

DAYLIGHT

ORGAN OF THE COUNTER - EVOLUTION GROUP

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

JULY/AUGUST, 1980

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

Dear Readers,

God bless all here! This is one of the between issues of Daylight, literally a newsletter, a letter of news, as mentioned in the Report with the April-May issue. Its main purpose being to record our activities and to introduce pamphlets giving a summary case against Evolution, as requested by readers. (The large Daylight, dealing more with the philosophies of Evolutionism, should still be appearing several times a year).

The enclosed Fact Sheet for Students is presented to readers for their serious study. A copy of this was received quite by accident, and it seemed to be the best overall statement yet, i.e., from a scientific point of view, of the anti-Evolution case, so we asked the American publishers to rush us a parcel by Air Mail. Alas! the postage by Air Mail—there is now no real surface mail—is the killer, being more than the cost of the pamphlet itself. On review of this anomaly, the publishers, most generously, have given us rights to reproduce the publication by photo-litho in this country—our heartfelt thanks to them.

This sheet is one of many uses; it can be used as a hand out in response to enquiries; above all, it can be used for pinning up in the classroom, and its illustrations are bound to attract the students attention. Our printer is able to reproduce this sheet, and the first estimate of cost is about 10p a copy. Readers who are interested should get in touch.

One might also point out that the little leaflet on the Bombardier Beetle is one that poses acute dilemmas for the Evolutionist.

Since the previous April-May issue Daylight has been engaged on much controversy—as often happens when we are **incommunicado**—with organs of the Catholic press and with an official of a Catholic organisation, who actually reported us to the local ecclesial censor! At the same time, it has been necessary to make a protest to Vatican Radio regarding a programme in praise of Teilhard de Chardin. Some details are given below for the interest of readers.

Regarding future publications. It is intended to send out with future issues some of the best pamphlets against Evolution. Also, it is intended to publish reprints of the best Daylight articles of past issues, to be entitled "Daylight Reprints". This has already been commissioned with the printer, and should be ready in another couple of months.

As always our great need is that of helpers in all directions, those who could distribute a few extra copies, and particularly those willing to engage in the letters columns of their local papers, those who can assist in any way. Thanking all present helpers once again.

Yours sincerely,
The Editor.

OUR CATHOLIC PRESS

The Universe:

Previously we had always been denied access to this newspaper, but under the new editorship there seemed to come a change. During 1979 the editor and several readers had letters published replying to those of evolutionists.

The last letter (by the editor) was published in November 1979, and after that we decided to let well alone, not wishing to irritate the seemingly compliant Universe by asking too much space.

But then, in February 1980 appeared a letter from a gentleman in the North of England, actually challenging those anti-Evolution writers who had appeared in the Universe columns. Of course, we replied to this at once. But our letter did not appear. We waited for a month, but still the letter did not appear.

Thereupon we wrote a personal note to the editor (who had previously corresponded with us) enclosing a copy of the letter, and pointing out that this was actually in response to a challenge to us which had been printed in the Universe columns. But the editor did not reply.

Then, after a month or two, the Universe printed a statement by Msgr. Curtin, in its Question Box, to the effect that life could have sprung from non-life. A reply was sent to this, pointing out that this sort of thing was the basis of the current Evolutionist propaganda. This letter also was not published, being returned in the enclosed S.A.E.

One can only remark that the editor seems to have undergone a change in his attitude during the period in question. For the moment we shall leave it at that.

The Catholic Herald

For many years this newspaper had not been highly regarded by conservative Catholics. But then came the appointment of a new editor, a lady this time. This lady gave the impression that she was open-minded, whilst a bit of a progressive herself she was willing to look at what might be good in the conservative case.

So, for a few months past this editress has been conducting in her letters page what was apparently an open forum on Evolution. Then a Daylight reader wrote us, saying that a letter from our body was required. Well, a letter was sent in to the Catholic Herald, accompanied by a polite covering note. And what happened? Almost by return post this letter was returned, but without any explanation, only with a "with compliments" slip! This material, of course, has been retained, and any reader who so wishes can have a photo-copy.

Here readers might well ask themselves, why was a letter from the only Catholic anti-Evolution body returned, the very first letter at that, just why did the editress return this letter so promptly and without any note of explanation? By the way, there might be an interesting sequel to this affair, to be dealt with in a future issue.

REPORTED TO THE HOLY OFFICE!

And this is surely the merriest affair of all! A certain prominent Catholic gentleman took umbrage against our leaflet "Teilhard de Chardin Speaks for Himself" and he took an extraordinary step. Here are his own words in a letter to one of our readers:—

Thank you for enclosing a broadsheet published by Mr J. Campbell of Stevenson, Ayrshire. I have made enquiries of the diocesan authorities in Galloway, and there is no record of this publication being passed by the censors there. I would suggest that you bear this in mind in reading other matter from that source.

Indeed and indeed, and our reader has to bear this in mind in reading other matter from "that source"! It is hardly a complimentary saying, is it?

So, we wrote to our critic, pointing out that we had merely printed the Holy See's Monitum declaring Teilhard's works as "full of such ambiguities, or rather grave errors, as to offend Catholic doctrine" and asking what ambiguous statements in his "Phenomenon of Man" could be taken to mean. Also, we pointed out that nowhere in our leaflet was a single philosophical or theological opinion given, and that, therefore, there was nothing to censor. Surely plain enough to anyone?

This letter evoked a rather long and confused reply, and to this we replied re-iterating the main points already made. This brought another letter also confused, but it seemed to indicate a departure from the first attitude, and for this reason we have decided not to name the gentleman and the organisation concerned, for the moment.

To this letter we again replied, again re-iterated the obvious points, and it can all be summed up in one passage from our letter:

But you do not seem to grasp the point that the Catholic journalist does not require the censorship of any subordinate authority when he points out that the Holy See has effectively censored Teilhard's works.....

This we think puts the business in a nutshell. At the same time, we requested the gentleman in question to partake in the orthodox crusade, and we shall see what transpires, and keep readers informed.

Is not this whole business unbelievable, i.e. if it were not supported by full documentation?

The Reason Why

Thus we see that the two Catholic papers in this country seem determined to prevent the anti-Evolution case reaching the Catholic public.

Here is a topic which everywhere evokes animated discussion and naturally should evoke such interest among readers of the Catholic press. But, though you can present pure heresy in our Catholic papers, once the case against Evolution is mentioned the bar comes down. Whilst, at the same time, an official of a Catholic organisation can go to the absurd length of trying to have our

publication censored i.e. stopped. It must be admitted that there must be something in the wind. Here let it be recalled that St. Pius X pointed out that Evolution is the very basis of Modernism, and with all these happenings, one can only conclude that there are Modernists able to exert influence in Catholic circles.

Well, here are the facts of these curious events, and the material is all here for any reader who wishes copies. It is a thought; these people cause a furor whenever such as Kung are censored by the Holy See, but they would try to use censorship in their cause of unorthodoxy.

An exception to this norm of the Catholic press is that of the splendid **Irish Catholic** (55 Lower Gardiner St., Dublin 1). This paper, orthodox itself, gives free expression to the views of orthodox Catholics, and recently our active reader, Mr Paddy Twomey of Cork, had a letter published exposing the Naturalistic Evolutionist catechetics in our schools. The **Irish Catholic** is widely available in the U.K. and is worth supporting.

VATICAN RADIO

To the consternation of many Catholics it was announced that the Vatican Radio was to run a series on the spirituality of Teilhard de Chardin. The series commenced (monitored for us by a lady reader in the South of England) and was on the usual ultra-pius lines, the speaker, Rev. Fr. Francey, S.J., made no mention of the very odd happenings in this priest's career, nor of the fact that he willed the Ms. of his "Phenomenon of Man" to his Evolutionist friends, who then published it with a foreword by the militant atheist, Sir Julian Huxley.

We wrote to Fr. Sean McCarthy of Vatican Radio—another reader doing likewise—presenting him with photo-copies of the relevant material. Then—coincidence or not—the series was discontinued, but whether or not this discontinuance means that the series has been abandoned has not yet been announced.

It is indeed surprising that Vatican Radio should venture to give praise to this dissident priest, but we would like to believe that those responsible, like many others in the Church, might not be aware of current controversies.

To date no reply has been received from Fr. Sean McCarthy, but we shall keep readers informed of any developments.

THE IRISH THEOLOGIANS

It will be recalled that the front page of the April-May issue was devoted to a criticism of a pro-Evolutionist pamphlet by two Dublin theologians. Now has come a surprising development—one of the theologians has sent a note saying that he was not responsible for the Evolutionist part of the pamphlet.

It goes to show that the theologians who write with such seeming assuredness may not be so assured after all, indeed that they may be lacking in essential knowledge. And often a courageous attack will suffice to make the seemingly impregnable fortresses open their gates.

In this matter we are indebted to a West of Ireland reader who has sent a copy of this issue of **Daylight** to each of the Irish bishops.

POPE JOHN PAUL II

There is very little space in this issue to comment on other events, but one notes our present Pope's arduous pilgrimages to many lands, and one notes that his main platform seems to be a direct appeal to the Catholic people, linking them directly to the Chair of Peter, the Pope as the immediate pastor of all Christians.

This is a unique Pope, particularly in his sensitivity towards the ordinary members of the faithful. In his recent document on the liturgy he actually apologises, on behalf of himself and fellow bishops, to the ordinary faithful for the various travesties of the Mass. Has anyone ever heard before of a Pope apologising to the ordinary members of the laity? How different is this attitude from that of some progressive bishops who so often do not deign to answer letters.

(And has anyone noted that this unprecedented Pope has produced a new doctrine of human rights, one based on the Humanity of Jesus Christ?)

But in this liturgical sphere the Modernist clergy seem to have adopted a policy of acclaiming the Pope whilst ignoring his wishes and instructions. For instance, wide pulci-

ty was given to the Pope's refusal to give Communion in the hand during his American visit and his re-iteration of the ban on this custom for Italy, and later he refused to give Holy Communion in the hand of Madam Giscard d'Estaing, wife of the French President, during his visit to France. In spite of these unmistakable indications this baneful custom is still practised—nay, almost enforced—in many countries. And if this is not disobedience in spirit what is it?

In the liturgical document referred to the Pope insisted on the right being respected of those Catholics who wished the old custom of receiving on the tongue—but they have demolished the altar rails and do not replace them. At the same time, the Pope insisted that those who receive standing should make an appropriate gesture of reverence, but, up to the present, there seems to have been no announcement of this instruction made in the churches.

It is of interest that one of our readers was refused Communion in Westminster Cathedral because he insisted on kneeling!

Thus, the lines seem to be drawn, on one hand the Pope and the faithful who remain faithful to Peter's Chair, on the other hand the Cranmerite clergy, who enact solely upon their own human authority.

STOP PRESS.....

Just as this sheet was being sent to the printer a copy of **New Scientist**, July issue, was received. This contains a truly sensational announcement, which we give in the words of **New Scientist's** own contributor:—

The British Museum (Natural History) is preparing a new exhibition of evolution.....It will be stated that evolution is not scientific theory in the sense that it cannot be tested and refuted by experiment.

So, after a century of shouting about scientific proofs the thing is now declared, by the former great champion of evolution, not to be a science at all! More of this in a later issue.

A rivederci

Well, folks, that is the tale for this time. It was thought right to put out this broadsheet giving the account of the controversies engaged in, for controversy is our main business—five controversies in all this year. But we manage to keep cheerful, aided by some success in the work and by the fact that the main Evolutionists seem to be abandoning their "scientific" claims.

It is hoped to make a trip to Rome in October to see the Pope, and either prior to it, or shortly after, to bring out another issue of **Daylight**.

Yours sincerely,



STOP PRESS—URGENT

As this matter was being set came the report in the **Universe**, 8/8/80, of Mr Billy Quirke, a journalist of Enniscorthy, Co. Wexford, Ireland, having gained a court injunction against the Trades Unions. Mr Quirke resigned from the National Union of Journalists owing to its backing of abortion. Whereupon the Unions decided to "black" Mr Quirke's work, i.e., irrespective of the fact that Mr Quirke's action was an imperative dictate of his conscience, and one which is such for every Catholic.

So, even in the over 90p.c. Catholic society of Ireland the powers that control the Unions are powerful enough to try and deprive a Catholic journalist of his livelihood for daring to oppose abortion. This certainly confirms, in a startling manner, our previous remarks on the control of the media.

We have written to Mr Quirke, enclosing donation for his court expenses, c/o Enniscorthy Post Office. Any readers wishing to write to Mr Quirke should send letters here, and they will be forwarded as soon as Mr Quirke's address comes to hand. Even the smallest donation helps to swell the fund.

J.G.C.