

# 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

JUNE 1979

## CONTENTS

EDITOR'S LETTER

CURRENT EVENTS

BIGBANGISM

CAN THEISTIC EVOLUTION BE TAUGHT?

THE ATTENBOROUGH LINE by Veronica King

THE GENESIS CLASS

## EDITOR'S LETTER

Dear Readers,

God bless all here!

If those great journals the *Times*, the *Daily Telegraph* and *Daylight* should disappear for a bit, it is only to be expected in these troubled times. But, actually, the gap with *Daylight* was caused, as notified, by the editor's visit to America. And here we are again!

It is not intended to give impressions of the American Pacific culture, for such can be gleaned ad infinitum from the columns of the daily press, though a few digested impressions may be given later.

The present issue is devoted, almost entirely, to the corrosive effects on the minds of the young of the present teaching of the Evolutionist philosophy in the schools and over the media, brought recently to the forefront. There is no apology for this, for it is the great and terrible matter confronting us today.

Regarding the furtherance of our anti-Evolution cause, it has been mooted that there should be a meeting of *Daylight* readers to consider ways and means, such a meeting to take place in London, or other convenient centre. Any suggestions from readers would be sincerely welcomed.

Cordially yours,

The Editor.

## CURRENT EVENTS

### Our active readers.

It was good to return from abroad and see letters from two of our readers, Mr. Frank Cahill and Mr. Dermot Doyle, exposing Evolution in the *Universe*. They are to be congratulated. At the same time, one of our lady readers appears quite frequently in the local paper in an English county. Certainly, the indications would seem to be that the wall of silence is being breached in various places; more people are getting to know that they have been deceived on the Evolution question.

### The Irish postal strike.

This strike, covering both the post and the telephone system, is now entering its fifth month, with great hardship to all concerned. If this issue should be seen by any of our Irish readers, they can be assured that two issues are waiting, enveloped and stamped, waiting for the posts to open.

### Creationist Conference

The Conference at Hayes Conference Centre in April was again a great success with a varied representation from most parts of the U.K., including, at least one of our readers, who was able to make significant contacts for us.

In a discussion on the general suppression of the truth about Evolution, it was pointed out that the *Journal of the Association for Science Education* had pointed out that the pro-Darwinist inculcation in the schools was "indoctrination", i.e. in the modern and bad sense of the word.

### The grtat dearth.

The western world has at last wakened up to the actuality of the energy crisis, that the deposits of oil are not renewable, and are being rapidly exhausted. There is serious crisis talk everywhere, but this still accompanied by fervently expressed hopes, that if new energy sources could be made available the western world could proceed upon its path of still greater material comfort. But it is all a matter of the blind leading the blind. That is, not a single public figure has pointed out that there is rapidly approaching a dearth of the prime energy, human energy, human beings.

In the early part of the year the German plan to give £1000 for the birth of each child - so alarming the population drop - caused a momentary sensation, but it was soon forgotten. Then, the other week came the report that in another decade half the births in an English city would be those of the coloured immigrants, and this was headlined. But no one dared to utter the word of truth, that the majority of the adult population in such areas is still of European stock and if they were bent on race suicide, to fade out from history, then they could not object to nature abhorring the vacuum and making a racial replacement. This is an example of the blind leading the blind.

The phenomenon can everywhere be seen. Already there is unemployment among the teachers, and another 3,500 schools (probably a minimum figure), are scheduled for closing. And the rot is also affecting the Catholic schools, as Archbishop Murphy of Cardiff points out.

Yet the State continues to hand out its free contraceptives and it continues its killings of the unborn children at the rate of 4,500 a week. And this is the hypocritical Year of the Child.

A writer in the *Universe*, Miss Rosemary Murphy, sums it up, based on the American figures. The average number of children per American family is beneath 1.9, whilst the mere replacement figure, zero growth, is 2.11, and she points out that this will inevitably bring a demand for the killing off of the old, the euphemism being "Euthanasia". She asks the question, "Will our children kill us?"

In passing, the writer, in Canada during the election period, noted that one bishop pointed out that there would soon be too many old for the young to support. But his pronouncement was drowned in the clamour of the politicians about the energy situation.

And it is not only the horror of the fragments of the aborted children's bodies being packed in plastic bags and carried to the incinerators, for Mrs. Phylis Bowman of the S.P.U.C. insists that the doctors are killing off the deformed born children by means of drugs and underfeeding. - such is the hatred of human life characteristic of our society. Does anyone think that such doctors would scruple at performing "Euthanasia"?

And here is the real dearth in the western society, the dearth of the young. Here the daily recurring current event, the Herodian killings of the unborn.

For Catholics there is the great problem of the unbaptised child. Fr. Brinkworth, S.J. (Convent of Mercy, Fishguard, Wales) is pleased to send leaflets showing how one can associate oneself with Baptism of Desire for the aborted children.

It is noteworthy that Pope John Paul, twice during his Polish pilgrimage, dealt with the killing of the unborn as the destruction of all human rights.

# BIGBANGISM

The human mind continually dabbles with the matter of the chicken and the egg, continually asking the great question - What comes first? What comes first, the human mind is impelled to ask this question, to probe towards the origin of things; and for this reason the philosophers of Evolution present us with the cosmology of Bigbangism.

Let us examine Bigbangism a little.

The Big Bang explanation proposes as the origin of things a gigantic explosion in space, which brought into being our earth, the sun and planets, the galaxies, the whole cosmos.

But here - right away - there comes the inevitable question - What was there before the Big Bang to cause the Big Bang, and what brought about this pre-Bang state of affairs? This obvious and natural question was put to a Big Bang exponent on the Canadian Television, and there came the reply, "the question is meaningless". This, of course, was pure bluff on the part of this pseudo-scientific savant. It brings again to mind the dishonesty that runs through the whole Evolutionist saga.

The pre-Bang state of affairs, it must have comprised some form of matter to give substance for the explosion, and, moreover, some forces of energy, dynamics, also to cause the explosion. Thus, Bigbangism fails in the first application of the test of common philosophy. It is merely a repetitive account - ad nauseum - of things already in being, and not at all what it pretends to be, an account of origins.

In passing, it might be said that the Big Bang savants are really postulating a world without origins, one eternally existing. But how could such a world suddenly start to change, that is towards a finality already proper to its being? It is not the place here to enter into a discussion of the nature of being, but only to point out that, once again, the first question has not even been presented.

In this account of things there is a quite startling contradiction. In the pre-Bang state of affairs everything was Chance, and then by Chance came the great cosmic explosion. But then, after that, the law of Evolution took over, and there began the great process of Uniformitarianism, the constancy of the Evolution laws throughout all time, those unvarying laws which enable us to trace (sic!) each minute transformation from the amoeba to man. Please note

that the great general law is always that of an evolution upwards towards higher forms, with never a slip backwards, a devolution, towards lower forms! This sort of thing is actually presented to the students. And one of the Evolution philosophers, Sir Julian Huxley, could blandly state that at a given stage Chance evolved Design in the universe. Simply, that which is presented is a world of myth and magic.

After the Big Bang the processes of Evolution take over and proceed on their way. But it is implicit in the whole thing that these processes operated by means of the laws of nature familiar to us all, the laws of Gravity, of Liquids and Solids, of Energy and Light and so on. And here we must look again at the Evolutionist philosophy of origin: everything is supposed to have evolved from some common root or bud (as man has supposedly evolved from the single cell). But then, by what process did Energy evolve from some static state, and by what process did Light conceivably evolve - light, the very nature of which is swiftness, "like lightning from east to west" - slowly evolve, from some state of darkness?

Indeed, when one looks at it scientifically, objectively, taking things as they actually are, the answer is in the eternal words - "God said let there be light, and there was light" Genesis 1.3

Thus we see that sudden and simultaneous creation of the laws of nature is the order of things, necessary before any system of the universe, Evolutionist or otherwise, could begin to operate. The very nature of creation is the sudden, ruling out any Evolutionist thesis whatsoever.

And this is nothing else than the great explanation of orthodoxy, creation *ex nihilo*. Creation *ex nihilo* (from nothing) must, by its very nature, be sudden. Whether the universe be the great mass or just the size of an orange is no matter. It means that once there was Pure Being (God) alone, and then there came into existence, created, other being. This transition from nothing outside God to something is obviously instant by its very nature, so instant, in fact, that with this creation of something outside God time began.

Yes, it is a great paradox, that the postulation of the Evolutionist Big Bang takes us right back to the matter of true origin, for here Evolution has simply nothing to say and falls flat.

The origin of things, in the truest scientific sense it is all summed up in the old and simple phrase - "God made all things out of nothing by His word."

J.G.C.

---

## Can Theistic Evolution Be Taught

Reports indicate that a certain attitude is still in vogue, that which is summarised in the statement - "Does it really matter if the Evolutionist approach is permitted, or even inculcated, as long as God is presented as being behind the process?" In short it is the tenacious business of Theistic Evolution, an attitude developed under the illusion that the rejection of Evolution means going against the findings of modern science.

This modern science aspect is the first pitfall in the teaching of Theistic Evolution. For, unfortunately, practically all the little Catholic pamphlets from this viewpoint inform the pupils that Evolution is accepted by "all the scientists". It is at once obvious that the clerical authors of these works are very much amateurs in the subject, but the recipients of the general message of the media: for any course of intensive reading in the subject would show that many scientists of world-wide fame, such as Lord Kelvin, Vialleton, etc., etc., have taken the trouble to publish works declaring that Evolution is contrary to the findings of their respective sciences. (A list of such scientists is given in the Daylight pink leaflet). This continuous theme - that all the scientists accept Evolution - is perhaps the most serious suppression of fact of all these suppressions of the modern media. And is it not a very serious business to begin the religious education of the child upon the basis of a current falsehood?

Moreover, there is the general fallacy contained in this approach, that is, that Eternal Truth (or at least its immemorial presentation) is something that is subject to the scientific opinions of any one age. Let there be remembered here the old adage - The science of today is the laughing stock of tomorrow. Yes, one could give quite a few examples of scientific opinions once held but now

rejected. It is a dangerous fallacy to present a theology which has as its basis the scientific declarations of the secular scientists.

However, the main difficulty in the presentation of an Evolution based religious education lies in the difficulty of interpreting it in the light of the fundamentals of the Catholic Faith.

Certainly the most fundamental of these fundamentals are: the direct creation of the human soul by God; i.e., not evolved from any animal; that Adam and Eve were the First Parents of all men; that there came The Fall of our First Parents, by which the taint of Original Sin was passed on to all their posterity. Without these fundamentals any talk of Redemption by Jesus Christ becomes quite meaningless. Therefore, can these fundamentals of the Faith be reconciled with the Evolution postulate?

### The human soul.

Evolution holds that the whole human person evolved from the animal, and Darwin himself insisted that man was solely of the animal kind. It is at once obvious that no Catholic can hold this view, that of classical Evolution. But has Theistic Evolution any way out of this Evolutionist dilemma for the Catholic?

The answer of Theistic Evolution is that the body of man evolved from the animal, but that the soul was directly created by God (though some Theistic Evolutionists qualify this by implying that the mind of man was evolved!) But this solution at once confronts us with formidable obstacles. Is it not the soul that gives form to the body? Thus, how can one picture the monkey body evolving into a human body whilst the monkey soul remains, evolving into a human body with the brain cells and the nerve motors and extensions meant to be animated by the human soul - indeed,

physiologically is not this an impossibility? Already, the attempted reconciliation of the direct creation of the human soul with the Evolution postulate lands us in deep water.

But assuming his very unusual evolved body were possible, in what way was the creation of the human soul accomplished? We might say that it was accomplished in an adult animal body. But, then, that animal body already possesses its own animal soul, which means that God would have to terminate that animal life and replace it with that of a human soul - that is to say, the creation of man from an animal corpse! This is not a solution that many would regard as fitting, and, indeed, in view of all this, what possible objections can there be to the direct creation of man from "the dust of the earth?"

There remains the solution of the direct creation of the human soul in the animal body at the moment of conception. But this would mean that the new human being would have to gain its human development in the midst of a family of animal brothers and sisters. Then as manhood was gained, this Adam would encounter his Eve, created by the same method, the pair taking up house together and becoming the first parents of the human race.

These are the questions that inevitably arise in the attempt to reconcile the direct creation of the human soul with the Evolutionist teaching. And if anyone thinks that the students do not realise the contradictions in this approach, then he is grievously mistaken.

### Adam and Eve

The Catholic is bound to believe that all men are descended from the common First Parents whose Original Sin was transmitted to the race and thus our Redemption by Jesus Christ. Obviously without the common First Parents Christianity is meaningless.

But Evolution teaches Polygenism, the multiple origins of the human race. Polygenism is indeed essential to the Evolutionist postulate, for if there be a universal law transforming the animals into higher animals and, finally, the monkeys into men it is quite inconceivable that the monkey-man transformation should take place at only one spot, with only one pair of monkeys, and stop there. Thus, we are faced with an unbridgable chasm between the doctrine of one pair of First Parents and Evolution. What solution do the Theistic Evolutionists offer for this dilemma.

Believe it or not - as the saying goes - Britain's leading Catholic Evolutionist, Fr. Nesbitt in his recent pamphlet, *Evolution and Original Sin* offers the solution that there was an Evolution of "5 or 6 pairs within the same stem or phylum", and, "then it would seem quite possible that if one or two sinned this would affect the rest, so that they would sin also."

Note, according to this thesis, God stopped the Evolution of the whole monkey race into man. Then, did He confine the great transformation to one pair of monkeys? No, He made the transformation apply to "5 or 6 pairs" (this solution to keep us on the Evolution platform). Then, undaunted by the penalty of death attached to the first Adam and Eve's sin, the other Adams and Eves went and did likewise - or, perhaps, each and every pair fell into the same sin simultaneously!

Quite seriously, this incredible sort of thing is what the Catholic Evolutionist teacher must offer to his pupils, that is if the doctrines of the First Parents and Original Sin are to be retained. Is it any wonder, then, that the pupils listen with tongue in cheek, and, as they have been told that Evolution is accepted by all the scientists, they plump for the real Evolution, Evolution without a God, for the idea of a "god" identifiable with the great Evolution process? And this is what is happening in the Catholic schools today.

## Genesis

According to the Theistic Evolutionists, Genesis is to be regarded as purely symbolic, "a hymn of praise", and so on; and attempts are made to interpret this first chapter of Sacred Scripture in an Evolutionist light. Yet the pupils are bound to observe that there are repeated statements which do not seem at all to be symbolic. Two statements will be examined in this review, that concerning the Six Days of Creation, the other, "each according to its kind".

### The Genesis Day

As is well known the Biblical Commission in 1910 gave permission for the word "day" (the Hebrew word "yom") to be examined as other than our present natural day. But it is incorrect to assume that the Biblical Commission thereby plumped

for the Evolutionist "day". The Commission's permission was that the Genesis day could be examined as other than our twenty-four hour day, as some period of time. It could be examined as a twenty-three hour day, as a thirty-six hour day, and in fact, it could be examined as a fraction of a second day, i.e., by those who incline to favour the lightning-flash idea of Creation.

However, what the Theistic Evolutionists do is to claim that the Genesis account can be interpreted in the Evolutionist context, that the days of Genesis fit in admirably with the Evolutionist aeons of time necessary for the Evolutionist emergence of the kinds, that each Genesis "day" represents a period of many millions of years. But let us look at Genesis again. And here we note that after the work of each day come the statements "And there was evening and there was morning, one day", "And there was evening and there was morning, a third day", and so on, and this statement is repeated six times. Thus, no matter how one might speculate on the periods of time, there is the fact that the same Sacred Writer who wrote the word "day" also wrote down - six times - after the account of each day, that the day was a period of light and darkness, as is our present natural day. Then, could alternative periods of light and darkness ("evening and morning") be applied to the Evolutionist "day" of millions of years? No, for million years periods of alternate light and darkness would have destroyed all plant life upon the earth even before the animals appeared to feed upon it! It is almost as if the Sacred Writer, by insisting upon "evening and morning", were forestalling any "symbolic" or Evolutionist idea of the Genesis day in advance.

### "Each according to its kind"

The other statement to be examined is, "each according to its kind" which occurs after the account of the creation of each kind of plant, fish, animal, etc. Please note, this phrase is used in Genesis 1 precisely ten times, as if the Sacred Writer, once again, were determined to give no room for the slightest misunderstanding or ambiguity. One could wax quite eloquent here, but it is only necessary to point out that phrase "each according to its kind" is the direct contrary of any description of evolution of the kinds from one primeval kind.

Here one might also mention that Evolution teaches that its processes began in the seas, and then came the millions of years climb upwards. But Genesis states that plant life was created on the third day, and the marine creatures not until the fifth day. The Evolution account has it that the birds evolved from the reptiles, which in their turn had evolved from the fishes, but Genesis states that the birds were created together with the fishes. And these are only some of the examples.

Thus, with the Genesis day, with "each according to its kind", with the Genesis chronology of creation and that of Evolution there appears an indubitable contradiction. And thus, it is quite useless for the Evolutionist teacher to say that he is interpreting Genesis, for one cannot honestly say that one is interpreting an account by dismissing its most positive and detailed statements as misstatements of facts.

And here let it be repeated, this twin business of saying that Evolution is proved by science and that the Bible really agrees with the Evolution account is received with tongue-in-cheek scepticism by the students. They conclude that - Evolution being scientifically proved - that Religion must be of the sphere of myth, and they plump for the real atheistic Evolution. It is well known that many, very many, of the pupils emerge from the Catholic schools today rejecting, or at least sceptical of, all supernatural religion.

But there is a way out for the Theistic Evolution teacher. That is to examine, scientifically and philosophically, whether Evolution be true or not. After all, should not one assure oneself of the truth of Evolution before setting out to make the teaching of Religion conform to it?

J.G.C.

## The Attenborough Line by Veronica King

BBC TV began their 13 part series on 'Life on Earth' introduced by David Attenborough, on January 16th.

It portrays the wonders of God's creation very beautifully, but it was sad to see these wonders attributed to the process of evolution and of course without a word about the various missing-link hoaxes.

Evolution was simply taken for granted and speculation was presented as fact. But guesswork is hardly scientific!

For example it was stated that when life first began on earth the atmosphere was filled with gases such as ammonia, methane hydrogen and steam. There was virtually no oxygen.

There is however no evidence for this and **much against it** (See 'Speculations and Experiments on the Origin of Life' by Dr. Duane Gish. Newton Scientific Association.)

But, the saying goes, "it must be true or the evolution of life would have been impossible!"

As he described his descent into the Grand Canyon, David Attenborough gave the impression that the fossils contained in the exposed layers of rock provided a perfect illustration of the evolutionary process. This is not in fact the case. At many levels the "right" fossils are not found and the strata are upside-down in many cases.

Virtually every evolutionary statement made in this series, can be criticised in this way. His whole approach demonstrated his **religious faith** in evolution.

The conflict, then, is not between religion and science, as he suggests, but between Religion based on God's Revelation to us and a religion based on human speculations.

For the thing to note here is that not an ounce of proof, scientific or otherwise is ever given. Evolution is to be accepted on faith as the only alternative to God the Creator. It is blandly implied that no thinking person ever considers creation by the direct act of God — and that is how it is done.

That is how it is done, and that is how the mind of the young even of those of tender years — is conditioned and perverted. That this blatant propaganda should be put over by a state organization, is it not perhaps a sign of the age?

## The Genesis Class

The examination of the truth or otherwise of Evolution was conducted in the lesson on Genesis. It was felt it had to be discussed in this context. For Evolution is regarded as the great demythologiser of Genesis. Moreover, it is quite useless to keep quiet about Evolution, for the young hear of its claims almost every week through the television channels. It was felt the matter had to be thrashed out.

That Evolution is accepted as scientific fact "by all the scientists" is the great Evolutionist claim, but a claim which is now being hotly challenged. Thus, there was examined a list of scientists of great renown who had published works rejecting Evolution, including such names as Lord Kelvin, Vialleton of France, Sir Ambrose Philips, Maurice Thomas of France, Professor Ed Blick, the American Aerospace scientist (who declared Evolution to be "a scientific fairy tale") and so on. The list was seen to be a very formidable one, and this particular claim of the Evolutionists was seen to be an untruth.

Next there were examined the great Evolutionist evidences, the matter of the skulls of the missing-links, the alleged hominoids. The Piltdown Man affair was first examined, that which all the world now knows to have been a deliberate forgery. But, in its shrine in the British Museum, it had been proclaimed by all the experts for forty years as the great proof of Evolution, until true scientific examination showed the skull to be composed of an ancient human skull and the jawbone of a freshly killed monkey. In the case of the famed Pekin Man it was noted that only a cast of the alleged skull had ever been produced, the official excuse being that the skull had been stolen by the rapacious Japanese soldiery! Neanderthal Man, it was next seen, had also to be relegated, for a thorough examination had revealed that the brain capacity here was greater than that of the average modern man. In like manner it was seen, that the claims of Java Man, Nebraska Man and all the rest had likewise been withdrawn.

(It was also noted that the "priest-scientist", Teilhard de Chardin, the Catholic philosopher of Evolution, was implicated in the hoaxes of both Piltdown Man and Pekin Man. Yet his works still adorned the school library.)

In this context there was also examined the admission of Professor Haeckel to the University Court, that his photographs of the evolving human embryos were forgeries. The conclusion was that the vein of untruth running through Evolution was general and that its true scientific evidences were nil.

It was at this point that a critical student raised the question of the Evolutionist method of enquiry being a science at all. In the first place, he pointed out, the story of Evolution simply

is not subject to repeated experiment in the accepted scientific manner. He pointed out that its evidences could not be subject to proof on the laboratory bench as were the claims in the other sciences, that its only evidences were small fragments of skulls woven into an assumed Evolution frame. The general opinion of the class seemed to concur with the views of the critical student.

The next session of the Genesis class brought an amusing incident. The Chaplain, a dogmatic Progressive, walked in, and right away launched an attack on the doctrine of the First Parents, saying that Polygenism was the scientific thing, and declared — "I hope I will not hear of anyone in this class believing in the myth of Adam and Eve!" He was seemingly unaware that the subject of Evolution had been under examination by the class, and was caught unawares by the whistle of protest and derision which greeted his remark!

Our critical student - a caustic character - now took up the cudgels. "Don't you see that it is Polygenism that is the myth, for it requires Evolution, which is itself a myth" he launched at the Chaplain. The Chaplain was somewhat stunned, but recovering, began "Why, all the scientists accept ....." and was obviously shocked that this opening was greeted by a gale of laughter. "It's the other way about!" came from quite a few of the students. The critical student added, "You obviously haven't done your homework on the Evolution question". The Chaplain, sensing that something had occurred, gathered up his papers, remarking that he would be back to go into the question of Evolution. But he avoided the Genesis class in future.

When the class met again there was a discussion on the fact that the leading Evolutionists had to admit that all the missing-links were absent in the fossil record. And here a young lady (who had obviously been reading up the subject) remarked, "And what of the Genesis Flood?" She pointed out that gigantic flood deposits were present throughout the world and on the mountain sides many thousands of feet above sea level, so that the Flood simply could not be dismissed as mythical, and if there were such a Flood, as seems undeniable fact, then the fossil strata were probably laid by it. An animated discussion grew on this subject of the Flood, and one telling remark was made - "When there are world-wide evidences, everywhere, they won't even look at them!"

There followed a general summing-up, in which the critical student, a believer in direct creation, took the lead. He pointed out that the customary examinations of the minutiae, from the amoeba to man, was a useless method, for it could go on forever, because, when one alleged missing-link was proven false, they simply searched for another. He insisted that if Evolutionist laws had brought about our existing world, then these general laws must be apparent in this our world to-day, now, and it was **obvious that the beneficent Evolutionist mutations were nowhere to be seen, and were, in fact, the contrary of the laws of nature. The vote of the class was that Evolution had to be dismissed as an explanation of creation.**

But why is there this general malaise, this pre-disposition to accept a spurious view of creation? This general acceptance of the Evolutionist view would seem to spring from acceptance of the premises - assiduously inculcated - that creation must be something "rational", probable, that is to say something according to the mode of human actions, actions which are limited in their power, of finite beings.

That which is left out - to which we are invited to close our eyes - is the vastness, the marvel and the mystery of creation. Here is our world, with the human race and all beings clinging to a globe spinning through space. The great planet the sun rises each morning on the eastern horizon, bringing instant light, to give life to our whole universe, and another planet, the moon, regulates the tides upon our globe, whilst the seaman and the aviator make their way upon the planet by the position of the stars. In short, it is not a probable universe in the human sense at all. It is a universe of mystery and omnipotence.

Mystery and omnipotence, these are the things with which our universe confronts us, and which must be brought to the attention of the young. And thus we are back again to the greatest of mysteries, creation *ex nihilo*, and it is from this viewpoint that all the talk of God working through secondary causes must first be regarded. It is a great truth, that only in the mysterious does the world become rational. Whilst at the same time, our world becomes endearing and familiar in the mystery of the Incarnation. (Note: A priest lecturer at a Catholic College of Education actually made the contemptuous remark on our First Parents as quoted. But unfortunately none of the students at that time were sufficiently briefed to challenge him).