

# 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

APRIL, 1980

## CONTENTS

	Page		Page
The Evolutionist Theologians . . . . .	1	The Voyage of the Ark . . . . .	3 & 4
St. Thomas on Man . . . . .	1	The Pope and the Theologians . . . . .	4
by Veronica King		Abortion . . . . .	4
Why Should Theology Stoop to Hegel? . . . . .	2 & 3		
by Father Valentine Long			

# The Evolutionist Theologians

## IRELAND

This key country at the moment is subject to a comprehensive campaign by the Evolutionists. The national T.V. borrows those famous films of the B.B.C., Evolutionist teachers in the schools present their leaflets to the defenceless pupils, and emboldened clerics deliver the new dogma in an attack upon the doctrine of Original Sin.

An Irish reader has sent us a pamphlet, which is about the most scandalous thing yet. It is perhaps the boldest expression so far of a world-wide trend. The Pamphlet is of the "Faith Today" series published by Dominican Publications of Upper Dorset Street, Dublin, and has been prepared by Gabriel Daly O.S.A. of Miltown Institute of Theology, and Conleth Byrne, O.P., lecturer in moral theology, St. Mary's Tallaght.

The authors truly state that Original Sin remains a profound mystery, and so it is; and the present writer has not the theological competence to enter into this aspect. True, the authors hasten on to express loyalty to the Council of Trent definition that Original Sin is passed on by propagation, but that is gliding over their previous body blow to the core of the doctrine: that Original Sin came about by the Fall of Adam, the perfect man created "in the image and likeness of God."

In the centre portion of the pamphlet, "Genesis and Evolution" they calmly inform us, "the line separating man from his animal ancestors must have been in keeping with their primitive natures." They go on to ask how could "the sins of the first creatures to cross the line" bring down upon us the dread penalty of Original Sin. Please note the switch to the plural here, quite a hint of polygenism — though, of course, this will be denied.

The line of thought is unmistakable, for in the preceding paragraph they inform us, "And the line dividing human beings from their purely animal forebears cannot be drawn with anything approaching accuracy, since so much depends on how we define 'human'." Indeed and indeed, the cat is truly out of the bag! In the same paragraph they inform us that the account of the direct creation of man by God is "this vivid myth." This at once brings on the sixty-four thousand dollar question — How did these two gentlemen get to know what happened in the Garden of Eden?

The answer they give in their own words; it is "the natural science of man's origins", which phrase they repeat. That is, the case of these two theologians does not rest on any theological fundamentals; it is not a theological case at all. Their case depends on what the atheistic scientists have told them is the explanation of human life (it is notorious how many scientists have said that they adhere to Evolution because the Personal Creator is "unthinkable"). The case here being put is simply that of the alleged natural science of Evolution.

Our two authors, in fact, have had the temerity to throw overboard the immemorial tradition of direct creation on the words of the Darwinist scientists who have flourished since the 19th century. They seem to be completely unaware of the

world famous scientists — since science is to be the criterion — who have declared Evolution to be impossible.

There is Vaillaton whose L'illusion Transformiste went through 17 editions in its first two years. There is Lord Kelvin, who chided the Evolutionists for their scientific ignorance, saying that the earth could not be of the age required by Evolution. Today Professor T. Barnes (Physics, University of Texas) states that the decline in the earth's magnetic field means that the earth's age can be calculated only in the thousands of years. Whilst Professor E. Blick, Nuclear Engineering, Oklahoma, states the Evolution contradicts the basic Second Law of Thermodynamics and is "a scientific fairy-tale"!

Alas! it seems to be the case that science in the Catholic seminaries seems to have stopped with the Darwinist writers of the 19th century, possibly to accord with an Evolutionist theology. None the less, it is surely the duty of the theologians, who would present a new theology to the Catholic public, to do some reading on the subject, to make sure that their scientific facts are really facts and not myths.

Amazingly, these two authors seem to be unaware that those great "proofs" of Evolution, Piltdown Man, Peking Man and Java Man are now known to be frauds. Their first task must be to demonstrate to the Catholic public whatever new proofs of Evolution they possess. We wait attentively.

## Saint Thomas "On Man"

Summa, Part I. Vol. 4., Q. 90., Art. 4.

*God made the first things in their perfect natural state, as their species required.*

*Now the soul, as part of human nature, has its natural perfection only as united to the body.*

*Therefore, it would have been unfitting for the soul to be created without the body.*

*It was created therefore at the same time as the body.*

*Both the body and soul of the first man were produced in the work of the six days.*

*As it is naturally the form of the body it was necessarily created, not separately, but in the body.*

*That the soul remains after the body is due to the defect of the body, i.e., which defect was not due when the soul was first created.*

Lest anyone should think that mere science, so full of corrections down the centuries, in its theories on pre-history, could find errors in the supreme Doctor of the Church, it is noteworthy that not only did Pope Paul VI reaffirm his validity today, but also Pope John Paul II has urged the study of his works as "indispensable for the renewal of the Faith," at the Angelicum University January, 1980.

VERONICA KING

# Why Should Theology Stoop to Hegel

By FR. VALENTINE LONG

Reprinted from the *Homiletic & Pastoral Review*, with the permission of its editor, Fr. Kenneth Baker, S.J.

No system of philosophy exerts so dominant an influence over the modernistic world as Hegelianism. One of its disciples by the name of Lenin admitted that, without it, *Das Kapital* would make no sense. The difference is, Hegel saw in his dialectic a spiritual process which Marx reduced to a continuous tension between purely material forces. At the same time Hegel did not mean to imply by his spiritual process a personal, transcendent God. Far from it! Like Heraclitus of old, he believed in a pantheistic soul that inheres in the world and along with the world struggles constantly toward some vague sort of betterment.

Hegel presupposes, as a first principle of his system, that a clash of opposites begets progress. First comes the affirmation of an idea, then its equally valid denial by another idea, to be followed by a compromise between the two which establishes a new idea. But the new idea does not remain fixed, having an ongoing fluidity. What it does is start the process all over again by producing a contradiction of itself and coexisting uneasily with that contradiction until the tension ends up once more with a third, another new idea *pro tempore*. Thesis, antithesis, synthesis: there you have the Hegelian method of, not achieving the truth, but finding and holding it for a while — before it evolves into something else.

That Marxism has adopted the Hegelian dialectic runs true to form. But who in advance would have expected the so-called higher critic of Biblical scholarship and the resultant process theologian to submit to it? Yet so they do. A look at the two of them at work, who are often the same person, will reveal their Hegelian dependence. These slaves to the dialectic do not fit philosophy or theology to the demands of God's revelation to man, as did St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas. They do the reverse. They even subject their omnipotent and self-sufficient Creator from eternity to the evolution of progress.

It was a Lutheran, Ferdinand Christian Baur, who founded the Biblical school of higher criticism at the University of Tübingen in the early nineteenth century. To say it another way: he introduced the Hegelian dialectic to exegesis.<sup>1</sup> Let it be recalled that Hegel saw in all historical developments three stages. First, a stand on some principle is firmly taken; then others take the opposite stand; and the conflict results in a third stand, neither one nor the other, but a hybrid of the two when not something altogether different from them. Applying this procedure known as historicism to the *Acts of the Apostles*, Dr. Baur established his thesis upon the Jewish converts of St. Peter who were of a legalistic mind, and his antithesis upon the Gentile converts of St. Paul who were just as vigorously hostile to the law, and his synthesis upon the fusion of the two parties into the Catholicism of the second century.

The fact that the council at Jerusalem ended in perfect agreement to refute such balderdash did not bother the founder of higher criticism. He declared *ex cathedra*, that is, from his professor's chair, that St. Luke's account of the council must be spurious for the simple reason that Paul of the *Acts* was not the genuine St. Paul who wrote *Galatians*, *Corinthians*, *Romans*, and no other Epistles than these three.<sup>2</sup> It was an easy way out, setting the precedent for future liberal Biblicists in a tight squeeze. Whatever would defeat their argument, by wind from the mouth is blown away.

The modernist theologian, whose methods identify him with the higher criticism, goes about examining doctrine through the same Hegelian process. He nullifies it. What Baur did, he does. To the article of faith that Christ rose from the tomb he agrees. But he affirms it with the tricky reservation that Christ did not rise bodily from the tomb. He then in a perfect synthesis concludes that Christ did in truth rise from the tomb, but symbolically, not bodily. And that is quibbling.

He has insidiously denied the doctrine as the Church understands it and insists upon its being understood.

Carol Jackson Robinson shows how this modern trickery is worked upon the unsuspecting minds of Catholic school children. She relates it with calm humor: "Yes, students should be taught the doctrines of the bishops' guidelines. But let these doctrines coexist in the classroom with the new results of theological speculation which contradict them. Then what? . . . We have these two contradictory claimants and we must decide between them. How?"<sup>3</sup>

That's easy. Historicism will solve the dilemma with its pat formula. Something new must be found and in the name of progress will be found to take the place of the two outmoded contraries. Against so relentless a process no dogma can stand immune. For evolution through a continuity of change advances the world and with the world every principle of theology to an ultimate perfection. Just give it time. revelation far from being static, goes on and on and on.

It does not apparently disturb the process theologian that the current philosophy on which he bases his faith is essentially a rehash of discarded philosophies and therefore not the outcome of an unbroken progress. Its Pantheism, its evolutionism, its Manichaean equation of good and evil with God are of antiquity. What is new in it is nothing to brag about: a penchant for contradiction to knock out every affirmative, which led Hegel to the silly postulate that the same thing can be and not be at the same time. Tell that to a pedestrian on the street, suggests Chesterton, but be prepared for his snicker of incredulity. Of this normal man without the higher learning, G. K. says with mock solemnity: "The moron refuses to admit that Hegel can both exist and not exist; or that it can be possible to understand Hegel if there is no Hegel to understand."<sup>4</sup>

Chesterton's man on the street has plenty of learned company. Coleridge and De Quincey, prominent in English literature, thought Hegel self-contradictory, affected and nugatory insofar as he could be understood.<sup>5</sup> Sydney Smith, known for his acute mind, said of Hegel more than of Kant that his obfuscation defies understanding.<sup>6</sup> Professor James Frederick Ferrier raises and answers his own indignant question: "Who has ever uttered one intelligent word about Hegel? No one of his countrymen, not any foreigner, seldom even himself."<sup>7</sup> Somerset Maugham, of all the philosophers he read, found only Hegel a bore. "I found him terribly long-winded and I could never reconcile myself to the jugglery with which it seemed to me he proved whatever he had a mind to."<sup>8</sup> But that is a mild denunciation compared with the next. "The lowest stage of degradation was reached by Hegel," writes Schopenhauer. He "turned philosophy into an instrument of obscurantism . . . and drew over her a veil of the emptiest verbiage and the most senseless hodgepodge ever heard out of Bedlam."<sup>9</sup> So on the debunking goes.

Allegedly Hegel himself said on his deathbed: "Only one man ever understood me, and he didn't."<sup>10</sup> Was he that man? Certainly the contradiction that he both did and did not understand his own philosophy, if it were he, would be entirely in character. The negation of a previous affirmative typifies his kind of thinking.

The most important condemnation of Hegelianism, in the interest of faith and morals, came from Pope Pius IX. In the *Syllabus of Errors*, eighty of them in all, the first proposition to be listed is the briefest summary of the philosophy that nurtures Modernism. The Holy Father translates its obscurities into intelligible speech to give us a clear idea what it is he condemns. Would that Loisy and Tyrrell had heeded Pope Pius IX to prevent the excommunication of the former and the near excommunication of the latter by Pope Pius X.

Here is what Hegel taught and Pope Pius IX in 1864 condemned: "There exists no supreme all-wise, all-provident God, distinct from the world; and God is the same as the nature of things and therefore liable to change; and God comes into being in man and in the universe, and all things are God and they have the same substance of God; and God is one and the same as the world, and therefore also spirit is one and the same with matter, necessity with liberty, the true with the false, the good with the evil, and the just with the unjust."<sup>11</sup>

In that papal condemnation, as Paul H. Hallett with his accuracy of insight points out, we have a more lucid statement than Hegel himself ever gave us of his confused pantheism and of jumbling together as co-equals any pair of contradictories as far apart as virtue is from vice.<sup>12</sup> What a twisted mind! To maintain as a serious premise that the true is identical with the false, good with evil, the just with the unjust, because all of them alike are God and have the same substance as God; surely this perverse reasoning must bring a shudder to the most incorrigible process theologian. It would have shocked the great minds of Grecian philosophy. The *non-sequitur* that evil, being God, has as much right as good to exist in the ongoing dialectic, would have drawn from Socrates a blast of his best irony and from Aristotle a devastating rebuttal, if either had heard of such nonsense in their day. As for Plato, he would beyond doubt have agreed with the classic argument in *The City of God*, which proves evil no more than a lack of what ought to be, without any right to exist at all. Did Plato possibly give St. Augustine the idea?

George Wilhelm Friederich Hegel knows how to produce upon the mind somewhat the effect of a telephone call when the operator at her switchboard has absent-mindedly plugged the wrong holes and an onrush of discordant voices answers back. "Somewhat the effect," I say, for through the jumbled lingo the trained reader learns to pick up what he can of the pattern of thought, however perverse, and to detect not an absent-minded but a determined effort. It is not to be dismissed as of no consequence. The reason stands clear: while the idea of evolutionary progress under the impetus of a pantheistic life force dates back to Heraclitus, with the obfuscation, Hegel has added to that the novelty of his triple dialectic to become the modern rage. He dominates contemporary thinking outside the religious spheres of influence, and into these has seriously intruded.

A philosophy to teach the great certitudes must of necessity accept the guidance of divine revelation. There is no other way. The unguided titans of Greek philosophy went far in their search for the ultimate truth. Their effort was honest. It was noble. It was not enough. The supreme answers from God which give repose to the questing spirit, except for those deducible from the natural order, Socrates and Plato and Aristotle missed.

We have simply to compare the works of Plato with those of Augustine or the works of Aristotle with those of Aquinas to see what an enrichment resulted from the decision of the two doctors of theology to adopt the best from the pagans in order to Christianize it, purify it of errors, fill in the omissions, so that the intake would befit its Catholic context. Why were we born? Where do we go from here? Why must we die? What happens to the soul after death? Is the grave the body's final destination? These are questions for which divine revelation alone has the complete answers. Hundreds of similar questions remain: and if the answers are not known, the attempt to find them on

the part of profane philosophy becomes little more than a guessing game in which one participant contradicts another.

Knowing this, Cardinal Newman did not keep the knowledge to himself. Grateful to his Protestant upbringing for the many revealed truths he had received from it, but at the same time regretful that the denominations had broken away from the Mother Church who preserves the creed intact, he went into the pulpit to speak his mind. "It will be found," the homilist tells his mixed congregation, "that either the Catholic Religion is verily and indeed the coming in of the unseen world into this, or there is nothing positive, nothing dogmatic, nothing real in any of our notions as to whence we come and whither we are going."<sup>13</sup>

Another statement, no less positive than pertinent, deserves to be quoted. "How I wept," the yet unconverted Augustine addresses the God of his yearnings, "when I heard your hymns and canticles, being deeply moved by the sweet singing of your Church. Those voices flowed into my ears, truth filtered into my heart, and from my heart surged waves of devotion."<sup>14</sup>

Do you know what put the ecstatic joy in his tears? The sudden conviction that the body of doctrines expressed in the liturgical chant were true, had to be true, had to be true, because the Church in her infallible authority from Christ taught them to be true. Without that guarantee, the doctrines would not have been believed by one who understood from his schooling in philosophy the vagaries of human reasoning on its own resources. Read the convert's perfectly clear admission: "I would not believe the Gospel unless moved thereto by the authority of the Church."<sup>15</sup>

The Bishop of Hippo knew that it was not Athanasius who won the battle for the divinity of Christ against Arius, but Athanasius with the backing of the Holy See. He knew that it was neither Eusebius of Dorylaeum nor Flavian of Constantinople who won the battle for the humanity of Christ against Eutyches, but these two members of the hierarchy with the backing of the Holy See. Did not the doctor of Grace, when locked in combat with Pelagius over the doctrine of original sin, refer the case to the Holy See? He knew that in the chair of Peter sat the only Infallible Authority on earth to settle the issue.

The grand harmony of doctrines, which the creed is and which God's infallible vicar on earth protects, brought satisfaction at last to the restless thinker who immortalised his profound contentment in *The Confessions*. His conversion to the Faith, he was quick to admit, gave meaning to the otherwise insoluble complexities of life. How often have we not read of a like acknowledgement from other converts! The process theologian, on the contrary, even when he claims to be of the Faith, obviously derives no such comfort from its fixed certitudes: he has committed himself to the impossibility of altering them to fit a false philosophy. He seems to have a grudge against them. Does he really believe in them?

## THE VOYAGE OF THE ARK

The Flood may be described as a natural, supernatural event. God intervened in His creation, then chose to effect His purposes by means of natural phenomena and by the instrument of the Ark. And it is the Ark, central to the whole Flood account, which has been the chief target of the "demythologisers" since this movement began in the 19th century.

In fact, the Scriptural account of the Ark goes into much detail, and is a very extraordinary one. The kind of wood is specified, gopher, probably cedar. Its dimensions are 300 cubits long, by breadth 50 cubits, in height 30 cubits. It had to be covered with pitch inside and outside. It had to contain "rooms," that is, a vessel with bulkheads, buttressed. It had to contain three decks, the top deck having a roof raised above it and with a look-out window.

The two common cubit measurements of the ancient world were respectively of 18 and 20.7 inches, according to Charles A. Totten of Yale University in his book, "The Flood, The Fact of History, 1892." But Totten, by various indications in Scripture, considers that the "great cubit" of 24 inches was that employed in the construction of the Ark. Taking this largest cubit we are presented with a huge ocean-going vessel of 600

feet long, by 100 feet breadth, by 60 feet high. However, taking the lowest cubit standard, it is still a vessel 450 feet long, breadth 75 feet, height 45 feet — still a huge ocean-going vessel. It was the largest vessel ever recorded until the Cunarder *Etruria* was built in 1860.

Now, it is the great theme of the rationalisers that the Scripture writers generally availed themselves of the traditions of the neighbouring peoples. But here is a writer, and of an inland people, who gave the proportions and method of construction of a large ocean-going vessel — where could he have possibly derived this detailed information? (The Ark, as given here, is very similar to the great sea-going timber barges which the writer observed plying the North American Pacific coast.) Not only that, it was far greater than anything envisaged in the ancient world, greater than the sailing ships of the 19th century, only to be equalled when the steam driven liners of that century appeared. The Noahic account is at once stamped with the extraordinary. Certainly, if the Scripture writer had derived his information from human sources, if he had wished to appeal to the sense of the possible of men of those times, he would not have given these details.

Sometimes the question is raised — could men of Noah's time have had the capacity to produce such a vessel as the Ark? To answer it one need only point to the pyramids of Egypt, to the palaces of Sumer the forerunner of Egypt, to the towers and walls of Babylon.

### THE ARK AND THE ANIMALS

This is what is considered to be the great objection to the account of the Ark, that it could not possibly have contained all the animals necessary for it to contain, that is a pair of each kind.

Then what is the actual number of the animals that had to be included? In their exhaustive volume, *The Genesis Flood*, Holcomb and Morris reproduce the table of all living species composed by Ernst Mayr, the leading American authority. The lists of the sea-borne creatures do not concern us, we need only extract the following, Mammals 3500, Birds 8600, Reptiles and Amphibians, 5500. Here we note the presence of the amphibians, and there is the fact that some among the mammals are also amphibian, but let us leave the figure untouched, 17,500 pairs or 35,000 animals.

The next thing is the size of the animals. Here there is a totally wrong mental picture, that is of hundreds, if not thousands, of giant animals like the elephant. In fact, the average size of an animal is that of a sheep, the figure accepted by the two authors mentioned. However, it is interesting to note that Byron C. Nelson, author of *"The Deluge Story in Stone"* gives the figures of 290 animals above the size of a sheep, 757 from the sheep to the rats and 1359 smaller than the rats! But for the moment, let us stick to a size of that of the sheep.

At this point there arises the question, what is a "species"? Here both Morris and Nelson raise the point that the term "species" is commonly used to denote what we once termed "varieties." These writers point out that the "kind" is not a "species" in the modern sense, a variety, but something which contains these sub-species. They, therefore, suggest that only one pair of dogs, one pair of great cats, one pair of pigeons (out of over 200 varieties) need to have been taken into the Ark; which, of course, would reduce the number of animals most drastically. But let us stick to the "species" figure of 35,000 animals, and keep it to the higher average, that of a sheep.

Now, the standard American double-decked stock car contains 2670 cu. ft., and it can contain 240 sheep, i.e. it would have required 146 of these cars to contain the 35,000 animals. But the 1,500,000 cu. ft. of space of the Ark could have contained nearly 600 of these cars. Thus, the Ark had capacity for the animals, with space left over for the clean animals, birds, the reptiles, and whatever feeding stuffs were necessary.

One other objection is that Noah and family could not have attended to the feeding of all these animals, the removal of manure, etc. But such critics seem to forget that animals in such circumstances would naturally go into a state of hibernation or estivation, as they do today. Their food was probably meant but to keep them alive in this state.

There is one final objection that must be answered — that all the animals, of all the climes, would not have been gathered in the one climatic area. But the evidences demonstrate, e.g., the fossilised tropical plants in the now Arctic areas, that the earth once possessed a uniform climate; the various kinds of animals would have been dispersed throughout the world. That they willingly gathered around the Ark is explicitly recounted in Scripture — here, once again, a Divine interposition in the order of nature.

Thus, when all the natural explanations and the evidences are taken into account we see that it was not at all impossible for the Ark to perform the function allotted to it by God.

### THE VOYAGE OF THE ARK

Since the middle of the 19th century the demythologisers have argued the case for a local Flood. But here a local Flood means one that would cover at least a sub-continent, destroying its whole civilization.

Let us remember here that there is not any record that even a Mississippi flood has covered any substantial part of the U.S.A. And are we asked to believe that a flood of the

Euphrates could perform such task? Moreover, this local flood was one that grounded the Ark upon the heights of Mount Ararat! Once again we note the curious disregard of reason on the part of the de-mythologisers: the local Flood which they postulate would be quite as miraculous as the Universal Flood itself.

But, disregarding these aberrations, let us go to the very essential of the Genesis account of the Flood: simply, the Ark had to contain a pair of each kind of mammal and bird, i.e., to save them from extinction. But everyone knows that the animals can sense catastrophe and will flee from the threatened area, and a trek of hundreds of miles is not at all unusual. However, that which best illustrates the absurdity of the local flood idea is the fact that the Ark also carried the birds. Has not everyone seen the birds foregathering in the sky as they set off on their migrations of thousands of miles. Thus, a flight of a few hours would certainly have enabled the birds to escape from the encroaching waters of any valley flood.

It would be tedious to give further examples of the absurdity of the local flood thesis. In short, with a flood of the whole Euphrates plain, it would only have been necessary for Noah and his family to journey to the nearest foothills.

The very presence of the Ark in the Noachic account renders absurd any local Flood theory. This insistence upon the local Flood idea, in fact, contradicts every line of the Noachic account, and nullifies its whole meaning. The school children, possessing fresher minds than their mentors, on being presented with such an absurdity, come to the conclusion that the whole of Scripture must be the wildest myth.

Possibly the exegetes might turn round and argue that the Noachic account was but a vision or dream granted to Noah, a parable of some kind about the need for human salvation. The present writer does not possess any theological or exegetical competence whatsoever, and would not dare to venture into this field. But here it is necessary to point out to such exegetes that the scientific evidences for the universal Flood are deposited on the high mountains of every continent, and that these world-wide phenomena correspond with the universal tradition among the peoples, that once there was a universal Flood from which only one family was the survivors. Therefore, such exegetes are faced with the core problem: if Noah and family were not the survivors of the Flood, then who were its survivors?

J.G.C.

---

## The Pope and the Theologians

Since the Pope started to discipline the dissident theologians there has arisen the most unearthly clamour, all in the name of "academic freedom."

Let us take the case of Professor Kung. Here is one who holds an official appointment as a teacher of Catholic theology, as an official spokesman of the Church. But in his written works he casts doubt upon many Catholic doctrines, and, above all, on the basis of everything, the infallibility of the Church. So, Professor Kung's case is that he should be allowed to continue as an official Catholic spokesman whilst denying everything the Church stands for. The old people had a very hard term for this sort of thing.

There is an element of wild comedy here — Professor Kung has the right to use his Chair, but Pope John Paul has no right to use his Chair!

The truth is that, Professor Kung, no longer accepting Catholic doctrine, has all the freedom in the world to leave his post and to depart to more congenial pasture with no constraint whatsoever. And what lack of academic freedom is there here?

---

## Abortion

It is a sinister sign of the times that the partial measure of Mr John Corrie's Bill has little prospect of passing in Parliament.

It is a terrible foretaste of the trend that the statistics of the New York Health Board show that there are now almost as many abortions as live births in the great American city.

One wonders if any Catholic has the right to vote for any candidate who supports abortion.