Lenten Conferences

Philosophical War

By Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P.

A few months ago we heard a great deal, from forum speakers and radio commentators, to the effect that the war in which we are now engaged is not only military and political but "ideological." Then, just as we were beginning to understand what the world meant, the speakers and the writers of best of writers, round up on the use of that particular word "ideological," and lately they seem to have dropped it. That's too bad. But then the world was the best or the easiest, but there was required for kind it. Perhaps a better word would have been "philosophical." At any rate the idea behind the word—either word—is that we are now embroiled in a titanic battle between two philosophies.

I wish we might call it just that, a battle in the dark, or as the French say a *combat à huis clos*, that goes on until one or the other combatant is altogether removed from the scene, but the strange fact is that the real enemy against whom we are fighting, or should be putting all our strength, will not be removed. In fact this enemy, stronger and more dangerous than any man or any thing or any combination will come out of this war stronger than it is. I don't mean Fascism. I don't mean Nazism. I don't mean the Japanese brand of Oriental Fascism. I mean the Japanese brand of Oriental Fascism. I mean ideology, philosophy, system of thought with which we are in conflict in Materialism, which is the denial of all spiritual entities, especially of the two spiritual entities that we call God and the Human Soul.

It is a notorious fact that in hundreds of colleges and universities in our own country and in England, atheism is taught. Even more than taught, it is accepted without discussion; it is taken for granted. With that deplorable fact the general public has been long acquainted. We have commented upon it a thousand times.

But perhaps the people, by and large, are not as well aware of the fact that in college text books the doctrine of the human soul is trundled out, and that in pretentious philosophical works it is discountenanced.

Let the present a example. I take it from a simple and popular volume on the great philosophers of the world. The name of the author doesn't matter. He isn't so much the author as the compiler or the reporter. Generally he doesn't say whether he accepts or rejects, he simply presents, with a kind of take-it-or-leave-it attitude. But perhaps I should say that he is a teacher in a college maintained at the expense of the taxpayers of a great city, and

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [