

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

February 1979

Annual Subscription £2.

CONTENTS

EDITOR'S LETTER

CURRENT EVENTS

THE PEKIN MEN

REPORT: SODOM AND GOMMORAH

IS EVOLUTION THE BUSINESS OF THE SCIENTISTS?

MAN'S BODY IMMEDIATELY CREATED. by Veronica King

THE QUESTION OF EVOLUTION by Dermot Doyle

POEM by Mary Carr

EDITOR'S LETTER

Dear Readers,

God bless all here! Alas! **Daylight** is always apologising for being that bit late, but this time we did have a really arctic winter. Moreover, the Editor was unwell for a period - and remember this is strictly a one-horse effort.

When on the subject, it might be as well to apologise in advance for another month's delay coming up, for the Editor has got an invitation for a month's stay in Western America. It is hoped to bring back views and news from readers and colleagues on the Pacific Coast - if only our stronghold, Queensland, were included!

As the subject of Teilhard de Chardin crops up again, we are including another copy of this supplement to refresh readers' memories.

There is also in preparation another supplement dealing in detail with the hoaxes and forgeries of Evolution.

Our great need, as always, is for helpers, for organizers, and for those who would be willing to receive copies of **Daylight** (free) and post them to key persons in their own areas.

Thanking all readers and colleagues once again,

Yours sincerely

The Editor.

CURRENT EVENTS

Forthcoming Conference.

A Creationist Conference will take place, D.V., at the Hayes Centre, Swanwick, Derbyshire, from April 10 to April 12th. A full programme of information is being laid on. The cost is £15 per person full board. Booking forms from Mr. D. J. Rivers, 5 Gallowfields Rd., Richmond, N. Yorkshire. Telephone - Richmond 3138.

The U.K.

In various places Catholics who object to Holy Communion standing-up are being virtually driven from their parishes.

Ireland.

The Bill legalizing contraception forges ahead, for, amazingly, in this moral question, the Whip is being applied to the Government Deputies. Incredibly, the Bill, whilst banning contraceptives for the unmarried, permits them for the married, thus making the Dail the moral and religious authority for the State. Yet, in this over 90p.c. Catholic country the bishops still remain silent, i.e., upon the excuse that they must not interfere in "political" questions. It is no wonder that Irish readers are perplexed.

At the same time, there are those who insist that the Bill is plainly contrary to the (written) Irish Constitution, which is being ignored. It shows the power of the hidden forces in international society.

A monsignor reviews.

We are again treated to another eulogy of Teilhard de Chardin,

in the **Universe**, by a Monsignor J. J. Curtin. One would have thought that the Monitum of the Holy See of June 30, 1962, warning against the works of Teilhard, would have been the first thing mentioned. But Monsignor Curtin does not mention it at all.

Monsignor Curtin goes on to say that for Teilhard nothing is "secular", and (giving Teilhard's message) "our attitude to material things should be an enthusiastic search for and acceptance of their Creator in them".

Here Monsignor Curtin's attention is drawn to Teilhard's definitive work, **The Phenomenon of Man**. In this work Teilhard, in all his account of the creation of things, does not mention God the Creator even once, and the term is not even in his index - just the usual business about "God - Omega". The question is, does Teilhard mean by "God" God the Creator, or is "God" to him something identifiable with the universe and produced by it? For, be it noted, Teilhard in this work declares that **the world was brought about by "some unbelievable accident"**, and this he repeats later on. Then, where is God the Creator?

One would have thought that Teilhard's involvement in the fiascos of Piltdown Man, Pekin Man and Java Man would now have made him suspect as an authority, on anything, in Catholic circles. Monsignor Curtin should do his homework on Teilhard de Chardin, before he next ventures into print on the subject.

From France.

Our French Correspondent, M. Hughes de Bohenuist, writes giving some details of a recent voyage to Israel. He made a point of going to Jericho, that incredibly ancient city, to view the remains of the Flood strata there on display. He remarks on the post-Flood and pre-Flood strata separated by deep strata of clay, beneath the remains of a totally distinct culture, that of the pre-Noahic people - "just as described in the **Daylight** supplement, **The Flood of Noah Scientifically Investigated**".

We are grateful to M. de Bohenuist for this on-the-spot confirmation of the authenticity of the **Daylight** report. And readers' attention is once more drawn to the importance of the Flood, for its actuality knocks into a cocked hat - as the saying goes - all the present-day philosophies of history.

Australia.

Correspondence received from beneath the Southern Cross indicates more resistance to Evolutionism among Catholics there than perhaps anywhere else. And, curiously enough, our stronghold there is the beautiful tropical state of Queensland.

And from the indefatigable Wallace Johnson of Brisbane we have received another two of his powerful cassettes, **Creation or Evolution** and **Behind the Global Crisis**. These also are obtainable from C & V Productions, 48 Cambridge Road, Gillingham, Kent, England.

U.S.A.

Another cheerful letter from Fr. Valentine Long, O.F.M. congratulates **Daylight** on the "Darwin Sails Again" feature. Fr. Long was the author of the recent Vatican Radio broadcast exposing Evolution (**Daylight** July 1978) and we hope soon to be printing another major feature from the pen of this distinguished Franciscan author. It is always a pleasure, and an encouragement, to hear from Fr. Long.

(N.B., reports from readers are always welcome. Ed.)

The Pekin Men

If it were not an Evolutionist affair one would hardly believe it, but it was two "discoverers" of Piltown Man who turned up to "discover" Pekin Man, Dr. Davidson Black and Teilhard de Chardin. Dr. Black by this time had an appointment at Pekin University, whilst Teilhard had some floating commission in China.

The following details are taken from the lengthy account by Fr. P. O'Connell in his **Science of Today and the Problems of Genesis**. This author was stationed in China throughout the affair, and was able to read the reports as they were issued both in the English and Chinese language newspapers. It was the contradictory nature of these reports that led him into his full investigation.

Excavations had been proceeding at Chouk-tien not far from Pekin, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation, under the overall command of Dr. Black. There were great expectations.

In 1922 a Dr. Zdanksy discovered two molar teeth, and in 1927 a Dr. Bohlin discovered another. Then Dr. Black in an article in **Paleontologica Sinica** declared that these finds showed that a "hominoid" had once had his abode in the area. He took the step of naming the creature **Sianthropus**, and the world press was alerted to the fact that another find as authentic as Piltown was in the offing!

In 1928 came the discovery of pieces of a skull and a skull cap, and **Sinanthropus** was born. It was presented to the world as a being of ape-like characteristics, but more man than ape, able to use tools and knowing the use of fire. Dr. Black promised that a cast of the skull, along with full details, would be shown later. But the details were not produced until 1931, and, not with the cast of the skull, but with an artist's model.

Meanwhile, Dr. Pei, in charge of the site, had been shipping the remains of 30 large monkeys to Peking, along with the remains of 10 normal human beings. No public mention was made of this, nor of the fact that the site was that of a lime-burning industry of ancient China, with the ashes some 600 feet in length, and with the quartz stones for the construction of the ancient lime-kilns. The moral is clear: the human-like bones attributed to the "hominoid" were simply human bones; whilst "the traces of fire" were those of a very considerable human industry!

And, meanwhile, Teilhard had become the **impresario** of the presentation. Right away he had sent off to the French press a statement informing the world of yet another "missing-link". He went to France and brought back Abbe' Briel, a paleontologist. But Abbe' Briel's assessment, whilst avoiding open contradiction with Black and Teilhard, expressed doubts on the nature of the finds.

The next visitor invited to the site was Marcellin Boule (the Father of Paleontology). His assessment was a shock. He rejected the theory of the monkey-man stoneworker and industrialist as "a fantastic hypothesis."

In 1934 Dr. Black died, to be succeeded by a Dr. Weidenrich. The new chief did not make his pronouncement until 1939. He then contradicted Dr. Black's figures for the skull capacity and rejected outright the cast of a mandible, declaring it to have been made from two different specimens. But, neither did he, in his turn, produce the long-promised cast of the skull. Finally, the only thing that was produced was a head sculpted by an artist, Miss Swan. In one way the story outrivals that of Piltown Man.

Naturally, this extraordinary story cannot be accepted solely upon the word of Fr. O'Connell; we must have some corroboration. Well, there is surely the most powerful corroboration in the fact that in the museum at Pekin there are on display the various skeletons from the site, but minus the original fossils of the alleged skull. Incredibly, the official explanation of all this is that the original fossils were looted by the Japanese soldiery - though they left everything else! And this official explanation is recorded in the 1952 edition of **Les Hommes Fossiles** by Boule and Valois.

But still today, life-like figures of Pekin Man are reproduced in the children's text-books, along with those of the other "hominoid" frauds.

The "science" of Evolution has been accompanied throughout by a series of frauds and forgeries, Piltown Man, Pekin Man, Nebraska Man, the forgeries of the embryo by Professor Haeckel, and all the rest. Then what kind of "science" is it? From whence does it come?

Man's Body Immediately Created

by Veronica King

Saint Thomas, Summa Theologica Q91. Art. 2. replies:-

"The first formation of the human body could not be made by the instrumentality of any created power, but was **IMMEDIATELY** by God.

"Some have supposed that the forms which are in corporal matter are derived from some immaterial forms, but the Philosopher refutes this for the reason that forms cannot be made in themselves but only in the composite as we have explained (Q. LXV. A. 4.) and because the agent must be like its effect, it is not fitting that a pure form, not existing in matter, should produce a form that is in matter, and which form is only made by the fact that the composite is made. So a form which is in matter can only be the cause of another form that is in matter, according as composite is made by composite.

"Now God who is absolutely immaterial, can alone by his own power produce matter by creation; wherefore He alone can produce a form in matter without the aid of any preceding material form. For this reason the Angels cannot transform a body except by making use of something in the nature of a seed, as St. Augustine says.

"THEREFORE AS NO PRE-EXISTING BODY HAD BEEN FORMED WHEREBY ANOTHER BODY OF THE SAME SPECIES COULD BE GENERATED THE FIRST HUMAN BODY WAS OF NECESSITY MADE IMMEDIATELY BY GOD."

Reply to Objection 1.

"Although Angels are the ministers of God, as regards what He does in bodies, yet God does something in bodies which is beyond the Angels' power, as for instance raising the dead, or giving sight to the blind; and so by this power He formed the body of the first man FROM THE SLIME OF THE EARTH.

Nevertheless the Angels could act as ministers in the formation of the body of the first man in the same way that they will do at the Resurrection, by collecting the dust!...

And here, let it be noted, is the statement of the Church's official theologian.

Report

Sodom and Gomorrah

"We now know that the Bible was born out of a highly sophisticated culture, and we can no longer think of it as just growing out of an oral tradition passed along by shepherds."

That is one of the significant results of the discovery of more than 40,000 clay tablets from the forgotten kingdom of Ebla, a bronze age city south of Aleppo, Syria.

Explaining the significance of the finds, Father Carlo Martini, S.J., Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, said that the discovery of the tablets in a language closely related to Hebrew has uncovered a treasury of biblical, historical and philosophical meanings that may take decades for scholars to unravel.

The discovery of the "third great civilisation" of ancient times — the others being Egyptian and Sumerian — "has changed our ideas of the pre-biblical world", Father Martini said.

Because of the discoveries, the existence of Sodom and Gomorrah in the Book of Genesis can no longer be regarded as a "fanciful tradition". They are among five cities listed on an Ebla tablet as having commercial dealings with the kingdom city, he said.

The Ebla discoveries go back in history much further than any other major archaeological find in this century. The Dead Sea Scrolls, excavated at Qumran, date only from 2 B.C.

The Biblical Institute has begun a programme in collaboration with the Hebrew University in Jerusalem for the continuing interpretation of the clay tablets, which are preserved in museums at Aleppo and at the excavation site.

Is Evolution the Business of the Scientists?

No apology is required for returning to this question, for, though it is not generally apprehended to be such, it is, in fact, the pivot of the whole Evolution debate. That is to say, we should first ask ourselves the question, is Evolution really any business of the scientists?

The great debate on Evolution has been continuing for over a century now, and, certainly, it cannot be said that the matter has in any way been brought to a head - in fact, no final conclusion and verdict seems to be in any way conceivable. It is the submission of the writer that this is because the debate has been conducted on the wrong lines, on a basis on which no final decision is possible, that is, it has been conducted on the lines of what is today termed "scientific". One is aware that today any aspersions on the omni-competence of the scientists are enough to make the ordinary citizen jump out of his skin, as the saying goes. But, in fact, if we do really live in a scientific age - in the exact sense of the term - we should have no hesitation in defining the role of the positive sciences.

The argument here is that the hoax of Evolution - the resuscitation of an ancient myth - has been floated upon the further hoax that the matter can be decided only by the scientific experts, and that the anti-Evolutionists have fallen into the trap of accepting these pseudo-scientific premises.

Here let us take a glance at what has actually taken place.

There were the debates about the movements of the little amoeba, debates about the bird with the alleged reptilian traces, about the posterior lobe of the serpent's ear, about the jaw structure of the whale, then again the debates about the erect, or non-erect, posture of the ape and about the knobs on its skull. Then again, there were the X-Ray bombardments of generations of fruit-flies, to see if any beneficent mutation could be obtained. Yes, indeed, it is only when one stands back a little and views the picture from a little distance that one observes how ridiculous the whole thing is! For, is it not obvious that by these methods we would have to review every specimen in creation? And this is what is meant by saying that the debate has been conducted on lines which make any decision impossible, that this pseudo-scientific method is simply a hoax.

Indeed, when one stands back and reviews the debate from the distance, is there not something quite comic about the whole thing. All sorts of people engage in the Evolution debate, but few, very few, of the participants are scientific experts. So, what it really all boils down to is a series of quotations from Professor Jones against Professor Smith on subjects in which the participants themselves are completely at sea. It is absurd.

At the same time, even with those who are scientific experts there is a decided element of bluff in the presentation of the Evolutionist case. There appears on the television one who is a Professor in a scientific subject as the exponent of the scientific case for Evolution; and he conducts us through the alleged "big-bang" beginnings of the universe, through the adventures of the amoeba, and finally disserts on the anatomical features of the various skulls. But again, when we look at it, the Professor is only a scientist in his own subject. Be it astronomy, he is but a mere layman in biology and anatomy and all the rest: the so-called expert scientific case is but a layman's view on the universe. And here is the arrogance of scientism, the doctrine that anyone with a qualification in any of the sciences possesses some sort of illumination which enables him to pronounce on universal questions.

The question now resolves itself into this - If the scientific methods at present in vogue are not of the nature to bring the Evolution debate to a head, then, what method is there that can be effective?

And the answer is, that the truth is sometimes so simple as not to be believed, that we have evidently forgotten the methods of the general human observation and reason when dealing with universal questions. By these time-honoured methods - since Adam was a boy as they say - we have always been able to affirm the

existence of God by the presence of design and cause-effect in our universe, and this without waiting for the scientists to confirm these phenomena in all the minutiae. 'Pon my soul! can we not state that water runs downhill until the last hydrologist gives the word? Then, the question is, is Evolution a matter of the general or universal?

Certainly, Evolution is such a general and universal statement. It states that the universe is self-creative by reason of the Evolution processes being innate in all being, these processes effecting beneficent mutations by which the organs evolve into new and higher organs; and thus the great ascent of the animals into higher animals, and finally that of the monkey into man. Undoubtedly, there is here being postulated a universal law.

And here becomes apparent the crucial thing: if the Evolution processes are of the nature of all being (as they must be if the world be self-creative) then, they must also be present in the world of today, in the here and now. Thus the endless speculations about the amoeba and other creatures of hundreds of millions of years ago are very much a smoke-screen. Our problem, therefore, becomes a much simpler one: to note in nature today the manifestations of this universal law of the transformation of kinds. In truth, in matters of the universal every man is his own scientist!

Indeed, it is obvious that, if we did live in a world wherein the Evolution forces were constantly at work - through all creation - we should see everywhere animals bearing nascent organs, a world of living missing-links. But everywhere we look it is the same: it is a world of fixed kinds - and, please, let no discoverer inform us that there are different breeds of horses and dogs.

Yes, viewing our world as it actually is, we do not need medical science to inform us that there is no law of beneficent mutations. (What would a beneficent mutation be like, a lump on the breast the bud of a new breast for posterity, a lump on the foot the bud of a new foot?) We can see for ourselves, instead of mutations creating better and higher organs, that the rule of mutations is that they are pathologic states acting towards the degeneration and destruction of the organs. And this we are only too well aware of, the mutations of cancer, the gross malformations of the joints, the animals born so mutated that they have to be destroyed; and not least, the terrible mutations of the thalidomide children. Before our eyes is a universal law contrary to that wished for by Evolution. The Evolutionists ask us to see that which we do not see.

In fact, here we have refutation of that bland statement that mutations require millions of years - always the retreat into the unseen. The cancer and other mutations can come to bloom within a twelvemonth, and the thalidomide mutations must have been produced within months. Again, another mystical statement concerning mutations!

Thus, looking at our world as it actually is, we can say that Evolution is a *non est*, simply because the laws of nature run contrary to Evolution. In a nutshell, Evolution is 'nt there.

Of course, we should avail ourselves of the particular applications of the sciences for the exposures of the Evolution hoaxes; and all honour to those who conduct the exposures. And we must be careful not to be denigratory to the genuine scientists at work in their authentic fields, for many of them have done noble work.

No, the condemnation is solely for the scientific charlatans who pretend that their expertise in their particular fields gives them a special illumination, the great modern heresy of Scientism which claims that the new scientific priesthood - it is nothing less - must be the arbiters of universal questions. It is amazing to observe how this new religious authority is assented to today, even by thinking men. If it be a discussion as to whether Michelangelo or Raphael be the greater painter, one can almost hear them ready to call in the scientists!

We must really shake ourselves free of this miasma, and declare that there is no superior body of knowledge known as "science", that there are simply the particular sciences. When, in the Evolution debate, there is this referral to the scientists we should

challenge this authority at the outset, and declare for the authority of the general human observation and reason. We should point out that Evolution, in fact, is an ancient Greek myth, giving Plutarch's, *Symosiacs* Book VII, quotation from Anaximander:

Men were first produced in fishes, and when they were grown and able to fend for themselves, were thrown, and so lived upon land.

And here is the Evolution statement, word for word. Thus, Evolution antedates our modern scientific age by thousands of years, and is clearly not derived from any discoveries of the modern sciences.

In truth it is now timely that we should re-assert our human rights, the rights of our human reason to our own universe. We must inform the scientific priesthood that they are but mere philosophers, like all the rest of the human race.

J. G. C

THE QUESTION OF EVOLUTION

by Dermot Doyle

While it is permissible for a Catholic to hold the theory of Evolution, he may only do so in so far as it does not conflict with the doctrine of the creation of all things by God and the special creation of Man. But herein lies the problem. For it is certainly true that the hypothesis of Evolution, as commonly taught, dispenses with the idea of Creation. Indeed, the missionary fervour with which its disciples cling to this idea is in inverse proportion to the scientific evidence supporting it. It can only be explained as a desperate attempt by unbelievers to clutch at any straw, however trivial and absurd, which can persuade them that God does not exist. This was certainly how men like Huxley and many others came to seize so eagerly on Darwin's ideas and even Darwin himself eventually lost whatever faith he may have had in Creation.

Once you admit the separate existence of various species from the beginning you have admitted the existence of the Creator and this is what the agnostics and atheists are determined never to do, whatever the evidence against them. So they postulate a certain form of undifferentiated lifeless matter from which everything has sprung from microbes to elephants, from ants to whales. They do not agree on what this remarkable "matter" is which possesses such vast intelligence and organising ability. Indeed they do not admit any kind of intelligence behind it. That would be too risky. So they have to say that the whole extraordinary world of Nature is just a huge accident. To such depths of stupidity are men led who are determined not to believe in God.

To support his explanation of how the vast variety of species came to exist, Darwin invented theories about the "survival of the fittest", about "mutations" and "random variations", "natural selection" and so on. But, however ingenious his explanations were they were not based on scientific demonstration, and demonstration is the essence of proof. They were, as Professor Thompson FRS expressed it in his centenary introduction to "The Origin of Species" in 1959, "fragile flowers of hypotheses based on hypotheses where fact and fiction intermingle in an inextricable confusion".

Today science is no nearer proving Darwinism than it was in 1859. On the contrary, it is further away. In my boyhood, Pittdown and Neanderthal and Java men were confidently displayed in Arthur Mee's "Children's Encyclopedia", in full detail, as Man's ancestors, on the strength of a few bits of bone. The first and third were frauds, and Neanderthal is now admitted to have been a true man. The supposed apelike reconstructions were simply fairy tales. Despite fraud and wishful thinking, no skeleton, or even the tiniest part of a skeleton, of any sort of "ape man" has ever been found.

But what is even more significant is that no intermediate fossil of any animal species has ever been found, nor can any living example be found. Of about one million kinds of animals and three hundred thousand kinds of plants, there is no evidence of a tendency to turn into something else. Every nurseryman bases his living on the fact that every one of the thousands of plants or seeds in his catalogue will only reproduce "according to its kind".

LIKE FATHER, LIKE CHILD

"Like from like" each fresh construction,
Cell from cell, or man from man,
Has a scheme of reproduction
According to the Maker's plan.
Mindless, evolving matter? Clever,
Lawless nature running wild?
As mankind now, so was it ever;
As the parent, so the child.
One nature fixed for all men living,
Organized by the species' form.
Descent from Adam with nature given.
No one may alter the human norm.

Mary Carr

You can cross roses with roses but not with delphiniums. You can cross cat with cat but not cat with dog. There is an obstinate determination in every species to stay the same.

From our modern knowledge of genetics, we know that each species is from the moment of conception programmed to be true to type down to the smallest detail. In the human embryo everything is there in miniature, down to toe-nails and eyebrows, from the start. It is the same with plant life. An acorn cannot produce any kind of tree but an oak.

But if we ask which came first, the oak or the acorn, the answer must be the oak, since only the mature animal or plant has the power to reproduce. Likewise the chicken comes before the egg. Here is another nail in the coffin of the evolutionists. Before any kind of life can reproduce itself there must first come the fully mature adults! This means that the various kinds of animal and plant life did not slowly emerge from some primaeval slime but appeared suddenly fully formed. This means special creation.

All the scientific knowledge that we now possess accords with the idea of the special creation of each species. It is in conflict with the idea of haphazard development of countless variety from one or a few forms of life and it is in conflict with the idea that life can accidentally develop from non-life.

I have no time in a brief article to record the enormous amount of scientific evidence against Evolution. But this is no academic exercise. The real issue is between materialistic evolution and special creation. This and not theistic evolution is the issue in the minds of the ordinary public who are unable to grasp philosophical

concepts such as Contingent and Necessary Being. The theory of evolution, as popularly presented, with its spurious air of being an established scientific fact, has played havoc with religious faith. Its destruction as a scientific fairy tale is necessary in order to undo the immense harm it has already done.

All the laws of matter are mutually interdependent. No law could exist without all the others to keep it company. A cow cannot exist without grass but grass cannot exist without soil, air, light, warmth, the sun, bacteria and heaven knows what else. So all these things had to come into being together, not at intervals of millions of years.

It is a pity that the case against Evolution from the Christian point of view is being put mainly by Fundamentalists. True to their belief in the Bible as literally true in all respects they have assembled a formidable body of scientific evidence against Evolution. We should look at this evidence on its merits and not be put off by the highly selective literalism which studiously ignores the literal interpretation of (let us say) "this is my body" or "whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven" or "Thou art Peter" and so on. Truth is important, no matter who utters it.