

Peter A. Redpath

How to Reverse the Widespread Global Disorder That Nonsensical Principles of Utopian Socialism/Marxism Are Currently Causing

Toward the start of his treatise entitled *On the Heavens*,¹ the great ancient Greek philosopher, tutor of Alexander the Great, and master of common sense and commonsense philosophy, Aristotle, sagely cautioned students that small mistakes in the beginning of a study tend greatly to multiply as the investigation continues. By this he meant that every human investigation naturally grows out of a commonsense knowledge of proximate first principles, starting points, of knowing: something an investigator should know best (principles of understanding) from which reasoning then proceeds. Today, physical scientists often call these evident commonsense, first principles “assumptions.”

As a master of common sense, evident to Aristotle was that to reason, become *educated* (*educere* by analysis or synthesis) about how some composite-whole organization is put together or can be taken apart, we must first understand, immediately *induce*, precisely what is the organizational whole, or subject/genus, we chiefly want to study (are interested in) and about which we are wondering, talking, and rea-

Peter A. Redpath — CEO, Aquinas School of Leadership, Cave Creek, AZ, USA
e-mail: peterredpathp@aquinasschoolofleadership.com • ORCID: no data

¹ Aristotle, *On the Heavens*, 1, 5, trans. J. L. Stocks: “[T]hat which was small at the start turns out a giant at the end.” Available online—see the section *References* for details.

soning. For we can only reasonably wonder, talk, and reason about what we know, not about what we do not know.

For example, competent engineers, those with common sense, who want to build a bridge do not start by mistaking the principles of grammar for those of engineering. They do not think that applying principles of grammar to some multitude of material could possibly cause that material to become a structurally-strong bridge. They understand, assume, that a bridge is a general and specific kind of organizational whole (real genus) that essentially demands application of principles of mathematics and physics to construct. And really professional engineers (people actually interested in studying engineering) would reasonably consider any so-called *engineer* who understood otherwise to lack common sense, be a fool, fake.

Aristotle's observation tells us is that, worse than bad reasoning in helping (educing) someone to become *educed*, or *educated*, is not to understand precisely: 1) the subject (genus/organizational whole) about which we are wondering, talking, reasoning, and 2) what actually can or cannot cause it to come to exist as an organizational unity and operate the way it does. In addition, Aristotle realized that an organizational whole (genus) considered simply as an organizational whole (genus) and considered as a subject demanding analysis or synthesis (one that interests us, that we psychologically wonder about, at this or that moment) immediately becomes somewhat of a qualitatively different kind of subject for us than, strictly speaking, it is considered in itself.

For example, considered as organizational wholes (genera), a human being, married man, father, car driver, firefighter, and a bowler are essentially and qualitatively different, real organizational wholes, or subjects/real genera. John Smith the married human person is essentially, qualitatively, different relationally and psychologically from John Smith the human being, husband, father, automobile driver, firefighter, and bowler: a being with essentially, qualitatively differently related, specif-

ic organizational parts, such as physical and psychological, faculties, capabilities, and talents.

Failure to recognize these distinctions on a daily, even moment-to-moment, basis will cause John Smith and others all sorts of personal and professional problems. Analogously, it will cause all sorts of difficulties for any educator trying to analyze or alter John Smith's behavior in this or that situation or set of circumstances.

When an educator, or any knower, studies a subject genus (organizational whole), an educator or knower does so as a qualitatively different knower of a qualitatively different subject known. Considered as a studied-subject (a subject of study), psychological examination (examination by the human psyche) is not identical with, is specifically and qualitatively different from, a subject considered simply as a subject.

For example, in a way, both a biologist and a heart surgeon study and do not study the human heart. Generically considered, both study the human heart. But specifically considered, the biologist does so as a life-scientist chiefly intellectually and volitionally (psychologically) interested in the human heart as life-generating while the heart surgeon does so, medically, as someone specifically, intellectually (psychologically), wanting to know about the human heart as health-generating.

While really existing as organizational wholes independently of a knower, *considered as specifically-known and understood educational subjects, psychological subjects of interest*, these organizational wholes are always situationally, circumstantially, interest-considered subjects. According to Aristotle and St. Thomas: 1) situations, circumstances, always enter into the specification of an act; and 2) a real genus, organizational whole, essentially exists in and grows out of, is generated by, the harmonious unity of relationships of the specific actions of its many, hierarchically-ordered, qualitatively more-or-less perfect, specific parts that constitute its real, not logical, *proximate principles/causes*.

For example, the habit of music considered as a real genus is not a logical premise. It is a real proximate principle/cause that exists only in and through specifically different individual actions of habits of qualitatively, unequal, more-or-less individually-talented musicians (like classical, jazz, orchestral, and so on) as more or less perfect ways of relating sounds into organizationally-pleasing wholes—pleasing sounds more or less beautiful to, and fostering, healthy human hearing in human beings. Every operational organizational whole (*which is all that a real genus is*) exists in and through the harmonious unity of its principles: its specific and individual parts. As a result, a totally unharmonious organization is no organization at all, and is no more conceivable as such than is the concept of a square circle. Consequently, *educational subjects* (genera, species, and individuals existing within genera and species) *are, and can only be, subjects of this or that specific and individual human, psychological interest*: Subjects that interest this or that person as a psychological subject of wonder in this or that way (circumstantially, situationally) as concretely existing at this or that time, or considered as abstractly existing apart from any time or place like the genera, species, and individuals that interest logicians.

The truth of what I am saying becomes glaringly evident if we analyze the difference between John Smith the day-to-day firefighter and John Smith the weekend-bowler. If John Smith the firefighter goes out on the weekend with fellow firefighters and a fire breaks out at the bowling alley, the behavior of these individuals in this situation would not likely be to throw bowling balls at the fire. Sane, adult human beings, investigators, *with common sense* would consider such behavior in this situation (set of circumstances) to be irrational, out of touch with reality, lacking in common sense. To make sense out of, make intelligible, understand, anyone's behavior at this or that time, or apart from any specific and individual place and time, requires that anyone with common sense consider who or what (efficient cause) is doing what

(formal cause), to what (material cause), with what (instrumental cause), where (place), why (final cause), when (time), and how (quality): the specific parts of what Aristotle and St. Thomas considered to be essential parts of an individual human act. As both Aristotle and Aquinas rightly recognized, as completely as possible understanding any specific and individual act essentially demands recognizing at work Aristotle's famous 4 causes, the intrinsic property of quality, and the external conditions and opportunity of time and place—all of which, considered as a whole, *specify and individualize an act within a real genus, or organizational whole.*

The Nonsensical Psychological Disposition of Utopian Socialists/Marxists and Their Topsy-Turvy Understanding of Human Beings and Education as Essentially Lacking Concrete/Real Common Sense

I raise the above points at the start of considering the nature of the nonsensical principles of Utopians Socialism and Marxism and how to reverse their influence to drive home to readers an essential difference between the abstract way in which, like logicians and ideologues, c"Marxist considered as a species of Utopian Socialist (Enlightenment intellectual), *someone sorely lacking in concrete (real) common'uense,* tends to look at education. He or she does not tend to do so in the concrete, commonsense fashion I have described above in which, better- or evidently-understood truths must first be known before reasoning happens and science can be achieved.

A Marxist does so in the contrary opposite way; and consistent application of this topsy-turvy manner of viewing human beings and human education is the chief cause that turns healthy children into little Marxists and older adults into big ones. As a political ideologue devoid of real common sense, but driven by an intense desire to be logically consistent (abstractly commonsensical), through use of a fairytale his-

tory he or she borrows from Jean-Jacques Rousseau's educational treatise *Émile, or Abstract Man*,² he or she transforms the real, concrete nature and history of human education into an abstract, fictional, imaginary epic similar to Homer's *Odyssey*. In this fictional tale, consciousness in the form of the god *Humanity* emerges in a systematically-logical fashion from a backward state of individual, emotional selfishness rooted in a pre-logical, pre-cultural, and prehistoric state of awareness. In this prehistoric, pre-cultural, and pre-logical state *Humanity* shows no sign of having a conscience, logic, or social consciousness. He is a greedy, uncultured, barbaric, anti-social, unscientific, insincere, intolerant, bad-willed individual who fights other such individuals in pursuit of possession of private property, not the historic, cultured, systematically-logical and enlightened sincerely-selfless, property-less, tolerant, Social-scientific Good Will into which he seeks to emerge.

According to this fairytale theological epic (metaphysical and moral educational history), once upon a time there lived a prehistoric god named *Humanity* who would someday emerge from being a train of logically-blind, selfish, individualistic, warring emotions into the systematically-logical idea of human freedom creating human history as the grand narrative, autobiography, of the poetic spirit of free creation of the human imagination. He is poetic free spirit (Absolute Spirit/*Humanity*), emerging from a state of backward religious consciousness (Subjective Spirit) in prehistoric and later, backward, different cultural times and geographical locations finally to become at the end of human history progressive scientific self-awareness of himself as Perfect Social-scientific Good Will.

² Cf. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Émile, or Concerning Education*, trans. Eleanor Worthington (Boston: D. C. Heath & Company, 1889), 14: "We must then take a broader view of things, and consider in our pupil man in the abstract, man exposed to all the accidents of human life."

As the story goes, long-long ago in a far off place in prehistoric/pre-cultural/pre-logical time, before logic and selfless, sincere, tolerant-of-all-difference (except intolerant, hateful difference) social-science and conscience had existed, supposedly an illogical, unenlightened human consciousness had existed as an irrational, selfish, greedy, insincere, intolerant, individualistic, train of hate-filled, conscience-less, anti-social, brute emotions that talked in hate-filled, anti-social, selfish ways. Somewhat like the ancient Israelites wandering in the desert and René Descartes wandering about Europe in search of a clear and distinct idea of himself and true science, *Humanity* (aka, *Abstract Man*) had roamed the Earth with no clear and distinct, concrete, scientific idea of who he truly was: the only real creator God.

Wanting to get a perfect idea of himself, but not knowing that he was the only cause of everything, all differences, *Humanity* decided to create a logic generated by the idea of progress, or development, that would give him a systematically-logical plan to enable him to emerge out of himself to hunt for perfect understanding of his true identity. Essentially, this logical plan consisted in creating a fairytale, or fictional narrative in the form of a human history of himself as a backward, unenlightened, selfish will, or train of emotions, engaged in an odyssey of projecting his emotions in contradictory ways historically, qualitatively onward and upward more perfectly, in different geographical regions of the Earth at different times. *Humanity* planned to do this to see whether he could recognize himself as the epic poetic idea of perfect freedom (the Spirit of Human Freedom as Scientific Will) always and everywhere progressing out of himself from a primitive, infantile, abstract, logically-unsystematic, train of emotions (abstract general ideas) into a concrete, adult, logically-systematic, train of ideas—the one and only social self and Scientific Will/God of metaphysical poetry that is the only real Creator of all Things: The One, True, God.

Every time he concretely did so, however, *Humanity* only saw some slight likeness of himself in those emotions. No one, or train, of them ever perfectly captured his likeness, clearly and distinctly with the thrilling, lively-enthusiastic, emotional clarity of a scientific likeness of the train of emotions containing systematic logic within it that he was convinced was identical with himself as a Perfect, Pure, Social-science Good Will containing all scientific understanding and real differences.

In their fantasy world (to which they often refer as a “narrative”³), this is the way Marxists, as Enlightenment intellectuals and Utopian Socialists, look at human history. They claim that, prior to emerging into one single consciousness of oneself as systematic, logical, social-science will, the only thing that exists is a human consciousness as a weakly-connected train of thoughts in the form of atomic-like, discrete, feelings, rationally-blind, rationally-un-integrated, un-trained emotions. Transformation from being atomized, rationally (logically)-blind emotions into being a logically systematic train of emotions that constitutes the nature of an enlightened, or social-science feeling (knowledge/perfect science as identical with Pure Social-science Good Will/God) only comes from *a train of thought possessing* a qualitatively higher form of social-political intelligence (what an ancient Greek would call higher *gnosis*). And they maintain, further, that this mysterious gift of qualitatively higher intellection is no act of intellect at all. Instead, it is an act of pure social/political, Sincere Good Will, or Socially-perfect Willpower.

In short, in contrast to the commonsense wisdom of Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, and most ordinary, intellectually-healthy human beings (who maintain that truth is a psychological activity located within the human faculty of a human intellect and naturally-knowable even to

³ For the Marxist approach, see Luc Herman, Bart Vervaeck, “Ideology and Narrative Fiction,” in *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. Available online—see the section *References* for details.

young children), strictly speaking, Marxists think that the truth is actually a sociopolitical, construct caused to a train of thoughts by economic relations. These economic relations, in turn, are supposedly caused by social-science relations that are only possessed by people (systematic trains of thought) of sincere/tolerant or insincere/intolerant feelings (good will [love]/or bad will [hate]): people like themselves with sincere, socially-consciousness, healthy, tolerant, political feelings who, more than anything else, love humanity, or people like property-developer Donald Trump, who love petty-bourgeois-philistine-individualism-individualists, and selfish possession of personal property.

As Gilbert Keith Chesterton once quipped about such individuals, these are people who tend to *love humanity*, but *hate their next-door neighbor*⁴: people who psychologically inhabit a world to which Chesterton referred as “Topsy-turvydom,” one in which everything is upside down. As intellectual descendants of Georg Hegel (someone Chesterton had considered to be a madman⁵), why Marxists should inhabit such a world is easily understandable. As Utopian Socialists, all Enlightenment thinkers inhabit this intellectual world in which emotions, feelings, have/cause people; people do not have/cause emotions.

Whether or not Hegel was actually mad, I do not know. That he lacked *real* common sense, I do know; and that Marxists are even more lacking in *real* common sense than was Hegel and Hegelians, I also know. While Marxists claim to stand Hegel on his head, they do not do so to get out of his nonsensical teachings. They do so more fully to imbibe them. Hegel, at least, pretended to make a distinction between matter and spirit. Marxists conflate the two with each other and with

⁴ See Chesterton’s poem “The World State,” in Gordon Mursell, *English Spirituality: From 1700 to the Present Day* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 431.

⁵ Cf. G. K. Chesterton, *St. Thomas Aquinas* (Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, Inc., 2009), 94.

human consciousness: humanity. Doing so is the chief cause of all their personal problems and all the problems they cause for those around them. Precisely how they got to be the way they are is an issue with which I will deal in a second essay related to the Topsy-turvy world of Marxism.

Marxism as a Secularized Christian Heresy: How It Came to Be and Its Precise Nature

As some Marxists readily admit, Marxism is a religion, or a secularized version of one: Christianity. As scholars like Eric Voegelin have well documented,⁶ Hegelians and Marxists are full-blown, secularized Christian heretics: neo-Gnostic millenarians who conflate in their nature principles of neo-Pelagianism, neo-Catharism, and neo-Albigensianism (the three being pretty much identical). They tend to consider this conflation to be *true science (as opposed to the hate-filled, backward thinking and rhetoric of science-deniers)*.

Heavily influenced by the millenarianism of the 12th-century Catholic monk, Joachim of Flora (aka, Joachim of Fiore), the neo-Averroistic dream of 14th-century Italian humanist, Francesco Petrarca (Petrarch) to unite poetry, philosophy, and theology into a humanistic/historical social science capable of reviving the cultural greatness of Rome in a Christianized form, and the neo-Gnostic spiritualism of 18th century Enlightenment intellectual, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, all Enlightenment thinkers incline to divide human history into 4 ages, one of which they consider to be prehistoric/pre-culture, and pre-social science:

1. Prehistory (an initially barbaric, pre-socialist age of war of individual human being against individual human being; for Hegel, *Hu-*

⁶ See, e.g., Eric Voegelin, *The New Science of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

manity's/Absolute Spirit's Age before logically-planned, external emergence).

2. The first age of human history (imperfect social science, under the Old Law, from the time of Adam to Christ), characterized by a heavy influence of external formalism on human consciousness and behavior (*Humanity/Absolute Spirit* wandering around the Far East, China and the environs for Hegel).

3. The second age of human history in which human consciousness achieves greater perfection in historical consciousness as social-science (in the sense of being a more universal and deeper emotional love of humanity) human consciousness, under the New Law, by the entrance of Spirit into human history within the context of the administrative Catholic Church (the Greek and Latin Age for Hegel).

4. The final age of human history, the Age of the Eternal Gospel, of Perfect Social Science in which the influence of Spirit perfects human behavior so widely, deeply, and intensely that no need any longer exists for a Church administration or organized religion (the Lutheran/Germanic Age and end of history for Hegel during which, for the first time in human history, conscience and all science come into being and humanity becomes aware that it is identical with Perfect Social-science: Perfect Good Will Consciousness/God).⁷

Sometime after his death, Europeans started to refer to followers of millenarianism of Joachim of Flora as "Joachitic enthusiasts" and often called their teaching "Joachitic enthusiasm." As is evinced in his famous work, *Education of the Human Race*,⁸ 18th-century Gotthold Ephraim Lessing was one of these millenarians. So, too, under his educa-

⁷ See also Daniel Little, "Philosophy of History," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta (Winter 2020 Edition). Available online—see the section *References* for details.

⁸ Gotthold E. Lessing, *The Education of the Human Race*, trans. Fred W. Robertson (London: Anthroposophical Publishing Company, 1927).

tional influence, were 18th-/19th-century Enlightenment intellectuals Immanuel Kant and Georg Hegel.

After the crumbling of the Berlin Wall (9 November 1989) and dismantling of Soviet communism toward the tail end of the 20th-century, the period celebrated by Western liberal elites and popularized by Francis Fukuyama was supposed to be “the end of history,” in the sense of being the time in which enlightened liberal democracy would finally transcend the transitional period of communist dictatorship and eradicate from the world the influence of backward religious consciousness.⁹

To understand the euphoric, *Joachitic enthusiasm*, that overtook Western Europe during this time and fully comprehend the nature of Marxism, Enlightenment Utopian Socialism in general, and neo-liberal, atheistic democracy (like that of John Dewey), crucial is the contemporary, neo-Averroistic form into which the Joachitic enthusiasm became transformed by the neo-Averroistic, religious, educational humanism of Petrarch unwittingly devolving, through the 19th-century neo-Averroistic *social science*—with its three stages of social evolution: 1) theological, 2) metaphysical, and 3) positive/scientific—proposed by Auguste Marie François Xavier Comte, into the *secular educational humanism* of the 20th- and 21st-century West.

During a late Medieval, academic battles about the relationship between philosophy and theology that the great Islamic scholar Averroes (ibn Rushd, 1126–1198) had with a previously-existing Islamic scholar named al-Ghazali (who died in 1111 and had considered philosophy to be inferior to theology and fake science), Averroes had countered Ghazali’s reductionist claim that the whole of truth is contained in the Qu’ran, by, knowingly or not, reviving a threefold distinction about the hierarchy of human knowing first introduced centuries before by Plato through his famous analogy of a divided-line of learning in which

⁹ Francis Fukuyama, “The End of History?,” *The National Interest* 16 (1989): 3–18.

Plato had made a distinction among 3 lower and higher forms of knowing: 1) the qualitatively-lowest being belief (which Averroes would later identify as a mindset common to poets); 2) the qualitatively higher one, being a kind opinionated imagining (that Averroes would later maintain is proper to theologians); and 3) the highest one being science (which Averroes would later reserve for Aristotelian philosophers). According to Averroes, while the whole of truth is contained in the Qu'ran, only the Aristotelian philosopher knows how to read, unravel the hidden truth, meaning of, what the Qu'ran actually says.

Seizing upon the critique by Averroes, Petrarch made the mistake of buying into an esoteric interpretation of philosophy/science as a hidden teaching, or body, or scientific system, of knowledge, known only to an enlightened group of intellectuals. In so doing, he treated philosophy/science as if it were reducible to a dialectical logic apprehensible only by some spiritually-elect group. While Petrarch hated Averroes (had called him a “mad dog”¹⁰) and was no fan of Aristotle, in criticizing Averroes, unwittingly he came to 1) adopt the understanding Averroes had promoted that philosophy is a hidden teaching, or body of knowledge known only to some enlightened individuals and 2) pass this understanding on to posterity.

Unhappily, to paraphrase and alter a bit a commonsense-gem of wisdom from Étienne Gilson, *We think, and choose, the way we can, not the way we wish*.¹¹ Outraged by Averroes's disdain for poetry, because Petrarch made the mistake of doing no more than dialectically turning Averroes's teaching on its head and not essentially changing it, *unwittingly*, by so doing, in effect he adopted in his own principles a kind of neo-Gnostic understanding of philosophy/science for which he

¹⁰ Cf. Armand A. Maurer, *A History of Philosophy: Medieval Philosophy* (New York: Random House, 1962), 104.

¹¹ Cf. Étienne Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), 302.

would become a conduit to intellectual posterity. He assumed and popularized among humanists of the Italian Renaissance that philosophy/science is an esoteric metaphysical and moral teaching, or body of knowledge, that was first given by God to Moses. Subsequently, to protect this teaching from being ridiculed by unenlightened, vulgar, illiterate masses, Petrarch and other Italian Renaissance humanists claimed true philosophy/science had been intentionally buried in the works of epic poets like Homer, Hesiod, and Virgil and esoterically transmitted to other enlightened poets.

Over the several centuries that comprised the Italian Renaissance, this Petrarchan popularization of philosophy as an esoteric teaching, or body of knowledge (which was to become a general assumption about philosophy held by Italian Renaissance humanists) became the popular understanding of philosophy that entered into Western Europe around the time of the Father of Modern Philosophy, 16th-/17th-century René Descartes. Disliking the poetic nature of the Jesuit education he had received, and much more favoring logic than poetry as the only sort of knowing worthy of being called *philosophy/science*, Descartes had maintained that the whole of truth is a body of knowledge buried, hidden, in some train of obscure thought of wandering images seeking to become a clear and distinct idea that he called a “mind,” human consciousness.

Descartes had claimed, further, that this hidden teaching was apprehensible not by poets, but only by a person of exceptionally strong logically-regulated will-power focused on the idea of a Perfectly-Good God capable of stabilizing the wandering imagination common to poetic types so as to be able to see truth to consist in a systematic train of ideas so clear and distinct that a strong, logical human will (one with which Descartes apparently had identified common sense) cannot deny their reality, including that of a human person being a totally-disembodied mind or spirit. In short, centuries before 18th-/19th-century Frie-

drich Nietzsche, Descartes had moved truth, and with it common sense, out of the human intellect and placed it in some logically-systematic train of ideas or feelings, thoughts, he called a human “will.”

In so doing, however, as the more poetically- and historically/humanist-inclined Rousseau had immediately recognized, Descartes had cut off philosophy/science, and with it, common sense, from human wisdom and what the Petrarch and Italian Renaissance humanists in general had considered to be its historical roots as a somewhat obscure religious body of knowledge first given by God as true philosophy/science to the Jews from whom all true culture and cultural institutions were born and passed on to posterity *as historical descendants from its original race*.

In so doing, Descartes had done more than entirely destroy the nature of philosophy/science, and real common sense, as a somewhat social-science history, or historical, educational humanist enterprise. The principles he had laid down for the nature of philosophy/science as a real genus had included the clear and distinct conviction he had inherited from Petrarch and Italian Renaissance humanists that the *Jews were the historical conduit, historical race/genus* from which all false philosophy/science and subsequent philosophical/scientific mistakes, intellectual and cultural backwardness, foolishness, lack of common sense, and sins had historically descended upon Europe and the world prior to the coming of Descartes and the later Western Enlightenment.

Unwittingly, Descartes had become a conduit who would later cause Rousseau’s educational principles, in his critique of Descartes’s teachings, become a conduit for later forms of anti-Semitism as an essential principle of Nazi forms of philosophy/science. This would include making the Jews a scapegoat for all Europe’s prior socially- and culturally-caused problems, evils, and sins.

In a similar way, through teachings of Rousseau critiquing him, Descartes would unknowingly become a historical conduit passing a-

long to posterity the mistaken notion that a real and scientific species is identical with a race historically-descended from original parents (instead of being part of an organizational whole that generates, proximately causes, organizational action: a division/part of a generic whole, or substance). In truth, a real genus only exists in a real species, and a real species only exists in real individuals. As Gilson once quipped, in the present, real species of animals exist only in real animals, such as those in zoos, not in historical descent or transmission, which no longer exists.¹² *If real species were historical descendants of ancestral species, since ancestors cannot historically-descend from themselves, the absurd consequence that would follow would be that historical ancestors could never belong to the same species as their historical descendants!*

Worse. The only way we come to know anything is in and through defining it. Doing so, however, essentially involves locating some being within a genus and species. By becoming conduits for essentially *racializing* the concepts of genus and species, Petrarch, Italian Renaissance humanists in general, Descartes, and Rousseau became an essential part of the historical conduit that brought into existence the contemporary enlightened *Woke*, anarchic, youth generation, “useful idiots” (who tend not to be able to distinguish real from apparent, logical or not logical anything, much less genera and species).

Rousseau contributed to this current fiasco in part by rightly criticizing Descartes for cutting off philosophy/science, and education in general, from its historical roots. While he admitted with Descartes that philosophy/science is a hidden body of knowledge, he denied that it (and with it, real common sense) is esoterically buried in an individual mind.

¹² See Étienne Gilson, “In Quest of Species,” in *Three Quests in Philosophy*, ed. Armand A. Maurer (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2008), 25–73.

Instead, Rousseau maintained that philosophy/science/real common sense is/are a historical project of discrete, disconnected, emotions to assemble themselves into a historically-driven, social-science consciousness: perfect humanity. In addition, he denied Descartes's distinction between matter (which Descartes had conceived as inert extension) and mind (which Descartes had identified with thought, spirit).

According to Rousseau, only spirit exists. Matter is simply unconscious thought/spirit. And, in a way, clear and distinct ideas (clear and distinct, more progressive genera and species), historically and progressively descend from one time to another (earlier emotions being historic ancestors of later, more progressive, enlightened ones somewhat resembling historical, backward ones, like later races historically descending from and somewhat resembling ancestral parents). After Rousseau, the idea of a real substance or nature, and real genera and species in the commonsense way that Aristotle and Aquinas had conceived them to be (as organizational wholes possessing faculties like intellect, will, and emotions) became replaced in the West by essentially different ideas of human beings, genera, species, individuals, and real common sense.

According to Hegel, for example, human beings are born as essentially illogical, un-systematic trains of unscientific, barbaric, emotions historically driven to project themselves and come into conflict with other historically driven, illogical, unscientific, barbaric emotions that (much like the savage Fuegians that the cultured, Enlightened-socialist Brit, Charles Darwin would later encounter on his first voyage on the *Beagle*) inhabit a wild geographical region (genus) so as eventually, at the end of history, to unite together into a systematic, or logical train of scientific, self-understanding qualitatively-higher emotions (species): perfect humanity, a Scientific, Pure Good Will in which all complete truth and perfect religion and perfect/science/wisdom will coincide in nature. Understanding human beings in somewhat this way, in

his educational tome *Émile, or Abstract Man* (humanity), Rousseau wedded a Western neo-Gnostic, millenarianism to a neo-Pelagianism on a historical march to become Perfect Social–science Consciousness aware of itself as such: *God!*

In so doing, like ancient Pelagius, Rousseau denied the reality of original sin as part of humanity as pre-historic, selfish, barbaric, uncultured, abstract man: someone like *conscience-deprived, crude, vulgar, selfish, intolerant, insincere, socially and culturally backward, brute* Donald Trump, emerging into concrete, selfless, socialistic, domesticated, cultured, sincere, tolerant, historic-scientific man: someone like neo-Gnostic, neo-Averroestic, double-truth-advocate Catholics Joe Biden, Nancy Pelosi, Mario and Andrew Cuomo. And Rousseau did so for precisely the same reason that, as neo-Gnostics spiritualists, all Enlightenment intellectuals incline to do so: They are, as he was, and as Chesterton rightly recognized about Hegel, *Monomaniacs*.

Like all the Enlightenment descendants he spawned, including Auguste Comte and his followers, Rousseau denied the evident, real, commonsense truth that real multitudes (real organizational wholes, natures), exist independently of something he understood to be *social consciousness*. To him and them, reality is social consciousness: the consciousness (systematic, scientific train of thoughts that once was blind emotions that has become Pure Social-Science Good Will). In actuality, for Enlightenment thinkers (the contemporary *Woke culture*) only one being is real, *only total unity exists*. Unity and social consciousness are identical and constitute what Marxists and all contemporary Utopian Socialists and neo-liberals call *humanity*, which they consider to be *God*. Hence, their often-repeated claims to be theists, good Catholics, and so on, not atheists or heretics.

The psychological constitution of a Marxist causes him or her to think that humanity is real, but John Smith is not. Like Hegel, the Marxist thinks that John Smith is simply where Absolute Spirit (which

Hegel identified with God, which he conflated with *Humanity*) happens to be conscious of itself at this or that historical moment. Reality to a Marxist is consciousness historically, progressively, realizing that only humanity—collections of socially-conscious feelings, emotions (consciousness feeling itself historically to be growing into self-awareness of being scientific feeling: Perfect, Pure, Sincere, Good Will)—is real. Anything apart from humanity considered in this way is an illusion caused by disordered economic relations (the cause of all cultural illusions).

Quite frankly, if seriously maintained intellectually, to a sane human being, one with actual common sense, such a way of looking at reality would be considered sociopathic. Nonetheless, this way of looking at reality is a fundamental assumption, non-negotiable, Marxist and Utopian-Socialist, Enlightenment educational first principle—an essential part of Marxist and Enlightenment self-definition, self-identity, and self-understanding. And education for both begins with and remains throughout its operation, application of this psychological principle behaviorally to modify the psychology of students. Knowingly or not to a Marxist and all Enlightenment Utopian Socialists, their educational principles essentially demand that they drive out from the psyche of their students any scintilla of real common sense.¹³

Marxism as Secularized Christian Heresy: How to Reverse Its Pernicious Mis-Educational and Anti-Cultural, Anarchic Influence

To combat the mis-educational and anti-cultural, anarchic influence of Marxism, crucial for its opponents to understand is the nature of

¹³ For more about the need for a renewal of the West by recovering common sense, see Peter A. Redpath, “The Nature of Common Sense and how We Can Use Common Sense to Renew the West,” *Studia Gilsoniana* 3, supplement (2014): 455–484.

common sense (especially real common sense) and where, as Utopian Socialists, Marxist principles must incline Marxists to begin to: 1) drive out real common sense from the souls of children and replace it with a fictional narrative devoid of real common sense; 2) promote humanistic atheism, the notion that humanity is God, and, especially, anti-Semitism; 3) mistake ethnic races for real genera and species; 4) and deny the evident existence of real natures with internal principles of organization, powers/faculties/capabilities within things in general and human beings especially.

All these effects are pernicious and are driving the contemporary West and the world toward total madness. Once again, the Enlightenment West is turning the Jew into a cultural scapegoat onto which it inclines chiefly to fix all its cultural and individual problems and blame for all its cultural and individual failings. In addition, by denying the reality of real natures, including human nature, no human faculties can exist in which human habits exist, in which unequal virtues and talents can and do exist. As a result, apart from temperance and courage, the cardinal moral virtues of justice (especially distributive justice based upon individual talent can be recognized to exist) and prudence (upon which, together with the other cardinal virtues sound leadership essentially depend), cannot exist at all, much less flourish.

Beyond this, denying the existence of really-existing organizational wholes (real substances), the principles of conceptual and behavioral contradictions and non-contradictions become incomprehensible. Conceptually, contradictory opposites involve the impossibility of some one substance or parts/properties of a substance having essentially opposite differences. If real substances do not, cannot, exist, neither can the principle of conceptual non-contradiction. Worse, neither can behavioral non-contradictions. The concept of really, or naturally, doable or undoable deed becomes intellectually incomprehensible. And if nei-

ther conceptual nor behavioral contradictions are comprehensible, neither are common sense, truth, or language.

In addition, because they lack any commonsense ability to recognize the reality of unequal talent and justly reward it as a contribution to a community or society, Utopian Socialists tend to do several things: 1) reduce the whole of justice to commutative justice, exchanges of equal value of benefit or damage, such as monetary exchanges of equal or unequal goods and services; 2) explain inequality of distribution of goods, wealth, not to reward for talent, virtue, but to exploitation, taking advantage, of the weaker (victims) by the stronger (victimizers); 3) reduce what remains of justice to being tolerant/sincere (good-willed), and injustice to being intolerant/insincere (bad-willed); 4) claim that all human inequality is based upon social victimization of innocent, sincere (good-willed), tolerant, sinless, just victims, by insincere (bad-willed) unjust, sinful victimizers; 5) always attempt to remedy the disastrous, impoverishing effects that application of this flawed understanding of justice/injustice has on a community/society by periodically reversing within a community/society the roles of victims and victimizers—at one period making the victims one social group or another (such as, black males, females, religion, this or that religion, white males, and so on) and at another time reversing these victims/victimizers roles.

Setting aside the evident absurdities and cultural evils with which Enlightenment Utopian Socialism and, especially, Marxism has infected the West, evident to readers by now should be that a Western and global return to sanity related to understanding the nature of truth and language essentially depend upon the ability of Western and world leaders to restore real common sense to national cultures. To do so, these leaders must, as precisely and quickly as possible, understand the nature of common sense considered in general, and especially real common sense.

Happily, through the examples and descriptions of it I have given in this essay, and especially through examples of its contrary opposite, a more or less precise definition of common sense appears easy to give. When we first consider the idea of common sense in relationship to examples of people who are more or less psychologically-healthy adults, it appears to be simply what most of us would call *common knowledge*, or *common understanding*.

In English, we have an expression we often give to people who say something evidently true, something everyone knows—"That goes without saying." By this we mean that what a person just said was so evidently true that no need existed to say it. The term *common sense* expresses this concept. In it, the word *sense* is synonymous with the word *knowledge*, or, more precisely, *understanding*.

In general, a person with common sense is someone possessed of what Aristotle and St. Thomas had identified as the natural and acquired intellectual habit (*habitus*) and virtue (*virtus*: virtual, or intensive quantity [quality]) of understanding. Such a person is someone who, in relation to observational (what Aristotle and St. Thomas had called *speculative* or *theoretical*) knowledge immediately understands (induces, intuitions) some thing or action to be what it is, or be true; or, in relation to practical and productive knowing, through practical or productive experience at living, immediately induces (intuitions), understands, what something is or is not, or that it is right or wrong to choose.

Aristotle and Aquinas had maintained that all human beings are born with natural *habitus* (qualities they imperfectly *have*). These include all the natural moral and intellectual qualities, virtues of temperance, courage, justice, prudence, art, philosophy/science, understanding, and even wisdom, and their contrary opposites. While not perfectly so, even young children are somewhat (at least naturally inclined to be) courageous or cowardly, hopeful or fearful, sensitive to pleasure/pain, more-or-less artistic, even prudent, wise, possessed of understanding

and common sense. The truth of this claim is evident from the fact that, at times, children are more prudent, wiser, than some adults. In addition, some are precocious: masterful musicians, painters, mathematicians, and so on.

To become perfected in such psychological qualities, however, Aristotle and Aquinas were convinced human beings need repeatedly to apply prudence and wisdom (common sense/understanding in its more perfect form) to their increasingly-perfected understanding to add perfecting qualities (virtues) to their naturally-possessed habits. *In its most perfect form, common sense is simply the perfected, naturally-possessed habit of understanding (the virtue of understanding) applied to this or that subject in this or that situation that makes the nature of some subject immediately intelligible!*

Following St. Augustine, some contemporary Christians, including Pope Francis, have recently started to refer to this quality of common sense in the form of *wisdom/prudence in immediate understanding* by use of the term *discernment*. No need exists for a discerning person, someone with common sense in this form, to reason to the conclusion that this something exists, or about: what it is, whether it is true, false, or fake; or whether it is good or bad, right or wrong, to pursue or avoid. The answers to such questions are immediately evident to this person. And so, too, is the adequate self-knowledge of personal nature and abilities immediately to draw this conclusion.

Consequently, especially in relation to productive and practical matters, healthy, adult human beings commonly identify a person with common sense as being someone possessed of the habit of good decision making, a good judge, either in general, or related to some particular subject. A person with common sense is a person possessed of common knowledge, common understanding: what everyone else who knows a subject understands about this subject in general or particular. The example I gave toward the start of this article related to an *engineer*

who claims to be an engineer mistaking the principles of grammar for those of engineering is a fitting, suitable, one to use to help make intelligible, understandable, to an audience what I am chiefly talking about, the chief intellectual point I want to make, related to the nature of common sense.

As opposed to the person possessed of common sense, the person lacking it, the fool, is devoid of knowledge of what everyone else knows, or should know about some subject. In a way, this person lacks knowledge of some principle of measuring, known truth, that comes to people possessed of the virtue of common sense immediately from observation or from common sense-experience at living.

As a result, the person who lacks common sense is often publicly ridiculed, is the butt of jokes. University professors, people who tend “to live in ivory towers,” especially some logicians (those with little practical experience at living), incline to be such individuals. In college, I had a friend like this to whom I used to refer as an “encyclopedia open to the wrong page.” While he was terrific in some forms of academic work, he tended to have no practical skills, or if he did, not know when and/or how to apply them.¹⁴

Aristotle actually had a word he used to describe such individuals that came close to, but did not completely capture, the nature of a person lacking common sense: “asinine.” In ancient Greek, this was the person lacking *synēsis*, someone who had the personal quality of *asynēsis*, a species of foolishness (non-*synēsis/sense*) that caused a person to be a bad imaginer, conceptualizer, judge, estimator, evaluator, especially of what a person should know in this or that situation.

To make intelligible to others more precisely the understanding (which he apparently acquired from Socrates) that wisdom is more or

¹⁴ See also Peter A. Redpath, “Why, Through Application of Its Educational Principles, the New World Order Can Never Generate Higher Education,” *Studia Gilsoniana* 9, no. 4 (October–December 2020): 651–661.

less identical with common sense, in his masterful work in moral psychology, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, when talking about the nature of prudence and working as a physician of the soul (behavioral psychologist), Aristotle went out of his way to explain that the person possessed of wisdom (of which prudence is a species) combines in his or her nature all the essential elements needed to be an excellent judge.

Recall that in Plato's dialogues the stone-mason/philosopher Socrates had repeatedly maintained that what, more than anything else, got him into trouble was an ordinary kind of wisdom he possessed, one unlike that of the professional orators and poets of his day. Unlike their wisdom, Socrates claimed that his was the ordinary kind of human wisdom, examples of which, to the chagrin of professional sophists like Thrasymachos, Gorgias, and Callicles, he constantly gave examples in reference to people like cooks, medical doctors, sailors, home builders, shoemakers, and tailors.

Psychologically, Aristotle claimed that this sort of wisdom, which someone like the prudent man Socrates possessed, combines in its nature four different qualities of excellent judging that, when rightly combined with the psychological quality of understanding, give to its possessor a generic, psychological quality of virtuous shrewdness, of which prudence, and apparently wisdom in general (whether practical, productive, or contemplative/speculative/theoretical/metaphysical) are species: 1) *eubulia* (excellence in deliberating); 2) *eustochia* (being a lucky guesser, somewhat excellent at being able to determine precisely the right thing to do at the moment: a good evaluator/estimator); 3) *synēsis* (right judgment about what happens in the majority of cases, what is really doable and not doable); and 4) *gnome* (right judgment about what is equitable in this or that situation).

Special difficulty understanding the nature of common sense arises at times from two facts about it: 1) to some extent, all human beings possess some of it, are familiar with it; and 2) when we talk about

it, we generally do so the way we talk about anything real: concretely, in terms of qualitatively unequal relationships to that of which it is said—that is, analogously.

Regarding this first fact, understanding common sense presents a difficulty similar to that which in Book 11 of his *Confessions*, St. Augustine admitted he had related to the concept of time: When someone does not ask him what it is, he is so familiar with it that he has no trouble knowing what it is; but when someone asks him what it is, he appears not to know.¹⁵ Common sense has a similar nature. When someone does not ask us what it is, we have an implicit knowledge of it as the virtue of understanding applied to this or that subject in this or that situation that makes the nature of some subject immediately intelligible. On the contrary, when someone asks us what is common sense (common *synēsis*), initially we tend to become tongue-tied, do not know how to reply.

As far as fact 2 is concerned, when we talk about a subject, apply objects of sentences to their subjects to identify them in relation to a subject, we always do so indirectly, according to relational meanings. We never do so directly; and the way logicians and ordinary people, as well as real scientists/philosophers, do this essentially differs. In their everyday, commonsense way of talking, philosophers/scientists and ordinary human beings do so by noting qualitative, nuanced (chiefly causal) distinctions, differences in relation that they immediately recognize exist between and among these relational meanings as they say, refer, them to a subject.

For example, in the ordinary course of conversation, two people might note that Mother Theresa was *more of a human being*—in the sense of being qualitatively more perfect metaphysically and morally

¹⁵ Augustine, *The Confessions*, trans. Edward Bouverie Pusey. Available online—see the section *References* for details.

(psychologically, in her soul!)—than was Joseph Stalin. Such a statement would strike a logician thinking as a logician as nonsensical, likely as an *ad hominem* attack violating the well-known, commonsense logical cannon that words, terms, definitions said of subjects must always have one, absolutely-fixed meaning, definition—when put in the technical jargon of a logician, *must always be predicated univocally, never predicated equivocally*.

For example, if I call Socrates and Plato men, a logician working as a logician naturally inclines to assume I mean that Socrates and Plato are equally men, that whatever the definition of *man* signifies is equally, not unequally, in one and the other—that Socrates is not more *man* than is Plato. Both are equally men.

If, on the other hand, a medical doctor says that John is not as *healthy* as Mary, in some way he is saying that, while John *is healthy*, the quality, or nature, of health is causally related to John as one that *exists less in John* than it does in Mary, that some cause called *health* exists more in Mary than it does in John. In addition, if I call bread or exercise *healthy*, in the first case, generally I mean that, when eaten, bread tends *nutritionally to cause, promote retention and increase of bodily health*; and in the second case, generally I mean that exercise tends *to cause, promote retention and increase of muscular coordination and stamina/strength*.

While, to some extent, all human beings tend to have a difficult time understanding the nature of analogy, my experience is that logicians generally have an especially difficult time doing so. Since analogy dominates the language of everyday life, especially productive and practical matters, logicians often have a difficult time understanding the psychological disposition of business people and ordinary people with real, not syllogistic, *common sense*. Since logicians tend to think in one fixed way, they also often have a hard time understanding comedy, not understanding jokes. This is especially true of Enlightenment logicians,

Marxists in general, and the contemporary *Woke* crowd of anarchists, who deny the reality of real natures. Since real *common sense* is chiefly said, referred to subjects analogously, Enlightenment intellectuals in general have a hard time grasping its nature.

Be this as it may, *common sense* mainly refers to common, evident intellectual understanding or knowledge that some person possesses in general, or related to a specific or individual subject as a natural or supernatural faculty or habit of the human soul. Analogously, people often extend, transfer use of, apply, this term to other human faculties (like will, memory, imagination, hearing, and so on); and even to subjects and circumstances, situations such as time and place in which they do not directly exist, but to which, somehow, they are relationally connected. For example, adult human beings throughout the world often say that performing this or that action generally, particularly, or individually *makes sense* or is *commonsensical*, or is nonsensical, makes no common sense. For instance, someone in the third century B.C. making plans to create a ship to fly to Mars would be planning something that most people today would say makes no common sense for that person; but they might likely agree that it could make common sense for Elon Musk seriously to consider.

St. Thomas Aquinas went so far as to locate moral prudence, and with it all practical and productive prudence partially on the sense level in an internal sense faculty that he analogously identified with the estimative intelligence, instinct, and brute animals. He called his faculty *cogitative*, or *particular, reason*. Together with the virtue of intellectual understanding, all the other cardinal and intellectual virtues and moral virtues, the integrated activity of all these faculties and their habits and virtues, plus whatever supernatural grace can add to these, appear to

comprise the whole of common sense in its most perfect form: perfect human wisdom.¹⁶

Crucial to understand today about Marxism, Enlightenment Utopian Socialism in general, and all the mis-named cultural institutions they have created over the tenure of their existence is that all of these are intentionally (or at least in principle) designed to drive common sense, *especially real common sense*, out of the human soul, the psychological constitution of individual persons; and to do so at the earliest age and throughout an entire lifetime in every aspect of human life.

A good example of this mis-educational influence are faculty members and administrators who are miserable human beings living miserable lives. Hating themselves, they tend to hate anyone who is not as miserable as they are. As a result, by intentionally influencing them to adopt the same nonsensical principles they use to direct their choices in life, they intentionally seek to make students as miserable as they are.

Other good examples considered in general of it are contemporary middle-management executives, corporate human resources executives/managers, and college/university administrators, ministers of education, all of whom, having been mis-educated in common sense at Enlightenment mis-educational institutions, tend to think univocally, not analogously; and tend to be sorely lacking in real common sense as I have described it. While, considered as human beings they might be wonderful, kind people, as administrators, Western colleges and universities and educational institutions that have been influenced by their Enlightenment mindset have pretty much driven out of their administrative psychology any comprehension of prudence, and common sense in general, and justice, especially distributive justice, which (instead of race,

¹⁶ See Peter A. Redpath, *The Moral Psychology of St. Thomas Aquinas: An Introduction to Ragamuffin Ethics* (St. Louis, Mo.: Enroute, 2017).

sex, political influence, diversity, and so on) is the chief just measure of equitable distribution of rewards for quality of work contribution to an organization).

The net result of the disordered educational psychology inhabiting cultural institutions throughout the contemporary West and world is that pretty much all of these institutions, and especially those of higher education (colleges and universities), have become ships of fools mistakenly thinking of themselves as creating local, national, and global world leaders, while they often tend to do precisely the opposite. Consequently, expecting most contemporary college and university faculty members and administrators to come up with a plan to reverse the current dire cultural situation in the West and globally, including their own, makes no real common sense. Doing so defies their natural and acquired abilities, which, related to such a feat, are largely disabilities, job-application disqualifiers.

For this reason, as colleges and universities increasingly begin to go out of business, collapse, on a global scale, colleagues of mine and I have decided that some institution of higher education, a *Commonsense Wisdom Executive Coaching Academy* (CWECA)—one that immerses its students in commonsense wisdom from all parts of the Earth—must immediately, on a global scale, be created to replace the disordered, mis-educational, intellectual institutions (colleges and universities) that Enlightenment hatred for commonsense has caused to come into being culturally and civilizationally increasingly to wreck the West and the world. Anyone seriously interested in discovering more about this project and perhaps joining, supporting, us in this effort is more than welcome to do so by checking out the nature of CWECA at:

<https://www.aquinasschoolofleadership.com/announcements>
and emailing us at: peterredpath@aquinasschoolofleadership.com

How to Reverse the Widespread Global Disorder That Nonsensical Principles of Utopian Socialism/Marxism Are Currently Causing

SUMMARY

Please write a 150-200 word summary of the paper.

KEYWORDS

Socialism, Marxism, common sense, wisdom, prudence, human nature, human person, the West, moral psychology, education, Thomas Aquinas.

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. *On the Heavens*. Translated by J. L. Stocks. Available online at: <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/heavens.html>. Accessed Oct. 12, 2020.
- Augustine. *The Confessions*. Translated by Edward Bouverie Pusey. Available online at: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3296/3296-h/3296-h.htm#link2H_4_0011. Accessed Oct. 12, 2020.
- Chesterton, G. K. *St. Thomas Aquinas*. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, Inc., 2009.
- Chesterton, G. K. "The World State." In Gordon Mursell, *English Spirituality: From 1700 to the Present Day*, 431. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History?" *The National Interest* 16 (1989): 3–18.
- Gilson, Étienne. *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.
- Gilson, Étienne. *Three Quests in Philosophy*, edited by Armand A. Maurer. The Etienne Gilson Series, 31. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2008.
- Herman, Luc, and Bart Vervaeck. "Ideology and Narrative Fiction." In *The Living Hand-book of Narratology*. Available online at: <http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de>. Accessed Oct. 12, 2020.
- Lessing, Gotthold E. *The Education of the Human Race*. Translated by Fred W. Robertson. London: Anthroposophical Publishing Company, 1927.
- Little, Daniel. "Philosophy of History." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta. Winter 2020 Edition. Available online at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/history/>. Accessed Oct. 12, 2020.
- Maurer, Armand A. *A History of Philosophy: Medieval Philosophy*. New York: Random House, 1962.
- Redpath, Peter A. *The Moral Psychology of St. Thomas Aquinas: An Introduction to Ragamuffin Ethics*. St. Louis, Mo.: Enroute, 2017.
- Redpath, Peter A. "The Nature of Common Sense and how We Can Use Common Sense to Renew the West." *Studia Gilsoniana* 3, supplement (2014): 455–484.
- Redpath, Peter A. "Why, Through Application of Its Educational Principles, the New World Order Can Never Generate Higher Education." *Studia Gilsoniana* 9, no. 4 (October–December 2020): 651–661, DOI: 10.26385/SG.090427.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Émile, or Concerning Education*. Translated by Eleanor Worthington. Boston: D. C. Heath & Company, 1889.

Voegelin, Eric. *The New Science of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.