it was no wonder that in due time the Spirit had to intervene to set this cart-before-horse relationship in proper order. Only recently there has been an abrupt and complete reversal of the long established but basically unsound relative emphasis placed on the two feasts. While there is room for speculation as to whether the change was influenced by enlightenment on the subject of the New Man or by clerical accommodation to the popularity of recent visions of the Immaculate Conception and other such phenomena, there can be no doubt of its significance and validity from the point of view of the New Man. Whatever the reason, the fact is that the Feast of the Assumption has now not only been shorn of its vigil and fast, but those very solemnities have been transferred to the Feast of the Immaculate Conception where they more appropriately belong!

13. *The Cult of Mary*

The striking success of the Satanic strategy of using the second best to obscure the best is demonstrated in the popularity of the cult of Mary. On one side of this picture there is an array of the best wisdom and deepest pious sentiment of man born of woman, led by theologians and popes and massively supported by the laity. This 'near deification of Mary' as non-Catholics sometimes describe it, has not only helped to confuse non-Catholics and become one of the chief stumbling blocks in the path of many seeking the true Faith, but it has subtly betrayed Catholics. On the other side of the picture is the simple and direct understanding of the New Man that the important thing is not the beautiful human aspect of the cult but its relation to the fundamental principle of the New Species. This concept in no way diminishes the status of Mary but, when properly understood, will not only benefit Catholics and remove an obstacle to non-Catholics but

will, in fact, be another logical and thus attractive aspect of the Christian Faith.

The comprehension of man born of woman is even more inferior to the comprehension of the New Man than Mary is inferior to Christ; which is why the mind and heart of man born of woman, filled to its capacity with all the wisdom and piety of its species, fails more egregiously to comprehend the New Man than Mary failed to comprehend the twelve year old Christ 'about His Father's business'. Thus, because they are more readily understood and so sentimentally satisfying, the beautiful human concepts become enemies of growth in the New Man when they are taught or chosen in preference. It is easy for man born of woman to understand the idea of motherhood and all the beautiful things it implies; the reciprocal affection between mother and child, the desire of one to please the other, the kindness of the ideal mother not only toward her own offspring but toward children in general, etc. When all these factors are exemplified on the level of the virgin motherhood of the Son of God, they reach a degree of sublimity which is all the human mind is capable of comprehending. In like manner, even the most significant matters of Faith may be cut down to the level of comprehension of man born of woman and thus induce complete intellectual satisfaction, emotional consolation, and, a betrayal of the New Man.

For instance; the fact that Mary had the unique prerogative of being the mother of God is to this day the usual and possibly the only reason suggested by churchmen for her Assumption. By way of this cart-before-horse teaching, churchmen bury the really fundamental and organic reason for the Assumption, which has to do with maturity in the New Man, a factor Satan would prefer to have ignored because of the personal lesson it holds for *all* mankind. But it cannot be gainsaid that Mary *could* have been the mother of God without having all her life been full to her predestined capacity in the New Life, while she could *not* have been immediately assumed bodily into Heaven unless she had *always* been full to her predestined capacity for the life of Heaven *even though she had been the mother of God*. It was not her maternity, which is shared by no one, that made her eligible for immediate entrance into Heaven, but her status in the life of the New Man, which life is shared in lesser degree by all New Men, and therefore is of direct personal significance to each baptised person. Since in her that New Life had always been present, complete and perfect according to her predestined capacity throughout her whole life on earth, Mary did not have to undergo the period of death till the general resurrection that every other mortal body must undergo before reaching Heaven.

But the man born of woman thinking and teaching of our clerical leaders succeeds in filling the mind and heart of man with the lesser concept based on her maternity, a factor remote from and inaccessible to the rest of mankind, hence of no personal significance or influence. Satan thereupon rejoices because the promotion of this limited concept safely obscures the real lesson the Assumption has for every Christian, namely reaching his predestined degree of maturity in the New Life before he dies. Actually, from this point of view, and without any reference whatever to her Maternity, Mary's assumption was inevitable. For what else could have happened to her under the circumstances?

The cult of Mary has also given us the Pope enunciated doctrine 'All grace through Mary' which, because it is taught, accepted and operates on the level of man born of woman, provides Satan with another opportunity to use a beautiful and pious notion to obscure the New Life. To be sure, the truth that is in the doctrine may again well fill the mind and heart of man born of woman, but that circumstance brings Satan no misgivings. Indeed, it is to him a sign that his strategy is working, because preoccupation with that doctrine as taught by churchmen and eagerly embraced by the faithful, is another sign of safe immaturity and therefore impotence, in the New Man.

It is only when redeemed man begins to sense a certain inadequacy in the doctrine as taught and becomes aware of a more profound truth being overlaid and obscured, that Satan becomes concerned. For such a stirring of consciousness is a sign that the New Man has begun to outgrow his infancy and may some day, in his maturity, become a real threat. Meanwhile Satan views with complacency, if not approval, the zealous promotion of the doctrine by churchmen, including popes, and the support of miracles at Lourdes, Fatima and elsewhere. Not because such teaching and miracles are *false* but precisely because they are true *but on a certain level*. Concentration on truth *on that level* stands in the way of discovering greater truth on a higher level, and so again the second best is found useful in obscuring the best. The question is: What does the doctrine 'all grace through Mary' mean and, more importantly, what does it obscure?

One of the cardinal points upon which the doctrine rests is Christ's words to Mary and John at the foot of the cross; "Mother, behold thy son" and, "Son, behold thy mother". These words can be taken as the consignment of a mother who had lost both spouse and first-born child to the care of that child's beloved friend, or they can be taken to indicate symbolically the maternal relation between Mary as the mother of the Redeemer and all of redeemed mankind—the

'father of his country' concept. It is in this latter sense that it may be said that 'all grace comes through Mary'. But taken in this sense it is clearly part of the redemptive picture, pertaining to the 'old' man now redeemed, and clearly *NOT* part of the Pentecostal picture, pertaining to the New Man (except insofar as redemption and the death of the 'old' man are a necessary prelude to rebirth in the New Man).

All material benefits flowing from, and demonstrating the power of God to effect, redemption from the dominion of Satan and from the ills which plague the human race as a result of Satan's early domination,—all these may well come through Mary. Things in this category are enumerated in the antiphon for the Benedictus on the feast of the Epiphany (a feast of the redeemed man): the baptism of Christ by John (a baptism of redemption), the gifts of the Magi, and the water made wine at Cana. Even as late as Cana, Mary understood Christ no more than when she found Him 'about His Father's business' in the temple many years before. Because she did not really understand, her Son humored her untimely request and permitted her to force His hand in public, while at the same time administering a mild rebuke at her lack of understanding. And through the cult of Mary the same lack of understanding has been perpetuated to this day. In the same category of material benefits would fall also the miracles at Lourdes, Fatima etc. as well as some very ancient miracles that God effected for the prophets, who were certainly not New Men. However, teaching, understanding and accepting the doctrine 'all grace through Mary' on that redemptive level involves no real *conflict* with the concept of the New Man. It is only when the doctrine attempts to comprehend and relate to matters beyond the redemptive picture that we see its limitations. Thus we find that in the last analysis the doctrine, measured by its relation to the doctrine of the New Man, reveals once again that the almost best, piously and vigorously promoted by churchmen, including popes, merely serves to obscure the best, which is all Satan can hope for.

To checkmate this success and carry the attack to Satan we must break through this protective cover and discover the hidden values. This we can do by analogy. Suppose a man owned a vast apple orchard and aspired to be another 'Johnny Appleseed' the legendary character who went about this country planting apple trees. Suppose now that he entrusted the distribution of all seed to his mother. She would therefore receive *all* seeds provided by her son and she could dispense them were she willed. Even if her will always coincided with her son's, all the seed the people received would have to come through her 'All grace through Mary'. But what gives the seed its value,—that is, the life principle it bears within itself and the nature of the species

which comes from that seed when developed and matured,—these things could in no way be attributed to nor depend on the will or the power of the mother.

Thus it is clear that neither before nor after it is a gift (i.e. 'grace') has Mary any more to do with the *content* of the seed implanted in the soul at baptism, or anything which develops from that seed, than the mother of the orchardist had to do with the content of the seed she dispensed. Yet when, in an effort to distinguish the New Man, that is, the nature and source of the New Life principle, it was stated in the version of Embers originally submitted to the Rev. Censor that: "one thing which cannot possibly come from Mary's intercession is the *content* of the seed implanted in the soul at baptism", the Rev. Censor said; (pronouncement of May 3 1953) "... The author's teaching on the Mediation and Intercession of the Blessed Virgin cannot be reconciled with the teaching of the Church. The Church does teach that *all* (emphasis in original) graces do come to man through Mary: e.g. Leo II taught in the Encyclical Octobri Mense: 'Nothing of that great treasury of all grace which the Lord built up is distributed to us, by the will of God, except through Mary'".

This of course puts the Rev. Censor (and the pope?) squarely in the position of teaching explicitly that the life principle of the seed implanted in the soul at baptism, hence everything which grows from that seed when matured, all these *originate* with Mary. Or else there is no such Life Principle as is proposed by the author. Thus does Church Authority draw the official theological curtain on the very concept of the New Man by arbitrarily introducing an altogether extraneous factor. Any number of popes may proclaim that the Gospel of Christ comes to us through Mary; even that the act of the will by which we accept the Gospel comes to us under the influence of Mary; but when they begin to teach that the life principle of the New Man *originates* with Mary the confusion is hopeless. It would be better to throw the doctrine out entirely.

The analogy with the mother of Johnny Appleseed suggests further interesting thoughts, for instance; It is obvious that the recipients of the apple seeds, to the extent to which they are aware of what they received, would appreciate not so much the source, whether the orchardist or his mother, as what was in the seed itself, its potential, the fruit it could bring forth. Moreover, it is only an understanding of the life principle in the seed, the nature of the species which comes from the seed when developed, that guides the recipient of the seed in its proper use and care. And finally, the nature of the ground on which the seed falls determines its fate, as is pointed out in the parable. In the case of the New Man, the recipient of the seed is literally

the ground on which the seed falls, as well as the husbandman who is supposed to know what it contains and how to cultivate it. The less the recipient knows about the nature of the seed, the less likely he is to use it to proper advantage. No matter how tender are the sentiments of the recipients toward the 'mediatrix of the grace', there will be no practical results of any concern to Satan if the recipients do not understand the nature of the seed and how to cultivate it. And this is the situation today, hence the seed does not bring forth its fruit, the New Man.

Instead of being taught and understood according to this interior significance and effect with respect to the life of the New Man, the modern cult of Mary is supported principally on the superficial basis of certain suspensions, or modifications, of what are called by Homo Sapiens 'laws of nature'. While no one can say what effect the signs and wonders at Lourdes or elsewhere may have on the growth of any individual New Man, it must be pointed out that the admitted cures which encourage this cult pertain chiefly if not exclusively to the bodily needs of man born of woman. This has been true from the beginning of miracles at Cana to those of today. His public miracles of physical healing were employed by Christ on earth to manifest the power of God precisely because they were the most cogent, if not the only, proof which could be offered to those who had not yet been given to see with the eye of the New Man. Certainly the vast concourse of people who today deem physical health such a great good as to be worth a suspension of the laws of nature are not particularly among the more mature New Men. This is a peculiarly human standard of value. The New Man has a different standard, and while he accepts suspensions of the laws of nature as a matter of course, phenomena on the level of Lourdes or Fatima, even if they be true miracles according to the Church, do not influence his conduct or occupy his mind. Therefore whatever purpose such miracles do serve, it is clearly not that of the development of the New Man. But it *could* be a pre-emptive or competitive factor vis-à-vis teaching and understanding the New Man. That would satisfy Satan.

Properly understood, the cult of Mary need be no obstacle in the path of anyone seeking growth in the New Life; nor, indeed, need the cult be subscribed to by anyone who is otherwise attracted to, and might accept, the concept of Faith as set forth in this essay. But, for those who follow devotion to her closely, it is interesting to see that on one of her most ancient and solemn feasts we are given two cleancut distinctions and a clear hierarchy of values between the best natural goodness and the goodness of the New Man. On both the vigil (that was) and the Feast of the Assumption, the respective gospels

show us that the good, even the pious, natural point of view is relatively unimportant. There is in the case of the maternity of Our Lady (Luke 11:27-28) a hierarchy of values and in the case of Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38-42) a conflict typical of family life. In both cases the point of view of the New Man is preferred to, or even opposed to, that of the merely dutiful or pious person. However, because of the popularization of the phenomena at Lourdes, Fatima etc. Catholic devotion practically revolves around and is measured in terms of, devotion to the cult of Mary under concepts which appeal to the human point of view and obscure the nature of the New Man. Incidentally, but inevitably, they often interfere with his characteristic work, which is Liturgical worship—the 'common work' whereby the New Man is formed, developed and prepared for his eternal activity, the praise of God. This is one respect in which many a pious Catholic is going to find himself a mere infant in the next life, but churchmen pander to this popular ignorance. It is not at all uncommon to have priest-led popular devotion to Mary actually compete with the Sacrifice of the Mass being offered at the same time, presumably by the same people, through another priest, and Liturgical prayer at other times has been extensively replaced by what are called 'gimme' Novenas.

14. *The Sacraments and the New Man*

There is provision in nature for all the life needs of every creature at every stage of its existence, both in the ordinary routine of daily living and often in the unusual accidents of life. The New Man is no exception. The essential life needs of the New Man i.e. all the nourishment and exercise necessary to develop him to his predestined degree of maturity in the New Life are supplied by Mother Church in what Catholics call the Sacraments, and *all* the Sacraments *the Church Administers* serve the new species.

Baptism, ordinarily but not necessarily administered in church, generates the New Life. Confirmation, significantly administered (in the West, at least), at the age of puberty, a time of profound physiological and psychological change in man, confirms his new life as against his old. Penance restores the New Life when it has been minimized or lost. The Eucharist nourishes the New Man. Extreme Unction, administered only at the point of death and ordinarily after Penance and the Eucharist, compensates for what the New Man may

be lacking of that degree of potential maturity in the New Life to which he had been 'predestined' (i.e. *could have achieved*). For even if the soul merits no punishment due to sin, failure to reach its predestined capacity for maturity is itself an imperfection and nothing imperfect can enter Heaven. By virtue of Extreme Unction, called 'anointing for glory' the New Man, if he deserves no temporal punishment due to sin, enters Heaven at once, *but only on that level of capacity for enjoying the life of Heaven (or the New Earth) that he attained in the New Life on this earth* and on that level he remains for eternity. These sacraments cover completely every phase in the life history of the New Man. There is no other aspect of that life, from birth to eternity, for which there could be need of another sacrament. Thus the two remaining sacraments do not have the same organic relation to the life of the New Man as do the five already mentioned, and neither the presence nor lack of either of them is of essential relevance to the life principle of the New Man although both, in different ways, are related to or affect people who have that life. These sacraments are, of course, Holy Orders and Matrimony.

Holy Orders is a 'functional' sacrament. It gives some New Men certain official duties and powers in the management and functioning of the Church on earth, including formal responsibility for continuing the praise of God, offering the Sacrifice of the Mass on behalf of the faithful, administering the Sacraments and bringing at least the letter of the Gospel to the world. With this responsibility goes the grace to do the work, just as God always gives man the grace to do his necessary work, though in the case of Holy Orders some of the work must be done under pain of sin. This Sacrament is certainly *of* the New Man, but though it imprints an indelible mark upon the soul of the priest, it does not necessarily increase his own 'holiness' that is, his wholeness in the New Man. The priest receives Holy Orders not for himself, but as a servant of the faithful. Holy Orders therefore stands outside his personal growth and maturity in the New Life. It reflects the special priestly power and mission of Christ, who was sent by His Father to atone for and gain forgiveness of the sin of Adam on behalf of mankind, and who in turn sent forth His Apostles to continue His sacrifice and forgive sins. It was a power conferred before Pentecost. Pentecost, however, brought the life of the Spirit itself, the life principle of Christ, after His redemptive mission had been accomplished, for the purpose of creating other Christs, the species herein called the New Man.

The Rev. Censor termed the statement that Holy Orders does not increase the holiness (i.e. wholeness in the New Man) in the cleric "a point of view not reconcilable with the Faith" and he went on

to say: "This, at least as stated, is to forget that the Sacrament causes an increase of grace and charity, i.e. an increase in the New Life." In support of his objection he declared that "Holy Orders imparts a resemblance to Christ". Of course, it *does*. But it is a *functional* resemblance. Under the circumstances the net result of the Rev. Censor's objection is to further obscure the 'resemblance to Christ' which is not merely functional, but goes to the essence of the life of the New Man whom this essay attempts to identify and describe, and which may reach the highest degree of maturity entirely outside of Holy Orders or any other profession in which a man may be engaged. The key to such clerical obscurantism seems to be the familiar use of the vague term 'grace' by the Rev. Censor. In its broadest sense 'grace' means 'unmerited gift'. But, as has been observed before, the term is meaningless unless we know the nature of the gift referred to. In this case again it is important to distinguish between unmerited gifts generally and the specific gift of the New Life. The latter gift is distinguished by its organic nature, paralleling the progression of all life from seed to fruit, with the offspring identical in species with the parent. Other unmerited gifts may come from the same source, may exist alongside such life; they may be given originally only to those having the life of the New Man. But it is the life that concerns us in this essay rather than the profession or vocation.

In the light of these necessary distinctions we find that the unmerited gift of sharing the sacrificing office of Christ, as a 'resemblance to Christ', remains even if the unmerited gift of the life of the New Man is entirely lost. "A priest in hell is still a priest". Thus the 'resemblance to Christ' referred to by the Censor cannot be the essential life of the New Man. If the life of the New Man is not to be obscured by the objection, the nature of both 'resemblances' must be understood. Since the nature of the New Man as described in this essay seems to be a deep mystery to the Rev. Censor, he is incapable of making the necessary distinction, but it is easily made by an analogy:

A second bar added to the one worn by a lieutenant in the army increases his 'resemblance' to the five star general. And every promotion, up to the rank of 4-star general further increases his resemblance to the 5-star general. But this is a functional resemblance, and even if the 4-star general gets his own 5 stars, he will never share the Life Principle of the other 5-star general. Similarly, the consecration of a layman to the duty of offering the sacrifice of Christ increases the functional resemblance to Christ, the first priest. The functional resemblance increases as the priest rises in the hierarchy. A

bishop shares the full priesthood of Christ, and the pope is the very vicar of Christ on earth. But such a resemblance is obviously not the same thing as a degree of maturity according to a life principle. Consider Pope Alexander VI.

15. *The Priest and the Monk*

The Church's own way of promoting essential resemblance to Christ is not Holy Orders, but Monasticism. That the priest *as such* and the monk are in entirely different categories, one consistent with worldly life, the other 'in the world but not of it', is clearly shown by their respective relationships to 'the great Sacrament'. There is no essential incompatibility between worldly marriage and Holy Orders. The celibacy of the Western Clergy is a mere matter of Church Discipline for pragmatic reasons. The discipline is not traditional in the Eastern Rite and ~~even~~ today is relaxed ^{even} in the west, where a number of former Lutheran pastors with families have, upon conversion, been ordained Catholic priests. Celibacy, however, has always been of the essence of monasticism, as a *sine qua non* for the attainment of maturity in the New Man. In monastic consecration the Church recognizes the holiness i.e. 'wholeness' of the act whereby the heart, mind and strength of the redeemed man, in the full freedom and responsibility of natural maturity, are deliberately turned unreservedly to the development of the New Life. What was promised by his sponsors at his baptism is now promised anew by the baptised, and in recognition of this fact monastic consecration restores baptismal innocence as a prelude to a fuller initiation into the Christ-life. Ordination to the priesthood has no such personal significance or effect.

Nor, indeed, is the concept of virginity as such particularly Christian. The 'religious' take a vow of chastity, which is essentially a denial of expression to and a subjugation of, part of the God-given nature of man-born-of-woman to more singlemindedly serve God. Virginity was similarly held in high esteem by the pagan Romans in the service of their deities, which clearly indicates that it is a human, and therefore from the viewpoint of the New Man a negative attitude. The positive, New Man attitude takes virginity for granted as part of his mores, or standards, as characteristic of maturity in the New Man as raising a family is characteristic of maturity in man-born-of-woman. The promise the monk makes is 'conversion of mores'. He takes no

special vow of chastity. The approach to and the significance of virginity according to the mores of the New Man are explored in the following chapter. It is for the purpose of facilitating the complete conversion of mores from those of the mere good, or even heroically self sacrificing man, to those characteristic of maturity in the New Man that the layman enters an institution specifically ordered to that purpose. But monasticism itself has not escaped its own peculiar form of deterioration. Under the influence of the 'Peters', the 'organization men', it has turned into mere clericalism with trimmings. Because by Canon Law, 'full' monks must be ordained, the priesthood has for some curious reason become a sort of 'status symbol' in monasteries.

This has had two undesirable 'side effects'. One is that because monasticism as such is not widely nor well understood, while the priesthood is a very familiar institution and part of a hierarchic order of which the top is no less than the pope himself, making a monk a priest has the distinctly unfortunate effect of promoting among the faithful (and often among priests) the erroneous notion that the height of Catholic spiritual life is found, or exemplified, in Holy Orders, as something *more* than being merely a monk. In this respect it would help put monasticism and the New Man in proper perspective if no man in Holy Orders could be elected an abbot.

Furthermore, because they are now priests, many monks have willy-nilly been compelled to further departure from monasticism. Because as priests they are available for 'organization routine', their monastic life is often dissolved into regular parish work, with little or none of the common life or other monastic observances peculiarly adapted to promoting their growth to maturity in the New Man.

When we consider that monasticism is the one and only institution that exists solely for promoting growth in the New Man, this Church-fostered enfeeblement of the institution has indicated ignorance of or indifference to the whole concept of the New Man as described in this essay. At the same time it has reflected a breakdown among monks of the understanding of their own life and place in the Christian community. Happily, there has set in a quiet but vigorous rejection of this degeneration with a recent revision of the concept of the relationship of the sacrament of Holy Orders towards the community and (hopefully) the beginning of the return of the layman to full monastic status (in new monasteries). This revives the Spirit of St. Benedict as reflected in his Rule.

In the Holy Rule of St. Benedict there is a clear-cut distinction between the New Man who is aware of what manner of man he is and who strives for maturity in his New Nature, and the mere candi-

date for, or possessor of, Holy Orders, who may not (and need not) have any awareness of the nature of the New Man as an evolving species. A priest as such was not to be too readily admitted to a monastery even as a guest because, after all, he might be a foreign element and influence among those whose only concern was reaching maturity in the New Life. Even if a priest was accepted into the monastic family, or if one of the monks was ordained, his priesthood was subordinated to the keeping of the Rule and to his vow of stability, to the extent that if he obstinately refused to obey the Rule and **the abbot, he was to be ejected from the monastery, his Holy Orders notwithstanding.** He could in fact celebrate Mass only when ordered by the Abbot to do so.

The rule of St. Benedict is a rule for laymen, or rather it is a rule written by a layman for reaching maturity in the New Life regardless of what secular or holy work a person may do. The extent to which popular (and therefore clerical) mores have obscured the higher concepts of the New Man is evidenced by the surprise and skepticism with which Catholics, both lay and clerical, receive the statement that if a monk had to make an exclusive choice between being a monk and being a priest, he would of course be a monk and not a priest. But obviously it does not make sense that a man who knew what he was doing would choose a mere function or office, however lofty, of the New Life and reject the life of the New Man itself. The function of a priest terminates with his death, but the life work of the monk is merely transferred to, and perfected in, eternity. St. Benedict himself did not view the priesthood as the next step for the monk in the perfecting of the New Man, or indeed of having any special relation to that life. His idea was that if a monk had reached the degree of maturity attainable in monastic life and still felt that he had not reached the maturity to which he was predestined, he might then be ready for single combat with Satan in the life of a solitary. St. Benedict himself, if he ever received Holy Orders, which is doubtful, certainly did not do so till near death in his old age.

The official attitude of Church Authority toward these ideas is indicated by the comment of the Rev. Censor:

pg 3. par. b) April 12 1951.

"The Author so exalts his own conception (and that a faulty one, in that he interprets history at his own convenience and sometimes substitutes past history for present reality) of monasticism by way of a pejorative description of the priesthood and Holy Orders that the faithful can be led to no other conclusion but that Christ instituted the Sacrament in vain, that no priest is ever or ever can be in the

priesthood a perfect Christian. This can only lead to a violent anti-clericalism which would be detrimental to the sanctification of the faithful. One gets the impression in this pamphlet that the priests of Christ's Church, from the Pope down, have no other role in the life of the Church except that of Satan's agents in the work of watering Christianity down to its destruction."

There remains one more 'state of life' Sacrament to be considered, the Sacrament of Matrimony.

Matrimony as a sacrament differs from all the other sacraments in one very significant respect. It is not administered by the Church. None but the real mother of Christians, Holy Mother Church, has the power and the means to nourish and develop the New Man; and by the same token, no part of the life of the New Man as such, from its inception at baptism (except in emergency) to its confirmation, to its protection or restoration or to its final anointing for glory, comes to man except through Mother Church. The Church does not administer the sacrament of Matrimony because it does not apply to the life of the New Man as such, though it affects that life. But Church Authority in the person of the Rev. Censor, has objected to this statement in the following terms:

"Since the basis of the life of the New Man is grace, and since matrimony gives *this* grace, it can hardly be said that matrimony has no relation to the life of the New Man." (The emphasis is added.)

This criticism is obscurantist almost to the point of irresponsibility. Because, far from saying, or even implying, that matrimony has no 'relation' to the life of the New Man, the author explicitly noted *two* relations of matrimony to that life. One was its *effect* upon the life, the other its *application* to the life. The distinction was made after citing a list of the sacraments which 'nourish and develop'—hence clearly *apply* to the life of the New Man,—and then indicating that matrimony had no place in this category. It was then stated that matrimony 'affected' the life of the New Man by instituting a state of life in which the New Man would have to develop. Since this effect of matrimony on the life of the New Man was pointed out some time ago by St. Paul, the Rev. Censor should have had no difficulty in following the distinctions made by the author. But the Rev. Censor managed to obscure the whole picture by lumping both categories together in the one equivocal term 'relation' (which could be either 'extrinsic' or 'intrinsic'), and throwing out the whole idea; Along with which mystifying sleight-of-hand we again find recourse to the handy theological use of the confusing term 'grace'.

If the Rev. Censor's words are intended to deny the author's statement that matrimony does *not* apply to the life of the New Man, then the Rev. Censor must mean that it *does* apply; that it increases, perfects or in some way supports or promotes growth according to the life principle received at baptism, as do the other sacraments which the author says 'apply' to the life of the New Man. But the Church teaches that perfection in the life of the New Man implies celibacy, 'an objectively higher state'.

Since maturity in the life of the New Man is the highest conceivable destiny to which man-born-of-woman can aspire, it necessarily implies the progressive choice of the highest of all objective states, (as well as subjective attitudes) leading to it. And obviously none of these states (or characteristics), having been achieved, can thereafter be *rejected* without marring the perfection of growth. (They may, of course, be superseded by a consistent but objectively higher concept or state). If, on the other hand, a state or concept *must* be *rejected* as inconsistent with one objectively higher, then that state or concept had no place in the healthy organic development of the New Man in the first instance. This is obviously the case with respect to sin; but there are degrees of imperfection short of sin which must be avoided, foregone or compensated for by Extreme Unction, if the New Life is to be achieved.

Viewed in this light, whatever the Rev. Censor may mean by 'grace' in reference to matrimony ("Since matrimony gives this grace") the term can hardly refer to, much less be synonymous with or promote the life of the New Man, since matrimony is one thing we must forego or give up when we go to live the fullness of the New Life in Heaven, or even here on earth, in a monastery, for in neither place is there marriage. The concept of the New Man has a difficult time surviving, much less being an effective influence, in the face of this obfuscation.

16. *Marriage, in the Old Testament and the New*

While theologians define the primary purpose of marriage in terms common to the mating of animals, namely the procreation of the species, we must realize that man approaches that union on a higher level than the animal. (And the New Man has a still different attitude). A wholesome human marriage is the continuation to the bodies of

what should already have been a union of hearts and minds. Marriage constitutes the fulfillment of the respective personalities of the man and the woman by the unreserved and reciprocal giving of total physical self to each other. But when we speak of a union of mind and heart we open two doors; one to a union on the level of the good redeemed man, the other to a union on the level of the New Man as he is developed by the Spirit through the Gospels and tradition. The level on which the union of heart and mind occurs is, however, capable of producing diametrically opposite results so far as the state of life is concerned, so the subject deserves examination.

Naturally Satan favors promoting the lesser good as against the greater. He is not so stupid as to oppose patent wrong to patent right. As with the cult of Mary, he is satisfied if the second best predominates over, or even competes for popular interest with, the best. If the second best can in some way be identified with the best, so much more effective will be the obscuring of the New Man. As between the two states of life therefore, let us see what Catholic faith and tradition holds, and what the Church explicitly teaches us on the one and the other. This will put the institution of marriage in proper perspective and indicate its place in the divine plan beginning with Adam and arriving at the New Man.

The Church teaches that a sacrament is an outward sign of inner significance, instituted by Christ. Clerics tend to bracket all the sacraments together except one, which is repeatedly singled out as 'the great Sacrament'—the sacrament of Matrimony—quoting St. Paul. However the Church teaches that virginity, which involves no sacrament, is an objectively higher state of life than the one resulting from the Sacrament of Matrimony. What then is the relation of marriage to the highest state, to wit, the life of the New Man, wherein we have only our natural lifetime to become mature seed? It is simply that we must exist as men before we can exist as New Men, and the proper ordering of our existence as men depends on marriage. It is in this sense that marriage is the sign, or Sacrament, of another fruitful union, a union in the supernatural order, between Christ and His bride the Church, from which union comes the New Man. For Christians the hierarchy of values is most explicit and pronounced, and marriage is merely a means on a lower level to an ultimate end on a higher. For man-born-of-woman the highest significance of marriage was found among the Jews of old because it would be of a Jewish wife and mother that there would one day be born the long awaited Messiah! However the Church tells us that before their espousal both Mary and Joseph had vows of virginity, and that their marriage, in the intention of

the spouses, was to be a virgin marriage, a union of mind and heart in God and the things of God which was not to extend to the bodies! Yet it was precisely to this married couple who had taken vows counter to the tradition of their people, counter even to the plans of God, it would seem, that the Messiah came! But that is only the introduction to a whole catalogue of life concepts which can only baffle the wise and prudent of man-born-of-woman but which, as we shall see later, have a significance that is revealed to even the little ones of the New Man.

Closer to the natural order we see the New Life emerge from the old in the story of the family of the precursor of Christ, John the Baptist. John's conception involved the natural process of generation. He was conceived of the line of Adam both flesh and spirit, hence in original sin. But he was born a New Man, having received the Holy Spirit while still in his mother's womb. He is the intermediate link in the closely knit but distinct and consecutive spiritual steps in the evolutionary progression represented by Adam, Mary, Christ and the race of New Men. Mary, like John, came from the flesh in the line of Adam, by the normal process of generation, but her life principle did not. The life principle infused into the soul of Mary at the moment of her conception was the same life principle which John received later, but John received it after his natural conception though before birth. Christ was the New Man both as to flesh and Spirit. He was not physically of the seed of Adam 'becoming man without man's aid', as the Liturgy puts it, though he was as truly man as Adam himself, who also had no father, and of course He had life by the same life principle in which Mary was conceived and John was born, the life principle of the New Man.

Thus we see all the steps which, arranged in the proper hierarchic order, give us the pattern of evolution from 'man-born-of-woman', of whom John was the greatest, to the New Man, and we see where marriage fits into the pattern. It is necessary for our existence but it is in another order than the New Life. It remains for us who are born in both the flesh and spirit of Adam through the union of our parents in marriage, to be reborn during our lifetime into the New Man through the union of Christ with His Church, and during our lifetime to acquire and exemplify the characteristics peculiar to the New Man.

We have just as much reason to believe and accept the message of the Gospel given us by the Church in this respect as Zachary had to accept the message of the angel. He was not required to believe in a miracle—i.e. a suspension of a familiar 'law of nature', but merely in something he did not at first understand. The fact was simply that

the law of nature was permitted to operate where previously it had not. But because he did not accept what was to him incomprehensible, though not contrary to reason, he was bereft of his power of speech. If we fail to accept the creation of the New Man, which is a logical evolution and *not inconsistent with and irreconcilable to the deposit of Faith*, we shall not be able to speak with the tongue of the New Man. The full truth may at first be as obscure as was the difference between John and Christ to the seekers after truth at that time. But because they sought the *better and greater* truth, Christ gave to the seekers evidence upon which they could reach the correct conclusion.

17. *Marriage and the Theologians*

Since the chain of circumstances involving Zachary, Elizabeth, John, Mary and Christ makes no sense from the standpoint of human reason or experience, our Church leaders are content merely to tell us the facts, which they cannot very well deny in view of the Church's official teaching, but which they certainly do not, and as mere theologians cannot, understand. We should take the illuminating hint that we have to look elsewhere than in modern theology for the deeper significance of the Holy Family in respect to marriage and virginity. So again we go to St. Paul.

If Churchmen quote St. Paul on the 'great Sacrament', the Church herself also gives us his teaching that it is well for man not to touch woman, that it is well if a man without a wife does not seek a wife, and that the man who does not give his daughter in marriage does better than he who does so give her. He points out that marriage militates against concern for things of the Lord, one of which is certainly growth to maturity of members of His Mystical Body, a maturity which comes only in the New Man, and he wishes all men were as himself, celibate. However, he says, if the unmarried do not possess that relative disinterest in marriage peculiar to maturity in the New Man, it is better for them to marry than to burn with perfectly natural carnal desires which cannot otherwise be lawfully satisfied. It is for them an unnatural situation. He says this from the viewpoint of the New Man, in which nature he knows himself to be mature and therefore competent to explain it.

The mature New Man no more 'burns' with carnal desire than he

burns to be rich and powerful. He realizes that it is foreign to his nature, though he may at times be buffeted by a 'sting of the flesh'. Because it was such a distraction to the life of the New Man as any foreign element (such as a pebble in the shoe) can be to man born of woman, Paul himself had to beg the Lord three times to have a messenger of the flesh (therefore of Satan as against the New Man) depart. With respect to these matters the same instinct for self-preservation which is so much a part of the natural man, now operates in the New Man. Distractions are a nuisance and sin, in the sense of turning away from the New Life, therefore from God, becomes as unnatural as suicide, and as repugnant.

But St. Paul's teaching on marriage and virginity has been formally garbled by Churchmen before it could reach the faithful, and confusion has been introduced officially by the joint efforts of a saint, (Jerome,) and a Biblical Commission. Because most Christians hear Paul's teaching only in their own vernacular, it must come to them in translation. By decree of the Biblical Commission (dated April 30 1943) the only translation permitted to be read publicly must be one from the Latin Vulgate. But when we read the Vulgate we find that it promotes a subtle confusion, or even betrayal, of the teaching of St. Paul on marriage and virginity. And thus, since the faithful cannot very well be told by their religious leaders, in public, anything different from what they are given in official translation, we have the scandalous spectacle of the Cardinal Primate of England telling a group of families on pilgrimage to his cathedral that St. Paul wanted the young women to marry and have families! (N.C.N.S. dispatch in the Tablet. U.S.) And this is what the Vulgate says.

Actually St. Paul used the word 'women' in a context clearly indicating that he meant 'widows', and many competent translations are properly explicit on this point. But, being non-Vulgate, these translations are suppressed by Church Authority as a source of public instruction. Thus do churchmen, by the combined efforts of a saint, the exegetes and the hierarchy obscure the New Man by teaching, not what is *error*, but what is not quite the whole truth. Widows are certainly women, but all women are not widows. So when the term women is used, it is a general term; but when the term widows is used, it is a very specific term and there is no chance for confusion with women in general. The Cardinal used the term *women* in talking to that group of families. How were they to know that he meant only widows, if he did? How thus could they in this instance know the mind of St. Paul, or for that matter the mind of the Church? So it is that the blind lead the blind.

18. *Marriage and the New Man*

The Rev. Censor called the author's concepts on marriage "confused and confusing". But the author had already noted the confusion, conflict and apparent contradiction, *according to Old Testament standards*, that began with the Holy Family, and specifically stated that:

"The key to this problem is to arrange the factors constituting the problem in a hierarchic order *according to the point of view of the New Man*. Then, instead of confusion and darkness and fragmentary knowledge, we shall have a monolithic body of thought, perfectly sound and integrated, which answers all questions, withstands all attacks, and which reflects the mind of the Church".

This is the 'other door' we open when we speak of the level of union of heart and mind. It is uniquely Christian, and we shall now see to what it can lead.

What one Christian as a New Man loves in another is precisely the reflection of the mind of the Church, (which is the mind of Christ), which he sees in that other. A union of mind and heart on this level, that is 'on the love of the things of God' is a union capable of infinite expansion because the subject is infinite, and it is capable of dominating all other considerations. We are in fact 'commanded' to love God 'with our whole mind and heart and strength' But this teaching is better understood not so much as a 'commandment' (for how can we be 'commanded' to love?) as a description of the attitude characteristic of the New Man. He *is* one who thus loves God. We love ourselves according to the extent of the New Life in us, according, therefore, to our capacity to appreciate it in ourselves, and we love our neighbors as ourselves according to our capacity for appreciating the extent of the New Life in him, or of wishing him to have it more fully. This is the specifically Christian love. As such it is spiritually fruitful, but being on a spiritual level, it cannot be carnally fruitful. Carnal fruitfulness is not peculiarly Christian, while spiritual fruitfulness is.

Since carnal fruitfulness, the procreation of children, is the primary purpose of marriage, we can see where marriage constitutes something of a detour, to say the least, on the path to maturity in

the New Man. Of course St. Paul has already stated this conclusion. The fact that marriage *is* something of a detour has been obscured by the theological interpretation of the command 'be ye perfect'—a command which clerics have whittled down to 'be ye perfect according to your state of life', and thus have given further aid and comfort to Satan. For the latter version can mean nothing else than 'perfect in the life of man born of woman' for persons in that state, which includes marriage, and thus the life of the New Man is again obscured. Christ, however, said to be perfect 'as your heavenly Father is perfect', a perfection *in kind* of course, and not possibly in *degree*.

Marriage does not have for its primary purpose the mutual sanctification or perfection in the New Man, of the parties to the marriage. Indeed this is not even the secondary purpose because the essence of the marriage contract is the legal right of reciprocal carnal access and in that act is found the second end, namely the fulfillment of the respective human personalities of the spouses by the unreserved and reciprocal giving of all of physical self to each other. Though this endures beyond the time when the primary purpose of marriage, the procreation of children, can ordinarily be accomplished, as there also endures beyond that time the relief of concupiscence which is also an admitted end, all these ends, without exception, are temporal and human. Meanwhile what becomes of the eternal and divine? After that, possibly taking a hint from nature regarding the attainment of the primary purpose, there may be that sanctification of the parties, that 'growth in God' which logically but not always practically leads to mutual renunciation because, again, marriage is a 'distraction', though now relatively unimportant humanly speaking, except perhaps in a socio-economic sense.

Human love is one of the most powerful of God's natural creatures, and we rarely do justice to it even on its own level. Ardor is a God-given attribute of both the 'old' and the New Man. Love therefore cannot be suppressed. In fact it goes against God's economy to attempt to suppress it. It can only be guided. And here again we find the familiar hierarchy of values between the best of the Old Law and the ideal of the New Man.

A union of heart and mind in God during three nights of continency between Tobias and Sarah freed them from the power of the devil. But there was for them no choice of a higher life, for the life of the New Man had not yet come upon earth. For Christians, however, even though the union of mind and heart in God and the things of God has brought the married couple to the point of consummating their marriage, there is still the possibility of something higher for them, to wit, perfection in the New Man. At this point the degree of union of

mind and heart on the peculiarly spiritual level may be so sublime that any continuation to the bodies, being on an animal level, becomes an anti-climax and a distraction. This is love in the New Man.

That the consummation of marriage may not side-track growth in the New Man for either or both parties, the Catholic Church rules that every married couple may have two months of marriage in which to consider the choice of a 'state of perfection', during which time the consummation of the marriage may be refused. Thus while human love can be guided, under God, to result in the perfection of either of two states of life, it is practically impossible to find plain common sense guidance in the life of the New Man where ardent love, directed to God, results in virginity, at least as a matter of the Spirit. We do not have many St. Paul's among our modern teachers. Yet it is precisely men and woman who, having known the best of human love that the world has to offer, come upon and prefer instead love in the New Man, who make the best and spiritually most fruitful religious. In fact, it would seem logically *necessary* that man born of woman reach full spiritual development in the best things that the life of his species can offer before he can begin to outgrow the life of man born of woman and begin life in the New Man.

A new species springs only from the more completely developed specimen of the species immediately before it. Obviously any development of a member of species which is but the full attainment, however lofty, of the potentialities of that species, still leaves us with the same species. Also, in the earlier stage of development of a new species all the essential characteristics of the parent species are of course present. However, even if the theory of the physical evolution of man from a lower form of life be true, it was not the external characteristics which made the difference between man and the lower species, but the infusion at some point of a human soul, which produced the visible characteristic of rationality.

This, the infusion of a new life principle, is exactly what makes the difference between man born of woman and the New Man. Whatever characteristics of the old man still remain and may still develop, as for instance in Thomas Aquinas, are not what gives us the New Man, any more that the old man characteristics gave us the Magdalene. Yet, in becoming a New Man St. Thomas did not lose his learning nor the Magdalene her ardor. Unfortunately all the evidence we have of a conversion of St. Thomas is his comment that all he had written was straw, and the fact that after his conversion he never again attempted to put his learning on paper. But when the Magdalene's ardor was inspired and transformed by the life principle of the New Man, the effect of the transformation was visibly demonstrated. Three

women chose to follow Christ to the foot of His cross: Mary, His Immaculate Mother; Mary of Cleophas, a type of the simple, devout person; and the ardent Mary Magdalene 'who had loved much', first in the world and then in Christ. But when He had risen from the dead, Christ chose as the first person to whose love He would respond, not His Mother who, churchmen tell us, had never known the consummation of human love, nor the merely pious Mary of Cleophas, but the Magdalene, who had loved even to a fault. It was the Magdalene's ardent love, now sublimated in Christ, which had brought her first to His tomb and had held her there, still seeking Him, when all the others had returned home. Neither the disciples nor the Magdalene understood that Christ was to rise from the dead, but because the Magdalene sought Him even beyond death, her love was uniquely rewarded.

As a practical matter it must be obvious that as the 'interested' couple promote in each other the love of Christ and reach a degree of maturity according to the New Life, each will realize two things: One is that the greatest act of love, both for the beloved and for Christ, is to lead the beloved to Christ; The other is a corollary, namely that as the hearts and minds of the lovers are turned more and more to Christ, the happiness that Christ will bring to each of them is so much greater than that which any earthly spouse could bring, that any attempt to divert any of that love to self, or 'to Christ through self' as love in marriage is sometimes idealistically portrayed, betrays the beloved. So we now have some hint as to why Mary and Joseph intended a virgin marriage and the birth that resulted. These New Man concepts make it clear why the Church teaches that virginity is an objectively higher state than marriage. The mature New Man is a virgin, at least as a matter of the spirit. What influenced Mary and Joseph is a mystery to us. For the time being.

To sum up, then, on the 'Great Sacrament':

Marriage is a Sacrament, but it is a sacrament in the sense that it is a 'sign'. That marriage brings the grace necessary to that state of life has always been so, since the very first marriage. That the marriage of Christians, since it involves not only the natural life but also the life of the New Man however embryonic, must bring some extra grace to preserve that life, is also reasonable. But marriage is a great sacrament only in the sense that it is a 'sign' or illustration, albeit on a carnal level, of a great thing—the loving guidance and fruitful obedience between Christ and His Church, as the author of this dictum explicitly stated. This is the only sense in which it can be said to have been 'raised to a Sacrament'. Indeed, some reputable modern scholars hold that the Pauline term 'great Sacrament' does not refer directly to marriage.

It is because marriage does not apply essentially to the life of the New Man that St. Paul, who as he says speaks from a degree of maturity in the New Man, can say what he does. St. Paul is concerned with the growth and perfection of his spiritual children, his children in the New Man, the products of his spiritual maturity and fruitfulness. He realizes that this growth cannot be imposed upon them and is therefore patient with their short-comings while being most explicit in his teaching and example. However, such a degree of maturity as Paul's usually comes after some degree of maturity has been reached in the natural life and a family started. Then what?

We have it upon St. Paul's word that the path to maturity in the New Man then becomes more difficult due to natural obstacles peculiarly associated with family life. Once again the best things of the world are the enemies of the growth of the New Man. That St. Paul nevertheless takes for granted some growth in the New Man despite marriage, and family life, we may presume from the fact that he conceives of a father reaching at least that degree of maturity in the New Life as to be able to guide, or at least advise, his daughter in the matter of marriage. For we must presume that the father who can explain to his daughter with some cogency the 'better way' must already have come to understand it himself to that degree, though family cares may prevent him from getting off his own 'detour' and more directly on the road to his own maturity in the New Man.

When we carry this idea to its logical conclusion according to the mind of the Church, we see that not even the 'great Sacrament' can be urged as a barrier to maturity in the New Man. Following Christ's teaching that those who would so grow must, if need be leave home, wife, children, lands etc., the Church, if conditions of human prudence are satisfied, will bless the mutual renunciation of the couple in favor of monasticism so that one or both can grow to their predestined stature in the New Man. For how can one achieve the higher state *through* the lower except by leaving the latter behind, at least as a matter of the spirit?

Yet love in the New Man can be a deeper and warmer love than any merely human love could ever be, a love that is at once eternal and without surfeit, a faint and fleeting albeit earthbound foretaste of things, good beyond human comprehension, which God has prepared for those who love Him. That teaching: "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to know the things which God has prepared for those who love Him," clearly indicates two levels of capacity for happiness, one of which cannot be fulfilled in this life. But if it is to be fulfilled at all hereafter, the capacity must have been prepared for and in a degree *attained* in this life.

The life which unfolds in Heaven is the fruit of the seed we have cultivated on earth, and what we should be concerned with on earth is the development of the capacity of the seed, so that it may bear within itself more abundantly the promise it will bring forth in Heaven. As the seed develops, it naturally seeks the environment suited to its growth, and the life within it seeks a transition somewhat like a butterfly bursting a cocoon. This urge to change is a step toward 'losing one's (old) life' and in the process we become impatient with the limited concepts and practices of the life of man born of woman, while increasingly seeking an environment more compatible with the nature of the New Man. The perfect environment is found only in Heaven. Since the transition from man born of woman to the New Man is a total organic thing, it is only logical that there be a psychological preparation for the change from life on earth to life in Heaven. Evidence of theological groping after this simple organic concept was lately found in a *Catholic Worker* review of a book entitled *The World to Come*. The author of the book, in the words of the reviewer:

" uses the insights of modern philosophy and psychology to illuminate certain areas of living and dying that were treated perhaps less than satisfactorily in some of the earlier Catholic speculations. . . . Example: In common with certain modern theologians, the author maintains that earlier considerations of death tend to treat it as an experience which the individual undergoes passively rather than a dynamic experience in which the soul truly acts. Death as a passive experience is unthinkable in the case of Christ. In the Christian it appears possible that the personal freedom would be engaged to an extent hitherto unrealized. Disengaging itself from the body, the soul freely assumes a consistent attitude to the world of values which was not realizable to this extent in its temporal life."

Which reminds the author of a story about Daniel Boone once wandering about in the wilderness for six weeks. It is claimed he was not really lost, but merely 'slightly confused'! However, Boone was in the kind of territory with which as a frontiersman he must have been well acquainted, so he eventually found his way. Theologians, even (or perhaps more particularly?) the modern ones, may not be so fortunately situated with respect to the territory in which they seem to be wandering.

19. *The Contemporary Scene*

Christ is His own day found greater faith outside Israel, which was officially the true faith, then He found within it. The greater faith was not a matter of more fervent belief, but of greater comprehension. The Jews saw in the miracles of Christ phenomena with which they were familiar in connection with many prophets and messengers from God, as signs of the authenticity of their messages. The Centurian saw in them *authority*. The Centurian understood, not more fervently, but more deeply. And so it is today. Those of us with wide acquaintance outside the Catholic Church cannot but love and sympathize with our separated brethren when they say "Catholics have the candles, but we are not without light". Many Christians (and even non-Christians) outside the visible Church truly belong to the soul of the Church and must have a great deal of the truth, much of which they often find it hard to discover among Catholics.

For instance, they see where some of the simple, powerful and essential aspects of the Christian message, very familiar to them, have been overlaid and obscured for Catholics by official Church teaching or toleration. One of the most conspicuous illustrations of this is spread all over public advertising at Christmas in the two different versions of the message introducing this first great Feast of the Liturgical year. The popular Protestant version is: "Peace on earth, good will toward men", which speaks of God's good will, while the Catholic version is "Peace on earth to men of good will" which speaks of man's good will.

From a purely human viewpoint the official Catholic version is certainly 'idealistic', speaking as it does of the peace which abides in the hearts of men of good will, often in spite of adversities, and indicating the best guide and norm for human brotherhood and happiness. But this concept was nothing new in the history of the human race to that time, and certainly was of no such revolutionary significance as to be worthy of proclamation by an angelic choir. In fact, unless there had been some *radical* change in the relation between *God* and *man* no proclamation along that line would have been called for at all. So the fact that such a pronouncement was exultantly heralded permits the presumption that here *had* been a basic change. In the Protestant version the presumption is accepted, obviously because the

nature of the change is understood, while in the Catholic version (from the Vulgate) there is no hint of any such change.

Up to the Incarnation the relation between God and man had been the fearful relation of a God of justice visiting His sanction upon rebellious and sinful sons of Adam ('man born of woman'), hence a God who was (at least 'formally') feared. But when the Son of God assumed our humanity, the relation between Jehovah and sinful man was replaced by the relation of God to the Man who was His Son, and therefore necessarily by a new attitude toward mankind now to be redeemed and reinstalled in God's good graces by this Son who had taken on the mission of atonement. All this reflected a change in God's attitude toward men, indeed an event of cosmic significance! A temporal king, magnanimously granting amnesty to rebellious subjects, would properly promulgate his display of good will with a certain amount of regal form and ceremony, and it should not be beyond the grasp of man-born-of-woman to understand that similar circumstances might attend the vastly more significant change of attitude of God toward man. But between these two concepts of the message of the Gloria, Catholics are officially taught the less significant, and no Protestant can reasonably be expected to abjure the traditional Protestant version as the price of his admission to the Catholic Church. Of course he would not in fact be required to, but what appears on the surface might inspire mistrust of the whole Catholic position and claim to leadership.

Occasionally the general deterioration reaches a stage where drastic action becomes necessary within the Church, as for instance the reforms effective beginning 1956, when much of the pious accretion of centuries was summarily swept away and what was left was returned more closely to the true spirit of Church life and worship. This was only a beginning, starting of course at the most important points, the Holy Week ceremonies, the Mass and the Holy Office. A few years ago the Easter Vigil was resurrected after several hundred years of neglect in the Roman Church and restored to its former and fitting observance. It had not been similarly neglected by some of our separated brethren in this territory. Unfortunately, in connection with admitting and belatedly rectifying this clerical neglect, churchmen blindly went to the other extreme. To stress 'the unique importance of Easter and its special baptismal significance', they awkwardly suppressed the blessing of the baptismal font at Pentecost, with its own peculiar significance. The major effect of this suppression has already been noted, but another unfortunate result is to confirm and formalize the previously noted general deterioration of understanding as to the relative significance of Christmas, Easter and Pentecost.

To those outside the visible Catholic Church, who are seeking the fullness of truth as to their spiritual destiny and welfare, the doctrine of the New Man is the whole answer. In it is found the key to understanding of the whole of Christian Revelation in its most perfect form, hence the deepest understanding of the Gospel message. It confirms the Bible Christian's conviction that the Bible is an adequate guide to Faith, with the slight and welcome adjustment that it be understood *according to the tradition of the Church*, as distinguished from the mere theological minds of her official leaders. It is precisely this depth of understanding and the infallible authority that has preserved the deposit of Faith and now makes it available to the understanding of the New Man, that will lead the non-Catholic growing in the life of the New Man to embrace the Church for the enlightenment and help it offers in spite of the exegetes.

The mind of God is infinity itself, and the finite mind of natural man can never hope to comprehend the nature and significance of the Christ-life of the New Man. But the Spirit by which the New Man has life '*searches all things, even the depths of God*'. Thus the New Man can know himself, know his purpose, his values and his judgments of things of the world even as God knows these things, but of course only to the degree of his maturity in the New Life. And he finds himself completely at home only in the Catholic Church. But we see how, and to what extent, the fire of the Faith which Christ cast upon the earth has been confined and subdued by satanic strategy working on human weakness, because the agent whom Christ had created at Pentecost, the New Man, has gradually lost sight of his nature and his mission. This degeneration has been due to the failure of theologians and 'practical' churchmen to bring to the people, in season and out of season, information and education oriented primarily toward developing in them an awareness of their natures as New Men. It has been demonstrated practically in numerous instances with respect to this essay that Church Authority is often a stranger to and therefore unsympathetic toward, the point of view of the New Man. There is no question of heresy in the author's position. There is however a question of a hierarchy of values, and Church Authority almost invariably takes the theological, i.e. human, scientific and therefore hopelessly limited viewpoint on these values. If the exegetes and those who, like the Rev. Censor, rely upon them, do not have the simple fundamental picture, then progress in Christian life just goes 'round and 'round and gets nowhere. Which is, by and large, just where it is now. In fact, by denying the truths set forth in this essay, the Rev. Censor may himself actually be guilty of heresy.

We must bear in mind that the priests come from, and bring with

them to the seminaries the mores of, the people; and that the business of the seminaries is not to convert the students to other mores, (particularly not to the mores of the New Man), but to train them for a professional career, again according to the exegetes. This is not monasticism. A training sufficient to enable the graduate to use properly as a servant of the faithful the powers conferred on him on ordination is a professional training. True, if we took a leaf from the book of our non-Catholic Christian friends and used the Word, the Bible, as the center of Catholic education, Catholics would at least be familiar with the Word and the professionals would have to be equal to the job of helping the layman get, from the New Testament at least, all there is in it. In this way the seed might be sown.

20. *The Last Days*

It is obvious that the natural life and the life of the New Man are not coterminous. But while we are fully aware that these lives do not begin simultaneously, we have lost sight of the important fact that they do not necessarily reach their predestined degree of maturity simultaneously, and this has a practical implication of revolutionary significance. A person may die before reaching his predestined degree of maturity in the New Man, or he may reach his predestined degree of such growth before he dies. With regard to the latter, and from a social point of view less important circumstance, two things can be set down as certain. One is that further increase in the New Life is not possible; another is that once the predestined degree of maturity has been reached Heaven has been won, that is the person is now ready for his eternal 'natural' habitat. Of course the New Man may still have to remain on earth for some time, and thus be in a certain amount of danger. But against such danger he can be protected in two ways; by serene preoccupation with the general subject of the life he will continue to live in the eternity upon which he will in not too long a time embark, hence by a greater degree of confirmation in the mores of the New Man, or, possibly, by irresponsibility, which frees him from blame for what he may do. In any event, when signs of physical or mental deterioration or death appear, the New Man can regard them objectively because he is in a sense 'beside himself'. Just as when he sees fruit ripening he knows it will soon leave the tree so he knows by other signs that he too is getting ready to be 'harvested'. All in all the

evening of the earthly life of the New Man is a rich and consoling time because he knows that in the not too distant future he is going to find out what he has been living for. At this stage of the game one does not resign oneself to dying but rather to living on, and to that because it is God's will and because it may offer further opportunity to be confirmed in the life of the New Man. It is then, however, that the world becomes a real 'vale of tears', for things of the world are an element in which the New Man finds himself increasingly unhappy.

But it is with respect to the other circumstance, the premature ending of growth in the New Man, that we find the real revolutionary dynamite of Christian Revelation. It is possible for the New Man to die *before* he has reached his predestined degree of maturity in the eternal life. While the two lives, the natural and the New run concurrently, there can be no doubt whatever in the mind of the New Man as to which of the lives is of greater importance. The greatest tragedy, indeed an infinite tragedy, is that man die by the will of another man without having reached that degree of maturity in the New Life, hence of eternal happiness, to which he was predestined in the cosmic plan. Absolutely no temporal consideration can be of any account whatever relative to the infinite importance of giving the fullest possible opportunity to each and every New Man, or potential New Man, to fulfill his eternal cosmic destiny. And it is absolutely certain that no mortal can ever know anyone's predestined capacity for, or the degree to which maturity has been, or will be, attained in that eternal life. Therefore EVERY arbitrary or deliberate premature termination of natural life, or any deliberate exposure to such termination, simply ignores God altogether. Yet sometimes it is done in His name, with the sanction of the theologians!

But for the New Man the command is absolute: *Thou shalt not kill*. Hence killing, whether by war, by capital punishment, or even in self-defence, however legal or seemingly just, is simply another Satanic trap, to be shunned by the New Man. What the theologians have done to obscure this simple, elementary and obvious fact need not here be reviewed in detail. Suffice it to say that they have buried it very, very deeply, subordinating it to and concealing it under natural virtues such as justice, patriotism, natural duty etc. and evaluating it merely by the 'keep out of hell' principle. Not with bad intentions, of course, but because as mere theologians they are trapped by good human logic or philosophy and the mores of their times, and just simply do not know how to evaluate these things from the viewpoint of the New Man. Their concern is with how a life may be arbitrarily terminated without the person responsible going to hell. The relation to the life of the New Man, either in the killer or the killed, just does not come

within their 'old' man scale of observation. Once again it is our separated brethren who publicly exhibit a practical awareness of the significance of the Commandment. In March 1961 the Protestant Episcopal Church publicly and formally urged the abolition of the death penalty because: "It is not for man to cut short his fellows possibility of redemption in this life", and because "The death penalty is contrary to the whole Christian concept of life as revealed in the New Testament, and incompatible with it".

21. *The End*

When the last New Man has reached the end of his mortal life, the world as we know it would seem to have served its purpose in the divine plan and would therefore have no further reason to exist. If the New Man has already ceased to be conceived due to the 'sterilization' of the 'womb of the Church' in 1961, then the end may not be far off, for it could well coincide with the termination of the earthly life of the last New Man born in our time. (The rest of men would be redeemed by baptism, but 'stillborn' as far as the New Life is concerned.) And this time, when we again arrive at a seemingly far-fetched proposition which is logical in the context, it is not at all difficult to conceive how this ultimate 'liquidation' could come about. Having given man free will, God gave him responsibility for his destiny. Mysteriously then, it is through man's exercise of his own spiritual faculties, his intellect and will, that God's own plan must be worked out. This plan includes 'the consummation of the world' as we know it, and man himself at this very moment has it within his power to work out this consummation.

At this juncture Christians should put away their present 'vertical' subdivisions based on relatively childish theological hairsplitting and worldly 'organization politics' and take their positions along a clear horizontal line of demarcation, on one side of which would be those whose beliefs are broadly reconcilable with, or at least not in opposition to, the thesis of 'Embers', and on the other side those who reject such concepts completely or to whom the ideas are incomprehensible tho not necessarily objectionable.

On the one side would be at least the possibility of further drawing together and on the other at least an awareness of what Christianity broadly represents, a clarification of their own positions

vis-à-vis the evolutionary concept and the possibility of reconciliation with certain Christian beliefs and practices.

Of course the question now arises:

What of those who do not now have the New Life? Has the suppression of the blessing of the baptismal font at the time of the coming of the New Life tragically and ironically snatched away from them the hope of sharing the destiny of which this essay itself may have only now made them aware?

Only God is omniscient. The mature New Man knows the depths of God's mind only as regards those acts of his own mind and heart which day by day develop his maturity in the New Life, and he knows these only according to the degree of maturity he has already attained in that life. But as to things closely related to his own essential development, the New Man can make intuitively, by the 'instinct' of Faith, what are called 'informed guesses'. These opinions are valuable in proportion to their 'kinship' with the personally essential information. One of these guesses was incorporated into these notes many years ago—a 'seed' dropped by another New Man and instinctively accepted as true. This is the reference already made to the direct coming down of the Spirit to supply for its lack of formal propagation on earth. As another 'informed guess', it is reasonably sure that a conversion based on the thesis of 'Embers' indicates an indwelling of the Spirit in the convert no matter when the conversion takes place and regardless of formalities. He would therefore share the destiny of the New Man as do John the Baptist and Our Lady, neither of whom was 'baptised with water'.

THE PRICE OF THIS PAMPHLET

Only 1000 of these pamphlets have been printed. While the quantity was limited by the financial resources of the author, the effectiveness is limited only by the power of the Spirit.

In practice, that depends upon you, the individual reader:
first upon your personal reaction and second
(if the reaction is favorable),
upon the active and unselfish sharing of this pamphlet
with anyone who might further the work.

Or you can return it for re-use.

THIS IS THE ONLY PRICE YOU ARE ASKED TO PAY,
and our thanks if you do so. A copy will be sent on the
same terms to anyone you suggest. Use enclosed post-card.

4
ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
M BL240.2 .S348
Embers of the faith : the cosmic signifi



33525001479978

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 782

SITY

Y

IAR

BL 240.2 .S348
Scott, Raymond L.
Embers of the faith

BL 240.2 .S348
Scott, Raymond L.
Embers of the faith