

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

OCTOBER - NOVEMBER 1979

CONTENTS

EDITOR'S LETTER

CURRENT EVENTS

THE NEW DOGMA OF PROCESS by Fr. Valentine Long.

THE FLOOD AGAIN

LATE NEWS ITEMS

EDITOR'S LETTER

Dear Readers,

God bless all here!

This issue should reach you D.V. in the early part of November. The year moves swiftly on, and soon we shall be again in the Christmas mail rush; and, as is now our custom, the December **Daylight** will not be posted until after Christmas. Besides, most readers are too occupied with preparations for the great Feast of the Family to attend to other matters. So, as this will be the last opportunity, wishing all of you a most joyous Feast of the Sacred Incarnation!

It will be noted that most of this issue is given over to a long article by our noted contributor Fr. Valentine Long, O.F.M., the author of Vatican Radio Broadcast (**Daylight**, June - July 1978). Herein Fr. Long, in his masterly but light style, pinpoints the heresies that afflict the Church today, and traces them back to their origins in pagan lore. No one should fail to read this article through.

By the way, it will have been noted that the business of the purely local Flood has cropped up again. Readers' attention is respectfully drawn to the article dealing with this vital matter.

Here again we would appeal for more **Daylight** helpers, helpers of all kinds. **Daylight** is the only anti-Evolution journal for Catholics in these Islands, and some inform us it is the only one such in Europe; and, with the present suspension of the American journal, it may be the only one in the world. Thus, it is a heavy responsibility to continue the fight (with expenses always on the increase). However, the signs are that **Daylight** has already achieved some successes in creating an awareness of Evolution untruth in Catholic circles, Deo Gratias! Those readers who would like extra copies of **Daylight** for distribution to key persons can have them free of charge.

Readers' prayers are asked for the continuing success of the journal, and particularly for one of our most distinguished readers who is not enjoying the best of health at the moment.

It only remains to wish you, one and all, again, A Very Happy Christmas.

Yours sincerely,

The Editor.

CURRENT EVENTS

Pope John Paul II

The year 1979 is noteworthy for the emergence of Pope John Paul II in his full stature.

Certainly, it took some time for the Pope to acquaint himself and thoroughly gauge the state of affairs in the Church. Then he appeared, direct, to untold millions of the Faithful, the ordinary Catholics, in Mexico, in Poland, in Ireland and in America (and to those who saw and heard him on T.V.) over the heads of all the theologians, as their Pastor Immediate, as Father of all Christians. Seemingly, the Pope had heard of the dangers confronting the

Church in Ireland, possibly that a divorce measure was being contemplated. He appeared in Ireland like a whirlwind, saying, like Patrick he had heard the voices of the Irish, reminding them that theirs is a Catholic and not a secular tradition.

He re-emphasised the doctrine of Transubstantiation. He condemned contraception, divorce and bluntly categorised abortion as "this unspeakable crime". At Maynooth he informed the theologians, in the most direct manner, to get back to orthodoxy and cease other speculations; and he insisted that the nuns and priests return to the clerical garb, return to their traditional vocations.

Then at Limerick came the Pope's parting and strongest shot - he specifically expressed his wish that the Irish State would never introduce divorce legislation! This historic visit of the first Pope to visit Ireland, but the Pope has warned that the future of Irish Catholicism will be settled in the next decade, mainly through the action of the youth.

In America the Pope forthrightly, and in the face of opposition, condemned the same heresies and aberrations, and here repeating several times that the ordination of women was out of the question. The Pope's forthrightness here can be seen as necessary by the fact that the American Modernists actually purchased advertising space in the newspapers to give a reply to him!

Now the Pope has called a meeting of the world's Cardinals for Rome in early November. At the same time, according to Mr. Peter Hebblethwaite on Irish radio, the Dutch theologian Schillebeeckx has been called to Rome to give an account of himself.

It would be well for all Catholics to pray that Pope John Paul II be given strength to continue on his mission.

The Catholic Press: the Universe newspaper

This Catholic weekly, now under the editorship of Mr. Christopher Monckton, grows better with every issue. Mr. Monckton himself recently did a book review on the old Penny Catechism. And there is now a weekly feature, under the imprimatur of Bishop Holland of Salford, on what the Church teaches. Still more, letters are now being published from **Daylight** readers on the Evolution question and Noah's Flood, the first time we have managed to get the truth aired in the Catholic press in this country.

All power to Mr. Monckton's elbow! His paper is one that Catholic parents can safely put into the hands of their children.

U.S.A. - another "monkey trial"?

A reader in Sioux City, Iowa, sends a cutting from the Sioux City Journal with his comments. The report, from Lemmon, South Dakota, recounts the tale of Mr. Lloyd Dale, a biology teacher, who has been dismissed for not teaching biology according to the Evolution hypothesis. The School Board relented somewhat by introducing new text-books, and re-employing Mr. Lloyd on condition that he teaches both Evolution and direct creation! However, Mr. Lloyd avers that he is not going to abide by these guidelines, and if dismissed again will bring a lawsuit on the grounds of violation of academic freedom.

Can we, then, look forward to another "Dayton monkey trial", this time in reverse?

The New Dogma of Process

By FR. VALENTINE LONG

THEY CALLED HIM "the dark philosopher". He wallowed in the obscurities of a heavy verbiage that did not so much express as it kept his tortuous arguments locked in confusion. "According to the ancient writers," states the Greek-Roman Classical Dictionary, "neither critics nor philosophers were able to explain his productions."¹ Heraclitus left them groping for his meaning. By contrast, his countryman Aristotle who wrote profoundly wrote to be understood.²

And yet, behind the murky reasonings of Heraclitus, lies a clear-cut basic principle. This he does not obstruct. He wants it known. He sets it forth plainly. It is the rationale of his confused philosophy: *all life evolves*.

To him the Life Force (his notion of God) has no terminal. It continues in an unending process of formation. Whatever it forms it constantly changes. Nothing is. Everything is only becoming. There are no fixed absolutes. Heraclitus the Obscure, the first of the evolutionists, the precursor of Hegel, might fittingly be known by another title, the father of process theology.

Process theology adopts the same basic principle. It disallows the fixed truth. It considers nothing permanent but mutability, which it honors as a dogma. Even God, not exempt from the dictate of the dogma, must undergo change. Father James Empereur of Berkeley had for an interviewer some years ago the ready answer why: "Because to be perfect means in process thought to become more what you are."³ But the blessed in heaven know, and so does the teaching Church on earth, that God enjoyed an infinitude of perfection from eternity; that He never had to become more Himself; that He always was and will always remain completely Himself.

Scripture so obviously vindicates the teaching Church that the process theologian must do violence to the sacred text to get his way. Nowhere in the Old and New Testaments does the Supreme Being evolve. It takes an incredibly flexible mind to interpret "I am who am" into meaning "I am who become." "From the beginning I am the same," which Isaiah quotes the Lord God as saying of Himself, does not promise the evolutionary exegete an easy time of it. And when he

reads of the Second Person of the Trinity, that "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and for ever" he ought to give up.⁴

But he doesn't. As far as he is concerned, St. Paul might as well not have warned against the error of preaching "another Jesus than the one we preached."⁵ The progressive type of theologian rather believes with Teilhard de Chardin that the eternal Son of God has not remained the same Jesus, but is evolving with the cosmos toward a continual betterment. Caught in the web of process thinking, his mind ought not to admit the self-evident truth that 2+2 was 4 a thousand years ago and stays 4 today and will forever come out 4. The correct answer does not evolve to a higher figure.

Process theology would have its followers believe that the dogmas of the Catholic Church evolve out of their former meanings into new ones because their interpretation depends on the human mind which under the influence of a passing culture changes from age to age. Thus Father Raymond Brown does not hesitate to say: "It is a fact of history that we have re-examined and re-understood doctrines."⁶ But who are his "we"? Certainly not the faithful who prefer to heed the warning of Vatican Council I than the pronouncement of a theologian who seems quite indifferent to the warning. "If anyone shall say," goes the warning, "that as science progresses a meaning may at some time be attributed to the Church's dogmas different from that which the Church has understood and understands, let him be anathema."⁷

Here a question begs to be raised. I hope it is not a discourtesy to raise it. Didn't Father Raymond Brown, when he was being ordained a priest, take the oath against modernism? An important promise, with the others in that oath, runs as follows: "I positively reject the heretical misrepresentation that dogmas evolve and change from one meaning to another different from the one which the Church previously held."⁸

Obviously, what the Church has held in the past remains open to a better understanding as time goes on. The believer comes by, or is given, deeper insights. In that sense a dogma develops, grows in meaning. But the meaning does not change into what it was not. It unfolds like a bud into full flower. It was implicitly

all there from the start, to be more sharply defined, more precisely explained, more solidly appreciated. It remains in essence what it was.

But the process theologian does not seek deeper insights into this or that dogma. He wants it essentially changed. He would destroy it. Taking care not openly to deny it, he still argues it away. His interpretation empties it of its meaning. Under the guise of giving it a new significance to bring it up-to-date and thereby do it a favor, he annihilates it.

HERE, FOR EXAMPLE, is how one modernist interpretation treats the Resurrection. The event is freely admitted, though not as a physical fact, rather as an eschatological fact, if you please. The admission, seen through the fog of such double talk, is seen nonetheless to be a denial after all. For in this devious reunderstanding of the dogma, the Resurrection does not mean that the slain body of our Saviour rose alive from the tomb. It only means that his faith in God has survived his death to become the living inheritance of his disciples. The whole hazy idea runs counter to the angel's forthright announcement to the holy women: "He is not here, for He has risen as He said."⁹

The quibblers, in their misinterpretation, ignore another doctrine: namely, that Jesus in reality had no faith because He didn't need it, because He was Himself God and enjoyed with the Father infinite certitude. Let that go without comment, however, to give place to the no-nonsense rebuttal of Cardinal Danielou: "The word *resurrection* does not have two senses. Either it signifies that the body of Christ lay no longer in the tomb, but was alive by the power of God and, therefore, able to be unmistakably identified as He always had been by witnesses—or it signifies nothing."¹⁰

The mania to remake doctrine, under the pretense of giving it relevancy, threatens the entire creed. No dogma, however sacred, is likely to escape. In his treatment of the Holy Eucharist, Father Edward Schillebeeckx argues that the consecrated bread at Mass remains bread because the idea if its becoming the Body of Christ and retaining in the transubstantiation only its color and taste and weight and shape "has lost significance in our times."¹¹ Why so? How does the tradition-

al doctrine, admittedly suitable to the past, now of a sudden lose significance? It is the same adorable mystery of faith as ever it was. How could its credibility in the first century, or the thirteenth, have grown impossible to the twentieth? "You might as well say," argues back Chesterton, "that a certain philosophy can be believed on Mondays, but cannot be believed on Tuesdays. You might as well say of a view of the cosmos that it was suitable to half-past three, but not suitable to half-past four."¹²

The misinterpretation, like most of the New Theology, is not new. Dr. Schillebeeckx has but given us a rehash of an old error even to the point of allowing that, while the consecrated bread does not change into Christ, it may be said to change in the sense that it has now become a *sign* of His presence. To the Catholic Church, "this is my body" means precisely that. She prefers to take the Lord's word as it is than to accept the insinuation that He didn't know His own mind and really meant to say "this signifies my body."

NOR WILL the Church agree to the proposition of Father John Kersten, that "Jesus is present in the bread and wine as the giver in the gift."¹³ The bread and wine no longer exist after the consecration, the Church unreservedly teaches, so that there can be no simultaneous co-existence. There is, exclusively, the Real Presence. What looks or tastes like bread and wine, but is not bread and wine, has become Jesus Christ. "If anyone shall say that, in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remain conjointly with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and unique conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood—the species alone of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation: let him be anathema." The Council of Trent, in so declaring, could not have made the meaning of the sublime mystery clearer.¹⁴

Neither could Pope Paul in his encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*.¹⁵ He spells out the meaning of transubstantiation, defending the word, insisting upon it, glorying in it. The word must be kept. Those

Progressives who would discard as out of date and hopelessly unintelligible to the modern mind the key to say their quarrel is not with the dogma but with that particular term. Are they sincere? Is it really an unintelligible term to the contemporary mind? Children, trained in any honest catechism of Catholic doctrine, understand what it means. The faithful are large do.

Calvin of four centuries ago surely did. Of all the earlier disbelievers in the Real Presence, was there a single one who did not? These dissenters took from the term the understanding that the Mass the reality of bread and wine is transubstantiated (or, if you will, transformed) into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. They understood perfectly — and simply would not agree. It was the dogma, which the term so well explains, that bothered them. And so Pope Paul, whom the dogma does not bother but rejoices, applauds the term. He does not only in the encyclical but again in his *Credo of the People of God*. "This mysterious change," he writes of the miracle of consecration, "is very appropriately called by the Church *transubstantiation*."¹⁶

POPE PAUL in his recount of the revealed truths was speaking for all the faithful. Why else did he call it their creed? And he issued it to close out the Holy Year which he had established between midyear of 1967 and that of 1968 in the hope of abating the growing menace of infidelity. The menace did not abate, however. Frank Sheed wrote a telltale book at the time, in which he unhappily had to admit: "There is hardly a doctrine or practice of the Church that I have not heard attacked by a priest."¹⁷

Think of it. Men ordained to preach the unalterable truths and then as cultists of change itching and attempting to undo them, what a mockery! Mr. Sheed was not exaggerating. It happened and is still happening, as who doesn't know? Dogma after dogma in the credenda has suffered from the attack of priests who are proud to be called process theologians. Characteristically, their dol had this to say barely two years before his death: "Christianity will only recoup its power to influence the world when it . . . sets itself to the task of rethinking the doctrine of original sin in terms of progress rather than of a Fall." So wrote, again a priest, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin in 1953.¹⁸

Three years previously, Pope Pius XII who had seen what was happening put his finger on the primary cause. He touched upon it deftly in his *Humani Generis*: "The fictitious tenets of evolution, which repudiate all that is absolute, firm and immutable, have paved the way for the new erroneous philosophy." They have, beyond doubt. One doesn't need to probe far into process theology to sense that. *The Stuff of the Universe* openly concludes that "a whole series of reshaping of certain representations or attitudes which seem to us definitely fixed by Catholic dogma has become necessary if we sincerely wish to Christify Evolution." Who would sincerely wish to do that, as if Christianity must subservise the fantasy of a mere theory? Who would write such a conglomeration of wishful thinking as *The Stuff of the Universe*? Teilhard would. He did.¹⁹

Evolution, which has given the incentive to process theology, meanwhile remains an unproved theory.

The process theologian unquestioningly accepts it. What is worse, religion teachers by a large count follow his directives to the detriment of their pupils who are being starved of the great, fixed, eternal truths.

The harm that the false but fashionable dogma of an ongoing revelation has done to catechetics in a disaster crying to heaven for vengeance. As for heaven, take a look at what Father Leon McKenzie wants done to that supernatural realm of the blessed: "The task of the religious educator is to demythologize heaven." To his way of thinking, heaven has not yet come into being. And when it does it "will be this world at its final stage of fullness." He made the statement in *Process Catechetics*. But others of his kind have said no less. Peter de Rosa reports of a group of them, with whom he consulted, that they understand the paradisaical state in *Genesis* to be "a projection, not a piece of history." Meaning what? That "there will be a state like this in the future."²⁰

Process theology simply will not abide by the definitions of council or pope, the *de fide* decrees. It must alter them to fit the advancing times. And in doing so, it thrives on long-winded vapidities which can be made to sound important. Certainly the Dutch Catechism requires more than ten pages of lofty language to explain original sin, but never gets to the point. That is, to the correct point. Adam escapes blame beautifully: "Original Sin is the sin of man-

kind as a whole." And do you know why? Our view of the world is not what it was. It used to be static. "But now our picture of the world has changed. We can see further into the distant past. It helps us to see that the world is involved in an upward movement, in a process of growth."²¹

What vague nonsense! But at least the flow of words has a cadence to adorn the shallow content. And that is more than may be said of this rigmarole from a good nun who instructs teen-agers and adults in Iowa. "I believe in Jesus," she writes in the *Religion Teachers' Journal*, "a man placed in first-century history and caught up in the web of structure and the pressure of his culture." Do her pupils ever hear from Sister that the Incarnate Son of God willed His lowliness and, far from being an impotent slave of circumstance, did not lack the power to break out of the web or escape the pressure? Undaunted, Sister Arlene sticks to her theme: "I believe He evolved through Process to the completion of the Perfect Man, who would be the exemplar of human freedom." As if that were not enough, there is more coming. "And I finally believe He affirmed by His life and death the possibility of mankind's owning in some distant future the full realization of Christogenesis."²²

If that is the sort of Heraclitean obfuscation which Sister Arlene teaches as well as writes about, I wonder what her pupils make of it. I know what Jacques Maritain made of it, as he studied it in Teilhard. He reviewed the convoluted explanation of an evolving cosmogenesis under the influence of the cosmic Christ toward the Omega point, with the noosphere becoming of course Christosphere, and having reviewed it the wise old layman found it "theology-fiction" and tagged the whole of it "the Great Fable". The truth is not in it.²³

That the Church's faithful on earth are already members of the Mystical Body of Christ, and that infidels are invited into the membership, reduces to hot air "the possibility of mankind's owning in some distant future the full realization of Christogenesis." That at death heaven awaits any human soul in sanctifying grace, after whatever delay in purgatory, if any, and that on the last day the body of that soul will rise up in glorified form to rejoin it, and with the soul share forever in the Divine Life, in the unimaginable joys of the Blessed Trinity: here we have a certitude of belief to

diminish to an insipidity the Teilhardian fable. And the very world which the fabulist considered pantheistic and therefore indestructible is in reality on its way to destruction, only to be renewed by its transcendent Creator to a greater spender.²⁴

Why should process theology presume to improve on the creed? How dare its more extravagant meddlers in doctrine say that God himself changes for the better and may alter a former decree to a new meaning and an up-to-date relevancy? Away with this so-called *continuing* revelation! Away with the whole false mess of reinterpretations! Incomparably superior to the most ambitious of them, transcending them all with a grandeur that is Truth Eternal, are the divine articles of faith as they stand, taught by the Church, unchanged in essence and unchangeable.

NOTES

- 1) Charles Anthon: *Roman-Greek Classical Dictionary*, Harper & Brothers N.Y., 1851.
- 2) Aristotle criticizes Heraclitus in his *Metaphysics* (4th book).
- 3) Interview with Father James Empeyre in the *National Catholic Reporter*, Feb. 1, 1974.
- 4) Ex. 3:14; Is. 43:13 Confraternity; Heb. 13:8.
- 5) 2 Cor. 11:4.
- 6) *The Virginal and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*. The Paulist Press.
- 7) Denzinger 1818.
- 8) Cf. "The Modernist Test" by Paul H. Hallett in the *National Catholic Register*, Jan. 6, 1974.
- 9) Mt. 28:6.
- 10) *La Resurrection* from which Cardinal Wright quotes in his article "Did Christ Rise or Not?" — *Friar Magazine*, April, 1973.
- 11) *The Eucharist*.
- 12) *Orthodoxy*, Chapter 5.
- 13) John C. Kersten, S.V.D.: *Bible Catechism*.
- 14) Denzinger 884.
- 15) *Mysterium Fidei*, published a few days before the final session of Vatican II.
- 16) *Credo of the People of God*, proclaimed on June 30, 1968, to close out the Year of Faith.
- 17) *Is It the Same Church?*
- 18) Cf. Donald Gray: *The One and Many*.
- 19) *L'Activation de L'Energie*, Paris. Editions de Seuil, 1963.
- 20) Peter de Rosa: *Christ and Original Sin*.
- 21) *A New Catechism*, Authorized Edition of the Dutch Catechism, Herder & Herder, N.Y., 1967.
- 22) "My Statement of Belief in Jesus" by Sister Arlene Einwalter in the *Religion Teachers' Journal*, April, 1973.
- 23) Jacques Maritain: *The Peasant of the Garonne*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, N.Y., 1968.
- 24) 2 Pet. 3:10-13; Is. 34:4; 65:17-66:22.

(Reproduced from Friar magazine by kind permission.)

THE FLOOD AGAIN

The matter of the Flood has cropped up again, as well it might. For if the Flood of Noah be historical reality, then most of the fossil record must be attributed to it, and this alleged Evolution proof thrown out the window. It means also that the whole philosophy of history as taught today - indefinite ages in the past and indefinite ages of still more progress to come - must be jettisoned: if it is a short past, then might it not also be a short future? Yes, indeed, is the Flood of Noah a very important business. It is practically the hinge.

Regarding the fossil record, let us be quite clear what a fossil is. Normally the dead animal body is serviced by the scavengers, then, by some process, its bones become pulverised and part of the soil. The dead body only becomes preserved as a fossil when it is encased in flood sediment to the exclusion of air; then when the sediment becomes petrified as sedimentary rock, so does the dead body also become petrified.

It would be redundant to give again the world picture here even if space permitted. It is contained in the **Daylight** supplement on the Flood, here again enclosed to refresh the reader's memory. To summarise, the picture is one, world wide, of flood sediments deposited on the high mountain tops, from Alaska to Patagonia; these sediments containing in almost infinite number the fossils of animals and fish - this world picture making nonsense of any claim for a purely local Flood. Of particular note is the presence of the fish and shark fossils, for the habitat of the fishes and sharks is in the water. It means that the water was so laden with silt that these creatures could no longer swim; i.e., a Flood of unimaginable proportions and turbulence.

In passing, let us deal for a moment with the counter-argument of the Evolutionists to the Flood world picture; that the fossil strata were laid down by the rising and recession of the oceans over the hundreds or millions of years. Please note that this would mean that these floodings occurred in always the exact same place, so as to lay down these strata exactly one above the other - it's one of those wild "scientific" statements that boggle the imagination. However, there is most positive refutation in the presence of the trans-strata fossils, fossils in the perpendicular position and thus piercing the strata - giving rise to the joke that the fish tails were hundreds of millions of years older than their heads! The same phenomena is witnessed with the trans-strata trees; one such was unearthed in the Craighleith quarry in Scotland, eighty feet in height, piercing through twelve different layers of limestone! And not to be forgotten is the fact that leading Evolutionists admit that continental areas were covered by water quite recently, between periods of human occupancy (vide Flood supplement).

The reader may have noted that these multitudinous scientific evidences are rarely if ever mentioned in the media, usually so avid to deal with every curiosity. Thus, the most sober observer is bound to conclude that there is a veritable suppression of news vital to humanity in the world media. If there is a counter argument against the world Flood record, by all means let us have it! But they do not seem to want to have the matter discussed at all.

Please be it noted that the acceptance of the obvious Flood record does away with any talk about accommodating Genesis to the hundreds of millions of years of the alleged Evolution epochs. Which brings us to the question of the suppression of the Flood record in the Catholic schools, wherein it is generally taught today as a mythical or local event.

Certainly, it is no task of Religious Education to keep abreast of the latest scientific discoveries which confirm the Flood record. But it is not a matter of recent scientific discoveries. The general world picture of the Flood was understood, and taught, throughout the Catholic world, through all the ages, until, quite recently, it was dropped.

Philo of Alexandria, the learned Jew, born about 15 B.C., in his treatise, **Concerning Abraham**, taught the universal Flood as a vast mutilation of the earth.

Tertullian, 155 - 222 A.D., spoke in the same terms, and quoted the marine creatures found on the mountains. Yes, the fossil record was common knowledge even then!

St. Chrysostom, 345 - 407 A.D., spoke of the Flood as the obliteration of all the earth.

St. Augustine followed the same tradition, speaking of the giant pre-flood bones unearthed in North Africa.

Coming to the Middle Ages, there is Fabius Colonna, an Italian,

who writing in 1616 described the Flood derived fossil record.

Nicola Steno, 1638 - 1686, is the great figure of this epoch. He was originally the Danish scientist Neils Steenson, credited with discovering the circulation of the blood and the excretory duct of the parotid gland and of the law of crystallography known as "the law of constancy of interfacial angles". (He afterwards became a saintly bishop of the Church in Italy). Steno pointed to the earth strata as deposits of the Flood in much erudite writing, at the same time emphasising that the fossil remains were, otherwise inexplicable. Dealing with the rock formations around Volterra, he declared that these were one fossilised mass.

Agostino Scilla in 1670 published a treatise on the Sicilian strata again emphasising the fossil record, and confirming Steno's conclusions.

Jacobus Graddius of Venice, writing in 1670, described the marine shells in the Alps, declaring - "No other waters could have come there but those of the Deluge".

Around this time a learned Jesuit, Athanasius Kircher published a treatise, **The Ark of Noah**, in which he described the changes in the earth wrought by the Flood.

Athanasius Bosizio, also a Jesuit, brings us to modern times. His **Geology and the Flood** appeared in Germany in 1877, in which he combated the Darwinian based geologies. Drawing attention to the Alpine fossils, he calculated that the Flood waters in a still state exerted a pressure of fifty tons per square foot, and in motion three times as much.

But today there is, as far as the writer is aware, only one prominent Catholic author proclaiming the Flood record, Rev. Patrick O'Connell in his **Science of Today & The Problems of Genesis**. For the rest there is silence. Indeed, one meets young members of the clergy today, who seemingly have never heard in their seminary courses of the scientific evidences for the Flood, known to the Early Fathers, continually examined by Catholic writers throughout the ages, and today confirmed by the discoveries of modern science.

This suppression of the Flood evidences - confirmed by modern science - can only be because of a will to conform to the Evolutionist chronology of the endless ages of time: scientific and verifiable fact waved aside for the claims of an Evolutionist pseudo-theology, a mythology. Surely somewhere there are learned scholars who have delved into this mass of Catholic and other writings, or are they too suppressed? Precisely, what is wrong in the seminaries today?

There remains the various objections concerning the Ark. In a following article there will be demonstrated the scientific, marine construction of the Ark, and its undoubted capacity to contain the required number of animals. Long live the Ark!

J.G.C.

LATE NEWS ITEM

Letter from Headingly Jail

Mr. Joe Borowski, former Manitoba cabinet minister, is in jail here for refusing to pay taxes towards abortion, and addresses an open letter to all pro-life people, asking them to persevere. Shall we see demonstrations - by Churchmen or others - for Mr. Borowski's "human rights"?

Great Bison Preserved in Alaska

The whole carcass of a giant bison has been found August '79 preserved in the permafrost north of Fairbanks, Alaska. The animal was found by two miners. It is reported to be the first time an entire frozen animal has been excavated for scientific examination in North America.

This, of course, is part of the phenomenon of the frozen mammoths of Siberia and the Arctic, one of the great remains of the Flood.