

*As wishes & Nativity Prayers, John*

# DAYLIGHT

ORGAN OF THE COUNTER - EVOLUTION GROUP

Editor and Secretary:  
John G. Campbell  
5 Wallace Avenue  
STEVENSTON  
Ayrshire  
Scotland

Patrons: The Immaculate Conception  
St. Joseph and St. Michael Archangel

December 1978

Annual Subscription £2.

## CONTENTS

EDITOR'S LETTER  
CURRENT EVENTS  
DARWIN SAILS AGAIN  
THOSE AGES OF THE ROCKS

THEORY AND THE WORD OF GOD by Veronica King  
DID ST. AUGUSTINE TEACH EVOLUTION? by H. W. J. Edwards.  
POEM by Mary Carr.

## EDITOR'S LETTER

Dear Readers,

This issue will probably reach most readers between Christmas and the New Year. Still, it is not too late to wish everyone all the blessings of the Nativity, as well as a Happy New Year. Let's not be too pessimistic, for God can still work miracles. See what a Pope we now have.

We would remind those readers who wish to continue, to please, confirm. They can send in subscriptions when they fall due.

It will have been noted that the B.B.C. has mounted another Evolutionist campaign, this time a film and a "lavishly illustrated book" propagating a cult of Charles Darwin. The special article on page 2 is the exposure of the truth about Darwin. We would also draw attention to the article by the Welsh Augustinian scholar, Mr. Henry Edwards, in which he disposes of the myth that St. Augustine taught Evolution.

For the New Year we have some special articles in the pipeline, including a feature by Fr. Valentine Long "Why Kowtow to Hegel?" Once again - God bless all here!

Yours sincerely,

The Editor.

## CURRENT EVENTS

### Cheers for Bishop Dwyer!

It was good to note that Bishop Dwyer of Birmingham has ordered prayers for the martyred Christians of the Lebanon, and is advertising for funds to alleviate the sufferings of this heroic people.

But, one has to comment, other ecclesial antennae in England and in Scotland do not yet seem to be working.

### Cheers for others too!

The first cheer is for the gallant Scottish sea-captain of the Glasgow freighter who stopped on the high seas to take aboard the several hundred Vietnamese in danger of drowning on their flimsy craft though he was well aware that he was acting against the current international regulations in doing so. He stated, simply, that the law of the sea demanded that he could not leave these innocent people to drown. So, there's hope for us yet!

It is also just that we record that the British Government acted in conscience and provided refuge in this country for these victims of the Marxist terror in their native land. See what one man can do!

### The hospital strikers, the Great Silence.

The Trades Unionists have conducted strikes in a chain of State Hospitals throughout the country, cutting off hot water, refusing to cook meals, even to blockade the entrance of surgical supplies. In Lanarkshire in Scotland a whole hospital, Hairmyres, had to be evacuated. Consultants have declared that these actions have caused the deaths of certain patients - as it must have - and injury to

many others, quite apart from the brutality of putting sick people out on the street. The daily papers have recorded it all in graphic pictures. The picture is one of sheer murder.

One could comment on various aspects of this matter, and particularly on the silence of the politicians of every hue. But, in fact, it would all be futile, for our society in general has already declared the principle of the murder of the innocent, the infanticide of the unborn. And are not these very hospitals the places wherein the Molochian State conducts its daily killings? What more needs be said?

Just one thing further. It seems there is now a procedure whereby expectant mothers are invited to have X-Ray tests, to ensure that there is not a deformed child with the consequent need of abortion! The moral surely is, to have as little to do with the State Health Service as possible

### Ireland.

As previously pointed out in this column, Ireland is now the object of the concentrated attack by the world forces of humanist atheism. And now the Irish Government has so far capitulated as to introduce a Bill for the legalization of the sale of contraceptives

In this 95p.c. Catholic nation there suddenly appeared a determined and vociferous Humanist movement, demanding the public sale of contraceptives, of abortion, with a genial attitude towards homosexuality brown in for good measure. Lavishly financed from abroad (verified) this mysterious lobby found itself supplied with powerful allies, seemingly ready-made, in the Irish media and in the legislature itself. So lavish are the finances that it is able to open shops in the main Irish towns for the free distribution of contraceptives! Who says there are not secret and mysterious groups at work in the world?

That which shocked many Catholics was the timorous attitude of the bishops. Whilst re-iterating that the Church's teaching is that the use of artificial contraception is in itself sinful, they made a very weak statement to the effect that the Church had no wish to interfere in public affairs. In the interim the Catholic battle was left to be fought by the gallant members of the Irish Family League (some of our readers among them).

Then a fortnight ago came the middle-page article by Msgr. Cremin, of Maynooth in the Irish Independent, Dublin's largest daily, in which he castigated the bishops for their timorous attitude. This has now been followed by a comprehensive brochure by the Knights of St. Columbanus, exposing the whole business of contraception. Meantime, on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, torchlight processions took place in the main Irish towns in protest against the proposed legislation.

Undoubtedly, there is a stirring in defence of the norms of traditional morality. But, at the same time, the mysterious lobby is ever active, its propagandists continually making the appeal to the unwary, that recognition of "minority rights" would harm no one. The Bill comes up for full debate in the Dail in January, and the issue is very much in the balance.

The disappearance of the traditional Christian Ireland into the maw of pagan sex-cult States would be a terrifying calamity. The prayers of all readers are requested that this attack by the forces of evil may be overcome.

# Darwin Sails Again

The cameras of the B.B.C. take us once more on the voyage of the *Beagle*, the purpose, of course, to feature the naturalist of the voyage, Mr. Charles Darwin, of white ascetic features, stares to far-off horizons, seeing visions which will lead humanity on and on to ever higher things. It is all in the familiar pattern with which the canonised saints of the secular and humanist world are depicted, those great searchers for truth and a more noble deal for suffering mankind. In one scene there is depicted the mild saint arguing against slavery with the "reactionary" captain of the vessel, though Darwin's own doctrines (as we shall see) form a basis for gross oppression.

The question is, who was Darwin and what his essential doctrine?

Contrary to the oft-repeated description of Darwin as "a scientist", he had no scientific qualifications whatsoever, his degree being in Divinity at Cambridge. He was, as the Italians say, "il clergyman".

For some years Darwin had enjoyed a friendship with Sir David Lyell of the ages of the rocks fame, and, in fact, he took Lyell's volume with him as reading matter during the voyage of the *Beagle*. At the same time, as Darwin himself admits, he had been introduced to the idea of Natural Selection through the works of Pastor Malthus. Thus, it is not difficult to see what was Darwin's mental equipment as he stepped aboard the *Beagle*; he was pre-disposed to look at the world through Evolutionist glasses.

It is not necessary here to repeat the details of his observations during the voyage, his discovery of the variations in the finches and so on. It is all recorded in his long and boring *Origin of the Species*, wherein, with mole-like industry he recounts the variations within the kinds throughout the world, those that naturalists had brought to his notice, seemingly oblivious of the fact that all the variations within kinds do not make a single case of a transition between the kinds. However, he did express the hope that some day the variations would produce true changes in kind!

What, then, was all Darwin's industry leading to? It was to nothing else but a new view of the universe, a new cosmology. And here the writer of the laudatory note on Darwin in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is quite frank:

**It was because Darwin provided a scientific explanation of how Evolution occurred, free from any miraculous intervention or unfounded fancy, that he succeeded where Lamarck had failed, in making the fact of Evolution acceptable.**

**Darwin believed that all morality was the result of evolution and that in man it had been produced, not by Natural Selection working on the individual, but by the improvement of social standards conferring survival on the social units whose members show them.**

The writer of the note is indeed frank. In the first paragraph we note that the "scientific" explanation of Evolution is acceptable because it is that of a universe without God. In the second paragraph we have the explanation of what Darwin meant by morality, and, please note, this evolution of morality appertains to "the mass"; the forerunner of the great modern heresy. But the latter part of the explanation - "conferring survival on the social units whose members show them" - inevitably prompts the question: As societies of non-improved social standards have survived admirably throughout the ages, why does the new doctrine introduce the idea of non-survival at all? (Seemingly here there is a cat - or a tiger within the bag!) For the answer let us rejoin the *Beagle* as it sails on to South America.

In his book *The Voyage of the Beagle*, Darwin records his impressions of the natives of Tierra del Fuego, the land about Cape Horn. He states, "I could not have believed how greater was the difference between savage and civilised man; it is greater than between wild and domesticated animals....." and, "Viewing such men, one can hardly believe that they are fellow creatures and inhabitants of the same world."

Darwin continues, "One of our arms being bared, they expressed the liveliest surprise and admiration at its whiteness, just in the same way as I have seen the orang-outang do at the zoological gardens". Regarding their speech, "The language of these people, according to our standards, scarcely deserves to be called articulate....."

Thus, we can see Darwin's contemptuous opinion of this people, quite animal-like, displaying the mimicry of the monkey, their speech hardly human speech at all. He further states that they have no feeling of home and family and no religious ideas whatsoever.

But a young English missionary, Thomas Bridges, afterwards made

his home among this people, and his son, E. L. Bridges, in his *Uttermost Parts of the Earth* gives quite a different picture to that of Darwin, "We who learned as children to speak Yaghan know that, within its own limitations, it is infinitely richer and more expressive than English or Spanish."

The testimony to the Tierra del Fuegians is continued by two Catholic priests, Fr. W. Koppers of Vienna and Fr. Martin Guisande later of the University of Washington. They testify that, "They have surprisingly high principles of morality and ethics. They acknowledge one Supreme Being and one only, who is the originator of the moral order and the framework of society".

Here are the testimonies of men who actually lived among these people as their friends and companions, who took the trouble to learn their language. And how different they are from that of the atheistic - agnostic - humanitarian, Charles Darwin. Is it not obvious that Darwin had viewed his people with the cold eye of Natural Selection?

Afterwards the common fate of such peoples overtook the Tierra del Fuegians, dying off by the European man's diseases and sometimes by outright slaughter, a process which Darwin, somewhat airily, describes in his *Descent of Man*, p. 197:

**At the present day civilised nations are everywhere supplanting barbarous nations excepting where the climate opposes a deadly barrier; and they succeed mainly, though not exclusively, through their arts, which are the product of the intellect. It is therefore highly probable that with mankind the intellectual faculties have been mainly and gradually perfected through natural selection; and this conclusion is sufficient for our purposes.**

None the less, in truth and justice, one has to record that Darwin himself does not seem to have been a ruthless man; he is reported to have been horrified at the fate of this people, and to have sent a cheque for the alleviation of their plight. He seems also to have been a mild and amiable man in his family circle and in his friendships. Thus, the question arises - for the human heart and mind are strange things - did he have some curious insulation from reality, was he really aware of what he was writing?

But, in fact, Professor Sedgwick, Darwin's old tutor at Cambridge, did try to warn him, and declared that if Darwin's teachings were accepted humanity "would suffer a damage that would brutalise it, and sink the human race into a lower state of degradation than any into which it has fallen since its written records tell us of its history."

But Darwin forged ahead, and his most active apostle, Herbert Spencer, opposed all sanitary inspection, poor laws as violations of Natural Selection - "If they are not sufficiently complete to live, they die, and it is best they should die" (*Social Studies*). At the same time, Marx, *Correspondence with Engels*, acclaimed Darwin's theories as "the basis in natural science" for his class-war.

Here, then, is the terrible legacy which the secularist saint, Charles Darwin, has bequeathed to mankind. But nature had its revenge, as they say, upon Darwin himself, for in his *Life and Letters*, in 1881, he revealed:

**With me the horrid doubt always arises whether convictions of man's mind, which has developed from the lower animals, are of any value or are at all trustworthy. Would anyone trust in the convictions of a monkey's mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind.**

Is there a dreadful parallel with the fate of Nabuchedenezzar in the Old Testament, the king whom God reduced to the animal state?

And here is the true story of the voyage of the *Beagle*, and the voyage of Charles Darwin. But the B.B.C., which consistently informs the children that Evolution is accepted fact, which has consistently refused time for the presentation of the case against Evolution, is now further engaged in creating a cult of Darwin, depicting him as a secular saint with a new revelation and hope for humanity. There could hardly be greater perversion of the truth. This organization would seem to regard its main function as the propagation of Evolutionist atheism.

## THEORY AND THE WORD OF GOD by Veronica King

What is a 'theory'? It is our attempt to impose rationality on this incredibly complex universe. And let us never forget that rationality is an attribute of the more human intellect, much lower than the instant apprehension of the angels.

The dictionary defines theory as 'a supposition', 'a hypothesis', 'a suggested system', 'a speculative opinion'. Therefore it partakes of the same limitations as the men who make it!

Properly used theory can be a powerful servant to man in his

exploration of the universe. Misused it can only be the enemy of Truth - whether it is scientific or religious speculation. To understand its nature and its limitations is the basic wisdom which must be expressed whenever we handle theories.

Any science whatsoever must be subservient to the WORD OF GOD - even Theology, 'the Queen of Sciences', must be judged by its harmony with that Word.

It seems strange that no-one has ever asked why God did not say that he used evolutionary methods or 'processes' to create the universe, if he actually did so?

Who are WE to question, much less alter, what He, in fact, SAID?

"How can this be?" as at the Annunciation, may be asked also by us regarding Creation, -but if we wish to be humble before God's Word, we have to admit that "with Him all things are possible", - and as in the first case of the Incarnation, so also in the second; some light other than that of the sun must have been already in existence.

"Let there be light..." and "I am the light of the world" provide the answer, as only GOD can provide it - in what essentially remain mysteries to us.

Like the Creation of life itself, God has reserved the mystery to Himself.

# Those Ages of the Rocks

Nothing probably has so much influenced people towards the Evolutionist mentality—that feeling that Evolution must be here—as has the account of the aeons-old age of the rocks.

Due to the omnipresent Evolutionist propaganda—one even notes it in Western stories—there is a widespread feeling that the long ages of the rocks is something that is self-evident to us. But, in fact, people of all previous generations could regard the rocks, and accept them as part of a comparatively recent creation. The truth is that the rocks themselves bear no labels of age, none whatsoever. Indeed, if one of the famed visitors from outer space were to land on our planet tomorrow, our landscape of mountains, of forests and fields, for all that it speaks to the contrary, might have been brought into existence but yesterday.

Thus, when we look at things objectively, the rocks in themselves bear no message to us at all. The truth is that that "funny feeling" about the rocks is derived from the pronouncements of what is today termed "modern science".

"The scientists say....."

The "science" aspect was brought forward in the 19th century by Sir David Lyell, a solicitor and amateur geologist, an Evolutionist before Darwin, as part of the great attack upon the historicity and credibility of Genesis. Lyell laid down as law that the forces operating in nature today had so operated uniformly (Uniformitarianism), weathering, erosion and so on, throughout all time—a statement which, in the very nature of things, was quite unprovable. Lyell was Darwin's font, providing him with the long ages required for his theory. There came a marriage of the two converging theories; the older rocks were those which contained but the most primitive Evolutionist fossils; the younger rocks were those which contained the fossils of higher developed forms. Thus there was born the famous Geologic Column.

But when one looks at things objectively, scientifically, once more questions at once come to the mind.

Fossilization does not normally take place today, normally the animal bodies are exposed, decay and disintegrate. If we consult the Encyclopaedia Britannica we learn that fossilization occurs only when a body is encased in sediment to the exclusion of air; then only does the process of fossilization, petrification, take place. Then, are we really to believe that successive floods were continually sweeping over the land mass of the earth, always providentially (if one might use the word!) to encase in vast bodies of sediment the products of Evolution as each one arrived upon the scene. Whence came these formidable floods, of what extent, where did they dissipate to, was it all by chance? The more one looks at this general proposition the more amazing it seems. Was it for nothing that such a one as Lord Kelvin could chide the Evolutionists for not working out the scientific implications of their theories? But the amazing paradox is that the Evolutionists will not have us believe in the Genesis Flood at any cost, whilst they present us with hundreds of floods as the basis of their theories.

However, not a score of years had gone by before observations of the actual rock strata throughout the world presented insurmountable obstacles to these geologic theories; it was found that in many places that the older rocks were solidly based upon much younger rocks. In Switzerland the top rocks of the Matterhorn are "old" rocks, whilst the base rocks are "young" rocks, and the Mythen peak in the same country displays the same formations, in the latter case the top formations are supposed to have been thrust all the way from Africa (**The Case Against Evolution** by Wallace Johnson, ps. 24, 25). The same phenomena are to be observed throughout America. The Lewis Overthrust in Montana, a mountain

mass 500 miles long and thousands of feet in height, has pre-Cambrian rocks on top resting on Cretaceous rocks supposedly 500 million years younger. Byron C. Nelson in his **The Deluge Story**, in Stone gives scientific diagrams of these phenomena in ps. 144, 145. And these are but a few examples of these reversals which are known by professional geologists to be present throughout the world, although these facts are not broadcast to the general public.

What explanations do the historical geologists give for these phenomena? Mr. Nelson, in the aforementioned pages gives the explanation of Professor Geikle in his standard text-book: "We may even demonstrate that strata have turned upside down if we can show that fossils in what are the uppermost layers ought properly to lie beneath those in the beds below them."

The operative words are surely, "ought properly", that is, if the facts of nature do not correspond with the Evolution theory we have to postulate incredible upheavals capable of turning upside down mountain ranges of 500 miles in length. And this is the standard explanation offered by the Evolutionist geologists. No further explanations are attempted as to the scientific possibility of these startling events actually occurring.

Regarding the fossils themselves, there is again a massive non-mention of the most pertinent facts, these being that throughout the world there are examples of what are called "vertical fossils". In one fossil graveyard in California there are many fish embedded vertically transfixing the various strata; which has prompted the remark that their tails are millions of years younger than their heads! (*ibid*, Wallace Johnson). In 1857 there was recorded the discovery in Craighleith Quarry, Scotland, of a large fossilised tree, over eighty feet in length, standing vertically, and piercing through ten or twelve different strata of sandstone. Of course, these phenomena of vertical fossils are known throughout the various coalfields (*ibid* Byron C. Nelson). And these are but some of the outstanding examples of the phenomena which are known to exist in many parts of the world.

In the context of these phenomena of the rocks and the fossils one may judge the truth of the statement that the "Geologic Column" is a scientific fact; and, indeed, in the ordinary common-sense reasoning of the ordinary man these facts would at once rule the whole Evolution theory out of court. Readers familiar with these columns will recall the oft-repeated warnings, that the Evolution case seems inseparable from "hoaxology".

(The Genesis Flood does seem the most scientific explanation of the various rock and fossil phenomena. For further reading there is recommended the aforementioned work by Byron C. Nelson and **The Genesis Flood** by Professor Henry M. Morris).  
**The ultra scientific.**

It must have been that the Geologic Column had become considerably eroded, for the 20th. century began to produce claims that the patriarchate of the rocks could be proven by actual scientific tests.

Our authority here is Professor Henry M. Morris, the American hydrologist. Professor Morris has held several chairs in American universities, was a member of the Federal Commission on Boundary & Water, his last appointment being Professor of Hydraulic Engineering and Head of the Department of Civil Engineering, Virginia Polytechnic. Thus, he is a practical scientist and an expert in the field of water effects upon the earth's surface, and is the author of twenty-five books and monographs.

In his various works Professor Morris has listed no less than 76 of the scientific tests for the establishment of the earth's age,

summarising these in his pamphlet *The Young Earth* (I.C.R. 2716 Madison Ave., San Diego, California 92116). Here are some of the examples which he gives, showing the age of the earth indicated by each test:

Influx of aluminium to the ocean via rivers	- 100 years.
Influx of chlorine to the ocean via rivers	- 164 million years.
Influx of strontium to the ocean via rivers	- 19 million years.
Influx of thorium to the ocean via rivers	- 350 years.
Formation of river deltas	- 5,000 years.
Growth of active coral reefs	- 10,000 years.

There are no less than 76 of these tests listed, with the age indications so wildly at variance that the whole business must be discounted; obviously some vital factor must be left out, to account for such incredible variations. Professor Morris mentions, as do other writers, the affair of the Hawian Lavas. Samples were taken from the lavas of the late 18th. century Hawia eruptions, and the laboratory tests dated them as 160 million years old.

#### Radio-active dating.

This test is the special pride of the Evolutionists, it being supposed to show by precise scientific calculations that the earth is ~~490~~ - ~~500~~ billion years old. The scientific phraeology used in this connection is so formidable that many are cowed thereby. But, in fact, the basic matter can be reduced to simplicity.

It seems that the constituents Uranium/Thorium convert into lead at a given rate, i.e., in the observable short-term, so, by measuring the amount of lead present in the rock, they claimed to be able to say for how long the process had been continuing, the answer being over these hundreds of millions of years. But here there become apparent some objections in the field of the common reasoning:

1. We do not know the original components of the rock. God might well have created it as a mixture of these components already in a state of interaction. Why not, as well as to create it all uranium/thorium?

2. It is not a closed system, i.e., we do not know what influences from the cosmos, cosmic rays, might have altered the processes.

Take a homely analogy. A tank of water may be losing by evaporation a given amount of water each week, but we cannot calculate how long the process has been going on unless we first know, whether or not there has been any change in the temperature during the process, and firstly, what was the amount of pure water in the tank at the beginning.

Professor Morris makes precisely these objections, in scientific terms, in his *Scientific Creationism*, ps. 141-142:

"..... free neutrons in the mineral's environment may be captured by the lead in the system to change the isotopic value of the lead. That is, Lead 206 may be converted into Lead 207, and Lead 207 into Lead 208 by this process. It is perhaps significant that Lead 208 usually constitutes over half the lead present in any given lead deposit. Thus, the relative amounts of these "radogenic" isotopes of lead in the system may not be a function of their decay from thorium and uranium at all, but rather a function of the amount of free neutrons in the environment."

And precisely the same conclusion is reached by another scientist Dr. Melvin Cook, in his book *Prehistory and Earth Models*, ps. 53 - 60, this after he had analysed uranium bearing ores from Katanga and Canada.

In short, this vaunted test is not that of a closed system, not a controlled scientific experiment at all. We cannot even say what was the original mixture in the rocks, so that any attempt to estimate the duration of any process is obviated from the very beginning. This so-called scientific experiment is like a tube open at both ends!

In passing, it is significant that the Hawian lavas were "dated" by this method.

#### Summary.

We have seen that the Geologic Column is false, for the very good reason that the "older" rocks - mountain ranges of them - are often firmly based upon rocks reckoned to be hundreds of millions of years younger. The fossils themselves give a quite opposite account to that of the laying down of the Evolutionist strata. For the scientific experiments, they are simply not scientific experiments at all. Thus, anyone believing that science has established an Evolutionist chronology of the earth is labouring under a delusion.

But, indeed, is the whole business not that of a red-herring? Evolution requires that its mechanism, the mutation of living forms to still higher forms, be of the nature of things. And, as this mechanism is demonstrably not in nature, the tale of rock chronology - in which it might have happened! - is but part of the myth.

# Did St. Augustine Teach Evolution?

By H. W. J. Edwards

A word here for those who believe that St. Augustine's theology can be invoked in defence of theistic evolution. The question whether the saint was an evolutionist would be ridiculous if one if one meant atheistic or sheerly material evolution without a soul in respect of man, for he makes God and the soul the very centre of his entire cosmogony. Superficially, theistic evolutionists seem to find support from him because of his "seminal principles". The first we know of to claim him as the founder of theistic evolution was Zahm in 1894 in his work, *Bible, Science and Faith*. Zahm congratulates St. Augustine for having anticipated "modern science" (which, however, suffers again for being outmoded) in granting the idea that "the world is under the rule of law and that God in his government of the physical universe does not always act directly and immediately but indirectly through the mediation of secondary causes which we call the laws and forces of nature. On this point Augustine is so explicit that it is impossible to be mistaken".

This view is, however, gravely inaccurate. St. Augustine did not think transformation was possible, and, on the contrary, he affirmed the immutability of species. In St. Augustine's work, *Concerning Genesis and the Letter of the Book*, he wrote: "The elements of this corporeal world have therefore their well-defined energy and proper qualities on which depend what each one of them can do or not do and what reality should come or not come from each one of them. Thus it happens that a bean does not grow from a grain of wheat, nor wheat from a bean. A beast does not give birth to a man or a man to a beast".

St. Augustine's well-known "seedlike principles" do not, as theistic evolutionists continue to think, constitute potencies in the elements to evolve "from homogeneity to heterogeneity", to quote Zahm again, see his work, *Evolution and Dogma*, (1897). St. Augustine's words already quoted appear in much the same way in his work on the Trinity (book 111). St. Augustine insists that God completed his creation on the sixth day. The only exception is a miracle. Strictly speaking, St. Augustine's "seedlike principles" have nothing directly to do with the creation. They are of a metaphysical character. To understand them at all with a reasonable degree of understanding it should be possible for the fairly intelligent Catholic to read Gilson's masterly work on the Christian philosophy of St. Augustine, notably on pages 205-207 where Gilson shows that St. Augustine has Plato's philosophy in mind. Gilson writes, moreover, that these "seminal principles" of St. Augustine's thought, "instead of leading to a transformist hypothesis are constantly called upon by St. Augustine to account for the stability of species".

It is true that the great doctor had difficulty in reconciling his metaphysics with the story of the six days of creation. But upon this he showed a virtue seldom ascribed to him, humility. He explicitly admitted a difficulty. He wanted those who read up on this to use "the liberty of understanding better" (in the same work on Genesis). Jules Martin in his *Augustin* utterly refuted Zahm's theory about St. Augustine's seminal principles, writing that St. Augustine "made no allowance for different realities to come from the same principle or seed".

It is possible that many Catholic children at a higher level in their Catholic education may be given a blanket assertion about St. Augustine in respect of the theory (N.B. the theory) of evolution. Very probably many Catholic children have already been given this blanket assertion and have never been able to contradict it. Of course, there are difficulties in understanding the Six Days of Creation; but a thousand difficulties do not make a doubt, as Newman observed. That there exist difficulties about the theory or theories of evolution is, apparently, never mentioned. Without doubt the forces behind the widespread diffusion of a theory of evolution know of such difficulties, but they evidently lack St. Augustine's humility.