

Approval Page

**A CRITIQUE OF EVOLUTION WITHIN CATHOLICISM AND ITS
SUBSEQUENT LINKS WITH FUNDAMENTAL CHRISTIANITY**

**JOHN DONNELLY DIP.PHIL., B.D., H.DIP.ED., DIP. MISSION STUDIES,
M.ED.,**

FREEDOM BIBLE COLLEGE AND SEMINARY

**THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION COMMITTEE IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCTOR OF
THEOLOGY DEGREE**

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	iv
Thesis Statement	v
Introduction	1
PART ONE: EVOLUTION AND CATHOLICISM	
Chapter 1: A Short History of Evolution Theory	3
Chapter 2: Evolution and Catholicism – The Current Position	34
Chapter 3: Can Evolution Blend with Catholicism?	54
Chapter 4: Why Evolution Can Never Become Part of Catholic Doctrine	66
Chapter 5: Why Catholics Should Reject Evolution	91
PART TWO: SOME PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND EFFECTS OF EVOLUTION WITHIN CATHOLICISM	
Chapter 6: Why Evolution is Pseudoscience – Some Philosophical Considerations	105
Chapter 7: Dangerous Effects of Evolution	130
Chapter 8: A Lesson from History	140
PART THREE: CATHOLICISM AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM – A NEED TO RETURN TO THE SCRIPTURES	
Chapter 9: Moses and the reliability of the Pentateuch	167
Chapter 10: Two Different Accounts in Genesis?	175
PART FOUR: CONCLUSION	
Chapter 11: Evolution, Catholicism and Fundamentalism	184
Bibliography	212

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to the following people: Amy Joy Reilly who helped me with advice on editing; Vidis my wife who kept encouraging me when things were going slowly, enabling me to recommence; my parents John and Alice who also were a source of encouragement and who goaded me on; my pupils who were so interested in this theme and created even more enthusiasm in me; my daughter Clodagh who has never ceased to ask questions about evolution and kept me on my toes.

THESIS STATEMENT

Evolution is a defunct belief system, which has adversely affected Catholicism, but the key to eradicate this is a return to the fundamental doctrine of Special Creation found in the Scriptures.

A CRITIQUE OF EVOLUTION WITHIN CATHOLICISM AND ITS SUBSEQUENT LINKS WITH FUNDAMENTAL CHRISTIANITY

Introduction

Evolution is a defunct belief system, which has adversely affected Catholicism, but the key to eradicate this is a return to the fundamental Doctrine of Special Creation found in the Scriptures. Many Catholics assert that the Catholic Church regards evolution as a fact thinking, “evolution is acceptable as long as God was involved”. On the contrary, I submit that evolution, when correctly defined, cannot be casually regarded as scientific fact. The objective truth, known from scientific evidence and theological arguments, contradicts evolution. I also submit that Catholic doctrine has always favoured *ex nihilo* creation (not Darwinian Evolution) as found in the book of Genesis and that this demonstrates a fundamentally Christian approach. This thesis will provide evidence that in general Catholic doctrine goes against evolution even though some Church theologians seem to state otherwise. Relevant documents will be examined to show the anti-evolution (Creation) theme. The aim of this thesis is not to critique all of the evolution bias within Catholicism but to point out the weakness of the evolution position and by doing so, evolution argument and bias will be exposed. It will also be shown that Catholicism has always had links with fundamental Christianity, demonstrating that Catholicism needs to go back to its origins and follow a more focused or fundamental teaching from the Bible against evolution dogma. Because Catholicism has not primarily focused on the Bible it finds that it has a lot of problems as a church today. This thesis is not an argument *for* Catholic doctrine in general but rather it is a critique of the philosophy/theology surrounding the topic of evolution, demonstrating the orthodox position which the Catholic Church has always had in relation to evolution, while pointing out the various errors that have crept into Catholicism. It is hoped that the conclusions to this thesis may open the debate, particularly in the Republic of Ireland which is a predominantly Catholic country.

The thesis consists of three parts. Part 1 deals with the critique of evolution. Part 2 has some philosophical considerations arising out of the critique and the dangers of evolution theory. Part 3 demonstrates that the

Pentateuch was indeed edited or written by Moses and that the Genesis account of creation is one unit.

Part 1 Chapter 1 exposes the false science of the evolution theory. Some scientific and technical language is used. The next four chapters are somewhat more theological in that they treat of the position of the Catholic Church. There is much historical information interspersed with scientific fact debunking modern evolution theory. This leads naturally into Part 2 in that having critiqued evolution for the first five chapters the next three deal with the exposition of the nature of evolution from a philosophical standpoint and the consequent dangers of supporting such a widespread belief system. Part 3 turns to Scripture because the modern day attack on the Bible in general and the book of Genesis in particular has caused a lot of people to doubt the word of God. The two chapters in this section try to restore confidence in Genesis and the author/editor as Moses.

Having defended the credibility of Scripture I then conclude in the final section by stating that the Catholic Church, in relation to the whole area of evolution, must indeed return to the fundamentals of The Christian faith. This is because the onslaught of evolution must be met head on. If evolution is no longer a fact of science then more authority is put on Scripture/Genesis as representative of simple but factual evidence. I argue that this can aid the Catholic Church in giving answers to her flock in the domain of faith, morality and direction in life. I try to show that the general Fundamental Christian position in the creation/evolution debate can be a sure way of bringing in the new evangelisation the Catholic Church has been looking for.

Various bible translations are used throughout this paper

PART 1
EVOLUTION AND CATHOLICISM

Chapter 1: A Short History of Evolution Theory

Despite having its heritage in ancient Greece, the theory of evolution was first brought to the consideration of the scientific world in the nineteenth century. The most carefully considered view of evolution was expressed by the French biologist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, in his *Zoological Philosophy* (1809). Lamarck thought that all living things were endowed with a vital force that steered them to evolve toward greater complexity. He also thought that organisms could impart to their offspring traits acquired during their lifetimes. As an example of this way of thinking, Lamarck suggested that the long neck of the giraffe evolved when a short-necked ancestor took to browsing on the leaves of trees instead of on grass.

This evolutionary model of Lamarck's was invalidated by the discovery of the laws of genetic inheritance. In the middle of the twentieth century, the discovery of the structure of DNA revealed that the nuclei of the cells of living organisms possess very special genetic information, and that this could not be altered by 'acquired traits'. In other words, during its lifetime, even though a giraffe managed to make its neck a few centimetres longer by extending it to upper branches, this trait would not pass to its offspring. In short, the Lamarckian view was simply refuted by scientific findings and went down in history as a faulty assumption.

However, the evolutionary theory formulated by another natural scientist, who lived a couple of generations after Lamarck, proved to be more influential. This natural scientist was Charles Robert Darwin, and the theory he formulated is known as "Darwinism".

The Birth of Darwinism

Charles Darwin based his theory on various observations he made as a young naturalist on board the *HMS Beagle*, which sailed in late 1831 on a five-year official voyage around the world. Young Darwin

was heavily influenced by the variety of species he observed, especially of the different Galapagos Island finches. The differences in the beaks of these birds, Darwin thought, were a result of their adaptation to their different environments.

After this voyage, Darwin started to visit animal markets in England. He observed that breeders produced new breeds of cow by mating animals with different characteristics. This experience, together with the different finch species he observed in the Galapagos Islands, contributed to the formulation of his theory. In 1859 he published his views in his book *The Origin of Species*, postulating that all species had descended from a single ancestor, evolving from one another over time by slight variations.

What made Darwin's theory different from Lamarck's was his emphasis on 'natural selection'. Darwin theorised that there is a struggle for survival in nature, and that natural selection is the survival of strong species, which can adapt to their environment. Darwin adopted the following line of reasoning:

Within a particular species there are natural and coincidental variations. For instance, some cows are bigger than others, while some have darker colours. Natural selection selects the favourable traits. The process of natural selection thus causes an increase of favourable genes within a population, which results in the features of that population becoming better adapted to local conditions. Over time these changes may be significant enough to cause a new species to arise.

However, this 'theory of evolution by natural selection' gave rise to doubts from the start:

1. What were the natural and coincidental variations referred to by Darwin? It was true that some cows were bigger than others, while some had darker colours, yet how could these variations provide an explanation for the diversity in animal and plant species?
2. Darwin asserted that living beings evolved gradually. In this case, formerly there should have lived millions of "transitional forms". Yet there was no trace of these theoretical creatures in the fossil record. Darwin gave considerable thought to this problem, and eventually arrived at the conclusion that further research would provide these fossils.
3. How could natural selection explain complex organs, such as eyes, ears or wings? How can it be defended that these organs evolved gradually, bearing in mind that they would fail to function if they had even a single part missing?

4. Before considering these questions, consider the following: How did the first organism, the so-called ancestor of all species according to Darwin, come into existence? Could natural processes give life to something which was originally inanimate and dead?

Darwin was, at least, aware of some these questions, as can be seen from the chapter “Difficulties of the Theory”. However, the answers he provided had no scientific validity. HS Lipson, a British physicist, makes the following comments about these “difficulties” of Darwin's:

On reading *The Origin of Species*, I found that Darwin was much less sure himself than he is often represented to be; the chapter entitled “Difficulties of the Theory” for example, shows considerable self-doubt. I was particularly intrigued by his comments on how the eye would have arisen.¹

Darwin invested all his hopes in advanced scientific research, which he expected to dispel the “difficulties of the theory”. However, contrary to his expectations, more recent scientific findings have merely increased these difficulties.

The Problem of the Origin of Life

In his book, Darwin never mentioned the origin of life. The primitive understanding of science in his time rested on the assumption that living things had very simple structures. Since mediaeval times, spontaneous generation, the theory that non-living matter could come together to form living organisms, had been widely accepted. It was commonly believed that insects came into existence from leftover bits of food and that mice came into being from wheat. Interesting experiments were conducted to prove this theory. Wheat was placed on a dirty piece of cloth, and it was expected that mice would appear in due course.

Similarly, the fact that maggots appeared in meat was believed to be proof for spontaneous generation. However, it was only realized some time later that maggots did not appear in meat spontaneously, but were carried by flies in the form of larvae invisible to the naked eye.

Even in the era when Darwin's *Origin of Species* was written, the belief that bacteria could come into existence from inanimate matter was pervasive.

¹ Lipson, 1988, p 6

However, five years after the publication of Darwin's book, Louis Pasteur announced his results after long studies and experiments which disproved spontaneous generation, a cornerstone of Darwin's theory. In his triumphal lecture at the Sorbonne in 1864, Pasteur said, "Never will the doctrine of spontaneous generation recover from the mortal blow struck by this simple experiment".²

Supporters of the theory of evolution refused to accept Pasteur's findings for a long time. However, as scientific progress revealed the complex structure of the cell, the idea that life could come into being coincidentally faced an even greater impasse. We shall consider this subject in some detail later.

The Problem of Genetics

Another subject that posed a dilemma for Darwin's theory was inheritance. At the time when Darwin developed his theory, the question of how living beings transmitted their traits to other generations – that is, how inheritance took place – was not completely understood. That is why the naive belief that inheritance was transmitted through blood was commonly accepted.

Ambiguous beliefs about inheritance led Darwin to base his theory on completely false grounds. Darwin assumed that natural selection was the "mechanism of evolution". Yet one question remained unanswered – How would these "useful traits" be selected and transmitted from one generation to the next? At this point, Darwin embraced the Lamarckian theory, that is, "the inheritance of acquired traits". In his book *The Great Evolution Mystery*, Gordon R Taylor, a researcher supporting the theory of evolution, expresses the view that Darwin was heavily influenced by Lamarck:

Lamarckism... is known as the inheritance of acquired characteristics... Darwin himself, as a matter of fact, was inclined to believe that such inheritance occurred and cited the reported case of a man who had lost his fingers and bred sons without fingers... [Darwin] had not, he said, gained a single idea from Lamarck. This was doubly ironical, for Darwin repeatedly toyed with the idea of the inheritance of acquired characteristics and, if it is so dreadful, it is Darwin who should be denigrated rather than Lamarck... In the 1859 edition of his work, Darwin refers to 'changes of external conditions' causing variation but subsequently these conditions are described as directing

² Fox and Dose, 1972, p 4

variation and cooperating with natural selection in directing it... Every year he attributed more and more to the agency of use or disuse... By 1868 when he published *Varieties of Animals and Plants under Domestication* he gave a whole series of examples of supposed Lamarckian inheritance: such as a man losing part of his little finger and all his sons being born with deformed little fingers, and boys born with foreskins much reduced in length as a result of generations of circumcision.³

However, Lamarck's thesis, as we have seen above, was disproved by the laws of genetic inheritance discovered by the Austrian monk and botanist, Gregor Mendel. The concept of “useful traits” was therefore left unproven. Genetic laws showed that acquired traits are not passed on, and that genetic inheritance takes place according to certain unchanging laws. These laws supported the view that species remain unchanged. No matter how often the cows that Darwin saw in England's animal fairs bred, the species itself would never change: cows would always remain cows.

Gregor Mendel announced the laws of genetic inheritance that he discovered as a result of long experiment and observation in a scientific paper published in 1865. But this paper only attracted the attention of the scientific world towards the end of the century. By the beginning of the twentieth century, the truth of these laws had been accepted by the whole scientific community. This was a serious dead-end for Darwin's theory, which tried to found the concept of “useful traits” on Lamarck.

Here we must correct a general misunderstanding: Mendel opposed not only Lamarck's model of evolution, but also Darwin's. As the article “Mendel's Opposition to Evolution and to Darwin,” published in the *Journal of Heredity*, makes clear, “he [Mendel] was familiar with *The Origin of Species*...and he was opposed to Darwin's theory; Darwin was arguing for descent with modification through natural selection, Mendel was in favour of the orthodox doctrine of special creation”.⁴

The laws discovered by Mendel put Darwinism in a very difficult position. For these reasons, scientists who supported Darwinism tried to develop a different model of evolution in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Thus “neo-Darwinism” was born.

³ Taylor, G R. 1984, pp. 36, 41–42

⁴ Bishop, 1996, pp. 205–13; also see Callender, 1988, pp. 41–75

The Efforts of Neo-Darwinism

A group of scientists, who were determined to reconcile Darwinism with the science of genetics, in one way or another, came together at a meeting organized by the Geological Society of America in 1941. After long discussion, they agreed on ways to create a new interpretation of Darwinism and over the next few years, specialists produced a synthesis of their fields into a revised theory of evolution.

The scientists who participated in establishing the new theory included the geneticists G. Ledyard Stebbins and Theodosius Dobzhansky, the zoologists Ernst Mayr and Julian Huxley, the palaeontologists George Gaylord Simpson and Glenn L. Jepsen, and the mathematical geneticists Sir Ronald A. Fisher and Sewall Wright.⁵

To counter the fact of ‘genetic stability’ (genetic homeostasis), this group of scientists employed the concept of ‘mutation’, which had been proposed by the Dutch botanist Hugo de Vries at the beginning of the twentieth century. Mutations were defects that occurred, for unknown reasons, in the inheritance mechanism of living things. Organisms undergoing mutation developed some unusual structures, which deviated from the genetic information they inherited from their parents. The concept of ‘**random mutation**’ was supposed to provide the answer to **the question of the origin of the advantageous variations which caused living organisms to evolve** according to Darwin's theory – a phenomenon that Darwin himself was unable to explain, but simply tried to side-step by referring to Lamarck. The Geological Society of America named this new theory, which was formulated by adding the concept of mutation to Darwin's natural selection thesis, the ‘**synthetic theory of evolution**’ or the ‘**modern synthesis**’. In a short time, this theory came to be known as ‘**neo-Darwinism**’ and its supporters as ‘**neo-Darwinists**’.

Yet there was a serious problem: It was true that mutations changed the genetic data of living organisms, yet this change always occurred to the detriment of the living thing concerned. All observed mutations ended up with blemished, weak, or diseased individuals and sometimes led to the death of the organism. Hence, in an attempt to find examples of “useful mutations” which improve the genetic data in living organisms, neo-Darwinists conducted many experiments and observations. For decades, they conducted

⁵ Spetner, 1997, p 20

mutation experiments on fruit flies and various other species. However, in none of these experiments was there a mutation which improved the genetic data in a living being.

Today the issue of mutation is still a great impasse for Darwinism. Despite the fact that the theory of natural selection considers mutations to be the unique source of ‘useful changes’, no mutations of any kind have been observed that are actually useful (i.e. that improve the genetic information). Another impasse for neo-Darwinists came from **the fossil record**. Even in Darwin's time, fossils were already posing an important obstacle to the theory. While Darwin himself accepted the lack of fossils of ‘intermediate species’, he also predicted that further research would provide evidence of these vanished transitional forms. However, despite all the palaeontologists' efforts, the fossil record continued to remain a serious hindrance to the theory. One by one, concepts such as ‘vestigial organs’, ‘embryological recapitulation’ and ‘homology’ lost all significance in the light of new scientific findings.

A Theory in Crisis

We have just reviewed in summary form the bottleneck Darwinism found itself in from the day it was first proposed. We will now start to analyse the enormous dimensions of this stalemate. In doing this, our intention is to show that the theory of evolution is not indisputable scientific truth, as many people assume or try to impose on others. On the contrary, there is a glaring contradiction when the theory of evolution is compared to scientific findings in such diverse fields as the origin of life, population genetics, comparative anatomy, palaeontology and biochemistry. As described by Prof. Michael Denton, an Australian biochemist and a renowned critic of Darwinism, evolution is a theory in “crisis”.

In his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), Denton examined the theory in the light of different branches of science, and concluded that the theory of natural selection is very far from providing an explanation for life on earth.⁶ Denton's intention in offering his criticism was not to show the rightness of another view, but only to compare Darwinism with the scientific facts. During the last two decades, many other scientists have published significant works questioning the legitimacy of Darwin's theory of evolution.

⁶ Denton, 1985.

In this thesis, this crisis will be examined. No matter how much concrete evidence is provided, some readers may be unwilling to abandon their positions and will continue to hold fast to the theory of evolution. However, reading this thesis will still be of use to them, helping them to see the real situation of the theory they believe, in the light of scientific findings.

THE MECHANISMS OF DARWINISM

According to the theory of evolution, living things came into existence by means of pure chance, and developed further as a consequence of coincidental effects. Approximately 3.8 billion years ago, when no living organisms existed on earth, the first simple single-celled organisms (prokaryotes) emerged. Over time, more complex cells (eukaryotes) and multicellular organisms came into being. In other words, according to Darwinism, the forces of nature manufactured simple inanimate elements into highly complex and faultless designs.

In evaluating this claim, one should first consider whether such forces exist in nature. More explicitly, are there really natural mechanisms which can bring about evolution according to the Darwinian scenario?

The neo-Darwinist model, which we shall take as the mainstream theory of evolution today, argues that life has evolved through two mechanisms: natural selection and mutation. The theory basically asserts that natural selection and mutation are complementary. The origin of evolutionary modifications lies in random mutations that take place in the genetic structures of living things. The traits brought about by mutations are selected by the mechanism of natural selection, and in this way living things evolve. However, when we look further into this theory, we find that there is no such evolutionary mechanism. Neither natural selection nor mutations can cause different species to evolve into one another, and the claim that they can is completely unfounded.

Natural Selection

The concept of natural selection is the basis of Darwinism. This assertion is stressed even in the title of the book in which Darwin proposed his theory: *The Origin of Species, by means of Natural Selection...*

Natural selection is based on the assumption that in nature there is a constant struggle for survival. It favours organisms with traits that best enable them to cope with pressures exerted by the environment. At the end of this struggle, the strongest ones, the ones most suited to natural conditions, survive. For example, in a herd of deer under threat from predators, those individuals that can run fastest will naturally survive. As a consequence, the herd of deer will eventually consist of only fast-running individuals.

However, no matter how long this process goes on, it will not transform those deer into another species (or another kind of animal). The weak deer are eliminated, the strong survive, but, since no alteration in their genetic data takes place, no change of a species occurs. Despite the continuous processes of selection, deer continue to survive as deer.

The deer example is true for all species. In any population, natural selection only eliminates those weak or unsuited individuals who are unable to adapt to the natural conditions in their habitat. It does not create new species, new genetic information, or new organs. That is, it cannot cause anything to evolve. Darwin too, accepted this fact, stating that “**natural selection can do nothing until favourable individual differences or variations occur**”.⁷ This is why neo-Darwinism had to add the mutation mechanism, as a factor altering genetic information, to the concept of natural selection.

We will deal with mutations next. But before proceeding, we need to further examine the concept of natural selection in order to see the contradictions inherent in it.

A Struggle for Survival?

The essential assumption of the theory of natural selection holds that there is a fierce struggle for survival in nature, and every living thing cares only for itself. At the time Darwin proposed this theory the ideas of Thomas Malthus, the British classical economist, were an important influence on him. Malthus maintained that human beings were inevitably in a constant struggle for survival, basing his views on the fact that population, and hence the need for food resources, progresses geometrically, while food

⁷ Darwin, 1998, p 127 (*emphasis added*)

resources themselves increase only arithmetically. The result is that population size is inevitably checked by factors in the environment, such as hunger and disease. Darwin adapted Malthus' vision of a fierce struggle for survival among human beings to nature at large, and claimed that "natural selection" is a consequence of this struggle.

Further research, however, revealed that there was no struggle for life in nature as Darwin had postulated. As a result of extensive research into animal groups in the 1960s and 1970s, V C Wynne-Edwards, a British zoologist, concluded that living things balance their population in an interesting way, which prevents competition for food. Animal groups were simply managing their population on the basis of their food resources. Population was regulated, not by elimination of the weak through factors like epidemics or starvation, but by instinctive control mechanisms. In other words, animals controlled their numbers not by fierce competition, as Darwin suggested, but by limiting reproduction.⁸

Even plants exhibited examples of population control, which invalidated Darwin's suggestion of selection by means of competition. The botanist A D Bradshaw's observations indicated that during reproduction, plants behaved according to the 'density' of the planting, and limited their reproduction if the area was highly populated with plants.⁹ On the other hand, examples of sacrifice observed in animals such as ants and bees display a model completely opposed to the Darwinist struggle for survival.

In recent years, research has even revealed findings regarding self-sacrifice in bacteria. These living things, without brains or nervous systems, totally devoid of any capacity for thought, kill themselves to save other bacteria when they are invaded by viruses.¹⁰

These examples surely invalidate the basic assumption of natural selection—the absolute struggle for survival. It is true that there is competition in nature; however, there are clear models of self-sacrifice and cohesion, as well.

Observation and Experiments

Apart from the theoretical weaknesses mentioned above, the theory of evolution by natural selection comes up against a fundamental impasse when faced with concrete scientific findings. The scientific

⁸ Wynne-Edwards, 1965, pp. 1543–48; Wynne-Edwards, 1986.

⁹ Bradshaw, 1965, pp. 115-155; cited in Spetner, 1997, pp. 16–17.

¹⁰ Andy Coghlan, 1999

value of a theory must be assessed according to its success or failure in experiment and observation. Evolution by natural selection fails on both counts.

Since Darwin's time, there has been no evidence put forward to show that natural selection causes living things to evolve. Colin Patterson, senior palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History in London and a prominent evolutionist, stresses that natural selection has never been observed to have the ability to cause things to evolve:

“No one has ever produced a species by the mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever got near it, and most of the current argument in neo-Darwinism is about this question.”¹¹

Philip Johnson has these words to say in his book *Darwin on Trial*:

The “evolution in action” of J Huxley and other biologists is simply the observation of demographic facts, local fluctuations of genotypes, geographical distributions. Often the species concerned have remained practically unchanged for hundreds of centuries! Fluctuation as a result of circumstances, with prior modification of the genome, does not imply evolution, and we have tangible proof of this in many panchronic species [i.e. living fossils that remain unchanged for millions of years].¹²

A close look at a few “observed examples of natural selection” presented by biologists who advocate the theory of evolution, would reveal that, in reality, they do not provide any evidence for evolution.

The True Story of Industrial Melanism

When evolutionist sources are examined, one inevitably sees that the example of moths in England during the Industrial Revolution is cited as an example of evolution by natural selection. This is put forward as the most concrete example of evolution observed, in textbooks, magazines and even academic sources. In actual fact, this example has nothing to do with evolution at all.

According to this account, at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in England, the colour of tree barks around Manchester was quite light. Because of this, dark-coloured moths resting on those trees could easily be noticed by the birds that fed on them, and therefore they had very little chance of survival.

¹¹ Colin Patterson, “Cladistics”, interview by Brian Leek, interviewer Peter Franz, March 4, 1982, BBC. (*emphasis added*)

¹² Johnson, 1991, p 27.

Fifty years later, in woodland where industrial pollution has killed the lichens, the bark of the trees had darkened, so now the light-coloured moths became the most hunted, since they were the most easily noticed. As a result, the proportion of light-coloured to dark-coloured moths decreased. Evolutionists believe this to be a great piece of evidence for their theory. They take refuge and solace in window-dressing, showing how light-coloured moths 'evolved' into dark-coloured ones.

However, although we believe these facts to be correct, it should be quite clear that they can in no way be used as evidence for the theory of evolution, since no new form arose that had not existed before. Dark coloured moths had existed in the moth population before the Industrial Revolution. Only the relative proportions of the existing moth varieties in the population changed. The moths had not acquired a new trait or organ, which would cause "speciation".¹³ In order for one moth species to turn into a different living species, for example, a bird, new additions would have had to be made to its genes. That is, an entirely separate genetic program would have had to be loaded to include information about the physical traits of the bird.

This is the answer to the evolutionist story of Industrial Melanism. However, there is a more interesting side to the story, not just its interpretation, as the story itself is flawed. As molecular biologist Jonathan Wells explains in his book *Icons of Evolution*, the story of the peppered moths, which is included in almost every evolutionary biology book and has therefore, become an 'icon' in this sense, does not reflect the truth. Wells discusses in his book how Bernard Kettlewell's experiment, which is known as the 'experimental proof' of the story, is actually a scientific scandal. Some basic elements of this scandal are:

Many experiments conducted after Kettlewell's revealed that only one type of moth rests on tree trunks, and all other types prefer to sit beneath small, horizontal branches. Since 1980 it has become clear that peppered moths do not normally rest on tree trunks. In 25 years of fieldwork many scientists, such as Cyril Clarke; Rory Howlett; Michael Majerus; Tony Liebert and Paul Brakefield, concluded that in Kettlewell's experiment, moths were forced to act atypically, therefore the test results could not be accepted as scientific.¹⁴

¹³ For more detailed information about Industrial Melanism, please see Johnson, 1991, p 26.

¹⁴ Wells, 2000, pp. 149–50

Scientists who tested Kettlewell's conclusions came up with a more astonishing result: The quantity of light moths would be expected to be larger in the less polluted regions of England, but the dark moths there still numbered four times as many as the light ones. This meant that there was no correlation between the moth population and the tree trunks as claimed by Kettlewell and repeated by almost all evolutionist sources.

As the research deepened, the scandal changed dimension: “the moths on tree trunks” photographed by Kettlewell, were actually dead moths. Kettlewell glued or pinned dead specimens to tree trunks and then photographed them. In truth, there was little chance of taking such a picture as the moths rested underneath the leaves, not on the tree trunks.¹⁵

These facts were exposed by the scientific community only in the late 1990s. The collapse of the myth of Industrial Melanism, which had been one of the most cherished subjects in “Introduction to Evolution” courses in universities for decades, greatly disappointed evolutionists. One of them, Jerry Coyne, remarked, “My own reaction resembles the dismay attending my discovery, at the age of six, that it was my father and not Santa who brought the presents on Christmas Eve.”¹⁶

Thus, “the most famous example of natural selection” was relegated to the trash-heap of history as a scientific scandal – which was inevitable since natural selection is not an “evolutionary mechanism”, contrary to what evolutionists claim.

In short, natural selection is not capable of adding a new characteristic to a living organism, or of removing one. Neither is it capable of changing an organism of one species into that of another. The ‘greatest’ evidence put forward since Darwin has been able to go no further than the ‘Industrial Melanism’ of moths in England.

Why Natural Selection Cannot Explain Complexity

As we showed at the beginning, the greatest problem for the theory of evolution by natural selection, is that it cannot facilitate new organs or traits to emerge in living things. Natural selection cannot develop a species’ genetic data; therefore it cannot be used to explain the emergence of new species. The greatest

¹⁵ Wells, 2000, pp. 141–51

¹⁶ Jerry Coyne, 1988, pp. 35–6 (A review of Michael Majerus's *Melanism: Evolution in Action*.)

defender of the theory of punctuated equilibrium, Stephen Jay Gould, refers to this impasse of natural selection as follows:

The essence of Darwinism lies in a single phrase: natural selection is the creative force of evolutionary change. No one denies that selection will play a negative role in eliminating the unfit. Darwinian theories require that it create the fit as well.¹⁷

Another of the misleading methods that evolutionists employ on the issue of natural selection is their effort to present this mechanism as an intelligent designer. However, **natural selection has no intelligence**. It does not possess a will that can decide what is good and what is bad for living things. As a result, natural selection cannot explain biological systems and organs that possess the feature of **'irreducible complexity'**. These systems and organs are composed of a great number of parts co-operating together, and are of no use if even one of these parts is missing or defective. (For example, the human eye does not function unless it exists with all its components intact.)

Therefore, the will that brings all these parts together should be able to foresee the future and aim directly at the advantage that is to be acquired at the final stage. Since natural selection has no consciousness or will, it can do no such thing. This fact, which demolishes the foundations of the theory of evolution, also worried Darwin, who wrote: **"If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down."**¹⁸

Mutations

Mutations are defined as breaks or replacements taking place in the DNA molecule, which is found in the nuclei of the cells of a living organism and contains all its genetic information. These breaks or replacements are the result of external effects such as radiation or chemical action. Every mutation is an 'accident' and either damages the nucleotides making up the DNA or changes their locations. Most of the time, they cause so much damage and alteration that the cell cannot repair itself.

Mutation, which evolutionists repeatedly hide behind, is not a magic wand that modifies living organisms into a more advanced and perfect form. The direct effect of mutations is harmful. The changes effected

¹⁷ Gould, 1977b, p 28

¹⁸ Charles Darwin, 1964, p. 89 (*emphasis added*)

by mutations can only be similar to those experienced by people in Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Chernobyl: that is, death, disability, and disfigurement.

The reason for this is very simple: DNA has a very complex structure, and random effects can only damage it. Biologist B G Ranganathan states:

First, genuine mutations are very rare in nature. Secondly, most mutations are harmful since they are random, rather than orderly changes in the structure of genes; **any random change in a highly ordered system will be for the worse, not for the better.** For example, if **an earthquake** were to shake a highly ordered structure such as a building, there would be a random change in the framework of the building, which, in all probability, **would not be an improvement.**¹⁹

Not surprisingly, **no useful mutation has been so far observed.** All mutations have proven to be harmful. The evolutionist, scientist Warren Weaver comments on the report prepared by the Committee on Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation, which was formed to look into mutations that might have been caused by the nuclear weapons used in the Second World War:

“Many will be puzzled about the statement that practically all known mutant genes are harmful. For mutations are a necessary part of the process of evolution. How can a good effect – evolution to higher forms of life – result from **mutations practically all of which are harmful?**”²⁰

Every effort put into “generating a useful mutation” has resulted in failure. For decades, evolutionists carried out many experiments to produce mutations in **fruit flies**, as these insects reproduce very rapidly and so mutations would show up quickly. Generation upon generation of these flies were mutated, yet no useful mutation was ever observed. The evolutionist geneticist Gordon Taylor writes accordingly:

It is a striking, but not much mentioned fact that, though geneticists have been breeding fruit-flies for sixty years or more in labs all round the world – flies which produce a new generation every eleven days – they have never yet seen the emergence of a new species or even a new enzyme.²¹

Another researcher, Michael Pitman, comments on the failure of the experiments carried out on fruit flies:

¹⁹ B G. Ranganathan, 1988 (*emphasis added*) quote accessed online at http://www.bbcrefuted.com/bbc_evolutionary_1.html

²⁰ Warren Weaver et al., 1956, p 1159 (*emphasis added*)

²¹ Taylor, G R. 1984, p 48

Morgan, Goldschmidt, Muller, and other geneticists have subjected generations of fruit flies to extreme conditions of heat, cold, light, dark, and treatment by chemicals and radiation. All sorts of mutations, practically all trivial or positively deleterious, have been produced. Man-made evolution? Not really: Few of the geneticists' monsters could have survived outside the bottles they were bred in. In practice **mutants die, are sterile, or tend to revert to the wild type.**²²

The same holds true for man. All mutations that have been observed in human beings have had deleterious results. All mutations that take place in humans result in physical deformities or infirmities such as **mongolism, Down syndrome, albinism, dwarfism** or **cancer**. Needless to say, a process that leaves people disabled or sick cannot be 'an evolutionary mechanism' – evolution is believed to produce forms that are better fitted to survive.

The American pathologist David A. Demick notes the following in a scientific article about mutations:

Literally thousands of human diseases associated with genetic mutations have been catalogued in recent years, with more being described continually. A recent reference book of medical genetics listed some 4,500 different genetic diseases. Some of the inherited syndromes characterized clinically in the days before molecular genetic analysis (such as Marfan's syndrome) are now being shown to be heterogeneous; that is, associated with many different mutations... With this array of human diseases that are caused by mutations, what of positive effects? With thousands of examples of harmful mutations readily available, surely it should be possible to describe some positive mutations if macroevolution is true. These would be needed not only for evolution to greater complexity, but also to offset the downward pull of the many harmful mutations. **But, when it comes to identifying positive mutations, evolutionary scientists are strangely silent.**²³

The only instance evolutionary biologists give of "useful mutation" is the disease known as **sickle cell anemia**. Here, the haemoglobin molecule, which acts to carry oxygen in the blood, is damaged as a result of a mutation, and undergoes a structural change. As a consequence of this, the ability of the haemoglobin molecule to carry oxygen is seriously impaired. People with sickle cell anaemia experience increasing respiratory difficulties for this reason. However, this example of mutation, which is discussed under blood disorders in medical textbooks, is strangely appraised by some evolutionary biologists as a

²² Michael Pitman, 1984b, p 70 (*emphasis added*)

²³ David A Demick, 1999 (*emphasis added*)

‘useful mutation’. They say that the partial immunity to malaria by those with the illness is a “gift” of evolution. Using the same logic, one could say that people born with genetic leg paralysis are powerless to walk and so are saved from being killed in traffic accidents – therefore genetic leg paralysis is a ‘useful genetic feature’. This logic is wholly unfounded.

It is obvious that mutations are entirely a destructive mechanism. Pierre-Paul Grassé, former president of the French Academy of Sciences, is quite unequivocal about this point in a comment he made about mutations. Grassé equated mutations to making mistakes in the letters when copying a written text. And as with mutations, letter mistakes cannot give rise to any information, but merely damage the information that already exists. Grassé described this detail in this way:

Mutations, in time, occur incoherently. They are not complementary to one another, nor are they cumulative in successive generations toward a given direction. They modify what preexists, but they do so in disorder, no matter how.... As soon as some disorder, even slight, appears in an organized being, sickness, then death follows. There is no possible compromise between the phenomenon of life and anarchy.²⁴

Hence for that reason, as Grassé puts it, “**No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution.**”²⁵

The Pleiotropic Effect

The most significant proof that mutations lead simply to damage, is the process of genetic coding. Almost all of the genes in a fully developed living thing carry more than one piece of information. For example, one gene may control both the height and eye colour of that organism. Microbiologist Michael Denton explains this feature of genes in higher organisms, such as human beings, in this way:

The effects of genes on development are often surprisingly diverse. In the house mouse, nearly every coat-colour gene has some effect on body size. Out of seventeen x-ray induced eye colour mutations in the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*, fourteen affected the shape of the sex organs of the female, a characteristic that one would have thought was quite unrelated to eye colour.

²⁴ Grassé, 1977, pp. 97, 98

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p 88 (*emphasis added*)

Almost every gene that has been studied in higher organisms has been found to effect more than one organ system, a multiple effect which is known as pleiotropy. As Mayr argues in *Population, Species and Evolution*: 'It is doubtful whether any genes that are not pleiotropic exist in higher organisms'.²⁶

Because of this characteristic of the genetic make-up of living things, any accidental change because of a mutation, in any gene in the DNA, will have an effect on more than one organ. Accordingly, this mutation will not be restricted to one part of the body, but will expose more of its negative impact. Even if one of these impacts turns out to be beneficial, as a result of a very rare fluke, the unavoidable effects of the other damage it causes will more than outweigh those benefits.

To summarize, there are three main reasons why mutations cannot make evolution possible:

1. The express effect of mutations is harmful: Since they occur arbitrarily, they almost always harm the living organism that undergoes them. Reason tells us that insensible intrusion in a perfect and complex structure will not improve that structure, but will rather impair it. Indeed, no "useful mutation" has ever been observed.
2. Mutations add no novel information to an organism's DNA: The particles making up the genetic information are either destroyed, damaged or moved. Mutations cannot make a living thing gain a new organ or a new characteristic. They only cause aberrations like a leg protruding from the back, or an ear from the stomach.
3. In order for a mutation to be transmitted to the succeeding generation, it has to have occurred in the reproductive cells of the organism: A random change that occurs in a cell or organ of the body cannot be transferred to the next generation. For example, a human eye distorted by the effects of radiation, or by other causes, will not be passed on to subsequent generations.

All the explanations presented above point out that natural selection and mutation have no evolutionary effect at all. So far, no visible example of "evolution" has been obtained by this method. Sometimes, evolutionary biologists declare that they cannot observe the evolutionary effect of natural selection and mutation mechanisms since these mechanisms occur only over an extended period of time. However, this

²⁶ Michael Denton, 1985, p 149

argument is groundless, in the sense that it lacks any scientific foundation. During his lifetime, a scientist can observe thousands of generations of living things with short life spans such as fruit flies or bacteria, and still detect no 'evolution'. Pierre-Paul Grassé states the following about the unchanging nature of bacteria, a fact which invalidates evolution:

Bacteria...are the organisms which, because of their huge numbers, produce the most mutants. [B]acteria...exhibit a great fidelity to their species. The bacillus *Escherichia coli*, whose mutants have been studied very carefully, is the best example. The reader will agree that it is surprising, to say the least, to want to prove evolution and to discover its mechanisms and then to choose as a material for this study a being which practically stabilized a billion years ago! **What is the use of their unceasing mutations, if they do not [create evolutionary] change?** In sum, the mutations of bacteria and viruses are merely hereditary fluctuations around a median position; a swing to the right, a swing to the left, but no final evolutionary effect. Cockroaches, which are one of the most venerable living insect groups, have remained more or less unchanged since the Permian, yet they have undergone as many mutations as *Drosophila*, a Tertiary insect.²⁷

In brief, it is impossible for living beings to have evolved, because there is no mechanism in nature that can cause evolution. Furthermore, this conclusion concurs with the evidence of the fossil record, which does not exhibit the existence of a process of evolution, but rather quite the contrary.

THE TRUE ORIGIN OF SPECIES

When Darwin's *The Origin of Species* was published in 1859 it was thought that he had put forward a theory that could account for the extraordinary variety of living things. He had observed that there were different variations within the same species. For instance, while wandering through England's animal fairs, he noticed that there were many different breeds of cow and stockbreeders selectively mated them to produce new breeds. Taking that as his starting point, he continued with the logic that "living things can naturally vary within themselves", which meant that over a long period of time all living things could have descended from a common ancestor.

²⁷ Grassé, 1977, p 87 (*emphasis added*)

However, Darwin's assumption about “the origin of species” was not actually able to explain their origin at all. Thanks to developments in genetic science, it is now understood that increases in variety within one species can never lead to the emergence of another new species. What Darwin believed to be ‘evolution’, was actually ‘variation’.

The Meaning of Variation

Variation is a genetic expression referring to an event that causes the individuals or groups of a certain type or species to possess different characteristics from one another. For example, all the people on earth hold basically the same genetic information, yet some have slanted eyes, some have blonde hair, some have long noses and others are short of stature, all depending on the degree of the variation potential of this genetic information.

Variations do not represent evidence for evolution because they are the outcome of different arrangements of already existing genetic information, and do not add any new trait to the genetic information. The important obsession for the theory of evolution is the question of how brand-new information to create a brand-new species could come about.

Variation always takes place within the confines of genetic information. In the science of genetics, this limit is called the ‘gene pool’. All of the characteristics present in the gene pool of a species may come to light in different ways due to variation. For example, varieties that have relatively longer tails or shorter legs may emerge in a certain species of reptile, as a result of variation, since information for both long-legged and short-legged forms may exist in the gene pool of that species. However, variations do not change reptiles into birds by adding wings or feathers to them, or by changing their metabolism. Such a change necessitates an increase in the genetic information of the organism, which is certainly not possible through variations.

Darwin was not aware of this fact when he devised his theory. He thought that there was no limit to variations. An article he wrote in 1844 stated: “That a limit to variation does exist in nature is assumed by most authors, though I am unable to discover a single fact on which this belief is grounded.”²⁸ In *The Origin of Species* he cited different examples of variations as the most important evidence for his theory.

²⁸ Eiseley, 1958, p 186; cited in Macbeth, 1971, p 30

For instance, according to Darwin, animal breeders who mated different types of cattle in order to bring about new varieties that produced more milk were eventually going to transform them into a different species. Darwin's notion of "unlimited variation" is best seen in the following sentence from *The Origin of Species*:

I can see no difficulty in a race of bears being rendered, by natural selection, more and more aquatic in their structure and habits, with larger and larger mouths, till a creature was produced as monstrous as a whale.²⁹

The reason Darwin cited such a fanciful example was the archaic understanding of science in his day. Since then, in the twentieth century, science has put forward the principle of "genetic stability" (genetic homeostasis), based on the results of experiments carried out on living things. This principle holds that since all mating attempts conducted to change a species into another have been open to doubt, there are strict barriers among different species of living things. This meant that it was utterly impossible for animal breeders to convert cattle into a different kind of animal by mating different variations of them, as Darwin had postulated.

Norman Macbeth, who disproved Darwinism in his book *Darwin Retried*, states:

The heart of the problem is whether living things do indeed vary to an unlimited extent... The species look stable. We have all heard of disappointed breeders who carried their work to a certain point only to see the animals or plants revert to where they had started. Despite strenuous efforts for two or three centuries, it has never been possible to produce a blue rose or a black tulip.³⁰

Luther Burbank, considered the most competent breeder of all time, expressed this fact when he said, "there are limits to the development possible, and these limits follow a law".³¹ In his article titled "Some Biological Problems With the Natural Selection Theory," Jerry Bergman comments by quoting from biologist Edward Deevey who explains that variations always take place within strict genetic boundaries:

Deevey concludes, 'Remarkable things have been done by cross-breeding...but wheat is still wheat, and not, for instance, grapefruit. We can no more grow wings on pigs than hens can make cylindrical eggs.' A more contemporary example is the average increase in male height that has

²⁹ Charles Darwin, 1964, p 184

³⁰ Macbeth, 1971, pp. 32-33

³¹ Macbeth, 1971, p 36

occurred the past century. Through better health care (and perhaps also some sexual selection, as some women prefer taller men as mates) males have reached a record adult height during the last century, but the increase is rapidly disappearing, indicating that we have reached our limit.³²

In short, variations only bring about changes which remain within the limitations of the genetic information of species; they can never append new genetic data to them. For this reason, no variation can be considered an example of evolution. No matter how often you mate different breeds of dogs or horses, the end result will still be dogs or horses, with no new species or kind emerging. The Danish scientist W. L. Johannsen sums the matter up, “The variations upon which Darwin and Wallace placed their emphasis cannot be selectively pushed beyond a certain point, that such variability does not contain the secret of ‘indefinite departure’.”³³

Confessions about ‘Microevolution’

As we have seen, genetic science has revealed that variations, which Darwin thought could account for ‘the origin of species’, actually do no such thing. For this reason, evolutionary biologists were strained to distinguish between variation within species and the formation of new ones, and to propose two different concepts for these different phenomena. Diversity within a species – that is, variation – they called ‘microevolution’, and the hypothesis of the development of new species was termed ‘macroevolution’.

These two concepts have appeared in biology books for quite some time. But there is actually a deception going on here, because the examples of variation that evolutionary biologists have called “microevolution” actually have nothing to do with the theory of evolution. The theory of evolution proposes that living things can develop and produce new genetic data by the mechanisms of mutation and natural selection. However, as we have just seen, variations can never create new genetic information, and are thus incapable of bringing about ‘evolution’. Giving variations the name of “microevolution” is actually an ideological fondness on the part of evolutionary biologists.

The impression that evolutionary biologists have given by using the term ‘microevolution’ is the false logic that over time variations can form brand new classes or kinds of living things. And many people who are not already up to date on the subject come away with the apparent idea that “as it spreads,

³² Bergman, 1992

³³ Loren Eiseley, 1958, p 227; cited in Macbeth, 1971, p 33

microevolution can turn into macroevolution.” One can often see examples of that sort of thinking. Some “amateur” evolutionists put forward such examples of logic as the following: since human beings' average height has risen by two centimetres in just a century, this means that over millions of years any kind of evolution is achievable. However, as has been exposed above, all variations such as changes in average height happen within specific genetic limits, and are trends that have nothing to do with evolution.

In truth, nowadays even evolutionist experts accept that the variations they call ‘microevolution’ cannot lead to new kinds of living things – in other words, to “macroevolution.” In a 1996 article in the leading journal *Developmental Biology*, the evolutionary biologists S F. Gilbert, J.M. Opitz, and R.A. Raff explained the matter this way:

The Modern Synthesis is a remarkable achievement. However, starting in the 1970s, many biologists began questioning its adequacy in explaining evolution. Genetics might be adequate for explaining microevolution, but microevolutionary changes in gene frequency were not seen as able to turn a reptile into a mammal or to convert a fish into an amphibian. Microevolution looks at adaptations that concern only the survival of the fittest, not the arrival of the fittest. As Goodwin (1995) points out, **“the origin of species – Darwin's problem – remains unsolved.”**³⁴

The fact that ‘microevolution’ cannot lead to ‘macroevolution’, in other words that variations present no explanation of the origin of species, has been acknowledged by other evolutionary biologists as well. The noted author and science expert Roger Lewin describes the result of a four-day symposium held in November 1980 at the Chicago Museum of Natural History, in which 150 evolutionists participated:

The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution. ...The answer can be given as a clear, No.³⁵

We can sum up the situation like this: Variations, which Darwinism has seen as “evidence of evolution” for some hundred years, actually have nothing to do with ‘the origin of species’. Cows can be mated together for millions of years, and different breeds of cows may well emerge. But cows can never turn

³⁴ Gilbert, Opitz, & Raff, 1996, p 361 (*emphasis added*)

³⁵ Lewin, 1980, p 883

into a different species or kind – giraffes or elephants for instance. In the same way, the diverse finches that Darwin saw on the Galapagos Islands are an additional example of variation that is no evidence for ‘evolution’. Recent observations have revealed that the finches did not undergo an unlimited variation as Darwin's theory presupposed. Moreover, most of the different types of finches which Darwin thought represented 14 distinct species actually mated with one another, which means that they were variations that belonged to the same species. Scientific observation shows that the finch beaks, which have been mythicized in almost all evolutionist sources, are in fact an example of “variation”; therefore, they do not constitute evidence for the theory of evolution. For example, Peter and Rosemary Grant, who spent years observing the finch varieties in the Galapagos Islands searching for evidence for Darwinian evolution, were forced to conclude that “the population, subjected to natural selection, is oscillating back and forth”, a fact which implied that no ‘evolution’ that leads to the emergence of new traits ever takes place there.³⁶ So for these reasons, evolutionists are still unable to resolve Darwin's dilemma of the ‘origin of species’.

The Origin of Species in the Fossil Record

The evolutionist claim is that each species on earth came from a single common ancestor through minor changes. In other words, the theory deems life to be a continuous phenomenon, without any predetermined or fixed categories. However, the examination of nature clearly does not reveal such a continuous picture. What emerges from the living world is that life-forms are strictly split into very distinct categories. Robert Carroll, an evolutionist authority, admits this fact in his *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*:

Although an almost incomprehensible number of species inhabit Earth today, they do not form a continuous spectrum of barely distinguishable intermediates. Instead, nearly all species can be recognized as belonging to a relatively limited number of clearly distinct major groups, with very few illustrating intermediate structures or ways of life.³⁷

Therefore, evolutionists presume ‘intermediate’ life-forms that constitute links between living organisms have lived in the past. This is why the fundamental science that can shed light on the matter is palaeontology, the study of fossils. Evolution is alleged to be a process that took place in the past, and the

³⁶ Lisle Gibbs & Peter R. Grant, 1987, pp. 513; for more detailed information, please see Wells, 2000, pp. 159–75.

³⁷ Carroll, 1997, p 9

only scientific source that can supply us with information on the history of life is fossil discoveries. The well-known French palaeontologist Pierre-Paul Grassé has this to say on the subject:

Naturalists must remember that the process of evolution is revealed only through fossil forms... *only* palaeontology can provide them with the evidence of evolution and reveal its course or mechanisms.³⁸

In order for the fossil record to shed any light on the subject, we shall have to contrast the hypotheses of the theory of evolution with fossil discoveries.

According to the theory of evolution, every species has emerged from a predecessor. One species which existed previously turned into something else over time, and all species have come into being in this way.

According to the theory, this transformation proceeds gradually over millions of years.

If this were the case, then numerous intermediate species should have lived during the vast period of time when these transformations were supposedly occurring. For instance, there should have lived in the past some half-fish/half-reptile creatures which had acquired some reptilian traits in addition to the fish traits they already had. Or there should have existed some reptile/bird creatures, which had acquired some avian traits in addition to the reptilian traits they already possessed. Evolutionists refer to these imaginary creatures, which they believe to have lived in the past, as “transitional forms”.

If such animals had really existed, there would have been millions, even billions, of them. More importantly, the remains of these creatures should be present in the fossil record. The number of these transitional forms should have been even greater than that of present animal species, and their remains should be found all over the world. In *The Origin of Species*, Darwin accepted this fact and explained:

If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking most closely all of the species of the same group together must assuredly have existed... Consequently evidence of their former existence could be found only amongst fossil remains.³⁹

Even Darwin himself was aware of the absence of such transitional forms. He hoped that they would be found in the future. Despite his confidence, he realized that these missing intermediate forms were the largest stumbling-block for his theory. That is why he wrote the following in the chapter of the *Origin of Species* entitled “Difficulties of the Theory”:

³⁸ Grassé, 1977, p 82

³⁹ Charles Darwin, 1964, p 179

...Why, if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, **do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms?** Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?...But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?... But in the intermediate region, having intermediate conditions of life, why do we not now find closely-linking intermediate varieties? This difficulty for a long time quite confounded me.⁴⁰

The only explanation Darwin could come up with to answer this objection was the argument that the fossil record discovered so far was inadequate. He asserted that when the fossil record had been studied in detail, the missing links/transitions would be found.

The Question of Transitional Forms

Believing in Darwin's prophecy, evolutionary palaeontologists have been digging up fossils and searching for missing links all over the world since the middle of the nineteenth century. Despite their best efforts, no transitional halfway forms have yet been uncovered. All the fossils unearthed in excavations have shown that, contrary to the beliefs of evolutionists, life appeared on earth all of a sudden and fully-formed.

Robert Carroll, an expert on vertebrate palaeontology and a committed evolutionist, comes to the conclusion that the Darwinist hope has not been satisfied with fossil discoveries:

Despite more than a hundred years of intense collecting efforts since the time of Darwin's death, the fossil record still does not yield the picture of infinitely numerous transitional links that he expected.⁴¹

Another evolutionary palaeontologist, K. S. Thomson, tells us that new groups of organisms appear very abruptly in the fossil record:

When a major group of organisms arises and first appears in the record, it seems to come fully equipped with a suite of new characters not seen in related, putatively ancestral groups. These radical changes in morphology and function appear to arise very quickly...⁴²

⁴⁰ Charles Darwin, 1998, p 124–5 (*emphasis added*)

⁴¹ Carroll, 1997, p 25

⁴² Thomson, 1988, p 98

Biologist Francis Hitching, in his book *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, states:

If we find fossils, and if Darwin's theory was right, we can predict what the rock should contain; finely graduated fossils leading from one group of creatures to another group of creatures at a higher level of complexity. The 'minor improvements' in successive generations should be as readily preserved as the species themselves. But this is hardly ever the case. In fact, the opposite holds true, as Darwin himself complained; "innumerable transitional forms must have existed, but why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?" Darwin felt though that the "extreme imperfection" of the fossil record was simply a matter of digging up more fossils. But as more and more fossils were dug up, it was found that almost all of them, without exception, were very close to current living animals.⁴³

The fossil record reveals that species emerged rapidly, with totally different structures, and remained exactly the same over the longest geological epochs. Stephen Jay Gould, a Harvard University palaeontologist and well-known evolutionist, admitted this fact first in the late 70s:

The history of most fossil species include two features particularly inconsistent with gradualism:

1) **Stasis** – most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth. They appear in the fossil record looking much the same as when they disappear; morphological change is usually limited and directionless; 2) **Sudden appearance** – in any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and 'fully formed'.⁴⁴

Further research only strengthened the facts of stasis and sudden appearance. Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge wrote in 1993 that "most species, during their geological history, either do not change in any appreciable way, or else they fluctuate mildly in morphology, with no apparent direction".⁴⁵

Robert Carroll is anxious to agree that "most major groups appear to originate and diversify over geologically very short durations and to persist for much longer periods without major morphological or trophic change".⁴⁶

At this point, it is necessary to clarify just what the concept of 'transitional form' means. The intermediate forms predicted by the theory of evolution are living things falling between two species, but

⁴³ Francis Hitching, 1982, p 40

⁴⁴ Gould, 1977a (*emphasis added*)

⁴⁵ Gould & Eldredge, 1977, p 115

⁴⁶ Carroll, 1997, p 146

which have deficient or semi-developed organs. But sometimes the concept of intermediate form is misunderstood, and living organisms which do not possess the features of transitional forms are seen as actually doing so. For instance, if one group of living things possesses features which belong to another, this is not an intermediate form or feature. The platypus, a mammal living in Australia, reproduces by laying eggs just like reptiles. In addition, it has a bill similar to that of a duck. Scientists describe such creatures as the platypus as 'mosaic creatures'. That mosaic creatures do not count as intermediate forms is also accepted by such foremost palaeontologists as Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge.⁴⁷

The Adequacy of the Fossil Record

Some 140 years ago Darwin put forward the following argument: "Right now there are no transitional forms, yet further research will uncover them". Is this argument still valid today? In other words, taking into account the conclusions from the entire fossil record, should we accept that transitional forms never existed, or should we wait for the results of new research?

The wealth of the existing fossil record will surely answer this question. When we look at the palaeontological findings, we come across a great quantity of fossils. Based on the billions of fossils uncovered all around the world,⁴⁸ 250,000 individual species have been identified, and these bear striking similarities to the 1.5 million identified species currently living on earth.⁴⁹ (Of these 1.5 million species, 1 million are insects.) Despite the abundance of fossil sources, not a single transitional form has been discovered, and it is not likely that any transitional forms will be found as a result of new excavations.

A professor of palaeontology from Glasgow University, T. Neville George, admitted to this fact years ago:

There is no need to apologise any longer for the poverty of the fossil record. In some ways it has become almost unmanageably rich and discovery is outpacing integration... **The fossil record nevertheless continues to be composed mainly of gaps.**⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Gould & Eldredge, 1977, p 147

⁴⁸ Gish, 1995, p 41

⁴⁹ David Day, 1989

⁵⁰ Neville George, 1960, pp. 1, 3. (*emphasis added*)

And Niles Eldredge, the well-known palaeontologist and curator of the American Museum of Natural History, expresses, as follows, the invalidity of Darwin's claim that the shortage in the fossil record is the reason why no transitional forms have been found:

“The record jumps, and all the evidence shows that the record is real: **the gaps we see reflect real events in life's history** – not the artifact of a poor fossil record.”⁵¹

Another American scholar, Robert Wesson, states in his 1991 book *Beyond Natural Selection*, that “**the gaps in the fossil record are real** and meaningful.” He gives details of this claim in this way:

The gaps in the record are real, however. The absence of a record of any important branching is quite phenomenal. Species are usually static, or nearly so, for long periods, species seldom and genera never show evolution into new species or genera but replacement of one by another, and change is more or less abrupt.⁵²

This situation annuls the above argument, which has been stated by Darwinism for 140 years. The fossil record is rich enough for us to understand the origins of life, and plainly reveals that distinct species came into existence on earth all of a sudden, with all their diverse forms. The rapid appearance of phylum-level differences is what is called the “Cambrian explosion.” Fossil discoveries over the last one hundred and fifty years have turned Darwin’s tree of life upside down by showing the Cambrian explosion was even more sudden and extensive than scientists once thought. Also, because the major groups of animals- instead of coming last, at the top of the tree- come first, when the animals make their first appearance in the Cambrian (layer of rocks). For example, the trilobite, with an articulated body, complicated nervous system, and compound eyes, suddenly appears fully formed at the beginning of the explosion. It is amazing.

The Truth Revealed by the Fossil Record

But where does the “evolution-palaeontology” relationship, which has taken subliminal root in society over many decades, actually stem from? Why do most people have the view that there is a positive connection between Darwin's theory and the fossil record whenever the latter is mentioned? The answer to these questions is supplied in an article in the leading journal *Science*:

⁵¹ Eldredge & Tattersall, 1982, p 59 (*emphasis added*)

⁵² Wesson, 1991, p 45

A large number of well-trained scientists outside of evolutionary biology and palaeontology have unfortunately gotten the idea that the fossil record is far more Darwinian than it is. This probably comes from the oversimplification inevitable in secondary sources: low-level textbooks, semi popular articles, and so on. Also, there is probably some wishful thinking involved. In the years after Darwin, his advocates hoped to find predictable progressions. In general these have not been found yet the optimism has died hard, and **some pure fantasy has crept into textbooks.**⁵³

N. Eldredge and I. Tattersall also make an important comment:

That individual kinds of fossils remain recognizably the same throughout the length of their occurrence in the fossil record had been known to palaeontologists long before Darwin published his *Origin*. Darwin himself...prophesied that future generations of palaeontologists would fill in these gaps by diligent search...One hundred and twenty years of palaeontological research later, **it has become abundantly clear that the fossil record will not confirm this part of Darwin's predictions.** Nor is the problem a miserably poor record. The fossil record simply shows that this prediction is wrong.

The observation that species are amazingly conservative and static entities throughout long periods of time has all the qualities of **the emperor's new clothes: everyone knew it but preferred to ignore it. Palaeontologists**, faced with a recalcitrant record obstinately refusing to yield Darwin's predicted pattern, **simply looked the other way.**⁵⁴

Similarly, the American palaeontologist Steven M. Stanley describes how the Darwinist dogma, which controls the world of science, has neglected this truth demonstrated by the fossil record:

The known fossil record is not, and never has been, in accord with gradualism. What is remarkable is that, through a variety of historical circumstances, even the history of opposition has been obscured....The majority of palaeontologists felt their evidence simply contradicted Darwin's stress on minute, slow, and cumulative changes leading to species transformation....**their story has been suppressed.**⁵⁵

⁵³ *Science*, July 17, 1981, p 289 (*emphasis added*)

⁵⁴ Eldredge, & Tattersall, 1982, pp. 45–6 (*emphasis added*)

⁵⁵ Stanley, 1981, p 71 (*emphasis added*)

All of this contradicts Darwinism which predicted the slow gradual development of organisms over time. There is really only one explanation that accounts for all the evidence. In any other field of research it would be obvious, but many scientists do not want to touch it in Biology, Geology and Anthropology. The answer is an **intelligent designer**.

Chapter 2: Evolution and Catholicism – The Current Position

In response to the question, “What is the origin of man and of the Universe?” there are four main different sets of beliefs competing for acceptance in modern Christendom. Which one will be the victor in society, is of no small magnitude as the salvation of souls may be at stake. What beliefs are being handed on to our children? What will the state of Catholicism be in 25 years time?

Before proceeding any further, from Chapter one, I define evolution as, “molecules-to-man natural transformation in which new, ‘higher’ genetic information is gained which was not possessed by one’s ancestors”. In public opinion, evolution is thought to involve change beyond kind, such as would allow reptiles to change into birds. But if reptiles never had the genetic information to grow wings, they could never transform into birds and give rise to the avian lung. The field data shows that evolution did not occur. The fossil record is devoid of transitional stages; the famous evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould acknowledges this.⁵⁶ Laboratory evidence shows that evolution cannot take place⁵⁷; transitional forms tend to be conceptually impossible as they involve horrendously multifaceted transitions.⁵⁸ Great variety occurs in life-forms but always within “kind”, never beyond. (This is also known as ‘microevolution’ although I dislike the term.) Cats are cats, and dogs are dogs, and rhinoceros will always be rhinoceros!⁵⁹

⁵⁶ “The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution” – Gould, 1980a, p 127.

⁵⁷ “All of us who study the origin of life find that the more that we look into it, the more we feel it is too complex to have evolved anywhere. We all believe as an article of faith that life evolved from dead matter on this planet. It is just that its complexity is so great, it is hard for us to imagine it did.” Harold C. Urey quoted in *Christian Science Monitor*, 4 Jan, 1962, p 4. In 1953, Stanley L. Miller and Harold C. Urey, working at the University of Chicago, conducted an experiment examining what kind of environment would be needed to allow life to begin. Scientists became very optimistic that the questions about the origin of life would be solved within a few decades. This has not been the case.

⁵⁸ “There is a growing conviction among many scientists that these transitional forms never existed” – Niles Eldridge, quoted in “Alternate Theory of Evolution Considered”, *Los Angeles Times*, 19 November, 1978.

⁵⁹ “This regular absence of transitional forms is not confined to mammals, but is an almost universal phenomenon, as has long been noted by palaeontologists.” – G G. Simpson, 1944, p 106.

Atheistic Evolution, Theistic Evolution, Progressive Creation and Special Creation will now be examined in light of scientific discoveries and truth known from Catholic Tradition. As one would expect, some things have common characteristics across the alternative beliefs.⁶⁰

Atheistic Evolution

The first alternative, Atheistic Evolution, may be defined as the theory that material forces alone can account for the existence of the Universe and all life-forms. Atheistic evolutionists believe that all we observe is the interaction of matter and energy; they regard the notion of a transcendent creative force as naïve wishful thinking and unnecessary to explain the cosmos. To them, evolution at the end of the day ‘explains’ everything – the unfolding of this Universe over billions of years and the developing of molecules-to-man transformation of matter in ‘upwards’ complexity. However tempting at a superficial level, this scenario starts to unglue when subjected to meticulous analysis.

The twentieth century would be incomprehensible without the Darwinian revolution. The social and political currents which have swept the world in the past eighty years would have been impossible without its intellectual sanction. It is ironic to recall that it was the increasingly secular outlook in the nineteenth century which initially eased the way for the acceptance of evolution, while today it is perhaps the Darwinian view of nature more than any other that is responsible for the agnostic and skeptical outlook of the twentieth century. What was once a deduction from materialism has today become its foundation.⁶¹

Agnostics are uncertain about the existence of the transcendent God. Their question, “what came before God?” only shoves the idea of a First Cause back a further step, and so they are still open to argument that He does exist. But atheists deny His existence and some supporters seem intent on eradicating belief in God. The human inventors of the concepts of Communism, Nazism, and Secular Humanism all appear to have been strongly encouraged to reject God. Given the bad fruits ensuing from militant promotion of

⁶⁰ By ‘tradition’ I mean Apostolic Tradition as outlined in the 1994 Catechism of the Catholic Church, paragraphs 74–100.

⁶¹ Denton, 1988, p. 358.

Evolutionism, is it going too far to suggest that they were driven by hatred of God and their driving force was satanically inspired?⁶²

Atheists are persuaded of the ‘fact’ of evolution, even though its supposed mechanism remains ever elusive. The ‘fact’ of evolution is taken as a ‘given’; it must have taken place because the alternative belief in a Creator cannot be tolerated.⁶³ Not surprisingly, atheists tend not to define ‘evolution’ with accuracy. Walter ReMine shows in his book *The Biotic Message* that the very notion of evolution is elastic, capable of explaining almost anything one wishes to assign to it. He also argues that life-forms have been designed to look nothing like evolution. For example, the platypus has a unique and fascinating combination of traits – where can it be placed in the evolutionary tree or bush?⁶⁴ The magical idea of natural selection is under increasing test since it tends only to preserve the existing; no truly new genetic information is actually gained. And ‘survival of the fittest’ has been challenged as little more than tautology; it could also have been ‘survival of the luckiest’ – the survivors were in the right place at the right time.

Some atheists, such as Stephen Hawking (ironically, a member of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences), think that there was no moment of Creation.⁶⁵ Universes must unfurl eternally one into another, perhaps via wormholes within black holes where time gets warped. So an age of billions of years for this Universe is taken as a ‘given’, accepted as being beyond serious doubt. All this in spite of the fact that no one has been able to figure out how the solar system could have formed naturally, following the imaginary Big Bang.

⁶²“Have you seen Agassiz’s weak metaphysical and theological attack on the ‘Origin’ in the last ‘Silliman’? [The *American Journal of Science and Arts* was commonly called ‘Silliman’s Journal’.] I would send it you, but apprehend it would be less trouble for you to look at it in London than return it to me. R. Wagner has sent me a German pamphlet, giving an abstract of Agassiz’s ‘Essay on Classification,’ ‘mit Rücksicht auf Darwins Ansichten,’ &c. &c. He won’t go very ‘dangerous lengths,’ but thinks the truth lies half-way between Agassiz and the ‘Origin’. As he goes thus far he will, nolens volens [willing or not willing], have to go further. He says he is going to review me in [his] yearly Report. My good and kind agent for the propagation of the Gospel – i.e., **the devil’s gospel** (emphasis mine). Ever Yours, Charles Darwin.” (Darwin to T. H. Huxley Aug. 8, 1860 [in *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, edited by his son Francis Darwin, Vol. 11, pp. 123-4, 1959])

⁶³“We take the side of science *in spite* of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, *in spite* of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, *in spite* of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because we have a prior commitment, a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our *a priori* adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.” – Richard Lewontin, ‘Billions and Billions of Demons’, *The New York Review*, January 9, 1997, p 31.

See also www.csus.edu/indiv/m/mayesgr/Lewontin1.htm

⁶⁴ ReMine, 1993

⁶⁵Hawking, 1988, p141

Sir Harold Jeffreys, one of the world's foremost geophysicists, after carefully examining the evidence for each of the various theories of how our solar system evolved into existence, summarised the state of affairs in this way:

To sum up, I think that all suggested accounts of the [evolutionary] origin of the Solar System are subject to serious objections. The conclusion in the present state of the subject would be that the system cannot exist.⁶⁶

One of the decisive forces of scientism was a fantastic imagination which could explain every irregularity in the solar system without explanation, jump the gaps in the atomic series without evidence [a leap required by the Big Bang theory], put forward the discovery of fossils which have never been discovered, and forecast the success of breeding experiments which have never succeeded. Of this kind of science it might justly be said that it was knowledge falsely so called.

Scientists should be open to having cherished theories challenged and ultimately overturned, but in reality they are weak and naturally have their own individual biases, as we all do. Being truly objective is easier said than done. Once trained in certain ways, how many of us are willing to embrace new techniques? Once educated in evolution as fact in school, how hard it is to see that one has been misled with phony science? In reality, of course, truth tends not to be always welcome to the allegedly objective scientific mind. How often in history have talented inventors had to struggle against ingrained peer opinion; validated only after years of affliction? Although once regarded as the queen of sciences, some modern academics seem to regard theology as inferior to physics.

The materialist belief system known as Naturalism, or Scientism, is upheld in pursuit of the goal of removing religion. But 'religion' is a broad term, open to various meanings, which can overlap. Every belief system requires faith by the believer. Naturalism requires faith to believe there is no transcendent Creator God, and total faith in random chance – time and time again – against astonishing odds. The theory makes a worshipful god out of random events.

“The irony is devastating. The main purpose of Darwinism was to drive every last trace of an incredible

⁶⁶ Jeffreys, 1970, p 359

God from biology. But the theory replaces God with an even more incredible deity: omnipotent chance.”⁶⁷

Are we not told that the evolution of eyes took place many times, separately, in different creatures? Think about the colossal odds against such possibility. ⁶⁸ No belief system can avoid offering an explanation for why things exist and why certain standards are either right or wrong. Regarding the deplorable murderous excesses of Social Darwinism, even ardent proponents of Naturalism are inevitably drawn into discussion of human rights, and this leads on to discussion of what “rights” are and what is their ultimate source. Thus, deliberation about the existence of conscience and of a possible moral source “beyond” human beings ultimately becomes fair subject matter for reflection, even for advocates of Naturalism. Given the range and nature of issues regarded as faith-defining criteria, particularly the appeal to Mother Nature in place of the Creator God, should not Naturalism itself be regarded as religious belief?

In our principally neo-pagan world, evolutionary propagandists generally get a free run in the secular media. Numerous cable and satellite TV channels provide a steady diet of pro-evolution documentaries (Mr Winston and the BBC⁶⁹), and there seems to be non-stop newspaper and magazine articles writing up some new supposed discovery. A whole industry centred on evolution has arisen and career jobs are involved in nurturing the myth of evolution. Turning this around calls for a major paradigm shift. How many Christian schools have basically followed suit, instead of imparting the pros and cons of, say, typology versus transformism to students? Compare this to the often hostile attention and caricature given to those who favour Creation.

The advent of the Intelligent Design (ID) movement has resulted in an excellent set of arguments being presented, from within science itself, which profoundly confront evolutionary beliefs of proponents of Naturalism. The strength of the ID writers is twofold:

⁶⁷ Roszak, 1975, pp. 101–02

⁶⁸ “Organs of extreme Perfection and Complication. To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree.” – Darwin, 1909, p190

www.talkorigins.org/faqs/origin.html

⁶⁹ www.bbc.co.uk/nature/animals/features/141water.shtml also, www.bbc.co.uk/beasts/fossilfun/skeletal_jigsaws/

1. The compelling arguments that Design is empirically detectable, of which Michael Behe's concept of "Irreducible Complexity" is a superb example.⁷⁰
2. The arguments against the zealots of Naturalism who insist that only science shall be addressed. Phillip Johnson has shown incisively that evolution beliefs are really philosophical beliefs, not to be swayed too much by actual scientific findings.⁷¹

It is disappointing that the ID writers themselves tend not to define clearly what they mean by the term 'evolution' and instead leave it open to interpretation. Conceding evolution via common ancestry, as compatible with Intelligent Design, only plays into the hands of Naturalism devotees who have not been slow to seize this compromise and hurl it back in rebuttal. William Dembski, in his book *Intelligent Design*, states that "Intelligent Design...can accommodate any degree of evolutionary change".⁷² So what does he mean by the term 'evolution'? Identifying Darwinism as the problem, while allowing evolution to remain ill-defined and elastic, has diluted the potential effectiveness of the ID movement.

Several prominent ID writers clearly distance themselves from the idea of the Universe being less than 10,000 years old. The presuppositions involved in the long ages view go largely unquestioned by these researchers, and this contrasts greatly with their otherwise rigorous analytical approach. They expect atheists and creationists to refrain from using selective argumentation, yet seem highly selective themselves. Dembski not only leaves the term 'evolution' loosely defined but also wrongly accuses creationists of treating the opening chapters of Genesis as a scientific text.⁷³ They don't believe that God is teaching empirical science per se in Genesis, and he misrepresents their position. In reality, most non-Catholic creation researchers treat Genesis primarily as historical revelation, and so does Catholic tradition. Let us not forget a crucial point in our neo-pagan times: the more remote in time we think of Creation, the more irrelevant God seems to modern man. If Creation took place in the not so distant past, then Christ's

⁷⁰We now know that there are in fact tens of thousands of irreducibly complex systems on the cellular level. Specified complexity pervades the microscopic biological world. Molecular biologist Michael Denton wrote, "Although the tiniest bacterial cells are incredibly small, weighing less than 10^{-12} grams, each is in effect a veritable micro-miniaturized factory containing thousands of exquisitely designed pieces of intricate molecular machinery, made up altogether of one hundred thousand million atoms, far more complicated than any machinery built by man and absolutely without parallel in the non-living world." Denton, 1986, p 250.

⁷¹ Cf Johnson, 1993 pp. 125–34

⁷² Dembski, 1999, p 252

⁷³ Dembski, 1999, p 248

Second Coming is likely to occur in the not so distant future; not when the Sun supposedly balloons up into a red giant millions of years from now.

Atheistic censorship of views favourable to the existence of a Creator is considered by extremists of Naturalism to be warranted on the ground that such views are anti-science. Even the idea of deducing an unseen Designer, as a detective can deduce what took place at the crime scene, is considered intrusion of religious views upon science. The entrenched power exerted by them in the academy means that careers and funding can be destroyed if one takes a public stance against evolution. Happily, most scientists are not zealots and though many probably do not care for evolution, they simply want to get on with careers in chosen disciplines. If enough individuals continue to stand up against intimidation and speak up for objective truth, in time evolution theory will eventually be seen as outmoded science.

Theistic Evolution

Let us now consider the alternative of Theistic Evolution. In seeking a synthesis of evolution and theology, this concept holds that God created the Universe billions of years ago and used the process of evolution and/or divine intervention in the creation of life-forms and subsequent changes beyond kind.

Theistic evolutionists are vague about their definition of evolution. Is it not fascinating that something over which so many heated arguments have taken place turns out to be so poorly defined? To evolutionists, is evolution “change over time” either slowly through imperceptible changes or rapidly in intermittent bursts via punctuated equilibria?⁷⁴ Is it ‘natural selection’? As noted already, in public perception evolution is not about micro changes within species, such as the variations between tabby cats and black cats; intuitively it’s held to involve change beyond kind – but this perception of supposed evolution is contradicted by the actual findings of specialists. Evolutionists point to changes within the species and call that ‘microevolution’, and then proceed to tell us that such sub-species changes prove that theorized changes across species (termed ‘macroevolution’) must also be occurring. But random gene shuffling within species only produces new varieties and breeds. **If the DNA code barrier is not penetrated, transformations across the species barrier can never occur.** New varieties and new breeds is not evolution but only

⁷⁴ Accessed online ,Oct.2005 at www.stephenjagould.org/library/gould_comes-of-age.html

variation within the already existing species. Men have bred certain domesticated animals for thousands of years, but all they have produced is variations of those animals—nothing else. For example, a cow may produce a Brown Swiss, a Devon, an Africander, a Holstein-Friesian, an Aberdeen-Angus, a Jersey, a Brahman (Zebu), a Galloway, a Shorthorn, a Guernsey, a Hereford, or a Catalo. But they are all merely varieties of cattle. Producing new breeds in animals is not evolution just as producing new varieties in plants is not evolution.⁷⁵ Evolutionists can assume that one species evolved from another one, but it is merely an assumption. **Assumptions are not science. They do not take the place of hard facts.**

That a known fossil or recent species, or higher taxonomic group, however primitive it might appear, is an actual ancestor of some other species or group, is an assumption scientifically unjustifiable, for science never can simply assume that which it has the responsibility to demonstrate . . . It is the burden of each of us to demonstrate the reasonableness of any hypothesis we might care to erect about ancestral conditions, keeping in mind that we have no ancestors alive today, that in all probability such ancestors have been dead for many tens of millions of years, and that even in the fossil record they are not accessible to us.⁷⁶

Gould's case for punctuated equilibria (intermittent bursts over long periods) has been challenged on grounds that (a) it attempts to prove something by its absence and (b) the odds against it are stupendously high.

Because there is no evidence from natural selection, mutations and fossils for transitional species (innumerable species with various small changes spanning across from one species to another), Richard Goldschmidt of the University of California proposed his "saltation theory", in which no transitional forms would be necessary. According to this theory, all evolution occurred by immense mutational leaps from one life-form to another. It went something like this:

Every so often a mammoth collection of billions of random mutations occurred at once – that produced a totally new species. For example, two rabbits produced a male bear cub, and coincidentally, just over the

⁷⁵ "The German zoologist, Bernhard Rensch [1959], was able to provide a long list of leading authorities who have been inclined to the view that macroevolution [changes across species] cannot be explained in terms of microevolutionary processes [changes within species], or any other currently known mechanisms. These dissenters cannot be dismissed as cranks, creationists, or vitalists, for among their ranks are many first-rate biologists." Michael Denton, *op.cit.*, p 86

⁷⁶ Nelson, 1971, p 27

hill two other rabbits produced a female bear cub! Both baby bears were able to get adequate milk from their mother rabbits so that they grew to maturity and reproduced all the bears in the world. That is how bears came into existence.

According to Goldschmidt, this is the way it worked for every other species in the world! Popularly referred to as the “*hopeful monster theory*,” it taught that one day a reptile laid an egg and a “brown furry thing” hatched out of it. Chance would have it, that when it grew up, this mammal found a mate that had also suddenly by chance hatched out of another reptile egg – and the result was a new species of animal.

In 1972, Stephen Gould of Harvard University, working with Niles Eldredge, expanded on Goldschmidt’s idea – and called it “punctuated equilibrium”. The May 1977 issue of *Natural History* carried an article with his position and his reasons for it.

As a respected palaeontologist, Gould was fully aware that there was no fossil evidence for evolution of one species from another. All the evidence from the world around us, and the fossil record from the past, points to separate, distinct species, with no transitional species linking them.

In the article, Gould opens up this entire problem – and says that “hopeful monsters” are the only possible answer: entirely new species which were suddenly born from totally different creatures. One day a lizard laid an egg and a beaver hatched out of it.

Declaring that “we never see the processes we profess to study”, Gould announced his new position which he described by an awesome new name: “*punctuated equilibrium*“. By this term he means that for 50,000 years or so, there will be no change (an “*equilibrium*” without any evolution). And then, suddenly in a very rare “*punctuation*” and by total chance, two totally different life-forms will emerge.

Because of the totally impossible mathematical improbability that a billion, positive, random gene changes could occur, in which all of the mutational changes worked together to smoothly produce a perfect new creature – Gould said such an event could only happen twice in every 50,000 years! Those two ultra-rare 50,000-year occurrences would always happen at the same time close to each other, producing one male and one female. This story sounds stranger than the legends of ancient Greece!⁷⁷

⁷⁷ Gould, 1977, p 14

Some Christians argue that God created matter with inherent natural properties that would change imperceptibly over time and thus 'evolution' takes place as continual creation. George Sim Johnston promotes this view in his book *Did Darwin Get It Right?*⁷⁸ If this belief were true, there should be innumerable findings of intermediate stages in the fossil record (as Darwin hoped for, in vain) and we should by now have great trouble in identifying distinct species. Instead, no fossils of transitional forms (e.g. a whale with legs) have been found in the strata; they do not exist.

In view of horrendously complex conceptual problems involved in the idea of intermediate stages, shown by Michael Denton in *Evolution: a Theory in Crisis*, other theistic evolutionists are forced to resort to the possibility that God intervened many times over many years to tinker with life-forms and thus implement evolution with a helping hand. But this belief contradicts the popular notion that evolution is a purely natural process. Since naturalistic evolution has to be abandoned, this concept would be better defined as Theistic Intervention rather than Theistic Evolution.

If one argues that Adam arrived as a baby boy after God tinkered with the genes of his animal parents so that they gave rise to a new kind, there would be no one to adequately nurture him to maturity. Hardly a convincing scenario! He must have been created as an adult, for the destiny of all mankind depended on his awesome choice of obedience.

If Adam and Eve were not real human beings – the first parents – but instead there were many 'first parents' then one encounters the problem of polygenism. This position is effectively impermissible for loyal Catholics to hold.⁷⁹ The choice of obedience seems likely to have been given to one man only. The future destiny of mankind rested on Adam's shoulders. If God had given the choice to a group of first parents, He would have had to consider the possibility of disagreement and that the minority choice would miss out. That party could feel betrayed and charge that God had let them down because their choice was never going to count, even though they may have voted for obedience, i.e. not to eat of the forbidden fruit.

Pope Leo XIII taught in the encyclical letter *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae* (1880) that the bodies of Adam and Eve were specially created and that Eve's body was created from a portion of Adam's. This papal

⁷⁸ Johnston, G S. 1999

⁷⁹ Cf. chapter 2 in relation to polygenism.

teaching effectively doomed any future attempted synthesis of evolution and theology. What evolutionist would accept the idea of evolution of males but not females?

Who were the supposed ape-like progenitors, lacking in rational souls? Pope Pius XII taught in *Humani Generis* that Catholics were not free to believe there were ‘pre-Adamites’ from whom we have descended. The non-existence of any intermediate stages descended from a supposed common progenitor of man and ape-like creatures in the fossil record has been well shown by Marvin Lubenow in his book *Bones Of Contention*.⁸⁰ The field evidence is either fully animal or fully human, but there have been fakes (Piltdown Man) and mistakes (Nebraska Man). And what actually constitutes a human being? The 1994 CCC informs us that, “it is a human body precisely because it is animated by a spiritual soul”,⁸¹ to be raised up on the day of general judgement. A good reason why God would not use evolution as part of the means of Creation is that it could convey the wrong signals. Since evolving life-forms would in time reach a stage when it would be confusing and difficult to discern separate species, it would then be much easier for some to argue falsely but persuasively that there is no transcendent God; things have always been this way on Earth and there is no need for a Creator. Some researchers believe that the Cambrian ‘explosion’ was a rapid (i.e., five million years) evolutionary burst of new life-forms; on the contrary, it was an ‘explosion’ of death during the global Flood of Noah.

Evolutionary beliefs favour an ‘upwards’ tendency from imperfection to perfection; Catholic tradition teaches a ‘downwards’ corruption since the Fall. Evolutionary beliefs hold that we came into being above a vast museum of death, and death was always part of the ‘good’ Creation; Catholic tradition teaches that we were created in a state of tranquillity but this earthly state of paradise was lost by Adam’s sin. Henceforth individuals would have to struggle to exist against such things as an often harsh climate, devastating diseases, sinful human beings, and subtle satanic attack from fallen angels.

In Romans 5:12 we are informed that death came only after the sin of Adam, not before.⁸² We would not have known death if Adam had been obedient to God. Since the Fall human nature is wounded in the natural powers proper to it.⁸³

⁸⁰ Lubenow, 1992

⁸¹ Para., 364

⁸² CCC 400,1008

⁸³ CCC 405

What if Adam had remained obedient? The question of animal death in a state of tranquillity and of the present predatory behaviour of wild creatures remains a mysterious area awaiting further clarification from the Magisterium. The notions of ‘kill or be killed’, ‘red in tooth and claw’, and of sharks killing seals in frenzy right next to non-fallen human beings swimming in the sea all seem most inconsistent with what we know about our gracious Creator/Redeemer.

As non-human creatures do not possess rational souls, Catholics need not hold that they were never intended to die, but perhaps their death would have involved peaceful processes had Adam had been obedient. Regarding predatory behaviour, it is possible that the behaviour of wild creatures was affected by the Fall; wounded in their natural powers while their intrinsic nature remained intact. Just as the bodies of human beings were made with the possibility of death and vicious behaviour perhaps this would have been overridden by grace had Adam remained obedient. As indicated in Genesis, we all could have lived together happily as vegetarians. In fact after all the animals got off the 450 foot Ark⁸⁴ the Scripture says that man could now eat them for food⁸⁵ whereas before he could not. Perhaps this is when the predatory instinct took hold in the animals. Also just because animals have sharp teeth does not mean to say they are meat eaters. Look at the Panda, it has sharp teeth and eats bamboo! Therefore it is possible that all the animals were vegetarian before the flood.

Pius XII declared in *Humani Generis* that evolution must not be taught as though proven fact and the 1994 CCC warned that, “we cannot tamper with the revelation of Original Sin without undermining the mystery of Christ”.⁸⁶ Theistic Evolution does tamper with this central doctrine; it should be regarded as impermissible belief for Catholics. In view of the strong link between the spread of Modernist beliefs and the teaching of evolution as fact in so many Catholic schools since the 1960s, as well as the massive falling away from practice of young people after leaving school, evolution is a doctrinal error parading in scientific guise.

⁸⁴ Genesis 6:15

⁸⁵ Genesis 9:2-3

⁸⁶ Para. 389

Progressive Creation

The third alternative concept, Progressive Creation, holds that God created the Universe billions of years ago and much later specially created each kind of life-form with repeated divine intervention at great intervals of time apart, and set genetic variation into operation to allow subsequent changes within kind.

Because of reluctance to address in detail the question of the age of the Universe, Progressive Creation proponents of aeons of time are driven, ironically, to rely upon evolutionist reasoning for origin of the fossil record. Whether the vast museum of death buried in the rocks came before or after the sin of Adam remains a profound conceptual problem for them. So, in their view, was it a 'good' Creation or not?

An age of billions of years for the Universe has serious theological and scientific arguments against it.⁸⁷ Also, since naturalistic evolution is rejected, it becomes necessary to resort to countless divine interventions to account for how life-forms kept coming into being. In contrast, Scripture holds that the Creation events reached finality soon after the events of Creation. The interdependence within diverse bio-systems required fairly rapid creation. Fruit trees created on the third day needed birds and bees to arrive on day five, not millions of years later. Why the quest to supplant direct creation with direct intervention, and which Scripture passages can be cited in support? "A day is as 1,000 years" (2 Peter 3:8) refers to timeless eternity rather than to the Creation events and the fact that God is not bound by time. We know that God, in Christ, instantly created space, time and matter, instantly turned water into wine and instantly brought the dead back to life. In keeping with Scripture passages, why not allow Him to instantly stretch out the heavens (i.e., the Universe) and light waves on day four, less than 10,000 years ago?

⁸⁷ What is the age of the universe, as calculated by some of the most prominent theories being considered in our time? Here they are: Gamow: 3–5 billion years. Peebles and Wilkinson: 7 billion years. Ashford: 10–15 billion years. Shklovski: 70 billion years. Alfven: trillions of years. Hoyle: infinite time. It is clear from this brief study that all the theories either begin with (1) self-creating matter, and/or, a step further down the road, (2) hydrogen gas. In each case, the gas then – slowly or rather quickly – forms itself into solids: stars, planets, etc. And that is it. Strip the theories of their high-sounding words, scientific phrases, and complicated logic, and you come to the bare essentials: spontaneous generation of matter, to be followed by gas pushing itself into solids, which is against laws of physics. The history of cosmology is the story of little people (as little as the rest of us) spending their spare time dreaming up ideas which violate natural law, in the hope that by so doing they will somehow be regarded as having great minds.

It seems likely that, at the tiniest level of matter, God keeps sub-atomic particles coming and going all the time, while allowing us to exercise Free Will. But the teaching on Secondary Causes⁸⁸ holds that God acts through his created life-forms and does not constantly intervene to tinker with Creation and produce new species by direct guidance. This is not to deny miracles; we know that they happen but few would argue that they occur in the multitudes required for the concept of Progressive Creation.

The global Flood of Noah is usually denied by advocates of Progressive Creation in favour of local floods. But this means that God's 'rainbow' promise, to no more destroy mankind through a flood, has been broken many times. (e.g. The floods from the Bangladesh tidal wave of 1971 killed 300,000 people.) How can Catholics loyal to the Church founded by our great Creator/Redeemer Himself, ignore or revise the words of Christ about the Genesis revelation, and similarly ignore the Scripture statements of St Peter, about the reality of Noah's Flood? 2 Peter 3:6 says "the world that then existed, perished being flooded by water". If a global Flood were to be conceded, the next question waiting to be addressed is this: did it occur before or after the sin of Adam? Genesis reveals that it occurred after Adam's sin, thus it must have occurred less than 10,000 years ago. The strata and fossils therefore cannot be any older than 10,000 years.

Those who favour aeons of time have to address Leo XIII's benchmark teaching in *Providentissimus Deus* (1893). He taught that there are various senses used in Scripture but insisted that the literal, obvious sense must hold ground until shown to be disproven. Since a meaning of 24 hours as a natural day was held by most of the Fathers and was permitted by the Pontifical Biblical Commission in 1909 as the proper sense and thus is unlikely to be overturned, the onus of responsibility of proof lies entirely with those who prefer aeons of years. It may not be possible to prove a young Universe scientifically but I contend that, ultimately, the long ages view is contradictory to Catholic tradition. (One example of evidence that the earth is young is recent findings by Boornazian that the Sun is shrinking by five foot per day i.e. the radius is decreasing daily by two and a half foot. Extrapolate backwards about 100,000 years and the sun would have been so big that the earth's seas would have boiled over. Go back a million years and the earth is *in*

⁸⁸ CCC 306,308

the Sun!!!) There are at least fifty of these so-called evidences – more than the evolutionists have for the supposed long age of the earth.⁸⁹

Where is the proof beyond doubt that the universe is billions of years old? Where is the indication in Genesis that a meaning other than natural days was intended to be conveyed and understood by the reader? The sacred writer could easily have informed us that the Creation took place over millions of years. Did the Fathers and Rabbis get it wrong, in holding that Genesis is primarily historical revelation, until the revisionist theological impact of the Darwinist era suggested otherwise? Where is the consistency of reasoning in arguing that the days of creation were much longer, but the hundreds of years of the ages of the patriarchs were much shorter than that? Did Christ lie in the tomb for three days or 3000 days? Surely a day is a day? Why is it always in the book of Genesis that a day doesn't equal a day for modern liberal exegetes?

Hugh Ross, a leading non-Catholic proponent of Progressive Creation, claims that the bondage to decay following Adam's sin refers only to entropy, yet entropy may have been in operation even if Adam had been obedient. He also asserts that the death brought on by Adam's sin was only spiritual death, and physical death was always part of the good Creation.⁹⁰ The 1994 CCC rejects this view;⁹¹ the original sin of Adam definitely brought on physical death as well as spiritual death.⁹²

Perhaps the Creator left clues within Scripture, on Earth, and within the Solar System to confound the modern doubters. As co-equal in the Divine Trinity, Jesus Christ has always known that in modern times there would be many doubters who would, wittingly or unwittingly, seek to deny the true historicity of Genesis. Genesis is foundational to crucial Christian doctrines, and so the Origins debate is all about the very integrity of these vital foundational doctrines. Perhaps this is why Christ ensured that mysterious

⁸⁹ For more young earth evidence go to <http://icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=type&ID=2> and view article by Russell Humphries – *Evidence for a Young World*.

⁹⁰ Ross, 1994

⁹¹ 400, 1008

⁹² Genesis 2:17; 3:19, Romans 5:12

Polonium radiohalos were scorched into the granites around the world, suggesting rapid creation.⁹³ Perhaps this is why Christ ensured that Janus and Epimetheus, two moons of Saturn which overlap by thirty miles, would swap places every four years instead of colliding. Also some planets rotate anti-clockwise including Earth, which goes against the Big Bang theory of explosion and big clockwise spin (due to the law of conservation of angular momentum). Perhaps this is why, in teaching on marriage, Christ asserted “from the beginning of the creation, He made them male and female” (Mark 10:6). Why mention “beginning of the creation” unless he deliberately intended to verify what he knew to be true.

Special Creation

The fourth alternative concept, Special Creation, holds that God created the angelic realm, the physical universe, and all living things *ex nihilo* (out of nothing) by divine will less than 10,000 years ago, with subsequent changes within kind (micro evolution). After the Fall, He engineered a global flood that produced most of the fossil record.

This belief is synonymous with fundamentalism in that it agrees with the basics of Christianity. Just as humankind could not deduce the existence of the Divine Trinity and it had to be revealed by God, so also an account of the Creation events had to be revealed. Otherwise we would be in the dark. The laws of nature were not revealed, but had to be discovered, painstakingly, by human endeavour. Genesis is thus not a scientific text; rather, it contains a partial, historical account of what actually occurred, given

⁹³ **Here is a brief overview of some of these findings of Robert Gentry, and their implications:**

1 – There are many polonium 218, 214, and 210 halos in granite, in fact, careful specimen counts and extrapolations based on these halos reveal that there are trillions upon trillions of them in granites all over the world.

2 – The vast majority of these polonium 218, 214, and 210 radiohalos have no uranium 238 halos with them.

3 – The primary polonium 218 halos are totally independent of radioactive parents. They are original in all rock in which they are found. There is no evidence that they were caused by uranium in the central grain, or by passing uranium streams.

4 – These independent Po-218 halos develop their half life halo in only three minutes, so the radiohalos had to be in those rocks when the rocks were first brought into existence.

5- The rock in which they are found had to be solid at the time it was brought into existence.

6 – Since Po-218 halos are found by the trillions throughout all the granites of the world, granite had to originally become solid in far less than three minutes, when it was first created, in order for the Po-218 halos to form properly.

7 – Since this granite is the basement rock, forming a thick layer, with the continents of the world above it and the basalt and magma below it, all this continental foundation apparently was created in less than three minutes time. With this fact in mind, there is little reason to expect the magma below and the continents above to have been formed in millions of years, if the granite between them was formed in less than three minutes.

See Robert Gentry, *Creation's Tiny Mystery*, Earth Science Associates, 1982

predominantly in the literal, obvious sense. In reality, there can be no real clash between science and theology, because God is the principal author of the Bible and also created the laws of nature. The Genesis reference to kinds cannot be ignored; great variety occurs in life-forms but always within 'kind', never beyond as I have already said. **Good science is observable, but evolution from molecules to man is not observable and should be assigned to an area called religion. It is not science!**

As noted earlier, it seems likely that there are no discrete sub-atomic particles; God continually keeps us alive while granting us Free Will to reject Him. The Creator impressed complex genetic information onto cells, which can reproduce and pass on information to the next generation. Now this part *is* scientific and observable. The reality of Secondary Causes, highly praised in the 1994 CCC,⁹⁴ shows that, while miracles do occur, God primarily works through already created life-forms rather than endlessly intervening to guide Creation. Human parents co-operate with God in the creation of new human beings, although God alone creates each new rational soul.

We can assert with certainty that all three Divine Persons were involved in the creation of angels, of the universe and all life-forms. But we are informed that the work of Creation was carried out by the Second Person in perfect obedience to the Father. Since His divine and human natures are inseparable, truly we can assert that Jesus Christ is Creator/Word/Redeemer/Judge. The Nicene Creed asserts, "I believe in Jesus Christ...through whom all things were made (John 1:3)... The 1994 CCC asserts that the second Adam created the first Adam.⁹⁵ So why not trust Jesus Christ implicitly in all things, including his powerful affirmation of Genesis events. He quoted the book of Genesis 25 times.

Theological reality can inform us more truly about objective truth at a deeper level than can empirical science. Scientists can describe the laws of nature, but science is silent about the origin of such laws. Leo XIII, in accordance with Scripture, taught in *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae* (1880) that Adam and Eve were the first two human beings, our first parents. According to Biblical genealogies,⁹⁶ they must have lived less than 10,000 years ago. Adam could have lived to a long age because there was a vault/firmament above the sky, in space, which blocked out the UV light. Indeed it seems that the whole earth was then a different place. Adam was requested to name all the animals including 'the beasts of the earth', so he must have seen

⁹⁴ 306, 308

⁹⁵ 359

⁹⁶ Genesis 4:17-5:32

the dinosaurs. They couldn't have become extinct 65 million years ago, because the inerrant Bible informs us correctly otherwise. They are mentioned in the book of Job (40:15 ff) as Leviathan and Behemoth (a tail like a Cedar is *not* an elephant!). Who are we to trust? The totally trustworthy Creator/ Redeemer who cannot deceive, who was there at Creation and who can implement creation of space, time and matter rapidly – or modern fallible scientists who were not there? All things considered, there is no need for the Church to declare further on the Age question; the Scripture and Leo XIII have taught enough.

Unfortunately, Eve was seduced by Satan and, through her, Adam was also seduced into disobedience of God through pride. This Original Sin was a catastrophe for humankind well beyond description. Banished from the Garden of Eden and from entering Heaven, fallen humankind since then has had to live in a flawed universe and to contend with the effects of Original Sin. Fortunately, God did not leave us in such miserable condition. In due course, our great Creator Himself paid the ransom for fallen human beings, taking on human form as the only way that God could suffer, and He obediently subjected himself to shame, torture and death out of love for humankind. How dearly must the dazzling Designer of the Universe love us! How can we grasp this fully? Does it not draw us onto our knees in awe? Read *Salvifici Doloris* by John Paul II for a wonderful interpretation of Scripture regarding the Passion of Our Lord and its connection with the book of Genesis and Adam.⁹⁷

The evidence of a global Flood is all around the Earth. We live upon a vast museum of death, including huge death pits with immense numbers of entombed creatures. The existence of polystrate tree-trunks, standing vertically through various strata, provides evidence of a cataclysmic, rapid, global flood. Fossilised fishes found at mountaintops and fossilised jellyfish found in hundreds on the central Australian desert are just some evidences left by Noah's Flood. It seems likely that all the coal and oil deposits come from vegetation smothered during the Flood events. Christ Himself spoke of his unhesitating belief in the Flood of Noah; why should we doubt him? Luke 17:26, 27 says this in the words of Christ Himself, "And as it was in the days of Noah, so will it also in the days of the Son of Man: They ate, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered the Ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all."

⁹⁷ www.cin.org/suffer.html

The Catholic Church has long taught that Genesis is revealed history and was not drawn from mythologies of pagan tribes. Genesis contains neither mythology nor errors. How could it, since God is the principal author of Scripture? Nor should we give credence to the false notion of the Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch, which was rejected by the Pontifical Biblical Commission (it was then an official arm of the teaching Magisterium) early in the twentieth century. As Cardinal Ruffini pointed out in the 1940s, what plainer words could God have used to inform us about the creation days?⁹⁸ How can modern scholars place doubt on the historicity of Genesis and assert that the first mention of the first day of Creation is metaphor? There is no prior basis for comparison, which is why I assert fundamental or basic approaches to Scripture.

As noted already, in 1880 Leo XIII ruled out evolution of Eve's body and thus doomed any attempted synthesis of evolution theory and theology. Pius XII insisted in *Humani Generis* (1950) that evolution must not be taught as fact, but he allowed discussion between specialists about the possible derivation of Adam's body from previously living matter. Incredibly, this encyclical, which was aimed strongly against the subtle Modernist subversion being made by evolutionists such as Fr Teilhard de Chardin SJ, has since been grossly misrepresented to suggest that the Church now officially accepts evolution! But Pius XII's warning that polygenism (many first parents) was unacceptable because it endangered the doctrine of Original Sin has not been so ignored; polygenism was effectively rejected in the 1994 CCC⁹⁹ endorsed by Pope John Paul II. Acts 17:26 RSV Catholic edition asserts, "He made from one blood every nation of men to live on the face of the earth". Tobit 8:6 says, "From them, Adam and Eve, the race of mankind has sprung." This is a wonderful answer to the racism of Darwinism, which considers the black man, aborigine and pygmy to be missing links! Let us not forget that John Paul, in his encyclical *Fides et Ratio* (1998), warned strongly against Scientism and also praised Pius XII for his 1950 encyclical *Humani Generis*. His private statements on Origins have to be seen in light of earlier, weightier papal declarations in Catholic tradition. Let us hope and pray that the new Pope will see fit to issue another encyclical on Origins, further clarifying Catholic

⁹⁸ "Divine revelation is so vast in extent and so profound in content, that sometimes its meaning can be determined only after study and discussion. Progress in this field consists in the deeper understanding by men of what is contained in revelation. The knowledge given to us by God is as unchangeably true as are the truths of mathematics." Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini, *The Theory of Evolution Judged by Reason and Faith*, Joseph F. Wagner Inc., New York, p 64. (English translation by Fr Francis O'Hanlon, Melbourne, Australia, 1959). Originally published in Italian in the 1940s.

⁹⁹ Para. 360, footnote 226

teachings about the doctrine of Original Sin, especially for guidance of the young but also for all future generations to consult.

A final thought. Several years ago Fr Denis Edwards of Adelaide, South Australia, wrote a pro-evolution book. The book's title – *The God of Evolution* – is especially apt for it speaks volumes about the confusion wrought by evolutionary consciousness within the Catholic Church.¹⁰⁰ In contrast, we can all do our own work in promoting Creation science and give our children some arguments against the tide of macroevolution sweeping the schools. We do not need to be dogmatic because, after all, the new evangelisation is about bringing people to Christ in a loving manner. Nevertheless countering the view that we all came from soup 4.5 billion years ago is a necessity and gives a sense of hope. That is why in my own classes, I always give both sides of the argument and then allow the pupils to make their own mind up. We cannot force people to be Christians. This has been the mistake of many educators in the past. We should allow the evidence to speak for itself.

Let us indeed give praise to our great Creator/ Redeemer and reject the myth of evolution, and place Christ the King truly in the centre of our lives, and ensuring that the true story of Creation and Original Sin is taught clearly to our children and proclaimed to a troubled world. The salvation of souls is at stake and “Christ crucified” means little to those who do not understand why He paid the price of Redemption.

¹⁰⁰ Edwards, 1999

Chapter 3: Can Evolution Blend with Catholicism?

What Is Evolution?

The Origins debate is hampered by the fact that so few bother to define precisely what is meant by the term 'evolution.' Instead of precise terminology arrived at by rigorous investigation, the term evolution remains confusing and ever elastic in public perception. Almost any evidence can be given an evolutionary interpretation as supposed proof. For example, creatures that became extinct were by definition less suited for adaptation yet those who survived were obviously able to adapt. Both outcomes are explicable by evolution theory. The discovery of living coelacanth fish off Madagascar in the 1930s showed that they had not become extinct millions of years ago, as was previously thought, and were identical to the fossilized ones. Did this cause zealous evolutionists to question the credibility of evolution? Not at all, the still-living coelacanths were simply labelled as "living fossils";¹⁰¹ they had somehow survived unchanged for supposed millions of years! So the live presence or dead absence of the coelacanths can both be explained in favour of evolution theory.

Unless evolution is defined precisely, we can be at cross-purposes with each other. It is hardly surprising that evolution is kept ill defined by those atheistic evolutionists who indulge in semantic games, but why is it not fully addressed and defined rigorously by Christians who propose alternative concepts to the idea of Special Creation? Divine interventionist concepts such as Theistic Evolution and Progressive Creation are also vague and elastic, as though all sorts of fanciful speculation are compatible with Scripture and tradition. So what exactly is the process commonly called evolution?

The true definition of evolution discovered by science is this: **Evolution is molecules-to-man, natural transformation in which new, 'higher', genetic information is gained which was not possessed by one's ancestors.**¹⁰² If this is a fair and reasonable definition, then we can be certain that evolution, as commonly understood, has never occurred because it cannot occur. Why? Because God has designed life-

¹⁰¹ Duane Gish, 1995, pp. 84, 85

¹⁰²The definition states "All the existing varieties of plant and animal...have come into being through a progressive diversification that has accompanied their biogenetic descent from their ancestors". This is quoted from *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*, Eds., Bullock and Stallybrass, Fontana, 1983, p 219. This definition certainly can be interpreted as a molecules-to-man progression.

forms so that only variety within kind is possible. The missing mechanism of evolution is doomed to remain missing because it never existed. That's why there are no intermediate stages found in the fossil record – they have never existed! This absence of intermediates was candidly admitted by the famous evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould.¹⁰³

Evolution per se – correctly defined – stands in contradiction to the reality of entropy, for the gaining of higher genetic information requires an increase in order and this clearly violates the second law of thermodynamics. The idea of the natural gaining of higher information is what the creation/evolution scientific debate is all about, despite the fact that zealous evolutionists don't want to concede the point, preferring to keep things vague.

Evolution should not be defined as 'transformism' or other vague concepts, which would introduce innumerable interventions by God. One can only wonder why God would override His own institution of Secondary Causes, especially within complex relationships of interdependent life-forms. Catholic proponents of evolution find little real comfort in official magisterial teachings. But their openness to Theistic Evolution necessarily involves a departure from standard evolution theory, in favour implicitly of innumerable divine interventions. In addition, they now face another problem of credibility. (Of course God is ever-active in keeping all life-forms alive at the level of elementary particles but that is an entirely different matter from the innumerable interventions required for the countless supposed transitions involved in Theistic Evolution.)

The crucial aspect is whether or not truly new genetic information can be gained in the process of change. As Prof. Maciej Giertych pointed out, "Evolution means construction of new genes. It means increase in the amount of genetic information, and not a reduction of it".¹⁰⁴ This point about increase in information is of such crucial importance to the modern understanding of 'evolution' that it cannot be emphasised enough,

¹⁰³ "...Yet Gould and the American Museum people are hard to contradict when they say there are no transitional fossils... You say I should at least 'show a photo of the fossil from which each type of organism was derived'. I will lay it on the line – there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument."

-Dr Colin Patterson, senior palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, in letter to Luther Sunderland, April 10, 1979. Cited in: Sunderland, Luther, 1984, p 89

¹⁰⁴ Keane, Gerard, *Creation Rediscovered*, Tan Books and Publishers, 1999, foreword

and it gets mentioned from time to time in creationist journals. For example, John Woodmorappe and Jonathan Sarfati make the following point: “...particles-to-people evolution requires changes that increase genetic information content. To date, not a single example of such a change has been observed, but such changes should be plentiful if evolution were true.”¹⁰⁵ Jewish scientist Dr. Lee Spetner shows that, “All point mutations that have been studied on the molecular level turn out to reduce the genetic information and not to increase it.”¹⁰⁶

The idea of gaining information naturally is what the average person intuitively understands about ‘evolution’. Of course they don’t think only of domestic cats or black cats; most individuals think of ‘big’ changes, such as would allow a reptile to change to a bird. In other words, they don’t simply think intuitively only about changes within kind but assumes that many changes beyond kind have occurred in the process commonly called ‘evolution’. Many individuals tend to accept the subtle message driven home relentlessly in books, articles and on television: that everything has changed somehow from the first molecules leading up to higher levels of creatures. The harsh reality of profound conceptual problems within evolution theory is largely glossed over by evolutionary propagandists.

Truth Declared in Scripture and Tradition

The whole point of the nineteenth century push to justify evolution was to enable a naturalistic explanation of Origins without the need for a transcendent Creator. Unfortunately, the compromise concept known as Theistic Evolution is of little use in the struggle against Materialistic Evolutionism. But the Catholic Church has not been silent in declarations in encyclicals and Councils about Creation and evolution.

Leo XIII taught in his 1880 encyclical *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae*¹⁰⁷ that Adam was made from the slime of the earth and that Eve was designed from a portion of Adam’s body. The Catholic Church has thus

¹⁰⁵ “Answers In Genesis”, *TJ*, Vol. 15 (3), Dec 2001, p 29

¹⁰⁶ Spetner, 1997 p 138

¹⁰⁷ www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_10021880_arcantum_en.html article 5 states, “We record what is to all known, and cannot be doubted by any, that God, on the sixth day of creation, having made man from the slime of the earth, and having breathed into his face the breath of life, gave him a companion, whom He miraculously took from the side of Adam when he was locked in sleep. God thus, in His most far-reaching foresight, decreed that this husband and wife should be the natural beginning of the human race, from whom it might be propagated and preserved by an unending fruitfulness throughout all futurity of time.”

declared that the first female human being was specially created; her body did not come via evolution. Thus, the origin of Eve’s body is not an open debate for Catholics.

Leo XIII also implicitly ruled out polygenism (many first parents) by insisting on monogenism in the same encyclical. Polygenism was also strongly condemned by Pius XII in *Humani Generis*.¹⁰⁸ He declared that Catholics, “cannot embrace that opinion which maintains either that after Adam there existed on this earth true men who did not take their origin through natural generation from him as from the first parent of all, or that Adam represents a certain number of first parents.”¹⁰⁹ It is also noteworthy that Pius XII had taught that polygenism is irreconcilable with the doctrine of Original Sin.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, polygenism was also ruled out in the 1994 Catechism of the Catholic Church: “Thou madest Adam of the slime of the earth and gave him Eve for a helper. From them the race of humankind has sprung...”¹¹¹ The “one ancestor” mentioned in the CCC could only be the first male human being, namely Adam. Therefore, polygenism is not an open question for Catholics who follow their own doctrine.

Leo XIII effectively pulled the rug out from under human evolution with his 1880 teaching on the special creation of Eve. With polygenism ruled out, the only possibility left was that of evolution-of-the-male-only (i.e., rapid special transformism within monogenism) but what evidence is there for such a concept? Yet another possibility – that God inserted a rational soul into an adult male member of a race of ‘almost human beings’ – is much too convenient and devoid of supportive evidence. Also the implausible idea that God intervened directly to change an ape-like creature into that of a human being (Adam) makes no pretence at qualifying as ‘evolution’ as most evolutionists understand the term.

The idea that Adam’s body arose by the intervention of God acting upon two ape-like parents so that they gave rise to a new ‘kind’ is untenable. Consider the result: a baby boy born of an animal who must fend for himself among animals until he reaches maturity maybe 25 years later when God would create Eve from a

¹⁰⁸ www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xii/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_12081950_humani-generis_en.html

¹⁰⁹ Ibid, para., 37

¹¹⁰ Ibid, para., 37

¹¹¹ CCC 360, footnote 226 reference to the Book of Tobit (Apocrypha) 8:6

portion of his body! This contradicts the Genesis revelation that both Adam and Eve were created on the same day, not 25 years apart. Why even call this concept 'evolution' when the natural process of evolution has had to be abandoned in favour of divine intervention. This scenario requires that Adam's body and rational soul would also have been carried within the female animal for a period of months. Given their rejection of ancient evolutionary, anti-Creation concepts, it is hard to see how the early church Patristics would have accepted such a scenario.

Other interventionist speculation involves the possibility of 'almost human beings' whom God acted upon when he brought Adam into being. If such creatures ever existed, where did they come from anyway – by natural evolution or by some form of interventionist creation – which only begs the question further? And what became of them all after Adam arrived? Are we to believe they all died out long before the global Flood could show evidence of their fossils and thus they left no trace that they ever existed? One can only wonder why God would not simply insert a rational soul into an adult female 'almost human being' instead of ignoring these females and creating Eve's body directly from matter taken from Adam. Multitudes of these 'almost human beings' and other supposed ancestral creatures would have died in the slow journey leading up to the arrival of Adam. However Romans 5:12 declares that death only began to occur after Adam's sin of disobedience. So when is a human being a human being? The 1994 Catholic Catechism declares that we are human beings precisely because we are animated by a spiritual soul.¹¹² The idea of 'almost human beings' does not qualify as credible speculation. The first male human being, on whom the awesome choice of obedience would be placed on behalf of all future humankind, is much more likely to have been specially created as an adult. Logically speaking if one holds that this reference to death applies only to human beings, then why do fossils of supposed ape-like transitional forms show evidence of the disease of rickets? Are we to believe that Adam and Eve were created upon a vast museum of death and that it was not a good, tranquil Creation after all? The buried fossils, in reality, resulted from the global Flood of Noah, many years after Adam and Eve.¹¹³

¹¹² Para., 364

¹¹³ There are approximately 300 Flood legends.

Consider some things known about the trustworthy Creator. Christ was not only present at Creation but actually carried out the work of Creation – “through whom all things were made.”¹¹⁴ He later took on human form and carried out the work of Redemption in perfect obedience to the Father. He must have been intimately involved in the truth revealed to Moses. God can neither deceive nor be deceived, so how can we ignore Christ’s various comments regarding the genuine historicity of Genesis, including the global Flood and the concrete reality of Adam and Eve.¹¹⁵

Let us not forget that Christ did some extraordinary things by human standards, such as calmly walking across the rough sea to Peter and the other frightened disciples in the boat.¹¹⁶ We know that he created space, time and matter rapidly at the beginning of Creation, changed water into wine rapidly, brought the dead Lazarus back to life rapidly, created a coin inside the mouth of a fish rapidly or at least directed Peter to a fish that had a coin in its mouth, multiplied five loaves and two fishes rapidly to feed 5,000 men plus women and children and he cured blindness and diseases rapidly,¹¹⁷ so why balk at the idea of his rapid creation of Adam and Eve in keeping with the Genesis text? Why not also believe that he rapidly “stretched out of the heavens” (i.e., the universe), during the Creation days?¹¹⁸ The implausibility of divine interventionist concepts comes into sharp focus when one considers that, in contrast to acceptance of the rapid adult creation of Adam, theistic evolutionists are driven to invoke innumerable rapid divine interventions over billions of years. So who do we believe about the truth of Creation – the trustworthy divine Son of God who was present at Creation, or fallible modern human beings who were not there?

Papal Authorization to Investigate Evolution

Many Catholics argue that Adam and Eve were not real, concrete, human beings and that the Genesis account is poetry and nothing more than early man’s attempt to comprehend the cosmos around him, but Pius XII taught quite the opposite. He declared in the 1950 encyclical *Humani Generis* that Genesis does contain real history, despite not being recorded in the way of modern historians, and that Adam and Eve

¹¹⁴ Colossians 1

¹¹⁵ Christ quotes the book of Genesis at least 17 times!

¹¹⁶ Matthew 14:25

¹¹⁷ Accounts of these can be found in the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

¹¹⁸ Isaiah 45:12, Jeremiah 10:12

were the first parents of all human beings rather than symbolic representations of humankind.¹¹⁹ Their rational souls were divinely implanted in acts of Special Creation, and Catholics are bound to believe this. He reaffirmed that Original Sin is “sin actually committed by an individual Adam and which through generation is passed on to all and is in everyone as his own”.¹²⁰

In fact he wrote against dissenters, such as Teilhard de Chardin, who were obviously intent on overturning the doctrine of Original Sin. He warned that Catholics must not take for granted that:

The origin of the human body from pre-existing and living matter were already completely certain and proved by facts which have been discovered up to now, and by reasoning on those facts, and as if there were nothing in the sources of divine revelation which demands the greatest moderation and caution in this question.¹²¹

He insisted that the pros and cons of evolution must be considered, and that no one should rush to support evolution and presume to impose their own views upon the Church. Instead Catholics should submit to the ruling as regards doctrine concerning the origin of the human body. The point is important although it implies that one must submit to a teaching authority ahead of Scripture; this perhaps is why so many Catholics have abandoned the Bible since it was interpreted for them by the hierarchy.

However having permitted investigation of human evolution in 1950, Pius XII subsequently indicated that evolution per se seemed highly debatable to him, when he addressed the First International Congress of Medical Genetics on Sept 7, 1953:

In recent works on genetics one reads that the connection between living things cannot be explained better than by supposing a common genealogical tree. It is, however, necessary to remark that what we have here is only an image, a hypothesis, not a demonstrated fact... If most research workers speak of genealogical descent as a fact, they are premature in doing so. One could very well formulate other alternative hypotheses... scientists of repute have emphasised in the clearest possible manner that in their opinion one cannot as yet say what is the real and exact meaning of terms such as ‘evolution’, ‘descent’ and ‘transmission’; that we are as yet totally

¹¹⁹ Para. 38 states, “the first eleven chapters of Genesis, although properly speaking not conforming to the historical method used by the best Greek and Latin writers or by competent authors of our time, do nevertheless pertain to **history in a true sense**”.

¹²⁰ Para. 37

¹²¹ Para. 36

ignorant of a natural process by which one being can beget another of a different kind; that the process by which one being can beget another is altogether unintelligible, no matter how many intermediate stages be supposed; that no experimental method for producing one species from another has been found; and finally that we would not have any idea at what stage in the evolutionary process the hominoid suddenly crossed the threshold of humanity ...one is forced to say that the study of human origins is only at its beginnings; there is nothing definitive about present-day theory.”¹²²

Let us look again at the key reason Pius XII gave in *Humani Generis* for allowing the investigation:

“It remains for us now to speak about these questions, which, although they pertain to the positive sciences, are nevertheless more or less connected with the truths of Christian faith. In fact, not a few insistently demand that the Catholic religion take these sciences into account as much as possible. This certainly would be praiseworthy in case of clearly proved facts; but caution must be used when there is rather a question of hypotheses having some sort of scientific foundation in which doctrine contained in Sacred Scripture... is involved. If such conjectural opinions are directly or indirectly opposed to the doctrine revealed by God, then the demand that they be recognized can in no way be admitted. For these reasons, the teaching authority does not forbid that, in conformity with the present state of human sciences and sacred theology (i.e. in 1950), research and discussions on the part of men experienced in both fields take place with regard to the doctrine of evolution insofar as it inquires into the origin of the human body as coming from pre-existent and living matter – for Catholic faith obliges us to hold that souls are immediately created by God.”¹²³

Doctrine is not dependent upon scientific arguments but Pius XII himself saw that false scientific arguments could impact adversely on Origins doctrine and he saw the need to obtain a good understanding

¹²² The address, given in French, was published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1953 (*emphasis added*).

¹²³ *Humani Generis* 36, 37

of what constitutes 'evolution' scientifically and pertinent theological comments regarding any possible effect on doctrine.

Nowadays, over fifty years later, it is easy to overlook the fact that Pius XII's 1950 encyclical was issued three years before Crick and Watson's 1953 announcement of the genetic code. Pius XII in 1950 did not fully understand terms like 'macroevolution' and 'microevolution'. How could he, when the best scientists of the day did not fully understand the terms themselves? A great deal of imprecision regarding the concept of 'evolution' must have prevailed among scientists and Church scholars long before 1953 and for many years afterwards.

Given that the Catholic Church seemed to be doctrinally united prior to the 1960s, there would have been no need for Pius XII to hurry and certainly no need to concede the status of 'open question' to evolutionists intent on overturning doctrine. However, it is also true that prior to 1953 it may have seemed credible that matter might contain inherent evolutionary properties which would allow life-forms to unfold naturally, imperceptibly, with minute small changes gradually giving way to large scale changes, with no need for divine intervention. This micro to macro speculation suffers profoundly from the complete lack of fossilised transitional evidence buried in the rocks, but who could have known with certainty prior to the 1953 watershed whether matter did or did not contain such properties? Years later, in 1975, Prof. Jerome Lejeune showed that no accumulation of micro changes can amount to macroevolution, but this finding was not available until 25 years after *Humani Generis* was issued. (Lejeune showed, for example, that there can be no such thing as an indiscernible gorillization.)¹²⁴

As scientific research progressed in the second half of the twentieth century it became increasingly clear to objective researchers that macroevolutionary changes are impossible. And it is almost impossible to postulate an earlier precursor to incredibly complex molecules. The possibility for evolution to occur is not affected by aeons of time but rather is determined by the specific information designed into life-forms. The evidence all points to Special Creation by a transcendent Designer. Since 1953, the obvious conclusion has

¹²⁴ www.archindy.org/prolife/lejeunetestimony.htm

stood out with ever greater clarity – the Creator must have designed life-forms so that only micro changes within kind are possible. This is because the discovery of DNA made it possible to understand the way that genetic information is coded and the way that changes in the code produce mutations. At last, it gradually became possible to correctly define the term “evolution”. Of necessity evolution requires the natural gaining of higher genetic information not possessed by one’s ancestors, and this possibility is ruled out on the basis that ‘nothing can give what it does not have’.

Thus, the pertinent information sought by Pius XII was finally available, long after his death. Detailed research and discussions have since been carried out by enough scientists and theologians, and the objective conclusion is that Adam’s body must have been derived from previously existent, but non-living, matter. On the sixth day God rapidly created Adam body and soul. In so doing he instantly transformed the use of sufficient elementary particles already created on day one within the inorganic soil into that of the functioning adult body of Adam, the first adult male human being, and simultaneously created his rational soul.

If Pius XII had known in 1950 what is now known in the twenty-first century, there would have been no need for an investigation since the Pope would have known that God has designed life-forms so that evolution cannot occur and that pro-evolution arguments lead inevitably to conflict with doctrine. Evolution would only have been an open debate scientifically for the time being after 1950 but that time has passed many years ago. Enough arguments have by now been assembled to show that pro-evolution theories are unable to dislodge the integrity of the Genesis account plus they contradict the encyclical teachings of Leo XIII and Pius XII. So the idea of evolution possibly being an open question both scientifically and doctrinally has lapsed from importance. It is indeed a pity that the Catholic Church did not stick closely to the Scriptures but sought to find authority in the Papacy or traditions of men which Jesus warned specifically against. Nevertheless the documents show that evolution cannot be accepted by Catholics and it is one of my concerted aims in this thesis to demonstrate why Catholics cannot pursue such an idea given the Genesis account.

Unfortunately, the Pontifical Academy of Sciences – which contains members who are not Christians in the regenerated sense and at least one atheist, the famous cosmologist Stephen Hawking – may have been passing incorrect information in support of evolution to the late Pope John Paul II. This Academy, in Catholic terms, has no authority in matters of faith and doctrine and expresses only the views of its own members. If any members are not evolutionists, they must be much muted in their opposition; when do we ever hear publicly about any dissent?

All that really matters now is that a good understanding of what constitutes evolution became known in the decades after 1953. The natural gaining of higher genetic information was found to be impossible and what is objectively impossible cannot also be possible at the same time. Since evolution correctly defined is impossible, it cannot be up for debate scientifically and, in keeping with Pius XII's concern expressed in *Humani Generis*, it should not be allowed to impact upon Catholic doctrine.

By way of analogy, if some scholars had suggested in the 1500s that spontaneous generation was how all life-forms had arisen, including human beings, this would have been a challenge to Church doctrine. So if a Pope of the time had declared that the Church “does not forbid research and discussion of the possibility of spontaneous generation and any relevant theological implications concerning the origin of the first human being”, one would think that the Pope's concern would have been fully answered when the later scientific findings of Louis Pasteur were fully known. Once spontaneous generation was found to be impossible, any previous permission to investigate it would have lost any possible status of being an open question scientifically and would have lapsed from being a threat doctrinally. The fact that such hypothetical papal permission may not have been closed by Rome for many years afterwards would not have changed the strength of this argument. Such delay could have been influenced by all sorts of other factors at work, such as war or the outbreak of terrible diseases. One can argue that Rome's not having closed the modern evolution discussion has been greatly affected by a variety of distracting factors, such as the strong pro-evolution bias of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences and the catastrophic collapse of belief within Catholicism. This is due in my opinion to the abandoning of Scripture as the inerrant word of almighty God and placing tradition on a level par with the Bible. That has always been Catholicism's main problem.

Unfortunately, some Catholics oppose Special Creation on the mistaken ground that its proponents overstate the case; they fear that private opinions may be imposed and portrayed as though Church doctrine. But the objective truth is quite the opposite; for too long the actual Church teachings and more importantly the teachings of Scripture have been greatly understated and not imparted rigorously to enough Catholic students. Given the continuing falling away from the practice of Christianity and the ongoing need for conversion of an increasingly pagan society, there is a pressing need for the full truth of Special Creation to be taught in Catholic schools and preached far and wide. The investigation recognised by Pius XII is of course still open until Rome declares otherwise. All that remains is for the Magisterium (teaching authority) to close the final chapter on an outmoded, unlamented, mistaken belief called evolution.

Chapter 4: Why Human Evolution Can Never Become Part of Catholic Doctrine

In this essay several definitive reasons are given as to why an evolutionary creation of our first parents can never become part of the teachings of the Catholic Church. It is imperative that the Catholic Church should not only reject the possibility of such an evolution without delay but should also reaffirm those teachings of Scripture that hold the creation of our first parents as described in the Book of Genesis chapter 2.

It is indeed unfortunate for both the faith and the moral well-being of Western society as a whole that the theological and scientific research and discussion permitted by Pope Pius XII in 1950 as to the possibility of human evolution was not brought to a head within a few years of that date.

This discussion should have elicited, at the very least, the theological reasons for the rejection of human evolution which are binding upon all Catholics. In addition, the discovery in 1953 of the complex nature of the living cell emphatically pointed to intelligent design and so ruled out chance, the factor upon which evolution theories are so reliant. Furthermore, in 1953–54 the “evidence” put forward to support the existence of the “Piltdown Man,” ‘discovered’ in England from 1908 to 1912, comprised a human skullcap plus the lower jaw of an orangutan, the teeth of which had been stained and filed to make them look human and match the size of the teeth in the upper human jaw. Although the hoax was poorly done, it fooled the establishment and was probably the most quoted ‘evidence for evolution’ for around 40 years, until 1953, when the fraud was exposed.

It seems, however, that the Church never organised any research and discussion, and so the decision of the Church has been held in abeyance ever since. This is most unfortunate because of the consequent events, as described hereunder.

In his book *The Virginal Conception and the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, (the late) Fr Raymond E. Brown, S.S., states that Pope Pius XII’s 1943 encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* “instructed Catholic

scholars to use the methods of scientific Biblical criticism that had hitherto been forbidden them. It took a little over ten years for teachers to be trained in the new approaches and for ideas to filter into Catholic seminaries and colleges, so that the mid-fifties really marked the watershed. By that time the critical method had led to Catholic exegetes abandoning almost all the Biblical positions taken by Rome at the beginning of the century.”¹²⁵

Someone might wish to argue that the publication of *Divino afflante Spiritu* in 1943, considered as a historical event within a continuing series of causes and effects, proved during the succeeding years to be an important factor favouring a far wider circulation of form-critical and other radical biblical theories than was ever possible in the Catholic Church before World War II. Similarly, it is not merely arguable, but undeniable, that Vatican Council II has, *de facto*, been the historical occasion for a great relaxation of Church discipline and for a radical pluralism of doctrinal theses, liturgical practices and ecclesial lifestyles that was unheard of before the Council. But just as this by no means proves that such a state of affairs was the one intended and objectively inculcated by the Council Fathers in their sixteen magisterial documents, so the historical effects of *Divino afflante Spiritu* – whatever careful research may reveal them to have been – cannot simply be presumed, by virtue of their *de facto* occurrence, to reflect faithfully the objective teaching of that encyclical. If any revolutionary trends in post-war Catholic exegesis were in part caused by *Divino afflante Spiritu*, they were in no way whatever *justified* by that encyclical, but rather, resulted from selective and abusive interpretations of it.

Fr Brown then goes on to claim that the instruction to abandon the biblical positions in favour of the critical method was ratified in writing by two non-member officials of the first Pontifical Biblical Commission. However, Msgr. John Steinmueller, a consultant to the Commission, documents in his book *The Sword and the Spirit* that their statements were unauthorized and were condemned by the voting Cardinals of the Commission.¹²⁶

Thus what happened was an unauthorized revolt of the (modernist) scholars who by the mid-fifties had rejected the teachings of the first Pontifical Biblical Commission and had seized control of most of the

¹²⁵Brown, 1973, p 4

¹²⁶Steinmueller, 1977, p 7

teaching institutions of the Church. Such scholars not only rejected the historicity of the Genesis account of human creation, but they embraced the ideas of the German “higher” (Biblical) critics that had been condemned by both Leo XIII and Pius X. In addition, and most importantly, they lent their support to the secular proponents of human evolution by endorsing the evolution hypothesis as being genuinely scientific. This can be verified by an examination of *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, which is riddled with liberal bible criticism, edited by Fr. Brown et al.¹²⁷

All of this has been the great tragedy of the twentieth century, for without any powerful Catholic opposition the secular rationalists, whose predecessors had seized control of scientific education earlier that century, have been free to misinform our society with the false claims that only science can provide us with a knowledge of our origins, and that since science is limited to natural causes, nature is all there is, was or will be. As a consequence, in the second half of the twentieth century this naturalism not only dismissed recognition of supernatural causes in the public sector of Western society, but also became the catalyst for Christian morality in most Western countries to be replaced by the “moral liberalism” of the philosophy of materialism.

INTRODUCTION

In this third millennium, people in most Western countries no longer live in a society that pays heed to Christian moral principles. Instead a “moral liberalism” now prevails.¹²⁸ This is based upon the philosophy of materialism which simply says that only material things exist. Materialism has gained its predominance in our society through the acceptance of the notion of naturalism, which claims that the universe, the earth and life on it came about by natural causes and that therefore nature is all there is, was or will be.¹²⁹ Acceptance of naturalism has, in turn, come from the notion of “positivism,” which claims that only

¹²⁷ Brown *et al.*, 1989

¹²⁸ In the July 2001, issue of the prestigious monthly, *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, David R. Carlin, Professor of Philosophy and Sociology at the Community College, Rhode Island, U.S.A., contributed an article entitled, “Christianity’s Struggle for Survival.” In it he pointed out that it was not a question of whether Christian moral principles in Western society would survive because they had already given way to a moral liberalism based upon a “personal liberty principle.” “That principle,” he wrote, “holds that people should be free to do what they like provided they don’t infringe upon the freedom of others to do what they like”. He estimated that it would take a century or two for Christianity to regain its former position.

¹²⁹ As to the acceptance of “naturalism,” see Johnson, 1995

science, through observation and experiment, can give us the positive truth about the origin of the universe and all that is in it, including life on earth.

This allegedly scientific explanation of the origin of all things is today generally presented in most educational text books, journals, encyclopedias and the media as three hypotheses, the Big Bang, Uniformitarian Geology and Organic Evolution, all of which are falsely claimed to be scientifically factual. However, there is another form of naturalism which has been named “theistic naturalism”.¹³⁰ This is not the contradiction in terms it appears to be, for it not only accepts the way things supposedly came about naturally but also holds that that is the way God our Creator ordained they should have come about. Theistic naturalism is better known as “theistic evolution,” a term which in the majority of cases embraces acceptance of the evolutionist worldview.

As noted above, in 1950 Pope Pius XII gave permission to those who were expert both in science and theology to research and discuss the question of whether the human body could have evolved from pre-existent, living matter.¹³¹ In the final analysis, the purpose of that research and discussion was to ascertain whether an evolutionary creation of our first parents could ever become a doctrine of the faith. In terms of theology, therefore, this is a critical issue.

From the point of view of the philosophy of science, it would seem that in making the aforementioned concession the Pope believed that this question might be one that fell within the scope of the so-called positive sciences,¹³² but, of course, he did not exclude discussion and examination of whether these positive sciences were indeed part of genuine science. The latter can also be seen to be a threshold issue because if the hypothesis of human evolution is shown to be outside of the scope of genuine science, further research and discussion is irrelevant.

¹³⁰Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 97–101, where Johnson gives an example of theistic naturalism. There may be some theistic evolutionists who say that evolution happened in accordance with God’s will and not by chance, yet if they accept evolution as being a scientific process, they are tied to natural causes that exclude supernatural intervention.

¹³¹*Enchiridion Biblicum*, p 616

¹³²*Ibid*, p 615

Unfortunately, neither of these threshold issues has ever been the subject of any study within the institutional Church. Instead for the most part it is now assumed that there are no theological or scientific objections to accepting human evolution as Catholic doctrine. There is also widespread acceptance of the belief that evolution textbooks contain scientific facts and arguments that must be taken into account when considering these questions. A consequence of all this is that theistic evolution is now generally accepted by the Roman Curia and taught by most teaching institutions of the Church in place of the Genesis account of creation.¹³³

There are many within the Church who say it does not matter whether we believe in a literal Genesis account or evolution; either method could be God's way of creating the first man and woman. This, it is submitted, is a very shortsighted view, for if Catholics accept that there is nothing wrong with theistic evolution or theistic naturalism, they are actually saying that apart from replacing God with chance as the cause of all things, there is nothing wrong with atheistic naturalism per se. Thus those within the Church who have taken this view have in a sense unwittingly aided and abetted the establishment of atheistic naturalism as the prevailing philosophy in Western society. If all members of the Catholic Church in the twentieth century all had instead vehemently rejected both atheistic and theistic naturalism, Christian morality in Western society would not have been so easily superseded—if at all—by the moral liberalism of the materialists.

In this essay it will be shown that there are a number of reasons—theological and scientific-cum-philosophical—why the hypothesis of human evolution can never become part of the Deposit of Faith, and that therefore in the Catholic Church the “*Humani Generis*” investigation should now be closed in favour of the traditional teaching of Genesis chapters 1–3 which contain “a narrative of things that actually happened; a narrative which corresponds to objective reality and historic truth.”¹³⁴

¹³³For example, David Beyers, Executive Director of the committee on science and human values of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in the United States, was reported by Laurie Goodstein in the *Dallas Morning News* (2 October 1996) as having said concerning Pope John Paul's just released letter to the Pontifical Academy of Science: “The Church went from saying you could either accept evolution or some other form of creationism, to saying, now we'll accept evolution, which is the de facto situation anyway. Who questions evolution now in the Catholic Church? I can't really think of anybody.”

¹³⁴As reaffirmed in 1909 by the first Pontifical Biblical Commission, with the approval of Pope Pius X; see *Enchiridion Biblicum*, p 325.

THE FIRST CRITICAL PROBLEM

(Whether there are theological reasons why human evolution cannot become part of the Deposit of Faith)

It is submitted firstly that human evolution cannot become the basis of any doctrinal teaching because it is “new doctrine” within the meaning of *Pastor Aeternus*, a document of the first Vatican Council (Vatican I).

This document (inter alia) states:

The Roman Pontiffs, moreover, according to the conditions of the time and affairs advised, sometimes by calling ecumenical councils, or by examining the opinion of the Church spread throughout the world, sometimes by particular synods, sometimes employing other helps which divine Providence has supplied, have defined those matters must be held which with God’s help they have recognized as [being] in agreement with Sacred Scripture and apostolic tradition. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by His revelation they might disclose new doctrine, but that by His help they might guard sacredly the revelation transmitted through the apostles and the deposit of faith, and might faithfully set it forth.¹³⁵

The “new doctrine” referred to is obviously doctrine that is completely outside of divine revelation, that is, it cannot be said to have been founded upon the divine revelation contained in Sacred Scripture and/or the Apostolic Tradition, nor is it a logical development of doctrine contained in those sources which has become part of the Deposit of Faith.

Lumen Gentium, a document of the Second Vatican Council (Vatican II), states (with a footnoted reference to *Pastor Aeternus*) that the Roman Pontiff and the bishops “do not admit any new public revelation as pertaining to the divine deposit of faith.”¹³⁶ What else is human evolution in relation to the Catholic religion but a new public doctrine that can never become part of the deposit of faith?

¹³⁵The above is taken from Heinrich Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari, 30th ed. (London: Herder, 1957), para. 1783. The full text explains that the “affairs advised” are matters that have arisen which bishops have referred to Rome for ruling on.

¹³⁶See *Lumen Gentium* 25, Vatican Council II, trans. Austin Flannery, O.P., p 381

Additional Theological Reasons

Moreover, as shown below, the literal and historical meaning of the passages in Genesis chapter 2 concerning the special creation of our first parents are upheld (a) in Sacred Scripture itself, (b) in the opinions commonly expressed by the Holy Fathers, and (c) in the Magisterium teachings of Popes Pius IX, Leo XIII and Pius X. It is therefore further submitted that for each and every one of these reasons human evolution must be rejected by all Catholics.

(a) Sacred Scripture

Genesis 2:7 states that God made man from “the dust of the ground.” The molecules of the dust of the ground, being non-living matter, are known to be symmetrical and bi-directional, whereas the molecules of living matter are asymmetrical and right-handed. In Genesis 3:19 God told Adam, “In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return.” It should be noted that once living human remains decay to dust, that dust reverts to the molecular structure and direction of non-living matter. The fact that Adam was created from “dust of the ground” is affirmed in Genesis 3:23; Ecclesiastes 10:9; 17:1; 33:1; Wisdom 7:1; and 1 Corinthians 15:47.

Genesis 2:21 tells us that God took a rib from Adam’s side and “closed up its place with flesh.” That flesh would have been the periosteum, the membrane in which bones are enclosed. It is a common medical practice to remove rib bone and use it as a repair substance for treatment of accident victims; after the membrane is “closed up” the rib bone grows again. (This corroborates the historical accuracy of Sacred Scripture.)

(b) The Common Opinion of the Fathers

In his book, *The Theory of Evolution Judged by Faith and Reason*, Cardinal Ernesto Ruffini demonstrates that the Greek, Syrian and Latin Fathers all held the description of the creation of our first parents in Genesis 2 to be literally true.¹³⁷

(c) The Magisterium Teachings of Pius IX, Leo XIII and Pius X

¹³⁷Ruffini, 1959, 124ff

Pius IX

In 1860, the year after the publication of Darwin's thesis on evolution, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, the Provincial Council of Cologne issued the following canon, which was approved by Pope Pius IX: "Our first parents were immediately created by God (Gen. 2.7). Therefore we declare as quite contrary to Holy Scripture and the Faith the opinion of those who dare to assert that man, in respect of the body, is derived by spontaneous transformation from an imperfect nature, which improved continually until it reached the present human state."¹³⁸

Pius IX also approved the following teaching of the first Vatican Council: "This sole true God by His goodness and omnipotent power, not to increase His own beatitude, and not to add to, but to manifest His perfection by the blessings which He bestows upon creatures with most free volition, *immediately from the beginning of time fashioned each creature, out of nothing, spiritual and corporeal, namely the angelic and the mundane; and then the human creation, common as it were, composed of both spirit and body.*"¹³⁹ The emphasized parts of this quotation come from the teaching of Lateran IV, a Council of the Church in 1215. Further canons were based upon the Vatican I teaching against materialism and pantheism. It must therefore be a dogmatic teaching. In order to have achieved that status, it must either have been explicitly revealed by divine revelation or developed from something else already revealed. In this instance the obvious source of revelation concerning the creation of mundane creatures is Genesis chapter 1, which clearly reveals that the various kinds of creatures known to man were created "immediately" and "from the beginning of time." Many of the Holy Fathers applied the latter expression to the whole creation period. Therefore this Vatican I teaching cannot be reconciled with any theory of the biological evolution of mundane creatures, which asserts that such life was not created immediately from the beginning of time but arose some millions or billions of years after that beginning, and then only as amoeba (a unicelled organism) which then took further millions of years to evolve into the kinds of living creatures specified in Genesis 1. Nor can it be claimed that God used an evolutionary system to create mundane creatures out of nothing.

¹³⁸Quoted in *ibid*, p 113

¹³⁹Denzinger, para. 1783

In addition, this teaching arguably supports the doctrine of the immediate creation of the first man and woman at the beginning of time, since it follows the sequence of creation in Genesis chapter 1. It is also consistent with Christ's own words where He used the language of Genesis 1.27 to teach us that "from the beginning" (Matt. 19:4) and "from the beginning of creation" (Mark 10:6) God "made man, male and female He created them."

Leo XIII

On 10 February 1880, twenty-one years after the publication of Darwin's first book, Pope Leo XIII issued an encyclical on marriage entitled *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae*,¹⁴⁰ in which he said:

We record what is known, and cannot be doubted in any way, that God, on the sixth day of creation, having made man from the slime of the earth, and having breathed into his face the breath of life, gave him a companion, whom He miraculously took from the side of Adam, when he was locked in sleep. God thus, in His most far reaching foresight, decreed that this husband and wife should be the natural beginning of the human race, from whom it might be propagated and preserved by an unending fruitfulness through all futurity of time.¹⁴¹

Pius X

In 1909 Pope Pius X approved decisions of the first Pontifical Biblical Commission concerning the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis. My answer to the particular question conforms precisely to the teachings of Pius IX and Leo XIII, for the commission states that these chapters convey the fundamental teachings of the Christian religion; it also agrees with the unanimous opinion of the Holy Fathers. Irrespective of the status Pius X gave to the teachings of the PBC in general in his *Motu Proprio* of 18 November 1907, it would seem that this particular teaching, by virtue of what is stated above, already had the protection of the Holy Spirit. Stated in a positive form, the decree teaches that Catholics cannot

¹⁴⁰Fr Brian W. Harrison, O.S., M.A., S.T.D., who drew attention to this teaching of Leo XIII, said that it affirms (inter alia) the historical character of chapters 1–3 of Genesis and the creation of Adam on the sixth day of creation, including the formation of Adam's body from the dust of the earth. See "Did the Human Body Evolve Naturally? A Forgotten Papal Declaration," *Living Tradition* 73–74, January–March, 1998, [journal on-line] available from <http://www.rtforum.org/lt/lt73.html>

¹⁴¹English translation from the encyclical of Leo XIII, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_10021880_arcantum_en.html, para. 5, accessed online Aug.2005.

bring into question the literal and historical meaning of Genesis 1–3, where those chapters touch upon the fundamental teachings of the Christian religion, including (inter alia):

- (a) the creation of all things wrought by God at the beginning of time;
- (b) the special creation of man;
- (c) the formation of the first woman from man;
- (d) the unity or oneness of the human race; and
- (e) the original happiness of our first parents in the state of justice, integrity and immortality.

Some, while admitting that human evolution cannot become part of the Deposit of Faith, might argue that nevertheless it is part of the valid conclusions of a genuine scientific theory, which, being valid, cannot be held to be against faith. However, as shown above, whatever may be a Catholic's personal beliefs, faith requires acceptance of the Genesis account of human creation as being literally and historically true. Since the majority of the Catholic hierarchy today appears to know very little about the case against evolution and accept it as scientific fact, it becomes necessary (1) to deal with the second critical issue and show why evolution is not a genuine scientific theory, and (2) to show that, in any event, it is contrary to the evidence of nature.

THE SECOND CRITICAL PROBLEM

(Whether the Capacity of Genuine Natural Science Covers Historical Unproven Hypotheses)

This issue is concerned with the true scope of natural science. The traditional, theological belief is that God's creation of material things, both animate and inanimate, as described in Genesis chapter 1 was a once-and-for-all creation, i.e., He finished the work of creation and rested on the seventh day (Gen. 2:2). However, He also created laws of nature that would ensure the continuity of His creation. He not only provided living things with the ability to nourish themselves in order to ensure their growth, but He also endowed them with a genetic system that would enable them to reproduce offspring or other forms of successive life.

It is submitted that insofar as God's creation involved bringing into existence out of nothing the first animate and inanimate things, it involved unrepeatable acts and so lies beyond the investigative powers of natural science. On the other hand the natural laws that ensure the continuity of both organic and inorganic systems are operative continuously and can therefore be the subject of testable, scientific theories. Secular science actually agrees with the necessity of repeatable observations for the execution of the scientific method, of which the penultimate step is the experimental testing of a theory.¹⁴² However, the propagandists of atheistic naturalism are quite inconsistent when they claim that only the scientific method can be used to discover the past history of the universe, the earth and life on it, for their hypotheses are based upon unrepeatable observations. This situation arose because the Genesis doctrine of creation was rejected by the philosophy of the Enlightenment, and was replaced later by a fallacious positivism.

The Rise of Positivism

The idea that the discovery of our origins lies solely in the domain of science came out of the philosophy of the Enlightenment (that is, if we extend that term to include the rationalist philosophy that followed on from Rene Descartes (1596–1650)). The proposition was first put forward by an Englishman, John Locke (1632–1704), who advocated the philosophy of “empiricism” which claimed that all knowledge comes from sense perception and that the paradigm of such knowledge is found in science. Locke was a Unitarian. Locke's ideas influenced the Scottish historian and philosopher, David Hume (1711–1776), an atheist who opposed both Christian revelation and morality and embraced the notion of what was later to be called positivism. Similarly, the pre-French Revolution “Encyclopedists,” who were mainly atheists—an exception being Voltaire (1692–1788), a deist—and followed the ideas of Locke and Hume, claimed that only science could reveal the history of our origins.

In Germany the “Idealist” philosophers, Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) and Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814), believed in a God of morality but rejected the God of Creation as revealed in Genesis in favour of an allegedly scientific explanation of our origins. Fichte went as far as claiming that “the concept of creation is

¹⁴²See, for example, the steps of the scientific method as shown in Biggs *et al*, 1991.

the absolutely fundamental error of false metaphysics.”¹⁴³ He also wrote that this “error” was the first criterion of all (religious) falsehood and that it was the original principle of both Judaism and paganism, thus putting them in the same mould.¹⁴⁴

G. W. F. Hegel (1770–1831), who came after Fichte, preferred the ancient Greek philosophers’ speculative approach to the Old Testament rather than Christian dogmatism.¹⁴⁵ With regard to the New Testament, he dismissed Christ’s miracles as being philosophically impossible.¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, he produced a dialectic system that was used by Karl Marx to formulate his communist teachings and the Tübingen theology professor, F. C. Bauer, to propagate theological error.

Although German philosophy as a whole wrought great damage upon the faith, it was the Idealists who did the most harm while pretending to retain some vestige of Christianity. Under their influence the nineteenth century theology schools in Germany universities introduced the “higher” Biblical criticism, which, inter alia, denied the divinity of Christ and the authenticity of his miracles. And furthermore, apart from producing a hypothesis that rejected the Mosaic authorship of Genesis, it also questioned the historical authenticity of the New Testament, including the account of the bodily resurrection of Jesus.

Positivism Defined

False philosophy thus paved the way for the widespread acceptance of the false notion of positivism, which, although inherent in Idealism, was not fully explicated until 1830 with the publishing of the book, *Cours de Philosophie Positive (Lessons from Positive Philosophy)*, written by the French philosopher Auguste Comte. Comte is said to have been a social scientist who earlier in his life was secretary to Comte de Saint Simon (1760–1825), one of the founders of Socialism and who advocated positivism himself.

¹⁴³In German, “der absolute grundirtum aller-falschen metaphysik,” quoted in Claude Tresmontant, *The Hebrew Christ: Language in the Age of the Gospels*, trans. Kenneth D. Whitehead, IL, Franciscan Herald Press, 1989, p 218.

¹⁴⁴Ibid. Claude Tresmontant, a teacher of philosophy at the Sorbonne in Paris and winner of the 1973 Maximilian Kolbe prize for his overall work from 1953 onwards, wrote in his book that German philosophy from Kant to Nietzsche and Heidegger was fundamentally, and not just accidentally, anti-Christian. This was true of German philosophy across the board, whether idealist or simply atheistic. He expressed the view that the Judeo-Christian doctrine of creation *ex nihilo* was the principal object of detestation by German philosophers, and that if ever that idea were to disappear, the Judeo-Christian idea of the one true God would also disappear.

¹⁴⁵G W F. Hegel, “The Positivity of the Christian Religion”, *On Christianity*, trans. T M. Knox, New York, Harper Torchbooks, Cloister Library, 1961

¹⁴⁶Ibid, “The Spirit of Christianity and its Fate”, in *On Christianity*.

In his book Comte claimed that there are three stages of man's thought: the first was the religious or theological stage where man invented gods and devils to explain his origins; the second was the metaphysical stage where man (unsuccessfully) tried to discover his origins by philosophical abstractions; the third and final stage was the scientific stage where man by scientific observation and experimentation will reach the positive truth. This was never anything but a fallacy, for (a) the past cannot be observed, and (b) since the events of past history are unrepeatable, any hypothesis that postulates such history as science can never be experimentally tested. Thus Comte used a fallacy to dismiss the Genesis history of creation as a human invention and the metaphysics of Aristotle and St. Thomas as having no validity.

Comte endeavored to found a "positive" religion which he called "the religion of humanity," with himself as high priest. Although some Positivist Societies did worship humanity, the movement as a religion was ultimately a failure. His "positive" philosophy, on the other hand, enjoyed success among atheist philosophers and scientists. For example, in Britain, Jeremy Bentham, John Mill and John Stuart Mill espoused it, while rejecting Comte's excesses.

In the twentieth century a group of philosophers, mathematicians and scientists in Austria known as the Vienna Circle attempted to restate positivism in a more intellectual way. Pursuant to this they introduced the principle of "verifiability," contending that any non-tautological proposition which in principle is unverifiable by observation is devoid of meaning. Their philosophy became known as Logical Positivism. The target of Logical Positivism's attack was theology and metaphysics. The characteristic claims of those disciplines concerning the nature of the world and reality (so these logical positivists claimed) were unverifiable and therefore had no meaning.

However, the principle itself was suspect. Was it either a tautology or something that could not be verified empirically? And what about the purported, scientifically determined, historical propositions or the many scientific generalizations, neither of which can be conclusively verified by observation?¹⁴⁷ The allegedly scientific history of the logical positivists was itself untestable and therefore unverifiable pseudoscience.

¹⁴⁷Cf. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, ed. Antony Flew, London, Pan Books, 1984, pp. 214–215

The renowned philosopher of science, Karl Popper (1902–1994), who personally knew some members of the circle, believes he killed off Logical Positivism with a published work in which he differentiated pseudoscientific theories from verifiable, scientific ones.¹⁴⁸

Despite the erroneous nature of positivism, the Western world today still accepts this false philosophy which says that only science can tell us the truth about the origin of the universe, including the earth and life on it. In fact it would be true to say that most of the Western world is saturated with this positivistic misconception.

The Distinction between Science and Pseudoscience

The fact that untestable hypotheses cannot be accepted by natural science is a long-standing axiom. Francis Bacon (1561–1677), in advocating the use of the scientific method, stressed the importance of experimental testing of a theory, which is the penultimate step of that method. However, such testing cannot be done if a hypothesis is based upon unrepeatable observations. Isaac Newton is said to have engaged in ceaseless polemic against what he called “hypotheses,” by which he understood any or all affirmations not derived from sensible phenomena and supported by carefully conducted experiments.¹⁴⁹ Popper (supra) recognized the non-scientific nature of untestable hypotheses (which ipso facto are also unfalsifiable). He therefore had to admit that Darwinism was not a scientific theory. In his autobiography, *Unended Quest*,¹⁵⁰ he stated, “I have come to the conclusion that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory but (is) a metaphysical research programme.”

In recent years other non-creationists have also affirmed this distinction between genuine natural science and the pseudoscientific hypothesis of Darwinism. Two biology professors, Paul Ehrlich (Stanford University) and L. Charles Birch (Sydney University), have stated that evolution was “outside of empirical science but not necessarily false” and that “no-one could think of ways to test it.”¹⁵¹ Dr. Colin Patterson,

¹⁴⁸Popper, 1982, pp. 87–90

¹⁴⁹See Wolfgang Smith (physicist and philosopher), *Cosmos and Transcendence: Breaking through the Barriers of Scientific Belief*, IL, Sherwin, Sugden & Co., 1984, 16. Smith, in support of this conclusion, cites in his footnotes the relevant passage from Newton’s *Principia*.

¹⁵⁰Popper, 1982, p 168

¹⁵¹Ehrlich & Birch, 1967, p 152

who before his death in 1994 was a leading palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, stated that in asking ourselves whether evolution is a scientific theory or just pseudoscience, it should be noted that it is purported to be a single process of species splitting and progressing. This part of the theory, he said, was about unique historical events, like the history of England, and unique events are not part of science because they are unrepeatable and so not subject to test.¹⁵²

Neither Popper nor any of the other aforementioned authorities could be accused by evolutionists as having any bias in favour of a supernatural creation. But perhaps even more to the point is an admission by one of the world's leading proponents of organic evolution that the hypothesis is untestable. S. J. Gould (now deceased) admitted in 1986 that evolution relies heavily upon inference and not on "steel balls rolling down inclined planes in a laboratory".¹⁵³ Nevertheless, he still criticized creation scientists who claimed that evolution was not part of empirical science.

In 1992, when Gould was teaching biology, geology and the history of science at Harvard University, he wrote a hypercritical (and most unfair) review of Professor Phillip E. Johnson's book, *Darwin on Trial*.¹⁵⁴ Gould claimed that Johnson held "a narrow and blinkered view of science" because Johnson had claimed that Darwin had "started his theory on the wrong road" by never proposing an experimental test for it. However Gould admitted that "Darwin's method is not generally experimental, for singular and complex events are not so explained by any historical science."¹⁵⁵ In trying to support his claim that evolution was nevertheless science and not metaphysics (in this context, pseudo-science), Gould argued that Darwin's methodology brought his theory within the ambit of natural science. He claimed that Darwin "used Whewell's 'consilience of induction' or bringing widely disparate information under an uniquely consistent explanation."¹⁵⁶

It has been shown above that any hypothesis proposing human evolution (being untestable) can never be part of genuine natural science. It follows that the type of evidence Gould sees as providing justifiable

¹⁵²Patterson, 1978, pp. 145–146

¹⁵³Quoted in Christopher Joyce, "Genesis Goes on Trial," *Weekend Australian*, 27/28 December 1986.

¹⁵⁴Johnson, 1991

¹⁵⁵Gould, 1992, p 194

¹⁵⁶Ibid

arguments favouring organic evolution is no more than circumstantial in character and as such is interpreted in accordance with his materialistic philosophy. It is directly opposed to the natural theology of St. Paul in Romans 1:19–20. Thus the issue is not one between science and religion, as the evolutionists would have it, but one between false philosophy and divine truth supported by sound philosophy (i.e., natural theology).

ORGANIC EVOLUTION REFUTED

What Darwin actually did in gathering information for his hypothesis of evolution was to search for circumstantial evidence from which to draw inferences in favour of it. Each small part of the “evidence” (such as the “horse series” and “vestigial organs”) can now be shown to have been a misconception, while his prediction that transitional forms would be found when the fossil record was more fully explored has come to nothing. Moreover, what was once regarded as the strongest evidence for the alleged descent of all organisms from a common ancestor, namely, the drawings published by German biologist Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919), have now been shown to have been forgeries.

Haeckel’s drawings were of the embryos of a number of different organisms. In their early development the embryos looked alike, but after a period of development differences could be seen. However, Haeckel’s drawings of the young embryos were fraudulent; actual photographs of these embryos at the early stages of their existence show them to be quite dissimilar.¹⁵⁷ If the alleged similarity of early-stage embryos was a strong argument in favour of the existence of a common ancestor, then their actual dissimilarity must be a strong argument against the existence of such an ancestor.

In his book *Evolution. A Theory in Crisis*, molecular biologist Dr. Michael Denton (an agnostic) states after a critical examination of all of Darwin’s arguments:

¹⁵⁷The photographs taken by Dr D M. Richardson and others are reproduced with permission in *TJ*, a creation journal, published by Answers in Genesis, P.O. Box 6302, Acacia Ridge, D.C., 4110, Queensland, Australia. Dr Richardson, a lecturer in medicine, is not known to be a creationist, but discovered the fraud through research. His findings are reported in *Anatomy and Embryology*, 196, no. 2, 1997, pp. 91–106.

Neither the two fundamental axioms of Darwin's macrevolutionary theory – the concept of the continuity of nature, that is the idea of a functional continuum of all life-forms linking all species together and ultimately leading back to the primeval cell, and the belief that all adaptive design of life resulted from a blind process – have been validated by one single empirical discovery or scientific advance since 1859. . . . Despite a century of intensive effort on the part of evolutionary biologists, the major objections raised by Darwin's critics such as Agazzis, Pictet, Bronn and Richard Owen have not been met. The mind must fill the large blanks that Darwin acknowledged in his letter to Asa Gray.¹⁵⁸

Denton's book contains a mine of information in which he not only refutes Darwinism but also rebuts the theory of punctuated equilibrium, proposed by S. J. Gould et al. to explain the absence of transitional forms in the fossil record.¹⁵⁹ Denton observes that with this proof of their absence, it is unlikely that future evolutionists will return to the old, comfortable notion that fossils provide evidence of gradual evolutionary changes.¹⁶⁰ However, there are still many die-hard Darwinists who continue to claim that this theory has been scientifically verified.

Dr. David Raup is a geologist and palaeontologist and was formerly Professor of Geology at the University of Chicago. At the time of writing a letter to the journal *Science* in 1981, he was the Curator of the Chicago Field Museum of Natural History, which has one of the largest collection of fossils in the world. Professor of Law, Phillip E. Johnson, draws attention to Raup's letter in his book, *Darwin on Trial*.¹⁶¹ In brief, Raup states that people outside of geology and palaeontology have unfortunately gained the idea that the fossil record is far more Darwinian than it actually is. He puts this down to the oversimplification of evolution in low-level text books and some plain wishful thinking. He says that Darwin and his advocates expected to find predictable progressions, but in general these have not been found. Yet optimism dies hard, and some pure fantasy has crept into text books.

¹⁵⁸ Denton, 1985, p 345

¹⁵⁹ Ibid, pp. 193–194

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, p 194

¹⁶¹ Johnson, 1991, p 170

Raup is an evolutionist, but no doubt he favours punctuated equilibrium over Darwin's gradualism. Nevertheless, what he says confirms Denton's statements (supra) about the mistaken evolutionist notion that there is a continuum of life-forms linking all species and leading back to the origin of life, and about the blanks in the fossil records that still exist. In his summary, Denton states: "One might have expected a theory of such cardinal importance, a theory that literally changed the world, would have been something more than metaphysics, something more than a myth. Ultimately the Darwinian theory of evolution is no more no less than the great cosmogenic myth of the twentieth century."¹⁶²

The complexity of the living cell with its many minute parts and multitude of functions, all packed into a container of no more than one thousandth of an inch wide, is now well known. According to some estimates, the instructions issuing from its DNA alone if written out would fill a thousand books of six hundred pages each.¹⁶³ Moreover mathematicians say if an event has only a probability of 1 in 10^{50} (1 followed by 50 zeros) of happening, it could never happen, while English astronomer Fred Hoyle calculated the odds against the enzymes in the cell coming about by random changes to be 1 in 1 followed by 40000 zeros.¹⁶⁴ H. Morowitz, a Yale biochemist, calculated the probability of the relatively simple, one-celled E. Coli bacterium coming about by random changes as 1 in 1 followed by 100 billion zeros.¹⁶⁵

Hoyle, who found the odds against evolution occurring through random changes totally unacceptable, adopted the suggestion made by Francis Crick (the famous Nobel Laureate researcher of the living cell) that life might have come from outer space, the theory of panspermia. Hence the name of his book authored with C. Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*. Concerning this, Denton comments: "Nothing illustrates more clearly how intractable a problem the origin of life has become than the fact that world authorities can seriously toy with the idea of panspermia."

Another intractable problem evolution has with the cell is that certain proteins depend upon DNA for their existence but at the same time DNA has a similar dependence upon those proteins. The only logical

¹⁶²Denton, 1985, p 358

¹⁶³As reported in the *National Geographic* magazine.

¹⁶⁴See Denton, 1985, p 323

¹⁶⁵Shapiro, 1986, pp.125-128

conclusion to be drawn from this otherwise vicious circle¹⁶⁶ is that they must have been created by God at the same time. A most important study on this subject was made by Michael J. Behe, Associate Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University in the United States. The systems in the living cell, he says, are irreducibly complex, and if one leaves out any of their parts they will not work. Professor Behe points out that “the simplicity that was once expected to be the foundation of life has proven to be a phantom, instead systems of horrendous, irreducible complexity inhabit the cell. The resulting realization that life was designed by an intelligence is a shock to us in the twentieth century who have gotten used to thinking of life as the result of simple natural laws.”¹⁶⁷

The impossible odds against the living cell coming about by chance through an evolutionary process are only the initial hurdle the hypothesis has to jump; there are many more mathematical impossibilities on the way to evolution’s supposed summit, the evolution of man. The human body consists of 75,000,000,000,000 cells and has numerous tissues, organs and systems. If one looks at only one organ, the human brain, one can see that the chances against it being an end-of-the-line, evolutionary product of a single cell are incalculable. The mature brain possesses 100 billion nerve cells called neurons, as well as other types of cells, but it only makes up 2 percent of the body’s weight. It is said that during every second, 100 million bits of information pour into the brain from the various senses. The brain handles this avalanche with ease in two ways. First, there is a network of nerves in the brain called the reticular formation, which acts as a control centre monitoring the millions of messages coming into the brain, sifting out the trivial and directing the essential for the attention of the cerebral cortex. This little network of nerves allows at most a few hundred types of messages to enter the conscious mind. Second, every two seconds the brains scans itself by means of sending out waves to ensure that it concentrates only on essential messages.

¹⁶⁶In 1974 Popper (supra) referred to this problem in the following terms: “The machinery by which the cell (at least the non-primitive one, which is the only cell we know) translates the code consists of at least fifty macromolecular components which are themselves coded in the DNA. Thus the code cannot be translated except by using certain products of its translation. This constitutes a baffling circle; a really vicious circle, it seems, for any attempt to form a model or theory of the genesis of the gene”, ed. F. Ayala and T. Dobzhansky, “Scientific Reduction and the Essential Incompleteness of all Science,” *Studies in the Philosophy of Biology: Reduction and Related Problems*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1974, 270.

¹⁶⁷Behe, 1996, 253

Finally, there is the fact that humans are rational beings. How could rationality be passed on from an irrational organism by means of natural selection? The evolutionist's proposal cannot possibly account for the supposed astounding changes (from one type of organism to a more complex one) that were needed to have occurred for evolution to be at all feasible. Indeed, there is no record of any fossil transitional organisms which should have been there in the millions if organisms have evolved from less complex ones. Anyone, therefore, who looks at the facts of life should be able to see that the theory of evolution is truly dead.

HUMAN EVOLUTION REFUTED

Evolutionists looking for evidence of apemen search for fossils that show anatomical features that look 'intermediate' between those of apes and humans. This has provided a fertile field for hoaxers.

Another huge hoax field has been the way in which scores of deformed humans were exhibited as 'apemen' or 'apewomen' in circus sideshows from the early 1800s for over a century, with no known scientific refutation of the frauds so perpetrated.¹⁶⁸

The desperate need of evolutionists to find a missing link has also contributed to some inexcusably gross scientific mistakes. The most notable of these was Nebraska Man. A pig's tooth, found by Harold Cook in 1922, was proclaimed by the eminent evolutionist Dr Henry Fairfield Osborne¹⁶⁹ to belong to the first anthropoid (man-like) ape of America, which he named *Hesperopithecus* ('western ape'). The *Illustrated London News* for June 24, 1922, printed an artist's impression of the tooth's owner as an upright-standing apeman, showing the shape of his body, head, nose, ears, hair, etc., together with his wife, domestic animals, and tools.

¹⁶⁸ One of the best known was Julia Pastrana (1834–1860), who suffered from several genetic diseases, which caused her to have profuse bodily hair and an ape-like protruding jaw. See Bergman, 2002, pp. 116–122.

¹⁶⁹ Then head of the department of palaeontology at the American Museum of Natural History.

This highlights the fact that fossils of so-called ‘hominids’ are often only fragments of bones which, when combined with a huge dose of imagination, are transformed into apemen. Another factor is that ‘hominid’ fossils are sufficiently rare that many researchers have never actually handled one, so that many scientific papers on human evolution are based on only casts or published photos, measurements and descriptions.

So where does all this leave the matter of the evidence for apemen?

Australopithecines

Australopithecus (‘southern ape’) is the name given to a number of fossils found in Africa. These are claimed by evolutionists to be the closest to the alleged common ancestor of apes and humans. However, Dr Fred Spoor has done CAT scans of the inner ear region of some of these skulls. These show that their semi-circular canals, which determine balance and ability to walk upright, ‘resemble those of the extant great apes’.¹⁷⁰

The most well known australopithecine is ‘Lucy’, a 40% complete skeleton found by Donald Johanson in Ethiopia in 1974 and called *Australopithecus afarensis*.¹⁷¹ Casts of Lucy’s bones have been imaginatively restored in museums worldwide to look like an apewoman, e.g. with ape-like face and head, but human-like body, hands and feet. However, the original Lucy fossil *did not include the upper jaw, nor most of the skull, nor hand and foot bones!* Several other specimens of *A. afarensis* do have the long curved fingers and toes of tree-dwellers, as well as the restricted wrist anatomy of knuckle-walking chimpanzees and gorillas.¹⁷² Dr Marvin Lubenow quotes the evolutionists Matt Cartmill (Duke University), David Pilbeam (Harvard University) and the late Glynn Isaac (Harvard University): ‘The australopithecines are rapidly sinking back to the status of peculiarly specialized apes ...’¹⁷³

¹⁷⁰ Spoor, F. *et al*, “Implications of Early Hominid Labyrinthine Morphology for Evolution of Human Bipedal Locomotion”, *Nature* 369 (6482): 23 June 1994, pp. 645–648. Spoor is Professor of Evolutionary Anatomy at University College London, UK, and joint editor of the *Journal of Human Evolution*.

¹⁷¹ Meaning ‘southern ape from the Afar Triangle (of Ethiopia)’. Lucy’s genus is now sometimes reclassified as *Praeanthropus*.

¹⁷² Oard, M., “Did Lucy Walk Upright?”, *TJ* 15(2), 2001, pp. 9–10, and “Lucy was a Knuckle-Walker”, *Creation* 22(3), 2000 p 7.

¹⁷³ Lubenow, 1992, p 167: which quotes Cartmill, M., Pilbeam, D. and Isaac, G., “One hundred years of paleoanthropology”, *American Scientist* 74:419, July–August 1986. Lubenow’s *Bones of Contention* is the definitive creationist book on human origins.

Homo Habilis

Next up is *Homo habilis* or ‘handy man’, so named because he supposedly was handy with tools. The most well known is called KNM-ER 1470,¹⁷⁴ comprising a fossil skull and leg bones found by Richard Leakey in Kenya in 1972. Spoor’s CAT scans of the inner ear of a *Homo habilis* skull known as Stw 53 show that it walked more like a baboon than a human.¹⁷⁵ Today most researchers, including Spoor, regard *Homo habilis* as ‘a waste-bin of various species’, including bits and pieces from *Australopithecus* and *Homo erectus*, and not as a valid category. In other words, it never existed as such, and so cannot be the supposed link between australopithecine apes and true man.

Homo Erectus

Next up is *Homo erectus* or ‘upright man’. Excavations of many of these fossils show evidence of the use of tools, the controlled use of fire, that they buried their dead, and that some used red ochre for decoration. Their brain size, though smaller on *average* than modern humans, was within the human range. Recent research on Flores has shown evidence of seafaring skills.¹⁷⁶ Spoor’s CAT scans of their inner ear architecture show that their posture was just like ours.¹⁷⁷ Even some evolutionists concede that they should be put in the same species as modern man, i.e. *Homo sapiens*.¹⁷⁸ Creationists can thus legitimately regard them as distinct variants of true humans.

Neanderthal Man.

This is a group that once lived in Europe and the Mediterranean lands and named after the Neander Valley in Germany, where the first fossils were found in 1856. The researchers who first reconstructed these fossils gave them a bent-over (i.e. ape-like) appearance. However, the early reconstructions suffered from a heavy dose of evolutionary bias, along with the fact that some specimens suffered from bony diseases such as rickets, which is caused by vitamin D deficiency from childhood and can result in bowing of the skeleton.

¹⁷⁴ Meaning ‘fossil no. 1470 at Kenya National Museum, East Rudolph’.

¹⁷⁵ Op. cit Spoor, F., et al

¹⁷⁶ See “Early Man Underestimated (Again)”, *Creation* 21(1), p 9, 1998, based on Thwaites, T., “Ancient Mariners: Early Humans Much Smarter than We Expected”, *New Scientist* 157(2125), p 6, 14 March 1998. Also, Morwood et al., “Fission-track Ages of Stone Tools and Fossils on the East Indonesian Island of Flores”, *Nature* 392(6672), pp. 173–176, 12 March 1998.

¹⁷⁷ Op.cit Spoor, F., et al.

¹⁷⁸ Wolpoff et al., showed that the features of various human skulls indicated that there must have been interbreeding among modern-looking *Homo sapiens* and Neanderthals and even *Homo erectus*. “Modern Human Ancestry at the Peripheries: A Test of the Replacement Theory”, *Science* 291(5502), pp. 293–297.

One cause of this is a lack of exposure to sunlight, consistent with their having lived in the post-Flood Ice Age.

Modern reconstructions of Neandertals are consistent with the creationist contention that they are fully human. Their minor skeletal variations from the modern average, including a *larger* braincase volume on average, are no different in principle from the minor physical differences between people groups today, which have been shown to be consistent with the genetic unity of humanity.

Despite attempts made on the basis of mitochondrial DNA fragments in one set of Neandertal bones to try to assign them to a separate species, even some evolutionist authorities claim that they should be regarded as *Homo sapiens*.¹⁷⁹

So how did these and other extinct human fossils originate?

Answer: Creationists say that the early human fossils are of various groups of people who lived post-Flood. The confusion and dispersion after Babel meant that they formed into distinct people groups. At Babel, the language barrier caused family groups to split from each other. Each group took with them certain genetic characteristics (e.g. genes for the production of more or less melanin (skin colouring pigment)

The reason the oldest ape fossils are found below the oldest human fossils in many locations is that, after the Flood, animal migration happened more quickly than human migration, which was stalled until Babel.

How fossil bones are interpreted depends on the worldview of the researcher. The theory of human evolution requires one or more missing links, so in the post-Darwin era many candidates have been put forward. Not one has stood the test of honest, rigorous investigation, as all have turned out to be from either an extinct ape or an extinct human. The fossil evidence does not compel belief in the existence of apemen, nor that man is the product of evolution. Man was directly created by God and in the likeness of God, not in the likeness of an ape.

¹⁷⁹ See M. White, "The Caring Neanderthal", *Creation* 18(4), pp. 16–17, 1996; also M. Lubenow, "Recovery of Neanderthal mtDNA: An Evaluation", *CEN Technical Journal*. 12(1), pp. 87–97, 1998.

Christians who flirt with the evolutionary idea that apemen once roamed Earth and that God chose one of these to be ‘Adam’ are flying in the face of both true science and the Word of God.

CONCLUSION

This piece has shown that divine revelation, theology, philosophy and science all point to the fact that Adam and Eve, and in fact all forms of life on earth, were specially created in their mature form by God as set out in Genesis chapter 1, and that the evolution theory is merely rationalist philosophy given to us in the form of just-so stories. The following two opinions, given by persons who are regarded as being expert in their fields but have opposing views on the purpose of life, express what has been demonstrated. Dietrich von Hildebrand was arguably one of the greatest Catholic philosophers of the twentieth century. In “Teilhard de Chardin: A False Prophet” (an appendix to his book, *Trojan Horse in the City of God*) he expresses this traditional Catholic viewpoint: “For one thing, every careful thinker knows that a reconciliation of science and the Christian faith has never been needed, because true science (in contradistinction to false philosophies disguised in scientific garments) can never be incompatible with the Christian faith.”¹⁸⁰ The evidence for intelligent design destroys the philosophical position taken by secular evolutionists. Their position is honestly described by a leading evolutionist, the geneticist (Professor) Richard Lewontin:

We take the side of science in spite of the absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just so stories, because we have a commitment to materialism. It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomena world, on the contrary, we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how

¹⁸⁰ von Hildebrand, 1967, 228

counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for we cannot allow a divine foot in the door.¹⁸¹

¹⁸¹Lewontin, 1997, 31

Chapter 5: Why Catholics Should Reject Evolution

For anyone who has searched, even only casually, for the relevant affirmative evidence, there can be no doubt that evolutionism invaded the Catholic Church during this century and is now firmly established as “scientific fact” in almost all Catholic places of learning.¹⁸²

Evolutionism is Not True Science

By evolutionism, I mean the worldview which has as its basic premise the belief that the well-known theory of organic evolution is the only reasonable scientific explanation of the origin of the variety of living organisms we see about us today or of those that once lived but are now extinct. In combination with the theory of uniformity, which postulates vast geological ages and uniform conditions from the beginning of time, the theory of evolution hypothesizes that all organisms evolved from very simple life-forms over those ages. From this basis, the concept of evolution has in turn been extended to provide what is claimed to be the only likely “scientific” explanation of how the universe as we now know it came to be. This explanation – that order evolved from chaos is put forward even though it contradicts the well-established Second Law of Thermodynamics, which infers that all ordered systems tend towards disorder.

The “science” of evolutionism, as it is taught in universities today, is wholly materialistic, for it requires a “natural” explanation of how things have come about and excludes any consideration of supernatural causes as being “unscientific.” This, of course, is based upon fallacious reasoning which was first expressed in Comte’s positivism in the early part of the nineteenth century. Contrary to what Comte claimed, the methods of empirical science cannot be employed either to prove or to falsify any theory that attempts to explain the distant unobservable past.¹⁸³ As a consequence, empirical science can only suggest,

¹⁸²We are inclined to regard Ireland as an Orthodox Catholic country. However, when I was in the national seminary at Maynooth, many of my clerical friends had the books of Teilhard de Chardin on their shelves. Many had read him and were believers in evolution – I know this because I was one of them.

¹⁸³In his *Cours de Philosophie Positive* (1830), Auguste Comte suggested three great stages of human thought: the theological, which brought about religious ‘inventions’; the metaphysical, which produced unsatisfactory metaphysical or philosophical abstractions; and

through inferences drawn from the circumstantial evidence available to us today, what a feasible scenario of the origin of life on earth might be. If, however, valid inferences cannot be drawn in favour of naturally caused origins, then it is both logical and scientific to consider whether the evidence infers supernatural causes.

Because materialists have been firmly in control of the educational system during this century (more particularly the second half), education in the natural sciences has been one sided. More importantly, the dogmatic teaching of most aspects of evolutionism as established scientific fact has amounted to a totally unjustified brainwashing in favour of what is no more than materialist philosophy.

Catholic Evolutionists

Many Catholics have been deceived by evolutionist dogmatism, but not all of them accept that only natural (i.e., non-supernatural) causes account for the existence of all things. Some hold to a theistic evolution which requires divine guidance. Others reject organic evolution, but hold to the “vast ages” as being scientifically established. Most regrettably, however, there are a highly significant number of Catholics, particularly amongst the well-educated clergy, who accept Fr. Teilhard de Chardin’s “synthesis” of theology and evolutionist “science,” which denies God’s role as Creator and instead reduces the position of his Son to the “Omega [or high] Point” of the evolutionary process.¹⁸⁴

All of these positions require some compromise with what is written in Sacred Scripture concerning the historicity of the early chapters of Genesis, compromises that were not seen to be necessary by Christian thinkers in the eighteen and a half centuries preceding Darwin, and, for those who have a proper appreciation of the facts of nature, are not seen to be necessary now. “It is claimed that the facts of Genesis are true as theological symbols, a kind of code for transcendent religious truths, but false historically and

the positive or scientific stage, when the ‘positive truth’ will be reached through scientific observation and experiment. “Positivism” was also called the “Religion of Humanity.” See online <http://www.bartleby.com/65/co/Comte-Au.html>

¹⁸⁴For a thorough exposition and criticism of the ideas and philosophy of Fr Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, see Professor Wolfgang Smith’s *Teilhardism and the New Religion*, Tan Books, 1988. Teilhard’s “New Religion” had much in common with atheist Comte’s “Religion of Humanity.”

scientifically. But it is just this claim concerning key data of Genesis that the Church has consistently denied throughout her history”.¹⁸⁵

The most extreme position is taken by those theologians who believe that the “insights of modern science,” as one theologian put it,¹⁸⁶ require not only the demythologizing of Genesis 1–11 but also of all other miraculous elements of the Old and New Testaments, including such fundamental articles of faith as the Virginal Conception and the Bodily Resurrection of Our Lord.

From Higher-Criticism through Demythologizing to Evolutionism

“Demythologizing,” of course, is nothing new. It was first suggested by the higher-critic, David Strauss, in his *Leben Jesu*, published in 1835. Strauss claimed, for example, that the narrative of the Virgin Birth was not intended to be taken literally, but was a religious message that meant that Jesus was the perfect gift of God. Strauss’s demythologizing of all the miraculous elements in the New Testament was based not upon impeccable scholarship but rather upon an unbelieving rationalism, instilled into him by F. C. Baur, his master at Tübingen University. Baur, a devotee of Hegel, rejected the reality of miracles. Hegel, in turn, had been greatly influenced by the rationalism of Rousseau. Strauss lived long enough to witness the rise in popularity of Darwinism, which he welcomed with the following words: “Darwin has opened the door by which a happier coming race will cast out miracles, never to return. Everyone who knows what miracles imply will praise him, in consequence, as one of the greatest benefactors of the human race”.¹⁸⁷

Condemnation by the Church of Higher-Criticism

It is little wonder that Pope Leo XIII gave the following prophetic warning in his encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*, against the acceptance of higher-criticism and the demythologizing it employed:

¹⁸⁵ Fr P D. Fehlner, O.F.M. Conv., “In the Beginning”, *Christ to the World*, Rome, Via Dei Propaganda, 1988, No. 2, p 18

¹⁸⁶*The Priest* 1, Spring, 1988, (published by the Australian Association of Catholic Clergy) makes mention of the “claimed insights of natural science” as the justification put forward for the reinterpretation of the facts of the Resurrection by a theologian attached to the Catholic Institute of Sydney. This theologian, who regards demythologizing as an exegetical tool, subsequently undertook to abide by a direction of his archbishop to realign his views with those of the Magisterium, viz., that the physical remains of Jesus, placed in the tomb after his death, were raised in his Resurrection.

¹⁸⁷ D F. Strauss, cited in Taylor, 1984, p 343

It will not throw on Scripture the light that is sought, or prove any advantage to doctrine; it will only give rise to disagreement and dissension, those sure notes of error, which the critics in question so plentifully exhibit in their own persons; and seeing that most of them are tainted with false philosophy and rationalism, it must lead to the elimination from the sacred writings of all prophecy and miracles, and of everything that is outside the natural order.(Para.17)

In his *Motu Proprio Praestantia Sacrae Scripturae*, Pius X reaffirmed the view of his predecessor when he said that the teachings of higher-criticism were clearly nothing but commentaries of rationalism derived from a misuse of philology and related studies.

It is now claimed by many Catholic Biblical commentators (for example, the editors of the Jerome Biblical Commentary¹⁸⁸) that Pope Pius XII gave permission in his encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* for the methods of the liberal, Protestant higher-critics to be employed in Catholic Biblical exegesis. Thus it is inferred that Pius XII overruled his predecessors. This, of course, reads more into the directions given by the Pope in his encyclical than is really there. What Pius XII was concerned about was the solving of long-acknowledged difficulties that appear in Sacred Scripture, and in giving those directions he never intended they be taken as permission for the unbridled use of rationalist criticism. In any event, in the same encyclical he reaffirmed the teaching of Leo XIII that all exegesis must conform with the teachings of the Church, the analogy of faith, and the universal opinion of the Fathers of the Church. Such an instruction is sufficient to rule out almost all of the opinions of the liberal Protestant higher-critics.¹⁸⁹

Demythologizing was, of course, carried further last century by the liberal Protestant form-critic Rudolf Bultmann, a theologian who has had considerable influence in leading Catholic scholars away from orthodoxy. The former Archbishop of Osaka, Paul Cardinal Taguchi (now deceased), wrote in 1975 that nearly all of today's Modernist errors condemned by St. Pius X sprang from the seedbed of nineteenth century liberal Protestantism. He went on to say that the job of exegesis is now seen to be

¹⁸⁸See the introductory statement by the editors.

¹⁸⁹The nine "fundamental teachings of the Christian religion" listed by the Pontifical Biblical Commission in their 1909 decisions concerning Genesis 1-3 appear to have been universally held by the Fathers of the Church, having been proposed by Origen and later accepted by St. Jerome.

demythologization. This means that everything in the sacred books implying the supernatural is portrayed as a **Myth, a Relic of The Past and is Said to be Repulsive to the Modern Mind.**¹⁹⁰

Evolutionism Responsible for Demythologizing by Catholic Critics

But why should the idea of miracles be repulsive to the modern mind? I can personally attest to the providence of God in my own life. So can thousands of others- I am not alone.

The answer to this question and the reason why many Catholic scholars have gone back to Modernist errors is, in my opinion, that clearly they have been deceived by false evolutionist dogmatism and the naturalistic, non-supernatural explanation of origins which it proposes. Every Catholic scholar I know who accepts that dogmatism is also attracted to the excesses of liberal Protestant criticism. Not realizing that such dogmatism is only materialism disguised as science, deceived Catholics like these scholars consider it to be “unscientific,” in the modern sense of the word, to continue to hold that miracles can happen; they believe modern man requires everything to be explicable as naturally occurring by way of the theory of evolution.

I have found ratification of this opinion on numerous occasions when I have read the views of those within the Church who are, or were during their lifetimes, leaders of dissent from the teachings of the Church. I will give a few examples. The late Fr. Karl Rahner, *inter alia*, did not accept the Church’s Christology, but replaced it with a Teilhardian-based one that represents Our Lord as not being at all times a divine person, but merely as one ascending towards divinity.¹⁹¹ He also rejected Pius XII’s prohibition against acceptance of the evolutionary inference of polygenism. The late Fr. Patrick O’Connell quotes Fr. Rahner:

The first question a theologian should seriously ask himself is: Can the Church logically leave us free to accept anthropological evolution on the one hand – as she does (DS 3896) – and on the other, condemn polygenism? This is the situation:

(a) If evolutionary hominization is acceptable, we have to accept that “Eve” came about the same way as “Adam.” Any other view can only be a worthless compromise. . . . The decision of the Biblical Commission in 1909 about the “formation of the first man” is no longer acceptable in the exclusive

¹⁹⁰Taguchi, 1974.

¹⁹¹ Karl Rahner, “Christology Within an Evolutionary view of the World” Trans. Karl H. Krueger, in *Theological Investigations 5*, New York, Crossroad, 1983 p 165

literal sense if one accepts in general with Pius XII the evolutionary origin of man (which basically conflicts with this decree). We cannot think of “Adam” in terms of evolution and deny this for “Eve” . . . One cannot therefore accept evolution for “Adam” and then reject it for “Eve.” Polygenism can therefore no longer be rejected in the case of one couple.¹⁹²

Fr. O’Connell stated that “it constitutes a calumny on the memory of Pope Pius XII to say that he accepted the evolution of Adam.” We must reject Rahner’s claims that Catholics are free to accept evolution and that Pius XII accepted the evolution of Adam.

Teilhardian contentions aside, it appears that some evolutionist theologians will not grant Our Lord full divine status because they believe He was in error in referring to certain passages in Genesis 1–11 as though they were true history. Fr. Richard McBrien of Notre Dame University in the United States, an evolutionist who has dissented from several of the Church’s teachings, holds that Jesus was capable of sin and error and did in fact make errors.¹⁹³ The late Fr. Raymond Brown, S.S., who wrote articles questioning the historical truth of the Virginal Conception, the Resurrection, and the Infancy Narratives, states that the view of the sacred writer of Genesis 1 was “naive and prescientific” and infers that anyone with a grammar-school education would not accept that the whole of creation was accomplished in six days.¹⁹⁴ Thus he subjects the truth of what is written in the divine books to what is said in the profane books of materialists.

In the Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia, a paper was produced for distribution to Catholic high schools which cited a passage from *Gaudium et Spes* out of context to lead the reader to believe that Vatican II had approved of evolution. The paper claimed that evolution must be accepted as scientific fact and that Genesis 1–11 should therefore be interpreted as religious myth. It also claimed that the Church had revoked

¹⁹²O’Connell, 1973, 78–9.

¹⁹³As pointed out by Msgr. Nelson W. Local in *Confraternity of Catholic Clergy (USA) Newsletter*, October–November 1980

¹⁹⁴See Raymond E. Brown, “Hermeneutics,” *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1977, 2:608: “No one with a grammar-school education can read the first chapters of Genesis without wondering if the world was really created in six days; yet considerable training is required to be able to distinguish between the religious teaching of Genesis about creation and the naive prescientific outlook of the author. To supply a standard, we may say that in order to read the Bible with intelligent appreciation a man’s biblical appreciation should be proportionate to his general education.”

her warnings against the writings of Fr. Teilhard de Chardin, and it carried a section devoted to praising Fr. Teilhard as a great scientist and great theologian.¹⁹⁵ The author of the paper acknowledged assistance he received in connection with the preparation thereof from four professors belonging to one of Australia's largest seminaries.¹⁹⁶ He also claimed that it was issued with ecclesiastical approval. After a short interval, the author, previously a science teacher at a Catholic high school was employed as a religious educator by the Sydney Archdiocesan Catholic Education Office, which reprinted and further distributed the paper in question. One of the documents annexed to the paper was an article written by an American theologian, in which he described Pius XII's teaching against polygenism as "fundamentalist." The same theologian was also cited as praising the "theology" of Fr. Teilhard, which he claimed was now acceptable to the Church.

Evolutionism also the Cause of Dissent by Moral Theologians

At a later date this same theologian wrote an article entitled, "New Perspectives on Sin."¹⁹⁷ In it he stated that a number of factors have moved Catholic thinking toward new ways of expressing the doctrine of Original Sin and that "perhaps the most important factors are the shift from Biblical fundamentalism and the acceptance of the general theory of evolution." These, he claims, have relegated Genesis to religious myth. His new perspectives are mainly based upon the views of Frs. Bernard Haring and Richard McCormick, both of whom have dissented from some of the Church's teachings on moral theology.¹⁹⁸ Evolutionism is thus seen to be the basic premise of most dissent within the Church today, whether this dissent is made on the ground of Biblical criticism or moral theology.¹⁹⁹

Catholic Indifference to False Evolutionist Claims

¹⁹⁵Price, 1986

¹⁹⁶The author named the four theologians in question, one of whom was the theologian in reference 5 above whose heterodoxy concerning the Resurrection required correction.

¹⁹⁷The article was written by Dr Brennan R. Hill, who teaches pastoral theology and religious education at Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio. It appeared in *Pace* 16, 156ff, (edition not known).

¹⁹⁸Amongst other things, they reject Pope Paul VI's teaching in *Humanae Vitae* concerning contraception.

¹⁹⁹In an address to the European Doctrinal Commission in May 1989, Cardinal Ratzinger stated that the litany of seemingly unconnected modernist claims stems from the rejection of the doctrine of creation in favour of evolutionist philosophy. Cardinal Ratzinger was elected Pope in 2005.

Pope Pius X recognized the significant role evolutionism played in the thinking of the Modernists. In his encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* he said of them: “First of all they lay down the general principle that in a living religion everything is subject to change, and must in fact change, and in this way they pass to what may be said to be the chief of their doctrines, that of Evolution. To the laws of evolution everything is subject – dogma, Church worship, the books that we revere as sacred, even faith itself.”²⁰⁰

Although Pius X firmly condemned Modernism and required that all entering Holy Orders should take an oath against it, he did not set up any body of Catholic scientists to critically examine the claims of the evolutionists. At that time, however, there existed a Catholic academy of science whose origins went back to the seventeenth century. Its revival, after some apparent lapse, was instituted by Pius IX and encouraged by Leo XIII, who in 1887 gave it a new constitution. It was given its present name, “The Pontifical Academy of Science,” in 1936 by Pius XI. Apart from the individual work of members of the Academy, scientific research was being carried out by members of religious orders, the Jesuits being the most prominent in this regard. Pius XI perhaps thought that such people of faith would in due course expose the false claims of evolutionism.

Alas, things have not worked out that way; except for a small minority, members of the Pontifical Academy of Science and religious scientists have succumbed in varying degrees to the dogmatism of the materialists. This trend was more noticeable in the second half of the twentieth century, when eventually the Academy comprised only scientists who had been thoroughly convinced by evolutionist dogmatism during their university training.

The Evolutionism of Members of The Pontifical Academy of Science

In 1980 Darwin’s gradualism, which had species evolving by minute steps over vast periods of time, was rejected by a conference of evolutionists meeting in Chicago, on the grounds that there was no evidence in the fossil record of the abundance of fossils of transitional forms which should have been found if the theory had been valid. A saltatory theory was suggested to replace gradualism and thereby supposedly to

²⁰⁰ http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_x/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-x_enc_19070908_pascendi-dominici-gregis_en.html para. 26

overcome the embarrassment of the lack of transitional forms.²⁰¹ Die-hard Darwinists have criticized the new theory on the ground that the sudden leaps which purportedly characterized rapid (saltatory) changes in species were genetically impossible. The criticisms of both sides are valid, and consequently, because of these and other factors, no theory of organic evolution is viable.²⁰²

In 1982, on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Darwin, twelve members of the Pontifical Academy of Science are reported to have met at the Vatican and to have been responsible for the following statement: “We freely acknowledge there is room for differences of opinion on such problems as species formation and the mechanisms of evolutionary change. . . . Nonetheless, we are convinced that masses of evidence render the application of the concept of evolution to man and other primates beyond serious doubt.”²⁰³ This amazing statement concerning the supposed existence of masses of evidence contrasts with one made the preceding year by Dr. Colin Patterson, a leading palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, to members of its American counterpart. Dr. Patterson said that after twenty years of research into evolution, he asked himself to name just one thing he knew for certain about it, but he could not come up with anything. When he had previously challenged evolutionist groups and colleagues with the same question, he was met with silence, which indicated that no one was able to give him any certain information about evolution.²⁰⁴

In 1985 Dr. Michael Denton, a molecular biologist, published his book, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*.²⁰⁵ In it he shows that all the arguments that had been put forward in favour of organic evolution had no real validity, and that the most relevant circumstantial evidence relating to the vital question of whether there ever had been a sequential relationship between organisms not only did not favour the evolutionary theory but was actually hostile to it. Dr. Denton was (and, so far as it is known, still is) an agnostic, and therefore cannot be accused of creationist bias. That members of a body which has the patronage of the Pope should

²⁰¹Dr Michael Denton (note 159) argues that the new saltatory theory, known as “punctuated equilibrium”, has a need for evidence of transitional forms to support its feasibility.

²⁰²Apart from this, the electron microscope has shown even the simplest forms of life to be so complex that the case for design is overwhelming and evolution by random changes (chance) is ruled out by the laws of mathematical probability. See, for example, Cohen, 1984.

²⁰³Edwin Dashbach, “Catholics and Creationism”, *Visitor*, 21 October 1984, p 3

²⁰⁴Recorded in Parker, 1984, p 25.

²⁰⁵Denton, 1985

have stated an opinion which is supportive of materialist philosophy and (as Denton shows) is blatantly contrary to the facts of nature again reveals how deeply entrenched evolutionism is within the Catholic Church.

The Disastrous Effect of Teaching Evolutionist Dogmatism to Catholic Children

Most Western countries have public education systems. However, even in those that have strong Catholic school networks, the curriculum for public examinations is often set by public authorities. Scientific and other textbooks required to be studied under that curriculum are usually written by university-trained textbook writers who follow the current trend of opinion in universities. As a consequence of this, the evolutionist worldview is usually taught in general studies and in related scientific courses. Even in primary school classes children are taught that the human race is descended from brute animals, and that the first humans remained for hundreds of thousands of years at a near animal level of culture before they finally learned to grow crops and domesticate animals.

This latter view was put forward in the nineteenth century by rationalist social anthropologists. They claimed that ancient remains and artefacts of primitive people represented the culture of the first human beings, and they steadfastly refused to consider that they were the remains of people who had migrated from civilized areas and whose lifestyles had subsequently regressed to primitive ones. The ideas of the social anthropologists suited the evolutionist scenario, which now makes the human race to be two million years old, and so they are retained in our educational system as part of the origins of “history” and “science.”

All of this is in stark contrast with the teaching of the Pontifical Biblical Commission that the first human beings, Adam and Eve, were created in a state of justice, integrity and immortality.²⁰⁶ The traditional view of the Church is that Adam and Eve were created as perfect human beings, both physically and intellectually, but that the Fall resulted not only in a loss of immortality but also in a substantial deterioration of the other qualities. Evolutionist obstinacy teaches that death entered the world millions of

²⁰⁶Denzinger-Schönmetzer, No. 3514; Denzinger-Rahner, No. 2123.

years before the arrival of the human race and that our supposed animal forebears were all involved in a struggle to exist.

Thus, in Catholic schools where evolution combined with social anthropology is taught as scientific and historical fact, it is little wonder that our school pupils cease to believe in the existence of our first parents, and as a consequence many of them, as Leo XIII warned would happen, give up believing altogether.²⁰⁷ For instance, In Australia, which has a strong network of Catholic schools, over ninety percent of Catholic schoolchildren are now said to give up the practice of their faith after leaving school, even though in the majority of cases their parents are practising Catholics. This contrasts with pre-World War II when eighty percent of school leavers, who had not been subjected to these evolutionist teachings, retained the faith.

The Uninformed Attitude of Traditional Catholics to Evolutionism

One of the tragedies of the present situation is that many orthodox Catholics who publicly oppose Modernism and the unorthodoxy of its adherents do not see the acceptance of evolutionism as being the basic motivating cause of Modernist beliefs, as Pius X had understood in the case of the earlier Modernists (see above). The reason for this, in my opinion, is that they now (quite incorrectly) accept that science has since shown the earth and the universe to be billions of years old and the human race to be far older than indicated by a literal reading of Genesis 1–11. They are therefore prepared to compromise the literal and historical meaning of these chapters, even to the extent of regarding “theistic evolution” as being theologically acceptable.²⁰⁸

Anyone properly informed about organic evolution knows that the genetic changes required to make any theory of evolution viable could only have been brought about by a miracle. However, any Catholic believing that this could have happened should ask why God would have worked such miracles without leaving us with any evidence that He ever did so, while at the same time inspire His sacred writers to give

²⁰⁷Condemning those who make evil use of the physical sciences to vilify the contents of the sacred books, Leo XIII spoke in *Providentissimus Deus* (No. 18) of the danger this has, because “the young, if they lose their reverence for the Holy Scripture on one or more points, are easily led to give up believing altogether.”

²⁰⁸Nearly a dozen natural phenomena which conflict with the evolutionary idea that the universe is billions of years old can be seen online at <http://www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c012.html>

an altogether inconsistent account of what (supposedly) really happened. The situation is really worse than this for theistic evolution because the really relevant, circumstantial evidence contained in the fossil record and in molecular structures not only does not favour the concept of organic evolution, but is actually hostile to it.

The “Vast Ages” and Their Relevance to Faith

The Roman Martyrology gives the date 5199 BC as the year “when God in the beginning created heaven and earth,” and the date of 2957 BC as the year of the Flood. These dates closely reflect those of the early Catholic chronologists Theophilus, Africanus and Eusebius, which are based upon those in the Septuagint. These chronologies show that the time of Peleg when the earth was divided (Gen. 10:25) was approximately 750 years after the Flood. If it is assumed that the earth was still one land mass before the time of Peleg, then the human and animal kingdoms would have had a period of 750 years to regenerate after the Flood and spread to the four corners of the earth. It would seem from a reading of Genesis 10 and 11 that the Tower of Babel incident took place before the time of Peleg, and therefore there would have been a mass migration of people from the centre of civilization before the earth was divided. By that time animal migration would have been dictated by the necessity to find food and avoid predators.

Now Genesis 7:19–20 implies that the Flood was universal, for water must quickly find its own level and it would be a physical impossibility for floodwaters to cover the highest mountains in one part of the earth and not be those of a universal flood. The universality of the Flood also appears to be affirmed in 2 Peter 3:6. If the Flood had only been local as some claim, then Genesis 7:8–17 would appear to have no meaning. Scientists in the seventeenth century, such as John Woodward,²⁰⁹ defended the account of a universal flood on the grounds of scientific observations. Flood geology was thus kept alive until the end of the eighteenth century when other theories emerged. Cuvier believed that there had been a succession of pre-Adamic catastrophes, while Hutton espoused the theory of uniformity, which states that present processes explain the past with no catastrophic upheaval.

²⁰⁹John Woodward, Professor of Physics at Cambridge University, wrote “An Essay toward a Natural Theory of the Earth” (1693); he is called the “Father of the Science of Palaeontology”.

Lyell, in his *Principles of Geology* (1830–1832), promoted Hutton’s theory, but to do so he had to get rid of the evidence for catastrophe. In the process he used arguments described as “a flight of dialectics” by one writer,²¹⁰ and by using such reasoning, according to leading evolutionist Stephen J. Gould, “pulled a consummate fast one.”²¹¹ There are now scientists who say there is abundant evidence of past catastrophes²¹² and as a consequence the theory of uniformity is in tatters. Lyell’s theory was later married to Darwin’s, and as a result the prehistoric time scale now shown in geology textbooks is based on organic evolution.²¹³ In a bout of circular reasoning, one theory is said to prove the other (the fossils date the rocks and the rocks date the fossils). If, as argued above, neither the uniformitarian nor the evolutionary theory is viable, then the geological ages represented by the theoretical geological column are only fantasies.

There are more problems for historical geology in that there are numerous anomalies relating to the supposed geological order of rocks, so much so that some years ago a leading geologist spoke of the deplorable state of their discipline and the need to reformulate its principles.²¹⁴ In addition to this, a French scientist’s experiments have shown that to date uniformitarian geologists have had a misconceived view of how strata are formed.

Thus, all the so-called laws or principles upon which geologic time is based (i.e., the “law of uniformity,” the “law of superposition” and the “law of faunal succession”) have been found wanting. Radioactive methods of dating, which have given discordant results, are nevertheless used to verify the tables of geologic time. However, they rely upon assumptions that cannot be proved. (This question is too large to be dealt with here, but it can definitely be said that there is no scientific proof of “vast ages” provided by radioactive or astronomical methods. Some of these questions are dealt with in the videotape mentioned below.)

²¹⁰Velikovsky, 1973, 31–35. In this book Dr. Velikovsky presents massive documented evidence of worldwide catastrophe. In addition he exposes the guesswork Lyell employed in establishing the supposed geologically ages and the deception Lyell employed in his claim that Niagara Falls had a greater age than the Biblical age of the earth.

²¹¹See Gould, 1975

²¹²Velikovsky, 1973; Gould 1975; Ager, 1973; Brown, Jr, 1989

²¹³W B N. Berry, Professor of Palaeontology at the University of California, Berkeley, is author of *Growth of a Prehistoric Time Scale*, San Francisco, W. H. Freeman & Co., 1968, and subtitled the book *Based on Organic Evolution*. Professor Berry indicates that the time scale depends upon the validity of the principle of uniformity throughout time.

²¹⁴R S. Allen, “Geological Correlation and Palaeontology,” *The Bulletin of the Geological Society of America* 59, January 1948, p 2

Recent Formation of a Group of Catholic Scientists Opposing Evolutionism

In recent years, that is, prior to 1990 a group of Catholic scientists has come together for the purpose of exposing false evolutionist dogmatism. They are associated in a Catholic organization known under the acronym of CESHE (Cercle Scientifique et Historique). CESHE holds that nothing known to science can be in conflict with the teachings of the Church, and is mobilizing Catholic scientific opinion against evolutionist dogmatism.²¹⁵ CESHE has produced a videotape recording in which five highly qualified and distinguished Catholic scientists (including the French experimenter mentioned above) are interviewed concerning the validity of evolutionist claims relating to origins. These scientists expose the falsehood of the main evolutionist claims that require the demythologizing of Genesis 1–11.²¹⁶

²¹⁵CESHE (Place du Palais de Justice 3 – B-7500, Tournai, Belgium) was founded to continue the work of Belgian scholar Fernand Crombette. It now has branches in France and the United Kingdom; executive member, Peter Wilders, 42 Bd. d'Italie, Monaco; website: <http://www.chez.com/ceshe/>

²¹⁶The video is entitled *Evolution: Fact or Belief?* Four of the five Catholic scientists who state their views in this video hold or have held the chair in their own disciplines at universities in Italy, the United States and Poland. All are distinguished academics. The fifth is a French geologist, whose original research into sedimentology (how sedimentary rocks are formed) is creating international interest.

PART 2
SOME PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND EFFECTS OF EVOLUTION
WITHIN CATHOLICISM

Chapter 6: Why Evolution is Pseudoscience – Some Philosophical Considerations

This article directs attention to the fact that organic evolution is not a testable scientific theory. It also reveals that it is no more than a metaphysical research program²¹⁷ based upon a naturalism (“nature is all there is”), which is clearly materialistic and emanates from positivism. The program in question uses a methodology that is obviously outside of the scientific method. However, it attempts to demonstrate that the facts of nature contain inferences supporting the view that man evolved from a molecule through random changes over a vast period of time. These changes, the theory asserts, were undirected and aimless. As shown herein, a leading evolutionist claims that despite its untestable character, Darwinism comes within an extended meaning he grants to science because it adopts this methodology. However, along with all other secular evolutionists, he rejects the inferences drawn in favour of intelligent design from the true facts of nature, on the ground that they are not wholly naturalistic. It is obvious that such a distinction cannot be accepted by any true Christian, who, in considering the creation/evolution issue should insist that the inferences in favour of intelligent design, and therefore creation by God, should also be taken into account.

This piece of writing also shows why the case for intelligent design is far superior to the case for evolutionist naturalism. My attention was drawn to a book compiled by experienced scientists, which demonstrates this point by making a comparison between the inferences from the facts of nature that point to evolution and those that point to creation.²¹⁸

²¹⁷Biggs et al., 1991; some would argue, however, that it is not a true metaphysical theory, more a belief system which is the basis of a pantheistic religion.

²¹⁸See Davis & Kenyon, 1993

I read a recent publication which confirms my line of reasoning that (a) the materialist philosophy of “naturalism” has permeated the whole fabric of Western society, and (b) this has resulted in the public substitution of Christian morality with a “permissive” one that does not acknowledge any responsibility to God, our Creator. *Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education*,²¹⁹ should be compulsory reading for any Christian who is engaged in the work of attempting to liberate our society of the permissiveness which takes the form of public sanction of abortion on demand, promiscuity in both homosexual and heterosexual lifestyles, the damaging, so-called sex education given to innocent children, pornography, etc. His earlier book, *Darwin on Trial*, is also highly praised.

It is unfortunate that ever since the publication of Darwin’s book, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, many Christians have believed they could take a middle position between the naturalistic hypothesis of evolution and creation by God. This middle position, called theistic evolution, contains two fundamental errors. Firstly it wrongly assumes that naturalistic evolution is part of natural science, even though it cannot be observed or empirically tested; and secondly it wrongly accords to what is no more than the philosophy of naturalism (nature is all there is, was and ever will be) the status of a scientific model. The widespread adoption of theistic evolution by Christians has had the effect of stifling criticism of the atheistic hypothesis, thereby allowing the rationalists to dictate the terms of, what is supposedly, education in the science of origins. The disastrous results of all this are detailed in Johnson’s book, *Reason in the Balance*.

Why Organic Evolution is Not Science but Only Materialistic Metaphysics

This evolutionist methodology – the drawing of inferences or inductions from present (circumstantial) evidence – can also be applied in the search for intelligent design in the universe. Naturally (as shown later) secular evolutionists vehemently oppose the teaching that the universe and life on earth contain valid inferences of intelligent design because these inferences are diametrically opposed to the materialistic philosophy of “naturalism” which they espouse. Therefore, the situation in relation to biological origins, and in regard to creation as a whole, is that there are two opposing metaphysical research programs: one

²¹⁹Johnson, 1995

which insists upon natural causes based only upon random changes; and the other, known as *natural theology*, which insists that there is abundant evidence for intelligent design that is far beyond the capacity of human beings. In that sense evolution and natural theology/creation are both religious philosophies. However, secular evolutionists claim that their program should be regarded as scientific and natural theology as non-scientific because science is concerned with natural causes only.²²⁰ This argument is a flagrant non sequitur. While natural science does demand natural explanations, its theoretical scope does not extend to historical hypotheses like evolution. True natural science is concerned with presently existing phenomena – it is not a philosophy of life.

Therefore the evolution/creation issue is first and foremost essentially one between a materialistic philosophy advocating naturalism based upon chance and a theological philosophy claiming intelligent design and therefore the existence of a transcendent Creator. Although it is also an issue between materialism and revealed religion, it is capable of logical resolution by a comparison of the former two philosophies.²²¹ It is a fact that after 145 years of research, evolutionists have not discovered any evidence at all from which any satisfactory inferences can be drawn in favour of their hypothesis,²²² whereas discoveries by natural science as to order in the universe, the design and function of living systems and the properties of matter all contain *irresistible* inferences of an intelligently planned universe.

The True Role of Natural Science in Relation to Creation

From a Christian point of view it should easily be seen that God was the transcendent First Cause of all created things, but that he also created secondary causes to uphold His creation and ensure the continuity of life on earth. The true scope of natural science is therefore the observation of created things and the investigation of those secondary causes created by God, that is, those perennially repeatable laws which

²²⁰In a “friend of court” submission to the Supreme Court of the United States in the State of Louisiana appeal, the American Academy for the Sciences put forward this misleading argument. See Johnson, 1991, 7.

²²¹Thus the evolution/creation issue is nothing more than the age-old controversy between materialism and natural theology.

²²²For a thorough dismantling of all of Darwin’s arguments, see Denton, 1985. At the time of writing, Dr Denton, a molecular biologist, was an agnostic and therefore cannot be accused of bias. See also Johnson, 1991. Apart from these two substantial critiques of Darwinism and many others that could be named, there are numerous admissions by evolutionists that there are no intermediate (transitional) forms to be found in the fossil record. Dr Colin Patterson, 1978, has been recorded as saying that after twenty years of research he knew nothing that was true about evolution, and that a watertight case could not be made for the existence of any transitional fossil in the fossil record. Sir Fred Hoyle, 1993 made a strong attack upon the evolution theory, calling it “scientific fundamentalism” and pointing out that it is a failure in relation to fossils and geology. He points out that “the trunk and the main branches of the evolutionary tree” are missing and only exist in the evolutionist’s imagination (see pp. 109–14).

govern the composition and function of created things and ensure their continuity. Being always subject to His will as to their operation and continued existence, God gave those laws their own autonomy. Natural science can only ever obtain a much less than certain knowledge of them, and thus the true investigatory task of scientists is an “unended quest.”²²³

The Evolution Worldview: Positivism

Some Christians, concerned about the loss of religious faith and the permissiveness that have taken hold in Western society today, have recognized that in all probability the basic cause is the role played by the atheistic notion of naturalism which claims that nature is all there is, was, or ever will be. In his book *Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education*, Professor of Law Phillip E. Johnson (also author of *Darwin on Trial*²²⁴), shows how naturalism is presumed as fact in science, law and education today.²²⁵ In a further book he indicates how Christians can recognize the flaws in the naturalistic arguments and so illuminate the minds of those who blindly accept them.²²⁶

For a number of years now, students in almost all our schools and universities have been dogmatically taught that a naturalistic explanation of our origins is the only one that is scientifically acceptable, with the consequences that the number of real Christians has diminished and the Christian ethic has been supplanted by a secular humanist one. But there is another philosophy, to which Christians who oppose naturalism have not paid as much attention, even though it is just as atheistic as naturalism and actually paved the way for the latter’s acceptance. The name of this philosophy is positivism.

It gets its name from a book published in France in 1830 under the title of *Cours de Philosophie Positive*. Its author, August Comte (1798–1857), claimed that there were three stages in human thought. The first was the theological stage, when men looked for supernatural causes and so invented gods and devils. The

²²³Karl Popper states concerning genuine scientific theories: “Although we cannot justify a theory—that is, justify our belief in its truth—we can sometimes justify our preference for one theory over another; for example, if its degree of corroboration is greater” Popper, 1976, 104. As an example he preferred Einstein’s theory to Newton’s. Thus Popper titled his book *Unended Quest*. Although Popper’s view concerning certainty in relation to scientific theories is considered by some to be controversial, it is no doubt correct in the case of cosmological theories.

²²⁴Johnson, 1991. In this book the author looks at the evidence for and against evolution from the point of view of an academic lawyer and finds a lack of proof for it.

²²⁵Johnson, 1995

²²⁶Johnson, 1997

second was the metaphysical stage, when men sought to explain their origins in terms of metaphysical or philosophical abstractions. The third and final stage is the scientific stage, when men by way of scientific observation and experimentation will reach the positive truth.

When this system was applied to origins as Comte had intended, it was never anything more than a fallacy, for the obvious reasons that (a) the past cannot be observed, and (b) any theory concerning unique historical events that, *ipso facto*, are unrepeatable cannot be experimentally tested. Nevertheless, positivism came to be widely accepted in the scientific community.²²⁷ The consequence is that since theology and metaphysics have been ruled out (humanity has progressed past those stages), only science can give us any positive knowledge of the past, and thus only natural causes can be taken into account. Thus positivism was the precursor of naturalism. The product of these two notions is, of course, the evolutionist worldview. Atheists are quite prepared to live with these fallacies, for to them supernatural creation is ridiculous. But what about theistic evolutionists? How can non-evolutionist Christians convince them that their theistic, evolutionist beliefs are based upon fallacies?

By using the language of science (e.g., observation, experimentation) in areas where it had no application, Comte muddied the clear Baconian waters that had for 200 years demarcated genuine natural science from other pursuits. In this article, I am arguing that once again the true distinction between natural science and non-science must be emphasized. It should be proclaimed loud and clear that natural science can be used for the investigation of a limited number of fields; positivism and all other origin theories are outside this domain because they are untestable, or contain vital assumptions that are untestable. They are philosophical in nature and are based upon either one or the other of two opposing, underlying, philosophical

²²⁷In a biography of Nobel Prize winner Marie Curie (1867–1934) written by her daughter, there is a photograph of Marie and an older sister, aged about 15 and 18. The title given to the photograph is “Two Little Positivists.” Marie belonged to a Polish Catholic family, but some time after the premature death of her mother and eldest sister the family, influenced by their father, gave up their faith. The father was a science teacher who had been attracted to Darwinism. Marie later married the son of a militant atheist and, so far as it is known, never returned to her Christian faith.

The “logical positivists,” known as the “Vienna Circle,” were a group of positivists in Austria in the twenties, thirties and pre-Nazi forties. They claimed that most of metaphysics (and consequently ethics and religious discourse) was literally meaningless, since its propositions could not be verified either by observation or experiment, or by logical deduction, thus following the same fallacious reasoning as Comte. Popper claimed responsibility for their demise, when he introduced his method for distinguishing science from non-science. (Apart from this, their “logical deduction” offended the rules of logic.)

In 1984 the National Academy of Sciences of the United States issued a polemic against creationism. In it they asserted that using natural explanations is a fundamental characteristic of science. This is true enough of genuine natural science, but positivistic hypotheses like evolution are not in that category.

assumptions: (a) supernatural causes; (b) natural causes only. The first assumption, usually known as natural theology, asserts that the evidence of nature reveals designs of natural things of such complexity and grandeur that nature must be the work of a supernatural designer/creator. The second, known as materialism, claims that only material things exist and, therefore, only natural causes can be taken into account.

Natural science involves the observation of presently existing phenomena, including those known by their effects, such as electricity, and carrying out experiments to test theories involving repeatable observations. It is not within its scope to investigate one-off events, like creation. However, because of their existence and repeatability, the secondary causes, or natural laws, which God created to uphold His creation and ensure the continuity of created things can be investigated. Sir Francis Bacon (1561–1626), the philosopher, lawyer, and statesman, first proposed the scientific method as a means for distinguishing genuine scientific theories from the non-scientific. According to a modern textbook,²²⁸ the scientific method is applied as follows: 1) define the problem; 2) collect information on the problem; 3) form a hypothesis; 4) experiment to test the hypothesis; 5) reach a conclusion. The renowned philosopher of science Karl Popper (1902–1994) reminded the world that for scientific theories to be genuine they must be scientifically tested. In his major work, *Die Logik der Forschung* published in 1934,²²⁹ Popper stressed the importance of falsifiability as a criterion for determining testability. If a theory could not be subjected to a falsification test, it was only pseudoscience. He singled out Marxism and psychoanalysis as examples of pseudoscience.

WHY EVOLUTION IS PSEUDOSCIENCE

Two professors of biology applied Popper’s philosophy to the theory of evolution:

Our theory of evolution has become, as Popper described, one which cannot be refuted by any possible observations. Every conceivable observation can be fitted into it. It is thus outside of “empirical

²²⁸See Bigs et al., 1991

²²⁹See Popper, 2002; the first English publication in 1959 was a translation of the original German work published in Austria in 1934.

science” but not necessarily false. No one can think of ways to test it. Ideas, either without basis or based upon a few laboratory experiments carried out in extremely simplified systems, have attained currency far beyond their validity. They have become part of an evolutionary dogma accepted by most of us as part of our training.²³⁰

Although he was attracted to Darwinism, Popper (obviously following his own arguments) admitted in his autobiography that “I have come to the conclusion that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory, but a metaphysical research programme – a possible framework for testable scientific theories.”²³¹ Referring to Popper’s statements and to the fact that it is only possible to test an hypothesis where there are repeatable observations, Dr. Colin Patterson, a leading palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, wrote in 1978:

If we accept Popper’s distinction between science and non-science we must ask ourselves whether the theory of evolution by natural selection is scientific or metaphysical (pseudoscience). Taking the first part of the theory, that evolution has occurred, it says that the history of life is a single process of species splitting and progression. This process must be unique and unrepeatable, like the history of England. This part of the theory is, therefore, a historical theory about unique events, and unique events are, by definition, not part of science, for they are unrepeatable and so not subject to test.²³²

Neither Popper nor any of these scientists can be accused by evolutionists as having any bias in favour of a supernatural creation. But perhaps even more to the point is an admission by one of the world’s leading proponents of organic evolution that the hypothesis is untestable. S. J. Gould admitted in 1986 that evolution relies heavily upon inference and not on “steel balls rolling down inclined planes in a laboratory.”²³³ Nevertheless, he goes on to criticize creation scientists who claim that evolution is not part of empirical science. In 1992, when Gould was teaching biology, geology, and the history of science at Harvard University, he wrote a hypercritical review of Professor Phillip E. Johnson’s book, *Darwin on Trial*.²³⁴ Gould said that Johnson held “a narrow and blinkered view of science” because Johnson had

²³⁰P. Ehrlich and L C. Birch, “Evolutionary History and Population Biology,” *Nature* 114, 12 April 1967, p 152.

²³¹“I have come to the conclusion that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory but a metaphysical research programme. It is important to remember that Darwinism is metaphysical and not scientific” Popper, 1976, p 168.

²³²Colin Patterson, *Evolution*, Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1978, 145–6.

²³³Quoted in Christopher Joyce, “Genesis Goes on Trial,” *Weekend Australian*, 27/28 December 1986.

²³⁴Bigs et al, 1991

claimed that Darwin had “started his theory on the wrong road” by never proposing an experimental test for it.²³⁵ However, Gould did admit that “Darwin’s method is not generally experimental, for singular and complex events are not so explained by any historical science.” In trying to support his claim that nevertheless evolution was science and not metaphysics (in this context, pseudoscience), Gould argued that Darwin’s methodology brought his theory within the ambit of natural science. He claimed that Darwin “used Whewell’s ‘consilience of induction’ or bringing widely disparate information under an uniquely consistent explanation.”²³⁶

What Darwin actually did was to search for circumstantial evidence from which he attempted to draw inferences in favour of his hypothesis. A huge part of the “evidence” (for example, the “horse series” and “vestigial organs”) can now be shown to have been misconceptions, while his prediction that transitional forms would be found when the fossil record was more fully explored has been refuted. In his book, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Dr. Michael Denton, a (non-creationist) molecular biologist, states after a critical examination of all of Darwin’s arguments that the two fundamental axioms upon which Darwin based his theory were false. The first was his proposal of continuity in nature, i.e., a continuum of life-forms linking all species and leading back to a primeval life-form. The second was his belief that all adaptive design in nature was the result of random processes, i.e., blind chance. Denton says “Neither axiom has been validated by one single empirical discovery or scientific advance since 1859.” And in relation to the numerous objections raised against the evolution theory by its early opponents, such as the biologists Agassiz, Pictet, Bronn and Richard Owen, Denton asserts: “Nor has a single one of the innumerable objections been met. The mind must still fill up the ‘large blanks’ that Darwin acknowledged in his letter to Asa Gray.”²³⁷ In his summary, Denton states: “One might have expected that a theory of such cardinal importance, a theory that literally changed the world, would have been something more than metaphysics, something more than a myth. Ultimately the Darwinian theory of evolution is no more no less than the great cosmogenic myth of the twentieth century.”²³⁸

²³⁵Gould, 1992, p 194

²³⁶Ibid,

²³⁷Denton, 1985, p 345

²³⁸Ibid, 358.

Surely Christians who do not oppose evolution can see the difference in approach between Denton and Gould. Denton, although an agnostic, is not wedded to positivistic/naturalistic preconditions and, therefore, his objectivity cannot be brought into question. On the other hand, Gould, as an atheist and materialist who *is* wedded to those preconditions, rejects out of hand any opposition to the (alleged) scientific status of evolution, and to this extent his objectivity suffers badly. Quite clearly, the theory of evolution is not part of natural science but is only a research programme aimed at supporting the fallacies of positivism and naturalism (and, consequently, atheistic materialism as a universal philosophy). Christians who continue to hold that evolution is a scientific fact or even a testable scientific theory are, therefore, naive indeed.

There has always been obvious evidence of intelligent design in creation (cf. the natural theology of Paul in Romans 1:19–20). Today there are scientific observations which show that some (if not all) life-forms must have been created as wholly functioning living systems, so they could not have evolved from simpler systems because they are irreducibly complex.²³⁹ Consequently, all evolutionists – including those Christians who continue to hold to the idea of theistic evolution and thereby help to thwart criticism of the materialistic philosophy – have even less excuse for holding to their beliefs.

Some theistic evolutionists might claim that this criticism is unwarranted and unfair on the ground that evolution is supported by historical geology. This discipline (they will claim), while having failed to locate any fossils that can be demonstrated to be truly transitional, has, nevertheless, shown from the fossil record that there is a definite order in which organisms have appeared on earth; this order approximates the theoretical order of evolved types and species. But does this order really exist? According to evolutionist/palaeontologist Dr. David Raup, not so! In the fields of geology and palaeontology, Dr. Raup should have known what he was talking about. Apart from the academic positions he has held at the University of Chicago, he was the Curator of the Chicago Field Museum of Natural History, which has one of the largest collections of fossils in the world. Phillip Johnson, in his book *Darwin on Trial*,²⁴⁰ cites a letter from Raup published in *Science* in which he states:

²³⁹A most important study concerning this issue was made by Michael J. Behe, Associate Professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University in the United States. At the conclusion of his book, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* he points out that "the simplicity that was once expected to be the foundation of life has proven to be a phantom; instead systems of horrendous, irreducible complexity inhabit the cell. The resulting realization that life was designed by an intelligence is a shock to us in the twentieth century who have gotten used to thinking of life as the result of simple natural laws."

²⁴⁰Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, 170

A large number of well-trained scientists outside of evolutionary biology and palaeontology have unfortunately gotten the idea that the fossil record is far more Darwinian than it is. This comes from the oversimplification in secondary sources: low-level textbooks, semi-popular articles, and so on. Also there is some wishful thinking involved. In the years after Darwin, his advocates hoped to find predictable progressions. In general these have not been found – yet optimism dies hard and pure fantasy has crept into textbooks... One of the ironies of the evolution-creation debate is that creationists have accepted the mistaken notion that the fossil record shows a detailed and ordered progression and they have gone to great lengths to accommodate this “fact” in their Flood geology.²⁴¹

This raises the question of whether historical geology is science or pseudoscience.

HISTORICAL GEOLOGY: SCIENCE OR PSEUDOSCIENCE?

Historical geology as taught by most textbooks is based upon the theory of uniformity, which asserts that the present processes in the formation of strata have always been the case throughout history. It also claims that there are two main laws or principles that are relevant to the determination of geological time. They are known as (a) the law or principle of faunal succession, and (b) the law or principle of superposition.

The Theory of Uniformity

A basic postulate of evolution is the concept of uniformitarianism. According to this theory, the way everything is occurring today is the way it has always occurred on our planet. This point has strong bearing on the rock strata. Since no more than an inch or so of sediment is presently being laid down each year in most non-alluvial areas, therefore no more than this amount could have been deposited yearly in those places in the past. Since there are thick sections of rock containing fossils, therefore those rocks and their contents must have required millions of years to be laid down. That is how the theory goes. The opposite viewpoint is known as catastrophism, and teaches that there has been a great catastrophe in the past – the Flood – which within a few months laid down all the sedimentary rock strata, entombing the fossils contained within them.

²⁴¹ Raup, David, letter, *Science* 213, 1981, p 289

No evidence has ever been adduced that uniform conditions on earth have always prevailed. Uniformity was merely an assertion made by James Hutton in 1797 and later adopted in 1830 by Charles Lyell in his *Principles of Geology*.²⁴² Lyell was not an atheist, but he did not accept Biblical history as fact. In 1829 he spoke of driving certain men out of the Mosaic record.²⁴³ He had no evidence to support the doctrine of uniformity and even admitted that there were “violations of continuity. . . so common as to constitute in most regions the rule rather than the exception.”²⁴⁴ To many this seemed to indicate the occurrence of great catastrophes; Lyell argued that it was due to the fact that there were many links in the chronological chain that were missing. He illustrated his point by using examples from human living. If a census were taken every year in sixty provinces, he said, changes in population would seem gradual. However, if it were only taken in a different province every year, the population change in individual provinces over the sixty-year interval would reveal changes that would appear to be very great.²⁴⁵ This argument of gradual changes, which were not apparent to the observer because of (alleged) missing time spans, was an argument from silence. It was on these grounds that Lyell dogmatically rejected “the assumption of sudden and violent catastrophies and revolutions of the whole earth – and its inhabitants.”²⁴⁶ He subsequently succeeded in causing the prevailing support for the Flood amongst geologists to diminish.²⁴⁷

Even S. J. Gould has criticized Lyell for duplicity. Gould was an advocate of the evolution theory of punctuated equilibrium, which states that the fossil record need not display the very slow and gradual evolutionary changes required by Darwin’s gradualism. Gould wrote that Lyell “imposed his imagination upon the evidence” and “pulled a consummate fast one,” when he tried to slip in a substantive claim (which had not been proven) with a methodological statement that must be accepted by any scientist, uniformitarian or catastrophist.²⁴⁸

²⁴²Lyell, 1830–1833, vols. 1–3

²⁴³Mrs Lyell, 1881, 1:253. Note that Mrs Lyell was the sister-in-law of Charles Lyell.

²⁴⁴Mrs. Lyell, 1881, 1:298

²⁴⁵Ibid,

²⁴⁶Ibid., 319.

²⁴⁷Abandonment of geological support for the Flood was gradual until 1859 but accelerated after Darwin had published his theory. While there are today some neo-catastrophists amongst evolutionist geologists, they do not recognize the Genesis flood as an historical event.

²⁴⁸Gould, 1975, LXXX, p 2

Theistic evolutionists should surely be able to see from these facts that the theory of uniformity is not based upon any scientific observations, nor is it even a testable scientific theory; at best it is no more than pseudoscience.

Faunal Succession

Uniformitarians claim that fossils of fauna appear in rocks in a definite, discernible chronological order, and therefore older rocks will contain fossils of more primitive organisms than younger ones. In the textbook *Growth of a Prehistoric Time Scale*, Professor W. B. N. Berry (former Professor of Palaeontology and Vice Chairman of the Department of Palaeontology at the University of California, Berkeley) writes of Darwin's contribution to the growth of the time scale, showing the importance he attached to that contribution by giving his book the sub-title, *Based on Organic Evolution*.²⁴⁹ Thus, according to this authority, faunal succession is nothing more than Darwinian evolution.

Uniformitarian geologists have been notorious for making their geological dating accord with the evolutionary age of the fossils found in them, and dating the age of fossils found in the rocks according to the alleged age of the rocks in which they are found. Thus, faunal succession, as supposedly evidenced by the rocks, is based on circular reasoning. This has been recognized by a number of evolutionist writers.²⁵⁰ In spite of the advantage gained from the favourable use of circular reasoning, leading evolutionist palaeontologist Dr. David Raup (see above) says that the fossil record does not reveal the progressive order of fossils required by Darwin's theory. Rocks are dated by index fossils. The strata are dated by what the evolutionists call index fossils. In each stratum there are a few fossils which are not observed quite as often in the other strata. As an alleged reason, these are the fossils which are used to date that stratum and all the other fossils within it.

It may sound ridiculous, but that is the way it is done. What are these magical fossils that have the power to tell men they lived so many millions of years ago? These special index fossils are generally small marine

²⁴⁹Berry, 1968

²⁵⁰For example, the evolutionist/palaeontologist Niles Eldredge stated in *Time Frames* (New York, Simon & Schuster, 1985, p 52): "And this poses something of a problem. If we date rocks by their fossils, how can we then turn around and talk about patterns of evolutionary change through time in the fossil record?" See also Tom Kemp (curator of the university museum at Oxford University), "A Fresh Look at the Fossil Record", *New Scientist* 108, 1985, p 66.

invertebrates – backboneless sea animals that could not climb to higher ground when the Flood came. Their presence in a sedimentary stratum is supposed to provide absolutely certain proof that that stratum is just so many millions of years “younger” or millions of years “older” than other strata! But then, just as oddly, the magic disappears when the index fossil is found alive:

Most of the species of maidenhair are extinct; indeed they served as index fossils for their strata until one was found alive...The youngest fossil coelacanth is about sixty million years old. Since one was rediscovered off Madagascar, they are no longer claimed as ‘index fossils’—fossils which tell you that all other fossils in that layer are the same ripe old age.”²⁵¹

In reality, within each stratum is to be found an utter confusion of thousands of different types of plants and/or animals. The evolutionists maintain that if just one of a certain type of creature (an “index fossil”) is found anywhere in that stratum, it must automatically be given a certain name, and more: a certain *date* millions of years ago when all the creatures in that stratum are supposed to have lived. Yet, just by examining that particular index fossil, there is no way to tell that it lived just so many millions of years ago. It is all part of a marvellous theory, which is actually nothing more than a grand evolutionary hoax. Experienced scientists denounce it as untrue.

Any rock containing fossils of one type of trilobite (*Paradoxides*) is called a “Cambrian” rock, thus supposedly dating all the creatures in that rock to a time period 120 million years long and beginning 60 million years in the past. But rocks containing another type of trilobite (*Bathyurus*) are arbitrarily classified as “Ordovician,” which is claimed to have spanned 45 million years and begun 480 million years ago.

But how can anyone come up with such ancient dates simply by examining two different varieties of trilobite? The truth is that it cannot be done. Add to this the problem of mixed-up index fossils—when “index fossils” from different levels are found together! That is a problem which palaeontologists do not publicly discuss. As we analyse one aspect after another of evolution (stellar, geologic, biologic, genetic, etc.), we find it all to be little more than a carefully contrived science fiction storybook.

²⁵¹ Michael Pitman, 1984b, pp. 186, 198

Fossils are dated by a theory but now comes the catch: How can evolutionary geologists know what dates to apply to those index fossils? The answer to this question is a theory! *Here is how they do it:*

Darwinists theorize which animals came first—and when they appeared on the scene. And then they date the rocks according to their theory—not according to the wide mixture of fossils creatures in it—but by assigning dates based on their theory to certain “index” fossils. That is a gigantic, circular-reasoning hoax. “Fossils provide the only historical, documentary evidence that life has evolved from simpler to more and more complex forms.”²⁵² The conclusions about which fossils came first are based on the assumptions of evolution. Rock strata are studied, a few index fossils are located (when they can be found at all), and each stratum is then given a name. Since the strata are above, below, and in-between one another, with most of the strata missing in any one location,—just how can the theorists possibly date each stratum? They do it by applying evolutionary speculation to what they imagine those dates should be.

This type of activity classifies as interesting fiction, but it surely should not be regarded as science. *The truth is this:* it was the evolutionary theory that was used to date the fossils; it was not the strata and it was not index fossils.

Vertebrate palaeontologists have relied upon ‘stage of evolution’ as the criterion for determining the chronologic relationships of faunas. Before establishment of physical dates, evolutionary progression was the best method for dating fossiliferous strata.”²⁵³ “*Fossiliferous strata*” means fossil-bearing strata. Keep in mind that only the sedimentary rocks have fossils, for they were the sediments laid down at the time of the Flood, which hardened under pressure and dried into rock. You will find no fossils in granite, basalt, etc.

The dating of each stratum and all the fossils in it is supposedly based on index fossils, when it is actually based on evolutionary speculations, and nothing more. The more one studies palaeontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone.²⁵⁴

²⁵² Dunbar, 1960, p 47

²⁵³ J F. Evernden *et al.*, “K/A Dates and the Cenozoic Mammalian Chronology of North America”, in *American Journal of Science*, February 1964, p 166

²⁵⁴ Wysong, 1976, p 31

The index fossils are dated by the theory. Amid all the confusion of mixed up and missing strata, there would be no possible way to date rocks—or fossils by the catastrophic conditions found in sedimentary strata. It is all utter confusion. So the evolutionists apply a theory to the strata.

Because of the sterility of its concepts, historical geology, which includes palaeontology [the study of fossils] and stratigraphy [the study of rock strata], has become static and unproductive. Current methods of delimiting intervals of time, which are the fundamental units of historical geology, and of establishing chronology are of dubious validity. Worse than that, the criteria of correlation—the attempt to equate in time, or synchronize, the geological history of one area with that of another—are logically vulnerable. The findings of historical geology are suspect because the principles upon which they are based are either inadequate, in which case they should be reformulated, or false, in which case they should be discarded. Most of us [geologists] refuse to discard or reformulate, and the result is the present deplorable state of our discipline.²⁵⁵

Big names and big numbers have been assigned to various strata, thus imparting an air of scientific authority to them. Common people, lacking expertise in the taxonomy of palaeontology, when faced with these lists of big words tend to give up. It all looks too grand to be understood, much less challenged. But the big words and big numbers just cover over an empty theory which lacks substantial evidence to support it.

When we examine it, we find that the strata-dating theory is based on circular reasoning. “Circular reasoning” is a method of false logic, by which “*this is used to prove that, and that is used to prove this.*” It is also called “*reasoning in a circle.*” Over a hundred years ago, it was described by the phrase, *circulus in probando*, which is Latin for “a circle in proving.” There are several types of circular reasoning found in support of evolutionary theory. One of these is the geological dating position that “*fossils are dated by the type of stratum they are in while at the same time the stratum is dated by the fossils found in it.*” An alternative evolutionary statement is that “the fossils and rocks are interpreted by the theory of evolution, and the theory is proven by the interpretation given to the fossils and rocks.” Evolutionists use their theory

²⁵⁵ Robin S. Allen, “Geological Correlation and Paleocology”, *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America*, January 1984, p 2

of rock strata to date the fossils, and then use their theory of fossils to date the rock strata! A number of scientists have commented on this problem of circularity.

“The charge that the construction of the geologic scale involves circularity has a certain amount of validity.”²⁵⁶

The intelligent layman has long suspected circular reasoning in the use of rocks to date fossils and fossils to date rocks. The geologist has never bothered to think of a good reply, feeling the explanations are not worth the trouble as long as the work brings results. This is supposed to be hard-headed pragmatism²⁵⁷

Are the authorities maintaining, on the one hand, that evolution is documented by geology and on the other hand, that geology is documented by evolution? Isn't this a circular argument?²⁵⁸

The professor of paleobiology at Kansas State University wrote this:

Contrary to what most scientists write, the fossil record does not support the Darwinian theory of evolution, because it is this theory (there are several) which we use to interpret the fossil record. By doing so, we are guilty of circular reasoning if we then say the fossil record supports this theory.²⁵⁹

Niles Eldredge, head of the Palaeontology Department at the American Museum of Natural History, in Chicago, made this comment:

²⁵⁶ Raup, 1983, p 21

²⁵⁷ J.E. O'Rourke, "Pragmatism versus Materialism and Stratigraphy", *American Journal of Science*, January 1976, p 48

²⁵⁸ Larry Azar, "Biologists, Help!" *BioScience*, November 1978, p 714

²⁵⁹ Ronald R. West, "Palaeontology and Uniformitarianism", *Compass*, May 1968, p 216

“And this poses something of a problem. If we date the rocks by their fossils, how can we then turn around and talk about patterns of evolutionary change through time in the fossil record?”²⁶⁰

First, reasoning in a circle is the basis of the “evidence” that evolution has occurred in the past. (*The fossils are dated by the theory of strata dating; the strata are then dated by the fossils*).

By the use of circular reasoning, evolutionary theory attempts to separate itself from the laws of nature! Limiting factors of chemical, biological, and physical law forbid matter or living creatures from originating or evolving. Actually, the entire theory of evolution is based on one vast circularity in reasoning. Because they accept the theory, evolutionists agree to all the foolish ideas which attempt to prove it.

But the danger of circularity is still present. For most biologists the strongest reason for accepting the evolutionary hypothesis is their acceptance of some theory that entails it. There is another difficulty. The temporal ordering of biological events beyond the local section may critically involve palaeontological correlation, which necessarily presupposes the nonrepeatability of organic events in geologic history. There are various justifications for this assumption but for almost all contemporary palaeontologists it rests upon the acceptance of the evolutionary hypothesis.²⁶¹

As we study the fossil record, we come upon a variety of very serious problems which undermine the strata/fossil theory. *Three of the most important are these:* (1) At the very bottom of all the strata (the geologic column) is the *Cambrian* strata, which is filled with complex, multi-celled life. This is termed the “*Cambrian explosion*” of sudden life-forms all at once. (2) There are no transitional species throughout the column. This problem is also called *fossil gaps* or *missing links*. (3) Mixed-up and out-of-order strata are regularly found. *Singly or together, they destroy the evolutionary argument from the rock strata. But there are many more problems.*

²⁶⁰ Eldredge, 1985, p 52

²⁶¹ David G. Kitts, “Palaeontology and Evolutionary Theory”, *Evolution*, September 1974, p 466

Because the waters of the Flood first covered the creatures which were not able to rapidly escape to higher ground, some of the “simplest animals” are found in the lowest of the sedimentary strata. Yet those creatures have complicated internal structures. Because the waters of the Flood first covered the creatures which were not able to rapidly escape to higher ground, some of the “simplest animals” are found in the lowest of the sedimentary strata. Yet those creatures have complicated internal structures.

One of the most common creatures found in the lowest—the Cambrian—strata are the *trilobites*. These were small swimming creatures belonging to the same group as the insects (the arthropods). Yet careful study reveals that they had extremely complex eyes. The mathematics needed to work out the lens structure of these little creatures is so complicated, that it was not developed until the middle of the last century.

Here is how an expert describes it. Norman Macbeth, evolutionist, in a speech at Harvard University in 1983, said this:

I have dealt with biologists over the last twenty years now. I have found that, in a way, they are hampered by having too much education. They have been steeped from their childhood in the Darwinian views, and, as a result, it has taken possession of their minds to such an extent that they are almost unable to see many facts that are not in harmony with Darwinism. These facts simply aren't there for them often, and other ones are sort of suppressed or distorted. I'll give you some examples.

First, and perhaps most important, is the first appearance of fossils. This occurs at a time called the '*Cambrian*,' 600 million years ago by the fossil reckoning. The fossils appear at that time [in the Cambrian] in a pretty highly developed form. They don't start very low and evolve bit by bit over long periods of time. In the lowest fossil-bearing strata of all [the Cambrian, they are already there, and are pretty complicated in more-or-less modern form.

One example of this is the little animal called the trilobite. There are a great many fossils of the trilobite right there at the beginning with no buildup to it [no evolution of life-forms leading to it]. And, if you examine them closely, you will find that they are not simple animals. They are small,

but they have an eye that has been discussed a great deal in recent years—*an eye that is simply incredible*.

It is made up of dozens of little tubes which are all at slightly different angles so that it covers the entire field of vision, with a different tube pointing at each spot on the horizon. But these tubes are all more complicated than that, by far. They have a lens on them that is optically arranged in a very complicated way, and it is bound into another layer that has to be just exactly right for them to see anything . . . But the more complicated it is, the less likely it is simply to have grown up out of nothing.

And this situation has troubled everybody from the beginning—to have everything at the very opening of the drama. The curtain goes up [life-forms first appear in the Cambrian strata] and you have the players on the stage already, entirely in modern costumes.²⁶²

Remember, we are here discussing one of the most common creatures at the very bottom of the fossil strata. *Science News* declared that the trilobite had “the most sophisticated eye lenses ever produced by nature.”²⁶³ Each eye of the trilobite had two lenses! Here is what one of the world’s leading trilobite researchers wrote:

In fact, this optical doublet is a device so typically associated with human invention that its discovery in trilobites comes as something of a shock. The realization that trilobites developed and used such devices half a billion years ago makes the shock even greater. And a final discovery—that the refracting interface between the two lense elements in a trilobite’s eye was designed [“designed”] in accordance with optical constructions worked out by Descartes and Huygens in the mid-seventeenth century—borders on sheer science fiction . . . The design of the trilobite’s eye lens could well qualify for a patent disclosure.²⁶⁴

Extremely complicated creatures at the very beginning, with nothing leading up to them; that is the testimony of the strata. The rocks are crying out; they have a message to tell us.

²⁶² Norman Macbeth, Speech at Harvard University, September 24, 1983, quoted in Sunderland, 1988, p 150.

²⁶³ *Science News* 105, 2 February 1974, p 72

²⁶⁴ Riccardo Levi-Setti, *Trilobites*, 2nd ed., University of Chicago Press, 1993, pp. 54, 57

There are enormous numbers of complex trilobites in the Cambrian strata, yet below the Cambrian there is hardly anything that resembles a fossil. As mentioned above, these little creatures had marvelously complicated eyes. But they also had other very advanced features: (1) Jointed legs and appendages, which indicate that they had a complex system of muscles. (2) Chitinous exoskeleton (horny substance as their outer covering), which indicates that they grew by periodic *ecdysis*, a very complicated process of molting. (3) Compound eyes and antennae, which indicate a complex nervous system. (4) Special respiratory organs, which indicate a blood circulation system. (5) Complex mouth parts, which indicate specialized food requirements.

Evolutionists maintain that the fossil record goes from the simple to the complex. But researchers have discovered that the simple creatures were also complex. In fact, there are actually few examples in the fossil record of anything like “from simple to complex” progression. This is partly due to the fact that the fossils suddenly appear in great numbers and variety, too much for simple-to-complex progression to be sorted out.

Included here are complex organs, such as intestines, stomachs, bristles and spines. Eyes and feelers show the presence of nervous systems. For example, consider the specialized sting cells (*nematocysts*) in the bodies of jellyfish, with their coiled, thread-like harpoons which are explosively triggered. How could this evolve? Eyes and feelers show the presence of nervous systems.

Thus, faunal succession is based firstly upon the untestable hypothesis of organic evolution, and secondly upon the supposition that the fossil record displays an evolutionary progression of fossils, which opposes the facts. It therefore cannot be held to be a true geological law or principle.

Superposition

Professor Berry in his book introduces the principle of superposition: “At the foundation of the understanding of the proper sequential order of rocks and the fossils contained in them lies the principle of superposition. That many rocks are layered and that such rocks commonly bore fossils, were observations

made by scores of naturalists from the beginning of man's investigation of the natural phenomena about him. Some rocks were tilted only a little. They could be seen to lie one on top of the other. Other sets were contorted. Their sequential order was more difficult to establish."²⁶⁵

He goes on to describe how in 1665, Nicolaus Steno had been led to induce the principle of superposition from observations of rocks in Northern Italy, which in effect was that each layer of rock was formed upon the nearly horizontal rock base beneath it. Each lower layer, therefore, must be older than the layer above it. Tilted and deformed strata (not fully horizontal at the time of deposition) must have been displaced by volcanic eruption or by a withdrawal of the substance beneath the rocks, causing a caving in. "From Steno's almost self-evident principle, geologists could work out local successions of strata with confidence that the lowest were the oldest. Through time, a set of criteria was established by which tops and bottoms of beds could be ascertained in badly deformed and strongly tilted strata. Geological structures could then be established and proper superpositional order demonstrated in any area."²⁶⁶

Using this superpositional theory, uniformitarian geologists devised a chronology of the geological ages. The supposition that rock layers were laid down successively and, therefore, in a sequential order was never suggested by Steno, nor did he carry out any experiments to show if this was the case. After all, Steno was an anatomist of some repute with only a passing interest in rock formations. And neither have any experiments been carried out by uniformitarians to test their theory of superposition. Uniformitarian textbooks, therefore, contain the gratuitous assumption that no rock strata were ever laid down by great catastrophes, and they dogmatically espouse the untested theory that today the strata are laid down in horizontal layers, one on top of the other, and, further, that this is how it has always happened.

But this theory of horizontal layering has been tested by Guy Berthault, a French sedimentologist. First he conducted personal experiments on microstrata. The results of these experiments were published by the French Academy of Sciences. Subsequently he directed experiments on stratification at the University of Colorado. The report on these latter experiments was published in the *Journal of the Geological Society of*

²⁶⁵Berry, 1968, 23

²⁶⁶Ibid, 25

France in 1993. The experiments reveal that the sediments washed out into the sea are sorted out by water currents into strata of different-sized particles. The strata do not form successively one on top of the other but sideways, upstream to downstream – where the water current changes, a series of strata can form simultaneously. In these conditions it is not possible to ascertain whether the higher strata are younger than the lower, nor whether fossils found in different strata or in different parts of the same strata are of the same age. These results leave the fossil record without a chronology and the evolution theory without support from geology and palaeontology. A visual explanation of the experiments is contained in an updated version of the video, *Evolution: Fact or Belief?*²⁶⁷

With regard to the pseudoscientific nature of uniformity and faunal succession, and the experimentally disproven principle of superposition, it can be seen that the supposed historical geology that appears in uniformitarian textbooks provides no real support for the theory of organic evolution, the principal theory of the evolutionist worldview. All other theories that support this worldview—the Big Bang, long-age dating etc.—when properly investigated can also be seen to have feet of clay. They contain untestable assumptions and will never be anything more than pseudoscience.

Conclusion: If Christianity is to survive as a worldwide influence, then positivism and its child, naturalism, must be exposed for the scientific and philosophical frauds they are.

The rationalist philosopher Auguste Comte, in his *Cours de Philosophie Positive* (1830), claimed that the first two stages of man's thought, the theological and the metaphysical, had been superseded by the final or positive stage when through scientific experimentation and observation man would reach the positive truth. Applied to origins, as he intended, this philosophy is a fallacy, for unique past events cannot be observed, nor can any hypothesis regarding their historicity be experimentally tested. Yet this is the philosophy adopted by modern scientific establishments who advocate a worldview built upon uniformitarian and evolutionist concepts, in which they claim to know the ages of geological strata, the earth and the universe. Suffice to say that all these suppositions contain assumptions vital to their validity, which are not only

²⁶⁷ Readers can obtain the name of its local distributor from <http://www1.newsource.net/efob/>; Internet.

unproven but also untestable and outside of the scientific method. Any claim that they scientifically contradict the Biblical history of origins is therefore untrue.

The Diabolical Purpose of Pro-evolution Censorship

During this century there has been an unrelenting censorship of arguments against evolution. In his book *Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist*, Thomas Dwight, the Parkman Professor of Anatomy at Harvard University, wrote that “the tyranny of the Zeitgeist in the matter of evolution is overwhelming to a degree which outsiders have no idea; not only does it influence (as I admit it does in my case) our manners of thinking, but there is an oppression as in the days of the ‘terror’. Very few leaders of science dare to tell the truth concerning their own state of mind! How many of them feel forced in public to do a lip service to a cult they do not believe in!”²⁶⁸ Another famous scientist of more recent times, the late Professor W. R. Thompson F.R.S., penned the introduction to what was virtually a centenary edition of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*. Concerning the suppression of criticism of evolution he wrote: “This situation, where scientific men rally to the defence of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigour, attempting to maintain credit with the public by suppression of criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science.”²⁶⁹ In 1993 Sir Fred Hoyle, the noted physicist, vehemently attacked the arrogance of evolutionists who have infiltrated the education system and have imposed a strict censorship against opposing views.²⁷⁰

This censorship and oppression has continued to the present day. In quite a number of cases in the United States, scientists have been deprived of teaching positions or have been rejected for doctoral or other post-graduate courses in science, not because their work was not first class but because they were known to be sympathetic to what is now popularly called “creationism.” If at present there were irresistible inferences for evolution but none for natural theology, there would be no need for this censorship and oppression. *The facts would speak for themselves*. However, the true situation is the very reverse.

²⁶⁸Thomas Dwight, *Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist*, London, Longmans Green & Co, 1927, 20–21

²⁶⁹See introduction to reissue of Darwin, 1962.

²⁷⁰Hoyle & Wickramasinghe, 1993, pp. 10, 13–15, 65

Details of this oppression are shown in the Dr. Jerry Bergman case.²⁷¹ Bergman has been featured in many creationist publications for his complaint that he was denied tenure and dismissed from Bowling Green State University solely because of his beliefs and publications in the area of creationism. He now has well over 600 publications in print or in press in 13 languages and has occasionally had false charges leveled against him. He epitomizes the view that the censorship of criticism of the evolution worldview has as its ultimate object the removal of all religious beliefs by classifying them as “anti-science.” But the artillery in this war against religion is not true natural science, but, as shown above, only pseudo-science.

In a speech recently made and now appearing in article form, Professor Johnson refers to another of these cases.²⁷² The evolutionists in control of scientific education at San Francisco State University stopped a professor of biology referring to the case for intelligent design when he was teaching the case for evolution to first-year undergraduates. Johnson gives this case as an illustration of why the creation/evolution issue is not really one between religious beliefs and science but between the argument for intelligent design (theism) and a philosophical “naturalism” (atheism); he concludes that any form of theistic evolution is a grave error. Many educators maintain that the theory of evolution should be included in science textbooks as the sole explanation for origins, and if the theory of special creation is taught at all, it must be restricted to social science classes. Fundamentalists claim that neither evolution nor creation qualifies as a scientific theory, because they have never been witnessed by human observers. Both theories are not subject to the experimental method, and therefore both are non-falsifiable. They claim evolutionary theory is no more scientific than creation theory and both are only validated by their ability to accurately correlate and explain historical data such as the fossil record. The Fundamentalists also state that if creation must be excluded from science in public school, because it requires a Creator, which is inherently religious, then evolution must also be omitted, because it is atheistic, which is also a religious belief

Christians should now realize that evolution is not part of genuine natural science but is no more than an excuse invented by men to reject God, their Creator (cf. Romans 1:19–20), and that theistic evolution likewise is unscientific. Consequently those who have advocated theistic evolution should now reconsider

²⁷¹<http://www.rae.org/BergmanTenure.htm>

²⁷² Johnson, 1994

their position, for to continue to do so will only give support to the secular theory and stifle criticism of it. This in turn will assist atheistic evolutionists in their quest to destroy all religion by relegating it to what they label as “anti-science.” Already in this post–World War II era, with the passive help of theistic evolution they have made giant strides in their quest to turn our Western society into a godless permissive one. They have been able to do this by *falsely* claiming that their pseudo-science – which replaces God the Creator of all things with atheistic “naturalism” – has the same authenticity and immense prestige as the science that split the atom and put men on the moon. It is time all Christians united to expose the deceit of this atheistic propaganda. To combat the massive propaganda in favour of evolution in scientific journals and in the media as a whole, and the brainwashing in its favour that passes as scientific education in schools and universities, all Christians should be shouting from the housetops that the theory of organic evolution has no place at all in scientific classrooms. Being metaphysical only, its true place is in the philosophy department where its naturalism would be met with very stiff opposition from the production of the overwhelming evidence for intelligent design.

Chapter 7: Dangerous Effects of Evolution

Creation and Evolution – Complementary or Contradictory?

Catholics who believe that Evolution can be reconciled with Christian doctrines invariably assume that the modern world view of educated unbiased people is based on the incontrovertible data of scientific research. Correctly arguing that the Faith and true Facts cannot be in opposition, they must then modify those aspects of theology which are logically contradictory to the current scientific orthodoxy, starting with the Genesis account of Creation.

But the theory of evolution poses a real problem – as a scientific explanation of origins, it can only allow natural causes from the material world, not supernatural acts of creation. Modern science claims to explain the entire cosmos, even its ultimate origin, entirely from the operation of chance and natural selection working with the laws of nature. The attempt to synthesise supernatural with natural causation by the expression “creation by evolution” is mere sophistry, and confuses the issue.²⁷³

Any catechism or basic theology text will show that Divine Creation means the direct action of God as primary cause, willing something into being, causing it to exist, ex nihilo – out of nothing. This must be an instantaneous, timeless, immeasurable act – there can be no half way stage – as also in the case of a miracle. Nor can it be subjected to any physical experimentation, or described by chemistry or physics.

Creation by God cannot mean a change within nature, which works with already existing matter, or like a human act of creation, such as a potter with clay. Evolutionary change involves altering existing beings through secondary causes, not by God’s direct intervention as ‘Creator’. If it were possible, God could have created a world in which natural processes caused the slow development of different material beings, one

²⁷³ “We cannot say: creation or evolution. The proper way of putting it is creation and evolution.” Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *In the Beginning*, Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1990, p 65

from another, but this could not be the meaning of Creation in the theological sense always understood in Genesis and in the Christian Creeds.²⁷⁴

Evolution provides a story of our origins, a creation myth, supposedly based on science, without the need for a personal Creator. Hence, without a God, Evolutionism can reject moral and social principles based on the absolute authority of the commandments of the Supreme Being, and replace them with merely human standards. Claiming to explain our past and predict our future, Evolution has really become a religion in itself, and is widely perceived as opposed to the doctrines of Christianity. Many moral and social evils of modern times have thrived through its influence, and it has even been recognised as harming Science on which it depends for credibility.

Evolution Damaging to Science

Anthropologist Dr. Loren Eiseley wrote:

After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort, could not be proved to take place today had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past.”²⁷⁵

Or, as Prof. Louis Bounoure put it more succinctly: “Evolutionism is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless.”²⁷⁶

Blunt, indeed, but rather mild and generous compared with the remarks of Dr. John Durant, who in 1980 told the British Association for the Advancement of Science that the secular myths of evolution have had – “a damaging effect on scientific research”, leading to “distortion, to needless controversy, and to the gross misuse of science.”²⁷⁷ In other words, worse than useless!

²⁷⁴ See Fr F J. Ripley, *Creation*, CTS, 1962, p 17.

²⁷⁵ “The Secret of Life”, in Eiseley, 1958 p 199

²⁷⁶ *The Advocate*, 8 March 1984, p 17

²⁷⁷ Durant, 1980, p 765

In passing, it may be noted how much time, energy and money is being spent by scientists now in various quests, such as supposedly to recreate the conditions at the 'Big Bang'. They try to detect messages from outer space – surely fruitless for communication if they be found to come from places claimed to be millions of light years away!

They want to send multi-milliondollar spacecraft to the planet Mars to search for dead bacteria they believe might be hiding somewhere on its barren surface. How is this huge expenditure justified, when there are so many more pressing needs on Earth? One answer is that those in control of these projects are desperately seeking real evidence to convince us that evolution really happened, and that the Bible and the Catholic Church are wrong about God, Creation and Man.

Harmful Effects on Society

After "The Origin of Species" was published in 1859, Social Darwinism quickly developed in England, and later in America, to justify the monopolistic practices of industrialists, their exploitation of labour, and "laissez-faire" capitalism in general. Having been used by Darwin to explain biological evolution, the ideas of "the struggle for existence", a term borrowed from Malthus's essay on Population, "natural selection," and "survival of the fittest" became slogans to apply to business, industrial and political life, and considered justified methods of progress.

John D. Rockefeller, oil magnate, said, "This is not an evil tendency in business. It is merely the working out of a law of nature and a law of God."²⁷⁸ Andrew Carnegie wrote of the "law of competition", by which – "Not only had I got rid of theology and the supernatural but I had found the truth of evolution."²⁷⁹

William Sumner, Professor of political and social science at Yale between 1872 and 1909, "influenced vast numbers of students with his doctrines that the principles of social evolution negated the traditional

²⁷⁸ Quoted in Dr Henry Morris, *The Long War against God*, Baker, 1989, p 56; an invaluable resource on the subject of this article.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid*,

American ideology of equality and natural rights.”²⁸⁰ This ideology, of course, had been founded on Christianity.

Darwin’s book was subtitled “The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life,” and with the backing of Thomas Huxley, evolutionism gave racism scientific plausibility and respectability. Negroes were viewed by scientists as a lower sub-species, irredeemably inferior to Caucasians. Indoctrination in these ideas led to institutionalised racism in Germany in the 1930s. It was also the cause of the rejection of belief in the origin of humanity being a single pair (monogenism) for belief in many separate origins (polygenism).

Evolutionism was not only applied to races but to social classes. Marx and Engels wrote of “The part played by Labour in the transition from ape to man,” and their ideas of the Class Struggle were worked out through Marxist dialectical materialism. When Communist troops overran China in 1940, Bishop Cuthbert O’Gara reports that the propaganda corps rapidly followed, with a week of seminars indoctrinating everyone in Communism. But initially, to his amazement, the very first lesson was, not the economic principles of Marx, but man’s descent from the ape. He realised later in jail that this was because the primary purpose of the Peking Government was to destroy all religious belief. “Darwinism negates God, the Human soul and the after life, and leaves a vacuum to be filled with Communism.”²⁸¹

Effects on Morality

If “natural selection” is a good and necessary force in the biological world, and artificial selection to improve domesticated plants and animals is morally acceptable, then if humans are merely evolved animals it is reasonable to apply selection to humans, in other words controlling who are allowed to survive and reproduce. Thus developed the science of Eugenics, the flavour of which can be experienced from a short quotation from Major Leonard Darwin’s book in a chapter entitled: ‘The Men We Want’:

²⁸⁰ Ibid, p 57

²⁸¹ O’Gara, 1995, pp. 12, 13

We can at all events assert that there are many kinds of men that we do not want. These include the criminal, the insane, the imbecile, the feeble in mind, the diseased at birth, the deformed, the deaf, the blind, etc., etc. How to lessen their numbers will be considered in later chapters. ²⁸²

These chilling conclusions follow from his premise that man is cousin to the lower animals, as seen from fossil remains and vestigial aquatic features in the embryo, “relics indicating the kind of life lived by our remote ancestors.” He recognises that “the strongest opposition to this belief in the lowly ancestry of man is based on religious scruples,” and argues that:

Each one of us developed before birth into something shaped like an animal which could not be distinguished from a pig or a sheep when at the same early stage of development. After birth we were for a time far more helpless and far less intelligent than a monkey. ²⁸³

The term “not fully human” comes to mind, although the evidences Leonard Darwin used in support of this idea are now scientifically disproven. Yet such views have been enthusiastically used by the birth controllers and population planners to foster the contraceptive mentality, abortion on demand, sterilization programmes and by extension the euthanasia movement. ²⁸⁴

Evil fruits indeed – but who has recognised the need to attack the evolutionary tree from which they continue to grow?

While none would claim that the modern ubiquitous emphasis on evolution is the root of all evils, there is undoubtedly a significant connection with greatly increased crime rates and falling moral standards, as the proscriptive authority of the Bible and the Church have been increasingly denied. Practices such as adultery, divorce, pre-marital sex, homosexuality, prostitution and pornography, once widely considered wrong, publicly shameful and often illegal, are condoned or even accorded “rights”, as free ‘lifestyle choices’ for the individual, and personal private matters.

²⁸² Darwin, L., 1928, p 25

²⁸³ Ibid, p 7

²⁸⁴ Phyllis Bowman, S.P.U.C, “How I Agree that the Darwin Myth is at the Root of all our Problems”, in *Man and the Evolution Myth*, Fr Peter Lessiter; Also see Theresa Croshaw , “Is Darwin ‘Gospel’ Truth?”, *Daylight*, No.5, Sept. 1992, reprinted from *Human Concern*, No 7, Spring 1981.

In fact, they are sins against Divine commandments relating to family life and relationships, and society at large. Other commandments of God are also ignored, with widespread disrespect for others' rights, cheating, lying, slander, blasphemy, stealing, violence, drunkenness, even murder – if the individual can benefit and get away with it, why not?

Philosopher Will Durant wrote in 1980:

By offering evolution in place of God as a cause of history, Darwin removed the theological basis of the moral code of Christendom. And the moral code that has no fear of God is very shaky. That's the condition we are in...I don't think man is capable yet of managing social order and individual decency without fear of some supernatural being overlooking him and able to punish him.²⁸⁵

Effects on Christianity

Many Christians today try to accept the science of evolution but maintain belief in creation by God through interpreting Genesis allegorically. They may attempt to retain some notion of Original Sin, and reject the immoral implications previously described.

These “theistic evolutionists” may claim that atheistic scientists have failed to recognise the Supernatural Cause of the process, and even argue that Evolution really expresses the Christian doctrine much better than the simple traditional belief in Special Creation. This latter-day ‘Gnosticism’ seems more likely to provoke scorn than respect, as witness the following responses to it:

Nobel laureate Jacques Monod, interviewed in 1976, said:

And why would God have to have chosen this extremely complex and difficult mechanism? When, I would say by definition, He was at liberty to choose other mechanisms, why would He have to start with simple molecules? Why not create man right away, as of course classical religions believed'?...[natural] selection is the blindest, and most cruel way of evolving new species...The struggle for life and elimination of the weakest is a horrible process, against which

²⁸⁵Dr John Durant, quoted in ‘How Evolution Became a Scientific Myth’, *New Scientist*, 11 September 1980, p. 765

our whole modern ethics revolts...I am surprised that a Christian would defend the idea that this is the process which God more or less set up in order to have evolution.²⁸⁶

Philosopher Bertrand Russell, in 1961, put it thus:

Religion, in our day, has accommodated itself to the doctrine of evolution...we are told that...evolution is the unfolding of an idea which has been in the mind of God throughout. It appears that during those ages when animals were torturing each other with ferocious horns and agonizing stings, Omnipotence was quietly waiting for the ultimate emergence of man, with his still more widely diffused cruelty. Why the Creator should have preferred to reach his goal by a process, instead of going straight to it, these modern theologians do not tell us.²⁸⁷

Atheistic Scientists are not even prepared to allow a supernatural origin of the soul, as they have already denied its very existence. Francis Crick, Nobel laureate, co-discoverer of the structure of DNA in 1950, in a recent book argues that science has shown that human personality can be entirely understood through the behaviour of nerve cells and molecules. It is revealing that he introduces his book with a definition of the soul – source, our Catholic penny catechism!

He points out that this belief was plausible when people thought that the earth was the centre of the universe, and relatively young -less than 10,000 years old – but: “we now know its true age is about 4.6 billion years.” So now the cards are on the table – replace geocentrism with heliocentrism, and recent creation with billions of years, and we lose our souls. Modern science, he says, has made spectacular advances that have given us a very different picture of the world today. True, but he goes on to infer that, 'You', your joys and your sorrows, your memories and your ambitions, your sense of personal identity and free will, are in fact no more than the behaviour of a vast assembly of nerve cells and their associated molecules."²⁸⁸

²⁸⁶ Jacques Monod, “The Secret of Life”, interview with Laurie John, Australian Broadcasting Co., June 10, 1976 – quoted by Morris, op.cit.

²⁸⁷ Bertrand Russell, *Religion and Science*, Oxford University Press, 1961, p. 73, quoted by Morris, op.cit.

²⁸⁸ Francis Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis – the Scientific Search for the Soul*, 1995, 3

This was Crick's 'astonishing hypothesis', from which came the title of his famous book. The hypothesis is that the mind - the thinking part, the 'I', the part of me that makes my decisions - is nothing more than brain cells. Amongst cognitive scientists, that's not so very surprising. Materialism has been the prevailing philosophy for a considerable time now, and the idea of an immaterial 'soul' is very much out of fashion. The materialistic neuroscientist sees no need for the soul concept. There is no personal life before conception or after death. Crick even suggests an evolutionary explanation for religious beliefs and a scientific account of free will, and expects that future research will explain other human mental activities as well. Science is all you need to explain the world – God has become redundant.

Australian Professor Hiram Caton wrote in 1987 these telling words:

The long evolutionary past removes the Judeo-Christian God to an infinite distance and finally extinguishes Him in the belief that our species is the chance product of blind natural forces. We are on our own and consequently we may do what we will, free of ancient prohibitions and divinely sanctioned codes.²⁸⁹

And long, long ago, a serpent said to a woman: “No, you shall not die the death...Your eyes shall be opened: and you shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil” (Gen. 3:4, 5).

Humanists are particularly forceful in rejecting a coalition between evolution and religion. The American “Humanist Manifesto II” (1973) begins:

As non-theists, we begin with humans, not God, nature, not duty...But we can discover no divine purpose or providence for the human species. While there is much that we do not know, humans are responsible for what we are or will become. No deity will save us; we must save ourselves.” Its second tenet includes the following: “Promises of immortal salvation or eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful...Rather science affirms that the human species is an emergence from natural evolutionary forces. As far as we know, the total personality is a function of the biological

²⁸⁹ Hiram Caton (Professor of Politics and History, Griffith University, Australia) “The Biology Battlefield”, *Quadrant*, May 1987. Quoted in *The Atheism of Evolution*, Newman Graduate Education, June 1996.

organisms transacting in a social and cultural context. There is no credible evidence that life survives the death of the body.²⁹⁰

We should be aware of the fact that over 260 people signed this Humanist Manifesto, all of them holding influential positions in education, government, industry or religion. These include key people in control of schools, publishing of books and programming the media, and their influence is world-wide.

We might wish to compromise with evolutionists, but they do not! The editor of *American Atheist*, 1988, wrote:

When the theory of evolution was advanced, that was the date that the Judeo-Christian religion began the decline in which it now finds itself in the West. The two theories are point-blank in contradiction one to the other. Any scientists, any educators, any religious persons who state to you that there is no conflict simply want to hang on to both worlds because they have not been able to divest themselves of the infantile belief system which was programmed into them when they were children. They want a foot in each camp. Religion is their emotional security blanket. Science is facing a world of reality which – in the final analysis – they cannot face. They are too cowardly to see religion should be abandoned so they stand there one foot in and one foot out.²⁹¹

G. Richard Bozarth, in an article “The Meaning of Evolution” wrote:

Christianity has fought, still fights, and will fight science to the desperate end over evolution, because evolution destroys utterly and finally the very reason Jesus’ earthly life was supposedly necessary...If Jesus was not the redeemer who died for our sins, and this is what evolution means, then Christianity is nothing!

What all this means is that Christianity cannot lose the Genesis account of creation like it could lose the doctrine of geocentrism and get along. The battle must be waged, for Christianity is fighting for its very life.²⁹²

²⁹⁰ American Humanist Association, “Humanist Manifesto II,” *The Humanist* 33, Sept/Oct 1973

²⁹¹ “Genesis and Evolution”, answer by the Editor in *American Atheist* 30, Jan 1988

²⁹² G. Richard Bozarth, “The Meaning of Evolution,” *American Atheist* 20, Feb 1978

Pope Pius XII warned us in 1950

He wrote of the “deadly fruit” of new theological opinions arising from Evolution, in his encyclical *Humani Generis*, which begins:

Disagreement and error among men on moral and religious matters have always been a cause of profound sorrow to all good men, but above all to the true and loyal sons of the Church, especially today, when we see the principles of Christian culture being attacked on all sides.”²⁹³

He is not amazed at discord and error outside the Church, and points out that the human intellect is prevented from knowing divine truths – “by the activity of the senses and the imagination, and by evil passions arising from original sin. Hence men easily persuade themselves in such matters that what they do not wish to believe is false or at least doubtful.”²⁹⁴

If systems of belief based on evolution are consequently in error, they must be resisted – this obviously includes the pantheistic New Age Movement, deeply beholden to the writings of Fr. Teilhard de Chardin, which atheist scientist Sir Peter Medawar honoured with the appellation “pious bunk”.

Catholics who have ignored Papal warnings may personally believe they have no problem with Evolution, but the implications described above prove that this is not merely a matter of private opinion. Should not these evolutionists be worried about the effects of the issue on others, and seriously consider the stability of their position in relation to the Bible’s and Church’s constant teachings?

While other issues such as abortion, crime, divorce, education, and the liturgy – may seem much more important to Catholics on a practical level than Evolution, are they aware of the wide-ranging and deep influences it has had on society, morality and religion? While many commendably attack the evil effects, they so often fail to value the significant extent to which the effects are fed from the evolutionary tree, and consequently the need to support the attack on its roots if long-term advancement is to be made in fighting these evils.

²⁹³ *Humani Generis* para. 1

²⁹⁴ *ibid*, 2

Chapter 8: A Lesson from History

There has been controversy in the Church over the dogma of evolution for over a century. Though most Catholic theologians at first opposed it, they could not agree that the Magisterium had ever overtly condemned the idea that the formation of the body of Adam might have involved some secondary natural causation, which very few of the early Church Fathers believed, rather than by an instantaneous *ex nihilo* Divine Act.

Liberal theologians, in spite of official warning, argued that this would allow for the possibility of evolution. Their ever-increasing influence has led to the present, pervasive belief that even the Pope accepts evolution as a fact and the Church no longer opposes it. While some Catholics believe that evolution does contradict Christian doctrine, others think it is purely a matter of personal opinion, or even believe it should be promulgated as the official Catholic position.

This piece will consider these views in the light of the Catholic Church's reactions to evolutionism during the twentieth century, and also examine the motivation of a Catholic organisation in England which promotes a theory of origins completely opposed to my own. While many Catholics and Christians reject evolution as a false philosophy which is dangerous to Christianity and harmful to society, and defend traditional doctrines, the FAITH Movement insists that evolution must be received by the Church and seeks papal endorsement for a new theology of creation. Yet both groups claim to respect the evidence of modern science, to be loyal to orthodox doctrines, and to oppose humanist and modernist influences. Both conservatives and FAITH believe they are promoting essential solutions to current problems in the Church and society at large, despite their contradictory positions in matters related to origins and Scripture.

The leaders of FAITH maintain that their ideas are developed for the needs of the Church in a scientific world at this time of crisis in faith. But is it truly in tune with the times to advocate the evolutionist gospel

when there exists an increasingly widespread apostasy against it by thousands of modern scientists?²⁹⁵

FAITH's recently published book provides an answer to this inconsistency: **their unshakeable conviction is actually based on a private revelation, as yet not sanctioned by the Church, claimed to have been received in 1929 by a laywoman who heard 'voices from God' telling her that evolution was true!**

Revolution to Evolution – and Back

Since the late nineteenth century, as the evolution doctrine became generally accepted in the academic community, more theologians began to assert that Catholics ought simply to accept evolution as a proven fact. They recalled that the Church had suffered in the past from being perceived as antagonistic to the progress of science – “we dare not risk another Galileo case!” Dogmas, they argued, must be modernized to meet the expectations of modern, well-educated people lest they reject Christianity as doctrinaire and opposed to truth.

Though many great Christian scientists, such as Pasteur and Mendel, had rejected Darwinism, their mind-sets were treated as being religiously inclined and therefore non-scientific.²⁹⁶ Thus evolution was portrayed as having been generally accepted by science; it became the widespread secular dogma, to be adopted as an unquestioned theory in all disciplines of research, with any opponents customarily relegated to academic irrelevance. This was inculcated by the publishing houses, the press, education, and later radio and television, most efficiently by the constant policy of excluding the influence of any authoritative opposition.²⁹⁷ Belief in special creation was considered anti-science and ridiculed as on a par with astrology and “flat Earthism”.²⁹⁸ As products of such social and cognitive conditioning entered the cohorts of the clergy, their earnestly held convictions gradually influenced clerical circles and eroded traditional doctrinal beliefs, draining the confidence of priests to defend the historical inerrancy of Holy Scripture and the associated doctrines of the Church.

²⁹⁵Scientific evidence and arguments opposed to evolution may be found in previous issues of *Christian Order and Daylight*, e.g. David Bird, “Evolution – Fact or Faith” and A. Nevard, “Catholic Doctrines of Creation and Original Sin,” *Daylight* 29, pp. 13–20.

²⁹⁶E.g. Asimov, 1975, 371: “Pasteur’s religious feelings also led him to reject Darwin’s theory of evolution.”

²⁹⁷Prof. T. Dwight had strong feelings on this matter: “The tyranny of the Zeitgeist in the matter of evolution is overwhelming to a degree of which outsiders have no idea; not only does it influence (as I admit that it does in my own case) our manners of thinking, but there is oppression as in the days of the terror.” From Dwight, 1911, 20.

²⁹⁸Prof. D. M. S. Watson noted that “the Theory of Evolution itself [is] a theory universally accepted not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only alternative is special creation, which is clearly incredible.” From D M S. Watson, “Adaptation” *Nature* 124, 1929, p 233.

Increasingly, seminarians were merely told that evolution was a proven fact, and were not “allowed” to study and discuss the scientific evidence and logical arguments for and against it. Their liberal professors would not allow these young men to believe the literal sense of Genesis, a book which had been written for “primitive people.” Biologists, palaeontologists, Biblical exegetes, archaeologists, linguists, historians – all the experts were summoned to oppose their common enemy: Biblical fundamentalism! Students were encouraged to study theological works that argued that Christianity could be harmonised with modern science. Progressive Biblical scholars were “demythologising” Genesis on the foundation of belief in the evolutionary origins of humanity. Few students could have been able to face up to their professors in all these fields of expertise! Would-be literalists could readily be dismissed as adopting a Protestant approach to the Scriptures, or mocked as ignorant of science and modern scholarship.²⁹⁹

But the attempts of theologians to make the body of supernatural dogmatic truths of Christianity to fit the materialistic straitjacket of the evolution hypothesis left profound contradictions unanswered, or required the twisting of a doctrine to the point of rupture. Several clerics who were working on the opinion that evolution was a proven fact were disciplined by the Church, most famously and frequently Fr. Teilhard de Chardin.³⁰⁰ But in recent decades, there has been a flurry of books written by highly qualified scientists attacking the theory.³⁰¹ Although creationist publications have been barred from secular bookshops and spurned by the media, they can now be obtained quite easily by mail.³⁰² The growth of evolutionism has borne poisonous fruit both in the Church and society at large.³⁰³ Consequently an increasing number of Catholics are no longer convinced by Darwin and his disciples, and have sought a rational alternative.

Catholic Creationism

Traditionalists believe that the Catholic Church has never given her official support to the theory of evolution because its principles and inferences are opposed to the essential, historical truths of the Genesis

²⁹⁹A useful little book on the spread of Modernism which focuses particularly on the part played by Teilhard de Chardin is Rev. Paul Wickens, *Christ Denied*, IL, TAN Books, 1982.

³⁰⁰For a list of critical works on Teilhardism, see *Daylight* 9, pp. 20–21. We note that *FAITH* refers to him uncritically as “a major theologian”; distinguished Catholics have used other epithets, such as heretic, pantheist, false prophet, rebel, racist, pro-fascist and pro-Marxist.

³⁰¹E.g. Denton, 1985.

³⁰²See answersingenesis.org or drdino.com

³⁰³E.g. A. Nevard, “Deadly Fruit of Evolutionism”, *Daylight* 23, Spring 1997.

account of origins and the doctrines of creation and original sin, which form the very foundations of the faith. At the first Faith of our Fathers Conference, held in London on 4 May 1996, thirty-five Catholic organisations gathered in participation in the proclamation of the authentic Catholic Faith. The only one stating a particular interest in science was described in the programme thus: “The periodical Daylight claims to demonstrate that the traditional Catholic doctrines relating to Creation, Holy Scripture and origins are supported by the discoveries of modern scientific research.”³⁰⁴

This approach welcomes the natural reading of the Word of God in the Bible as interpreted by Christian tradition and reason, subject to the Church’s rulings and supervision. The word “discoveries” above refers only to established scientific data, not to untestable materialistic hypotheses and naturalistic speculations falsely camouflaged as facts. Some Catholic experts, having closely examined both sides of the origins issue, have become persuaded that the evolution model is not credible, and believe that a recent, Divine creation is far more well-suited to the fruits of modern research than the outmoded arguments of atheists, constrained by their anti-supernaturalistic predisposition.³⁰⁵ Based on this conclusion, they have no need to try to complement evolution with Christian dogma by the use of “theistic evolution,” which employs God as the cause of evolution.

The Catholic Church Opposed to Darwinism

Since the publication of *Origin of Species* in 1859, evolution has been perceived as an attack on the Church. Historically, Darwinism served the anti-Biblical speculations of a Victorian age preoccupied with a philosophy of scientism. Darwinism was adopted as the pseudoscientific basis of Marxism, Communism, laissez-faire capitalism, Nazism and secular humanism.³⁰⁶ While Christ’s enemies continue to use evolutionary propaganda to attack the Faith and moral teachings of the Church at their foundations by destroying the rational basis of belief in the Creator and the credibility of the Bible, the theistic evolutionists attempt to join their personal interpretation of Christianity to this godless materialistic hypothesis, and even consider their efforts an invaluable bonus to the spread of the Gospel. Yet there have

³⁰⁴Daylight also had a stall at the 1997 and 1998 FOOF Conferences.

³⁰⁵E.g. in the award-winning video, *Evolution – Fact or Belief* <http://www.nwcreation.net/store/videos/evolutionfactorbelief.html>

³⁰⁶See Morris, 1989

been many private and public decrees by Catholic authorities related to the harmful implications of the theory of evolution since Darwin's day, and although it is true that none of these were in themselves ex cathedra dogmatic declarations, all of them have, in essence, been opposed to evolution. In 1860, the provincial Council of Cologne declared: "Our first parents were immediately made by God. . . . Hence, we declare openly opposed to Holy Scripture and to the Faith the opinion of those who go so far as to say that man, so far as his body is concerned, was produced by the spontaneous transformation of the less perfect into the more perfect, successively, ultimately ending in the human."³⁰⁷

Biologist Dr. Mivart wrote *The Genesis of Species* in 1871, in which he criticised Darwinism but offered a customized evolutionary theory which accepted the creation of the human soul. Though severely criticised by Catholic writers, no action was taken against it.³⁰⁸ In 1891, Père M. D. Leroy, O.P., published a work entitled *L'Evolution restreinte aux especes organiques*. His theory resembled that of Mivart, but he took the view that Scripture does not exclude the idea of bodily evolution, and that the Fathers are not decisive on this point. He argued that the Council of Cologne only excluded spontaneous evolution, reasoning thus: according to St. Thomas's principle, the form determines the matter, so that God had only to create a human soul and infuse it into an animal body for it to become human. No other Divine intervention would then be required. In 1895, Rome ruled that his thesis "has been judged untenable, especially in so far as it concerns the body of man, being incompatible alike with the texts of Holy Scripture and with the principles of a sound philosophy."³⁰⁹ Leroy complied with orders to renounce and retract all he had published in favour of the theory, and to withdraw and prevent further sale of his book.

In 1898, the Holy See's Congregation for the Index condemned Dr. John Zahm's book *Evolution and Dogma*. He believed that no concession was possible between being evolutionist or creationist, and therefore proceeded to reinterpret the Fathers and Doctors of the Church to bring them into line with his evolutionist thinking.³¹⁰ Other cases could also be cited that show that Catholic establishment at the turn of the century viewed the hypothesis of the evolution of the human body from animals as a rash and unproven

³⁰⁷Messenger, E ed., *Evolution and Theology: A Sequel to Evolution and Theology*, London Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1931), p 226

³⁰⁸Ibid, p 232

³⁰⁹Ibid, pp. 232-233

³¹⁰Ibid, p 233

novelty, especially in the light of the condemnations of Modernism emanating from Rome. So the Vatican did not clearly condemn the theory by a public act, but it did discourage it privately. However, the decree of the Biblical Commission in 1909 reinforced the literal historical sense of the first three chapters of Genesis in regard to certain topics, as well as the special creation of man and the formation of the first woman from the first man. Some theologians nevertheless argued that what was special, or peculiar, was the mode of formation of Adam's body from the slime of the earth, which certainly implies pre-existing matter, and does not necessarily exclude an evolutionary origin. Père Hugueny, O.P., in his *Critique et Catholique* (1914), remarks:

The transformation of a purely animal organism into an organism capable of human life, by way of natural and progressive evolution, if it were proved, would not trouble the believer. The Bible and the Church teach us that God took from the earth the elements of the body of man, but they do not tell us if the formation of this body was instantaneous or whether the evolution of animal species gradually prepared the terrestrial elements in our nature for the special creation which introduced into the material world a spiritual soul, and which also gave to this matter, which was to be informed by this soul, the dispositions necessary for this higher degree of life.³¹¹

In *Evolution and Theology* (1931), Dr. Ernest Messenger notes that theological manuals of the late nineteenth century stated that "evolution is theologically untrue, philosophically absurd, and so on." However, as less prejudiced opinions had since then been set forth by others without ecclesiastical intrusion, he concludes that the avoidance by the Holy See of explicit condemnation of the doctrine of human evolution showed that its discussion had been judged inconvenient rather than theologically erroneous.³¹² He considered the scientific evidence adequate to establish "the *fact* of, at any rate, *some* evolution, though opinions must necessarily differ as to the mode. And from the theological point of view, we consider that evolution is the only reasonable way of harmonising our modern knowledge of the succession of geological epochs, with their flora and fauna, with the Scriptural statement that the earth produced all the present-day species."³¹³ He argues that although missing conclusive proof, it is logical to believe that man also has evolved. In his view, "*Scripture neither teaches nor disproves the doctrine of the*

³¹¹Ibid, p 230

³¹²Ibid, pp. 80, 238

³¹³Ibid, 274 (*italics in original*)

evolution of the human body.”³¹⁴ Several of the Church Fathers had taught that some part was played by secondary causes in the formation of man, while others held that Adam’s body was formed entirely by a Divine creative act. Their attitude “was at least in part a consequence of their physical and scientific theories.”³¹⁵ However, Scripture and Tradition leave no doubt that Eve took her origin from Adam by some means, and could thus not have been a separate product of evolution. Messenger speculates along the lines of some mode of special asexual propagation, though admitting he could not imagine how it could have actually happened.

Regarding Adam, he reasons that there must have at least been Divine involvement in the creation and infusion of the rational soul, and the raising of body and soul to the supernatural state. It seems probable that a special Divine intervention was required “to give the embryonic body of Adam the last disposition required before animation by a human soul.”³¹⁶ If nature alone could produce bodies fit for animation by human souls, why should it only happen once? And anyway, it is a philosophic truth that a human soul cannot exist in an animal body but only in a human one. The hypothesis of the existence of pre-Adamites who had died out before Adam seemed useful at the time to explain “many apparently imperfect types of humanity which recent archaeology has revealed.” But why would God, in His Wisdom and Providence, have willed such races to futile lives leading to ultimate extinction, when “*the Creation was meant from the first to lead up to the formation of man*”?³¹⁷

In conclusion, Dr. Messenger reminds us of the need for a Catholic to yield to Church authority in matters of doctrine, both in the interpretation of Scripture and of Tradition. The theologians of his day (1931) who opposed evolution (and who were the majority) he thought mistaken; he believed that freedom of opinion and discussion were allowable. He was also insistent that “the theologians *do not form part of the teaching church*. . . . The teaching church consists of the hierarchy, in union with the Sovereign Pontiff.”³¹⁸

³¹⁴Ibid, 275 (*italics in original*)

³¹⁵Ibid, pp. 269–273

³¹⁶Ibid, 277

³¹⁷Ibid, 277 (*italics in original*)

³¹⁸Ibid, 240 (*italics in original*)

Theological Opinions in the Early Twentieth Century

Some theologians continued their complete opposition to evolution, including the reputed writer Cardinal Lepicier. Although in his book *De Opere Sex Dierum* (1928) he accepted the idea of spontaneous generation as a hypothesis, he maintained that “the evolution of species is impossible, even as a hypothesis . . . It openly contradicts the sacred text, and the universal opinion of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.”³¹⁹ Mgr. Janssens was one who allowed the possibility of plant or animal evolution as not in principle dissimilar to revelation, but he saw real problems in deriving the first human being:

But, if we consider the matter in the concrete, then there are difficulties. If the animation by the intellectual soul took place in the embryonic age, a brute beast would give birth to a real human being instead of to an animal of its own species. If animation by the intellectual soul took place during infancy, who saw to the bringing up and education of this youngster? And if this animation took place at the adult stage, how is Scripture able to say that, when there was question of finding a companion for Adam, it was impossible to find one like himself? For it would have sufficed if God had breathed a soul into a female of the same animal species from which came the body of Adam.³²⁰

P. Pignataro, S.J., in *De Deo Creatore*, affirms:

But we do not exclude secondary causes, as the angels, or natural agents, in the formation of the body, as instruments of the Deity, although the instrumental concursus does not seem likely. But we altogether reject that man originated as far as his body is concerned from the transformation of species of animals of a lower order. . . . Reason itself, and the teaching of Divine revelation, forbid us to regard our first parent as a sort of monkey. . . . The constant way of speaking of the Scripture assigns as the subject matter of the production of man, not some flesh already generated from seed, but the slime of the earth.³²¹

The dominican theologian P. Hugon in *Cursus Philosophiae Thomisticae. II* (1927), though granting that the Church had not specifically defined anything on the topic, believed that Scripture and the Church did not allow the supposition that the human body was produced from an animal body. Van Noort argued that

³¹⁹Alexis Henri Marie Lepicier, *De Opere Sex Dierum* Osnabruck; T H Wenner Verlag 1928, p 80.

³²⁰Laurentius Janssens, *De Hominis Natura*, Frieberg Herder 1919, pp. 673–674

³²¹Quoted in Messenger E, pp. 246, 259

“no prudent person would contend that the body of Adam was formed by evolution, and that of Eve without evolution.”³²²

In the *Dictionnaire Apologetique de la Foi Catholique*, “the masterly survey of the whole subject” (Messenger’s words), Père de Sinéty, S.J., observed three current opinions among theologians: those who reject evolution as theologically incorrect, those who consider Catholics absolutely free to accept transformism, and the greatest number who take a middle position. He concluded that “in view of the fact that the harmonising of the theory of the restricted evolution of man with certain points of Catholic doctrine, notably with the unity of origin implied by the doctrine of original sin, appears to be, if not absolutely impossible, at least very unlikely; and the further fact that the scientific arguments on which this theory rests have not a strictly demonstrative value – it would be temerarious to teach it as proved, or even as positively probable”.³²³

Pope Pius XII Teaches on Evolution

Over the subsequent years, reputable progressive theologians like Dr. Messenger who had not been disciplined by the Vatican had much authority in seminaries and religious houses. Papal teaching on Biblical exegesis tried to promote a more flexible approach to Scriptural interpretation. Clergy anxious not to appear doctrinaire were ready and willing to adopt a theology of origins acceptable to science, which appeared to have proved indisputably that evolution was a fact as certain as the roundness of the Earth, even though the Church did not officially accept it. Thus was fertile ground prepared for the radical speculations of Fr. Teilhard de Chardin, whose works have since been condemned by Rome (see note 300).

In 1950, Pope Pius XII responded to the situation with his encyclical *Humani Generis*, which was intended to quell the disorder resulting from “doctrinal errors outside the Church and their effects among Catholics” that he identified as arising from “false evolutionary notions.” Despite the anti-evolutionist tone of the whole document, we may regret that the Pontiff had been advised not to close the debate absolutely. He

³²²Quoted in Messenger, pp. 247–248.

³²³Quoted in Messenger, p 249.

permitted evolutionary research to continue, but only in respect of the possible emergence of the human body from pre-existing living matter. He did, however, make this clear warning:

There are some who take rash advantage of this liberty of debate, by treating the subject as if the whole matter were closed – as if the discoveries hitherto made, and the arguments based on them, were sufficiently certain to prove, beyond doubt, the development of the human body from other living matter already in existence. They forget, too, that there are certain references to the subject in the sources of divine revelation, which call for the greatest caution and prudence in discussing it.³²⁴

Many theologians had already considered the question closed—in favour of evolution! Since there had been no previous limits on their publications or debate, many clergy ignored these magisterial warnings, using the excuse that not every statement in an encyclical has to be held as infallible teaching.³²⁵

Believing there was an burning need for the Church to “update” doctrines that appeared to conflict with modern science, they preferred to believe that the encyclical allowed them to pursue such studies as the “evolution of dogma,” which had been closed to the Modernists by Pope Pius X in 1907.³²⁶ They often quoted the Pope as stating, “The Teaching of the Church leaves the doctrine of Evolution an open question.”

Some modernists, ironically, seem to treat this phrase like an infallible dogma, even arguing that creationists are disloyal to the Pope by claiming that evolution cannot be reconciled with Catholic doctrines! This is an unfair twist of the document as a whole, which soberly warns us of the evil consequences of the philosophy of evolutionism. But an even more telling fact is that the words “an open question” are totally absent from the original Latin text, and must have been inserted by the translator, Mgr. Ronald A. Knox.³²⁷ In fact, the Pope clearly warned the bishops that it was wrong to believe and teach that evolution was a proven fact. But, in stark contrast, Catholics have never been forbidden to believe and teach that evolution is false, a danger to Faith and Morals, and contrary to Scripture and Doctrine.

³²⁴ *Humani Generis*, para. 36

³²⁵ “In these letters the popes exercise their ordinary teaching office, and therefore all Catholics have the duty of accepting this teaching; but an encyclical letter is not necessarily infallible.” From *Virtue’s Catholic Encyclopaedia*, London: Virtue’s, 1965, 2:373.

³²⁶ See *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*.

³²⁷ Nevard, 1994, pp. 22–23

Assenters and Dissenters to *Humani Generis*

By no means did all the clergy and hierarchy accept evolution. Cardinal Ruffini's book, *The Theory of Evolution judged by Reason and Faith* (1959), wanted to show that "evolution applied to living beings, as is propounded by materialists, has no scientific basis; and that, in particular, transformism applied to man – even if restricted to the body – cannot be admitted."³²⁸ He argues that the Fathers of the Church unanimously interpreted Genesis literally in respect of the formation of Eve from Adam, and that the concept of God intervening to introduce a human soul into an animal body both departs from Catholic tradition and excludes scientific transformism. One wonders how many seminarians in the 1960s ever had the opportunity to study and discuss this work.

In 1988, the review *Christ to the World* published several in-depth, theological articles by Fr. Peter Fehlner, O.F.M. Conv. entitled "In the Beginning," which reiterated that Pius XII never gave permission for the rejection of the literal or historical sense for any part of Genesis. Fr. Fehlner concluded:

Good arguments can be adduced in fact to show that evolution is simply not a scientific hypothesis. It is a dogma providing the context for all scientific endeavours. And it is just this assumption of 'Evolutionism' as the universal paradigm that directly conflicts with the teaching of the Church and constitutes an abuse of the limited permission of Pius XII to propose tentatively hypotheses of evolution within the limits of certain scientific questions and without questioning the decisions of the Church in matters touching Revelation.

It is claimed that the position generally called "theistic evolution" permits the believer to hold a belief in God, which the agnostic or atheist evolutionist rejects. In such a synthesis religion is said to explain "Who" made the world and "why," while science describes "how" He made it, i.e. by evolution. Religion deals with final causes, while science deals with efficient causes, methods and facts. The Catholic believer, however, cannot cut from his belief facts bearing on the origin of the physical world as expounded in the revealed account of these origins without in fact also changing the nature of that belief, something not in

³²⁸Quoted in *Daylight* 18, Winter 1995–6, p 14

his power to do. Hence, “theistic evolution” cannot be a viable Catholic position since it is a priori inconsistent with its assumed downgrading of the “how” of creation to science.³²⁹

A third expert, Fr. Andre Boulet, who has qualifications in both science and theology, reached the same conclusion in his 1995 book, *Creation et Rédemption*: that the theory of evolution is bad science and incompatible with creation theology. Among the points he makes deals with the problem of disorder, suffering and death before the Fall, the apparent trickery of Genesis in asserting the perfection and value of all created kinds if most of them became extinct, and the conflict produced by claiming the brutish origin of man by evolution is a basis of our evil tendencies while at the same time stunting the physical perfection God endowed our first parents with.

Is it surprising that a God unable to create without suffering or death, or worse still, wanting to use such a process of creating, is not the object of praise, thanks or love? How could his Wisdom and his Goodness be admired? How could such a Creator so ill-inspired in our eyes arouse other than fear, resentment, revolt, or at the best indifference along with strong disillusion. Does not the principal reason for the atheism or religious indifference of our contemporaries lie in the unacceptable idea of God conveyed by evolutionism; a God responsible for suffering and death, even though evolution is claimed to be compatible with the Christian faith?³³⁰

Such voices of reason and Tradition have been largely drowned out by the large, powerful and vocal group of rebels who continue to shout for a major upheaval in Church teaching on creation, original sin and interpretation of Scripture. They include eminent members of the Hierarchy including Pope Benedict XVI, formerly Ratzinger, whose opinions may be read in his *Principles of Catholic Theology* (1987): “The impetus given by Teilhard de Chardin exerted a wide influence. With daring vision it incorporated the historical movement of Christianity into the great cosmic process of evolution.”³³¹ His *In the Beginning* (1990) includes the following: “For science has long since disposed of the concepts (Gen. 1–19) that we have just now heard we hear of the Big Bang, which happened billions of years ago. . . It was rather in

³²⁹Quoted in *Daylight* 33, no. 3–4, pp. 246–247

³³⁰Quoted in *Daylight* 23, Spring 1997, p 27

³³¹Ratzinger, 1987, p 335. (Note: it seems that Cardinal Ratzinger, now Pope Benedict XVI, has modified his views in recent years and is less supportive of evolutionist thinking; see <http://www.geocities.com/romcath1/darwin.html>.)

complex ways and over vast periods of time that earth and the universe were constructed,” and “We cannot say: creation or evolution. The proper way of putting it is: creation and evolution.”³³² Compare such ideas with the Catholic theology and papal teachings already quoted.

The Pontifical Academy of Evolutionists

Despite evolution having being widely accepted, even at the highest level in the Church, there has never been any authoritative teaching approval of it. Hence the reaction of the worldwide media to the late Pope’s message to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences on 25 October 1996. The confusing phrase that evolution is “more than just a theory” was greeted with glee by the materialistic press as an official admission of the collapse, under the weight of scientific research, of the Church’s traditional beliefs in Adam and Eve and any literal sense of Genesis.³³³ Yet by no stretch of the imagination can his message (which, arguably, was not even personally written by him) be considered a magisterial teaching, still less an infallible new dogma of faith which overrules previous doctrine.

If John Paul II were unaware of the contemporary crisis in the integrity of evolution, this could be related to the fact that his eighty scientific advisors in the Academy were all evolutionists, including Fr. Stanley Jaki and the atheist cosmologist Stephen Hawking. This partiality must severely limit the competence of the Academy to fulfil the intentions of Pope Pius XI declared on its foundation in 1936, “who wished to surround himself with a select group of scholars, relying on them to inform the Holy See in complete freedom about developments in scientific research and thereby to assist him in his reflections.”³³⁴ In his 1996 message, John Paul reminded the Academy that the Magisterium has already made pronouncements on these matters, and cited the encyclical *Humani Generis* in which Pope Pius XII thought the doctrine of ‘evolutionism’ a serious hypothesis, worthy of investigation and in-depth study equal to that of the opposing hypothesis. A comparison with the text shows that the message paraphrases the encyclical in a subtle but misleading way, and omits its explicit warning that the evolution of man must not be treated as

³³² Ratzinger, 1990), pp. 12, 65

³³³ E.g. Pope John Paul II, “The Pope and the British Press,” *Daylight* 22:, p 5. We may note that this Pope’s Catechism of the Catholic Church reiterates traditional doctrines regarding creation and Genesis.

³³⁴ Pope John Paul II, *L’Osservatore Romano* 44, 30 October 1996, accessed online at <http://www.christusrex.org/www1/pope/vise10-23-96.html>

certain fact.³³⁵ It is also difficult to believe that “the opposing hypothesis,” which remains unnamed but is presumably Special Creation, can have been investigated and studied in-depth by the Pontifical Academy if there is not one specialist on Creation Science included among its members! A prudent Catholic could not regard such pronouncements, especially in the contemporary post-Vatican II context, to be of sufficient weight to overturn two millennia of Scripture, Tradition and authoritative teachings.

A New but Orthodox Theology?

Could the Catholic Church have been confusing humankind for nineteen centuries by teaching the Genesis accounts of Creation and the Flood as real historical facts? Cannot modern science better describe and explain the origins of the Universe? Don't we have proof that time began with a “big bang” about 15-20 thousand million years ago? Should we not seek an “Hegelian dialectic” between these opposing truths, a new blend from Divine Creation and Materialistic Evolution, which will displace these naive traditional beliefs—in short, a New Theology? Modernists have been attempting to do this since the last century. The FAITH movement founded in Surrey, England, in 1972, aims to achieve this end while also retaining orthodox doctrines.

This organisation of priests and lay people works “to foster the Catholic faith and spiritual life of many people, through youth work, adult education, retreats, conferences and publications.”³³⁶ Most of the latter are pamphlets under some forty titles, including three on “Science and Religion” by (Rev.) Roger Nesbitt. The catalogue summarises his “Evolution and the existence of God”: “Argues from Evolution as a fact, that the whole process would be impossible without the existence of the Supreme Mind we call God.”³³⁷ The pamphlet “Evolution and Original Sin” is described accordingly: “Outlines the teaching of the Church in this difficult area and then shows how a correct understanding of Evolution harmonises perfectly with Original Sin.”³³⁸

A bimonthly review is also published (edited for many years by Rev. Edward Holloway and now by Fr. Timothy Finegan), which continues to endorse theistic evolutionism. Their flyer attributes the loss of faith

³³⁵Nevard, 1996–7, pp. 8–10

³³⁶The Faith Movement flyer

³³⁷Faith pamphlets catalogue, Summer 1997

³³⁸Ibid

in the Western world particularly to “the breakdown of the neo-scholastic synthesis of philosophy and theology.” In their view, evangelization “calls for a new presentation of the revealed Wisdom of Christian tradition in a way that makes sense of the modern world. All major theologians of our time (Teilhard de Chardin, Henri de Lubac, Karl Rahner, Hans Urs von Balthasar) have sought to develop such a synthesis.” The flyer continues: “The particular focus of the FAITH movement is a new synthesis of science and the Catholic faith as defined and proclaimed by the Church’s Magisterium. Inspired by the seminal work of Fr. Edward Holloway, the FAITH Movement offers a perspective of creation through evolution.”³³⁹ The work referred to is his 500-page tome, *Catholicism: A New Synthesis*.³⁴⁰ Like the pamphlets of Fr. Nesbitt, its entire purpose is dependent on its basic premise: that evolution is a fact, so a new theology must be developed to accommodate it. The book does not seem to provide any scientific evidence or rational arguments in favour of the theory. Fr. Nesbitt’s pamphlet “Evolution and the Existence of God” offers the usual “evidence” of comparative anatomy, likenesses of embryos and cells, genetics, classification and the fossil records; it argues that “our modern world transformed by science and technology is witness to the fact that man’s knowledge is real and genuine. . . . As far as evolution is concerned the overall outline is clear, and so are many of the details, even if there is still a great deal more to learn.”³⁴¹

This statement fails to make the distinction between valid scientific theories which have had real practical application and the philosophy of evolution which is not even a proper, scientific hypothesis, being unobservable, not empirically testable, unfalsifiable, and lacking predictability. Despite the indisputable link between evolution and atheism, both of these writers argue that, on the contrary, evolution should be understood as proof for the existence of God, for it encourages a better appreciation of the grandeur of His Creation. They rightly point out that the interdependence of the components of the natural world and its operation by a highly ordered system of laws contradicts the argument that the universe came about by chance events. However, instead of concluding that this manifests the supreme, creative power of God, their theory is that evolution is one of the laws God built into the universe, what they call a “Unity Law of Control and Direction,” which itself must have been derived from a “Supreme Eternal Being.” Fr. Nesbitt

³³⁹ See The Faith Movement flyer

³⁴⁰ Holloway, 1969

³⁴¹ Nesbitt, 1971, p 3

says: “The evolution of matter through time as an ordered ascent to ever more perfect forms would be impossible without a Centre of Control and Direction which can foresee the future developments in terms of the initial poising of the elements.”³⁴²

It is agreed, even by many atheists, that the natural world shows the appearance of design, order and purpose. The real question for science is whether the evidence fits better the evolution model or the creation model. But the religious implications of evolution mean that a Catholic may not judge the issue in isolation from the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ, which come to us on the authority of His Church. We must note that Fr. Holloway does not claim his “new synthesis” to be inerrant, but submits his work to the ultimate judgement of Rome. In the conclusion to his book, he even invites “men of goodwill, theologians and scientists, Christians and non-Christians to add, correct, deepen, and enrich. For his own part, the writer yearns to listen and exchange more than expound. . . . It is certain that better scholars and deeper, holier men could much improve and further refine on what is written in this thesis. God grant that they may do so, and quickly!”³⁴³ Documents already cited in this chapter show that many scientists have already corrected the basic error of this “new synthesis”—belief in evolution—and many theologians during this past century have shown how it leads to errors in philosophy and doctrine. There is no purpose in analysing the theological ramifications developed by Fr. Holloway and Fr. Nesbitt if their arguments, although logical consequences of their prior convictions, are based on false premises or unreliable authorities.

Evolutionist Fathers from the East?

According to their flyer, the FAITH Movement claims there is much support for their views not only from modern science, but in the Bible and the early Church: “Thus linking Creation, Incarnation, Salvation, Church and Sacraments in one coherent theology, we seek to present a dynamic and attractive vision of the faith. . . . The outlines of this perspective are found in many writings throughout Scripture and Tradition, especially in the Eastern Fathers. In the West it would be named “Scotist” from the thought of John Duns

³⁴²Ibid, p 15

³⁴³Holloway, 503

Scotus who, among other saints and doctors of the Church, championed this synthetic view.”³⁴⁴ The FAITH position is the combination of human evolution with Catholicism. It would be fascinating to read documented evidence to support the opinion that many writings of Scripture and the Church Fathers delineate belief in the evolution of man from an animal, and that several saints and doctors of the Church defended this view!

It is true that the Church Fathers held various opinions on the Days of Creation in Genesis. The Alexandrian school favoured an allegorical exegesis, believing that God created all things simultaneously, while the literal school, centered in Antioch, attempted to link the six days to existing scientific understanding, including belief in the four Aristotelian “elements” and “spontaneous generation”. In this “concordant” approach, such natural secondary causes were employed to explain the reiterated commands of God, e.g., “Let the earth bring forth . . .” However, these are given only on the real days of the Creation week, not entrusted to an evolutionary time scale. The creative acts of God are consecutive *ex nihilo* works, not changes from previous forms of life. Scientists since Pasteur have rejected the possibility of spontaneous generation. Attempts by Christians in the eighteenth to twentieth centuries to merge vast evolutionary ages with the days of Creation (day–age theories) were rife with contradictions and extreme Bible twisting and now gain little credibility among theistic evolutionists.

There is no evidence that any of the Church Fathers, even Scotus, believed that man evolved from an ape, yet this is a basic argument of the FAITH position. According to magisterium, Scotus was not an evolutionist and did not question traditional beliefs: “The Fathers are in accord in teaching that God immediately created the first man, both as to body and soul.”³⁴⁵

Both Thomists and Scotists were in the full sense scholastics, faithful to the authority of the pope and the traditional teaching of the Church, while at the same time recognising Aristotle’s supremacy in philosophical questions. In general it may be said that, while St. Thomas gave the first place to knowledge and reason, Scotus gave it to love and the will. . . . Nevertheless, the difference between the

³⁴⁴Ibid,p.503

³⁴⁵Ott, 1960, 95

two schools moves within very narrow limits, and can be of little interest for those who are outside scholastic systems of thought.³⁴⁶

While it is certainly possible that the understanding of a doctrine may be deepened or developed through research, insights or even private revelation, the Church has laid down strict safeguards against any attempt to challenge previously held beliefs. The latter were used long ago as a pretext by the Modernists, especially under the influence of their adherence to the doctrine of evolutionism.

The doctrines of the faith which God has revealed have not been proposed to human intelligences to be perfected by them as if it were a philosophical system, but as a divine deposit entrusted to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly interpreted. Hence also that sense of the sacred dogmas is to be perpetually retained which our Holy Mother the Church has once declared, nor is this sense ever to be abandoned on plea or pretext of a more profound comprehension of the truth.³⁴⁷

... I accept sincerely the doctrine of faith transmitted from the apostles through the orthodox fathers, always in the same sense and interpretation, even to us; and so I reject the heretical invention of the evolution of dogmas, passing from one meaning to another, different from that which the Church first had... I disapprove likewise that method of studying and interpreting Sacred Scripture, which disregards the tradition of the Church, the analogy of faith, and the norms of the Apostolic See, and adheres to the fictions of the rationalists.³⁴⁸

Explanation of the Mystery of FAITH

The works of Fr. Holloway and Fr. Nesbitt offer no new evidence for evolution from scientific research or Biblical exegesis. Their views have been proclaimed in the public domain and printed literature for over twenty years, even in a Catholic Truth Society pamphlet, without mention of their true source. No Church Father, canonised Saint or magisterial teaching has ever taught that the world evolved over 15 billion years

³⁴⁶ *Virtue's Catholic Encyclopaedia*, London, Virtue's, 1965, v: 922.

³⁴⁷ *Vatican Council 1870*, Denzinger 1800.

³⁴⁸ Pope Pius X, "The Oath against the Errors of Modernism", 1910, Denzinger 1954, pp. 2145, 2146.

or that Adam had animal parents. What authority could refute the Word of God, which the theory of evolution appears to contradict?

The answer to this question was revealed in a booklet published in 1988, entitled *God's Master Key: The Law of Control and Direction*, by Mrs. Agnes Holloway, "a humble South London housewife and mother."³⁴⁹ She claimed to have received a new revelation from God in 1929 which unlocked the wisdom of modern science and the full orthodox Catholic Faith. She understood that her son, the future Fr. Edward Holloway, was to broadcast this message to the world.

While not judging the earnestness of mother and son, one is bound in caution to question the basis of any new doctrine which requires us to abandon traditional beliefs of the foundational texts of Holy Scripture. Any comments made here should not be taken as personal criticisms. As Fr. Holloway says, "This vision does not belong to any man or woman as their personal theological school. It is, if true, simply a God-given indication of the authentic line of development in the doctrine of the Church needed by the Second Vatican Council, and all but destroyed by Theological Humanism. It belongs to the Church, and to humankind."³⁵⁰ I also modestly claim to belong to the Church and humankind, and intend to exercise my right to examine more strictly the claims of FAITH which appear to be incompatible with Catholic teaching. Readers are welcome to verify the facts for themselves and draw their own conclusions.

The booklet contains about forty A5 pages in which Mrs. Holloway expounds on science, theology and an exegesis of Genesis 1–3, followed by fifteen pages of "Answers to certain questions," then a thirty page autobiography. Fr. Holloway provided a six-page introduction, and commentary by footnotes. It must be appreciated that it is on the authority of this private revelation that the credibility of the FAITH position depends, for I do not find theistic evolution to be in agreement with reason, Scripture, Tradition or genuine science.

³⁴⁹ Holloway, 1988, back cover

³⁵⁰ Ibid, 15

Uncritical Acceptance of Popular Secular Science

In his introduction, Fr. Holloway states that his mother's ideas took shape from certain conversations they had in 1940 in which she attempted to understand the language of the scholastic philosophy he had learned in Rome.

Some other terms and language would have been taken from her humble efforts to learn something about science from the popular magazines and reviews of the 1930s. She did not read them until after this revelation was given her which was in the year 1929. She then began to look for some sort of corroboration from the sciences for this vision. I can remember *The Science of Life* edited by H. G. Wells and J. Huxley being around the house in weekly parts. I also read it with interest.

Another popular journal of the time which sometimes made pretensions to be serious philosophical reading was *John O'London's Weekly*. My mother had neither the money nor the education for more serious reading in the philosophy of science, or in the relationship between science and theology. Her education had been RC Elementary School of around 1900 to 1910. It did not take one very far. Besides, she would not have had the knowledge to distinguish between the reliable and the slanted in more specialised works.³⁵¹

It appears that the parish clergy were unable to supply answers to the problems for Faith posed then by unbridled rationalists like Wells and Huxley, who were like the TV specialists (e.g., Attenborough and Dawkins) of today.

Edward had such ideas in mind at junior Seminary, when he read modern psychologists – Freud, Jung and Adler – and later in Rome, when he first studied physics. I had never heard of the periodic table of the elements, but I had now heard of the “Unity-Law” that worked through evolution. I realised with a thrill that the evidence of the table of the elements alone, meant that the Universe was a great Equation, and equations are not random! The Universe was centred in a Unity of Mind!³⁵²

Edward, now convinced that evolution was true and geared up by his mother's claims, readily absorbed novel ideas in the seminaries in Rome and at Stonyhurst.

³⁵¹Ibid, 6

³⁵²Ibid, 8

I found myself being introduced to a theology of the Church that developed the Fathers above all, and was much deeper than the post-Reformation Catholic theology concerning the Fall of Man and the nature of Original Sin. . . . I developed my own rapid and sweeping synthesis of the complex of ideas given to me. At times they flatly contradicted certain party lines of the speculative theology taught to me. They never contradicted the Faith.³⁵³

We now know that this “New Synthesis” actually came into being in the 1930s, and was based on the naturalistic Darwinist doctrine of secular rationalists, uncorrected by sound Catholic philosophy. Its proponents had no formal training in science, but derived their understanding of evolution from popular magazines. With the confidence that they had been inspired by God, their philosophy and theology had been habituated to reject ideas of origins which discounted evolution.

My mother did tell me, as I have said, before I went to Rome, that it would be my duty first to develop and to defend this complex of doctrine and insights into the loving wisdom of God. If it is true, it is not a new public revelation. It is a master correction of the Divine Word Incarnate, through the Holy Spirit, to the development of doctrine of faith and morals in this age. Without such a true and certain course the Church must falter, and is faltering in this age. It is no more than God’s own indication of the true line of development in wisdom, love, and understanding. My mother once said to me that she did not think there was a single thing in it, which great and holy minds could not have worked out for themselves, but they did not. She thought they lacked holiness and humility equal to the challenge.³⁵⁴

Is it disrespectful to wonder why no Catholic scientist, philosopher theologian, Pope or canonised Saint in 1900 years had been given this “correction,” without which “the Church must falter” because none were so holy and humble as Mrs. Agnes Holloway and her “beloved son” Edward?

Inspired by the Holy Spirit?

This “Master Key” statement of Mrs. Holloway, dated 1940, does show some logical progression of ideas in an attempt to tie evolution to Genesis, though each section consists mostly of very short paragraphs or

³⁵³Ibid, 8

³⁵⁴Ibid, 9

sentences, some reasonable or trite, others obscure or “profound”. I shall only comment on the most significant passages.

I am told during these revelations that acting through and with all known laws of Nature there is a law, a vital principle, of which all other laws, also Time and Space, are but the instruments. It is The Law of Control and Direction – Two aspects of one reality – One Law. The constant succession of the same phenomena necessarily supposes a constant cause producing them, this constant cause Science calls a law. The custom of scientists of today to speak of all things in terms of electrons etc. leaves the laws of Nature untouched.³⁵⁵

This Law of Control and Direction, mentioned fifty times in the booklet, is used to credit the cause of some process to God, as part of His evolutionary plan. It says much the same as “God makes evolution happen,” which is no more a scientific explanation than saying “God did it.” As a religious doctrine, it is a complete novelty, nowhere to be found in Scripture or Tradition.

Agnes’s dependability as a seer was almost certainly built upon her piety and reputed supernatural gifts. In her autobiography, she reports several “strange things” from when Edward was about ten years old, including answers to prayers, a vision of a lost object, a talking statue of “Our Lady”, hearing the voice of her guardian angel, and knowledge of future events. She attended Catholic Evidence Guild meetings, although she was not an open-air speaker. She describes the “moment of truth” accordingly:

There had been much discussion in the press at about this time of the theory of Evolution and Darwin’s book was causing much excitement. Our speakers were coming against it at their outdoor meetings. One evening there had been much discussion about it at our meeting, as to how it would affect the Christian faith. I was – like all my friends in the Guild – strongly against it. One evening after one of these discussions I was having my supper and picked up a Catholic paper, “The Universe”. There was an article by a leading Catholic theologian who was rather in favour of the theory. I read it through rather indifferently, to the end which ended with the words “How much is mind and how much is matter, that is the question on which Christianity will depend in the next fifty years and must stand or fall. Yes, I said to myself, I wonder how much is mind and how much is matter? Immediately I heard the words “That which controls”. I was puzzled by this and repeated the words “That which controls”.

³⁵⁵Ibid, 14

Again the voice said “a thing cannot be its own cause and its own control. It must come into contact with that which it controls, but cannot be caused by it, this is a universal law.” My soul was filled with wonder and by the Holy Presence of God which I had before experienced when the voice spoke to me. I knew these words held the key to the theory of Evolution. I would there and then have died for the truth of it, whereas five minutes before I would have given my life against it.³⁵⁶

She reports that the voice spoke again the next day and she was able to ask it questions.

This went on at intermittent times for about five or six months . . . when . . . I had to listen and write down what I heard. I began to know this Divine presence as that of the Blessed Trinity, indeed my knowledge of God since is always that of the undivided Trinity. There seems little mystery about it to me. But of course this is because of my ignorance and lack of education.³⁵⁷

It is not necessary to analyse the whole of God’s Master Key here, but simply to quote two passages which particularly give reason to doubt its validity as “the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.”³⁵⁸ They also epitomize the peculiar stylistic qualities and scientific understanding of the seer.

The effect of The Law of Control and Direction on the brain of man is shown to me in this way. Science has said and it is undoubtedly a fact that man has evolved from a lower species of animal now extinct. There is every evidence to support this theory. Man is organic to the world, he belongs to its process, he has his roots in its order and draws his life blood from it. The life principle within him has its seeds in the Universe itself, inside it.

Man is the highest outcome of the process of evolution, and it is reasonable to judge the character of the process from the stage of it of which we have knowledge.

There is a characteristic about him which distinguishes him from the other species of animals.

Although undoubtedly a product of Nature, because his natural evolution from the ovum is in keeping with the order of the Universe, he himself is a contradiction to the natural order. . . .

³⁵⁶Ibid, 92

³⁵⁷Ibid, 94

³⁵⁸Ibid, 13

I have said that man is organic to the world, he belongs to its process, he is in all material aspects like unto the animals in as much as his organism resembles theirs.

There is this difference, it is found on examination that his brain is larger than theirs, the brain cells I understand are the same in number but the development greater.

An eminent scientist has said that he believes the key to the whole explanation is in the brain of man.

It does seem to be so, and is indeed so, if the explanation given to me is true.³⁵⁹

The argument seems to follow this logical fallacy: 1. Of all animals, only man is rational; 2. Reason and intelligence are sited in the brain; 3. Therefore the only material difference is his larger brain. In fact, the normal human brain is neither the largest among animals in proportion to body mass nor by direct comparison, and there are many unique human features, physical and other.³⁶⁰

The account she gives of the origin of our first parents differs significantly from the inerrant Word of God in Genesis:

It is shown to me that the first soul of the first man was breathed into him in the womb as it is today.

Let us in our mind's eye vision to ourselves the manlike creature which directly preceded man.

Its organic structure will greatly resemble man, its brain will have reached that state of development on reaching maturity which is the highest possible in the animal world without being detrimental to its natural existence. It will naturally have a developed sense of direction, this is necessary to prevent the greater development of its brain from destroying it.

As the first man grew from babyhood to maturity there came a time when with the dawn of reason he is conscious for the first time of the urge to be good which is directed by his sense of direction to his intelligence, and he realises he is free to obey or not.

The first human female was born of the same species as the first man. The two, male and female, because of their natural association would grow up together, and under the guidance of God become the first of our race, the parents of humankind.³⁶¹

³⁵⁹Ibid, 22.

³⁶⁰Nevard, 1997, pp. 28–31

³⁶¹Holloway, 1988, pp. 35–36.

The unsolved logical problems of the development of a true human being from animal parents were acknowledged a century ago, and are not answered by mere statements. Nor are their implications unrelated to moral issues. One of the FAITH clergy at a meeting was once asked the question: As according to you, Adam and Eve's parents were only animals, would they have been entitled to kill their father or mother and eat them for dinner? The answer given, with some hesitation, was – "YES!"

Spiritual experiences – How May We Judge if they are From God?

There are many ways in which a person can be affected by the supernatural. Not all obvious miracles, visions and utterances are necessarily holy, nor need they be signs of holiness of the recipient. The devil uses clever tactics under the appearance of good in tempting more spiritually advanced souls. Even some saints have sometimes had visions judged to have been deceptions of the devil. The golden rule in Catholicism is that the Deposit of Faith and the hierarchical, official Church are above private revelation. In other words, true obedience and the rule of faith are used to judge the truth of a vision. Opposition to them proves the vision to be false.

Ignatius Loyola wrote several Rules for Discerning Spiritual Influences, and points out that the evil spirit, after moving us to do good, gradually tries to drag the soul to his secret designs and crooked purposes. When the soul is prepared by prior awareness or knowledge of anything which might induce consolation, the bad spirit can produce such consolation in the soul. The fruits must be considered as a whole: if they be not entirely good, it is a sign of an evil spirit. Even saints have been fooled by evil in the appearance of good.³⁶² Even if the Church were to approve a vision, there is no precedent for thus changing the meaning of the revelation of Divine and Holy Scripture. "Private revelations do not belong to the Catholic faith strictly so called. . . . Such revelations can often help a Catholic in his devotional life, but they are not an essential part of the Christian Faith."³⁶³

³⁶²*The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola*, trans. Thomas Corbishley, London, Burnes & Oates, 1963, pp. 330–333. Also see Rev. Fr Ludovic-Marie Barrielle, *Rules for Discerning the Spirits*, MO, Angelus Press 1992.

³⁶³*Virtue's Catholic Encyclopaedia*, 2:873.

Reactions of Fr. Holloway's Superiors

Mrs. Holloway recalls in her autobiography:

From the age of eighteen onwards, from the time he entered the senior seminary any utterance of these ideas in the presence of superiors has brought upon him suspicion and ridicule. He was even not allowed to take a degree [doctorate] because they thought he would teach heresy and ruin the minds of the students.³⁶⁴

Fr. Holloway notes that in 1946 he sent to Pope Pius XII “a very full summary of the ideas and their basic development,” and again in 1950 “a copy of a sort of prototype of Catholicism: a New Synthesis.”

To the letter of 1946 I received a verbal acknowledgement from Archbishop Godfrey over the telephone. To the 1950 and any subsequent correspondence, usually to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, I did not ever receive any acknowledgement. At the insistence of Cardinal John Wright, I did receive a formal acknowledgement from the Secretariat of State, when I presented a copy of Catholicism to Paul VI. It was however, curt and even unfriendly in tone, – stone cold.³⁶⁵

It is difficult to see how Pope Pius XII could give his backing to a book that forthrightly disobeyed his clear demands articulated in *Humani Generis* that evolution was not to be taken as a proven fact. Yet, clearly, Fr. Holloway did not see it that way. In his psyche, the Church had lost its way. Why? Because Rome had not heeded the advice of Agnes Holloway and her son. With quite astounding arrogance he states:

I would say that the prototype of Catholicism: a New Synthesis which reached Pius XII about the time of *Humani Generis*, would, if it had been taken seriously and in all humility [italics in original] have given the Holy See the essential vision on which to base a new framework of speculative Catholic philosophy and theology in time for the Second Vatican Council. “Prophets in rags” have never been accepted in the Old Covenant or the New. Yet, God has never spoken to His Church through any other

³⁶⁴Holloway, 1988, p 99

³⁶⁵Ibid, 101

medium. Rome did have the warning it needed, and the material it needed before 1960, but took no notice of it.³⁶⁶

Simple Rule: Respect the Scriptures

Obviously, evolution is not the only doctrinal issue on which Catholics have become confused in the recent past, nor is such a situation unique in the history of the Church. However, this theory was recognised by Pope Pius X as of fundamental importance as being the root cause of Modernism, and it has re-emerged as the neo-Modernism of our day. It is not difficult to see the parallels with Fr. Holloway's "new synthesis" when reading these words of the Pius X in *Pascendi* paragraph 26: "First of all they lay down the general principle that in a living religion everything is subject to change, and must in fact be changed. In this way they pass to what is practically their principal doctrine, namely, evolution. To the laws of evolution everything is subject under penalty of death dogma, Church, worship, the Books we revere as sacred, even faith itself." Thus, by those who study more intimately the ideas of the modernists, evolution is described as resultant from the conflict of two forces, one of them tending towards progress, the other towards conservation. Thus they are obliged to speak and write publicly. Let authority scold them if it please—they have their own conscience on their side and an intimate experience which tells them with certainty that what they deserve is honour. Pius X wrote that "these enemies of divine revelation extol human progress to the skies, and with rash and sacrilegious daring would have it introduced into the Catholic religion as if this religion were not the work of God but of man, or some kind of philosophical discovery susceptible of perfection by human efforts."³⁶⁷

³⁶⁶Ibid,

³⁶⁷Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, para.28 quoting Pius IX

PART 3

CATHOLICISM AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM – A NEED TO RETURN TO THE SCRIPTURES

Chapter 9: Moses and the reliability of the Pentateuch

Many Catholics believe that Moses did not write the first five books of the Bible. These books: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, are often referred to as the Pentateuch or Torah. Moreover, outside of the more conservative Christian Fundamentalist seminaries and churches, it is commonly held that Moses did not write these books, that they are a compilation of works by numerous writers over an extended period of time.

Theology and Religious studies courses at most universities teach that the Pentateuch is a complex work consisting of four literary components. The four strands have been allocated the letters J, E, D, and P; each representing a different document or source that was woven into the fabric of the Bible. This set of assumptions has been tagged by a number of names including the documentary theory and the Graf-Wellhausen theory. According to this analysis, the letter “J” stands for the *Yahwist* (“J” from the German *Jahweh*) *narrative*, coming from the era of the early Jewish monarchy, about 950 B.C. “E” stands for the *Elohist narrative* from the region of the Northern Kingdom dating from about 750 B.C. “D” is best represented by the book of Deuteronomy and is said to have originated in the Southern Kingdom about 650 B.C. or soon after. And finally, “P” is the priestly document that comes from the epoch after the fall of Israel in 587 B.C. According to the theory, the Pentateuch reached its current form around the time of Ezra or about 400 B.C.

Why is the issue of Mosaic authority a vital one? Those who believe the documentary or Graf-Wellhausen theory argue that the content of these books should be seen as a mixture of plausible historical events and religious poetry sparked by man’s religious imagination. For example, on the subject of Moses and God on Mount Sinai, one author of an Old Testament survey writes that, “It would be foolish, for instance, to rationalize the burning bush, as though this vision were something that could have been seen with the

objective eye of a camera.”³⁶⁸ Holders of this analysis reject the notion of supernatural revelation and view much of the Pentateuch as folklore and Hebrew storytelling.

On the other hand, the conservative analysis supports Mosaic authorship and treats the books as a literary unit. This does not mean that Moses didn’t use other documents to inscribe his books. He clearly did. But since other Old Testament authors assert Mosaic authorship, as do numerous New Testament writers and the early church fathers, the reliability of the Bible as a whole begins to disintegrate if Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch.

In this piece we will take a closer look at the source of the documentary theory regarding Mosaic authorship and offer a retort that argues for the integrity of the Bible.

Origins of the Documentary Hypothesis

For almost two thousand years Christians accredited Mosaic authorship of the first five books of the Bible. That’s not to say that some didn’t acknowledge problems with the text. Many had noted what seemed to be two separate creation stories in Genesis, as well as the problem of Moses recounting his own death in Deuteronomy 34.

In 1753, a French physician named Jean Astruc began the modern study of source or literary criticism by writing a commentary on the book of Genesis.³⁶⁹ He noted that the first chapter of Genesis refers to God as Elohim, while the second chapter uses mostly Jehovah or Yahweh. Astruc believed that Moses must have used two different sources in writing Genesis, each having different names for God, and that the Elohim source was the older (I deal with this problem in Chapter 10). This established the first principle of what would become known as the documentary hypothesis, the supposition that different divine names must mean different authors or sources. In 1780 Johann Eichhorn took this theory and ran with it. He applied the idea of two sources to the rest of Genesis, Exodus, and finally to most of the Pentateuch. He ultimately renounced the view of Mosaic authorship as well.

The next step came in 1805, when Wilhem De Wette argued that none of the Pentateuch was written before David. He established the “D” document standing for Deuteronomy, which he believed was written as

³⁶⁸ Anderson, 1966, 37

³⁶⁹ Archer, 1975, p 81

propaganda to support political and religious union in Jerusalem during the reign of king Josiah around 621 B.C. We now have three source documents: J, E, and D. Although others in the late 1700s and early 1800s found as many as thirty-nine fragments in Genesis alone, the final, “P” or Priestly document of the current theory was added by Hermann Hupfeld in 1853. He thought that the E source should be split in two, the later becoming the new P document.

The name most linked with the documentary hypothesis is Julius Wellhausen. His publications in the late 1870s didn’t add much new information to the theory, but rather argued for it from a Darwinist-evolutionist perspective. Wellhausen claimed that the J, E, D, P sequence followed the development from primitive animism towards the more sophisticated monotheism that would be expected as the Jewish culture and religion evolved. He claimed that those parts of the Old Testament that dealt with refined doctrine (one God, the Ten Commandments, the tabernacle, etc.) were not truth revealed by the living God, but were ideas that evolved from inferior stages of thinking, including polytheism, animism, ancestor worship, etc.

The impact of this relationship was immediate and powerful. The documentary hypothesis undermines the authenticity of the Genesis Creation/Fall/Flood accounts, as well as the whole patriarchal history of Israel. It presupposes that the whole of the Old Testament is one enormous literary deception, and calls into question not only the reliability of Moses, but also the trustworthiness/divinity of Jesus

Even though both liberal and conservative scholars removed much of the foundation of the documentary hypothesis in the twentieth century, the idea remains deep-rooted. As Gleason Archer states, “For want of a better theory . . . most non-conservative institutions continue to teach the Wellhausen theory, at least in its general outlines, as if nothing had happened in Old Testament scholarship since the year 1880.”³⁷⁰

Problems with the Documentary Hypothesis

Let’s now look at the problems with this theory:

³⁷⁰ Ibid, 88

First, it should be mentioned that conservative scholars did not sit around casually as this theory developed and spread. In the late 1800s Princeton Seminary scholars Joseph Alexander and William Green “subjected the documentarian school to devastating criticism which has never been successfully rebutted by those of liberal persuasion,” according to Gleason Archer.³⁷¹ In Germany, Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg ably defended the Mosaic authorship of all five books of the Pentateuch. His 1847 book *The Genuineness of the Pentateuch* did much to promote conservative thinking.

It should also be noted that the Wellhausen theory found what it was looking for. The theory grew out of a movement to find rationalistic, natural explanations for the biblical text. Once one assumes that supernatural revelation cannot happen any other explanation must take precedent. The late dates and various authors assigned to the books allow for purely naturalistic sources. This is a textbook case of question begging. The underlying premise, that there can be no such thing as supernatural revelation, resulted in the conclusion that the Bible is not a supernaturally revealed document.³⁷²

Another problem with the theory is that it assumes that “Hebrew authors differ from any other writers known in the history of literature in that they alone were incapable of using more than one name for God,” or for that matter, more than one style of writing.³⁷³ It is interesting that the Qur’an (Koran) uses multiple names for God, but few question that Muhammad was its sole author. Regarding the various writing styles, it would be like arguing that C. S. Lewis could not possibly have written children’s stories, literary criticism, science fiction, and allegorical satire; and maintaining that numerous sources must have been involved. Educated as an Egyptian prince, Moses probably would have been exposed to many writing styles that were available during that time.

Another bias is evident in how critics regard the biblical data as unreliable and untrustworthy, despite its old age even by their own dating methods. The inclination is to disregard the biblical content immediately

when a non-biblical source disagrees with it, even when the biblical document is older. In the words of one conservative Old Testament scholar:

³⁷¹ Ibid, 85

³⁷² Ibid, 105

³⁷³ Ibid, 106

It makes no difference how many biblical notices, rejected as unhistorical by nineteenth-century pundits, have been confirmed by later archaeological evidence (such as the historicity of Belshazzar, the Hittites, and the Horites), the same attitude of skeptical prejudice toward the Bible has persisted, without any justification.³⁷⁴

In the next section we will continue to offer arguments against the documentary hypothesis and for the Mosaic authorship of the first five books of the Bible.

A Conservative Approach

Despite what Gleason Archer calls “The overwhelming contrary evidence from Genesis to Malachi,” advocates of the Wellhausen theory cling to its most fundamental principle: that the religion of the Jews evolved from primitive animism to a more refined monotheism.³⁷⁵

But their unsupported assumptions don’t stop there. Modern scholars assume that Hebrew writers never used the repetition of ideas or occurrences even though authors in other ancient Semitic languages did so. They also assume that they can methodically date the texts, even though they have no other ancient Hebrew writings to compare them with. Documentary scholars have felt free to amend the text by substituting more common words for rare or unusual words that they do not understand or do not expect to see in a given context.³⁷⁶ Although it claims to be scientific, the documentary hypothesis is anything but neutral.

What are the arguments for Mosaic authorship? First, there are numerous passages in Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy that point to Moses as author. For instance, Exodus 34:27 says, “Then the LORD said to Moses, ‘Write down these words, for in accordance with these words I have made a covenant with you and with Israel.’” In fact, there are references throughout the Old Testament (Joshua, 1 & 2 Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, and Malachi) that claim that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

New Testament writers assumed that Moses wrote the first five books of the Bible as well. In Matthew 19:8 Jesus refers to laws regarding marriage in Deuteronomy and credits Moses with writing them. In John 7:19 Jesus says, “Has not Moses given you the law?” In Romans 10:5 Paul states that Moses wrote the law. It

³⁷⁴ Ibid, 107

³⁷⁵ Ibid

³⁷⁶ Ibid, 108

would be hard not to ascribe either deception or error to Christ and the apostles if Moses did not write the Pentateuch.

There are many other internal evidences that point to Mosaic authorship. The writer of Exodus gives eyewitness details of the event that only a participant would know about. The author of Genesis and Exodus also portrays remarkable knowledge of Egyptian names and places. This knowledge is evident even in the style of writing used. One scholar has noted that the writer used “a large number of idioms and terms of speech, which are characteristically Egyptian in origin, even though translated into Hebrew.”³⁷⁷

Having received teaching in the most advanced literate culture of the day as well as having access to the Jewish oral tradition make Moses an extraordinarily able and likely candidate for God to use in writing down the founding of the Jewish nation.

Summary

Now let us consider the current state of Old Testament studies:

Since 1670, when the Jewish philosopher Baruch Spinoza (1631-1677) suggested that Ezra might have authored the Pentateuch, source criticism has developed to such an extent that it has successfully removed serious consideration of Mosaic authorship for many scholars. However, the twentieth century has seen the pillars supporting the Wellhausen theory, also known as the documentary hypothesis, weakened or removed. The result has been the uncomfortable reliance by many scholars on a system of literary criticism that no longer has a firm foundation. As one Old Testament scholar has written:

Wellhausen’s arguments complemented each other nicely, and offered what seemed to be a solid foundation upon which to build the house of biblical criticism. Since then, however, both the evidence and the arguments supporting the structure have been called into question and, to some extent, even rejected. Yet biblical scholarship, while admitting that the grounds have crumbled away, nevertheless continues to adhere to the conclusions.³⁷⁸

Since the turn of the century, scholars have challenged the divine-names criterion or principle for determining authorship. W. F. Albright, who remained within the documentary camp, called the minute

³⁷⁷ Ibid, 113

³⁷⁸ Harrison, 1969, p 81

analysis of the Pentateuch after Wellhausen “absurd” and “irrational.”³⁷⁹ Hermann Gunkel, who introduced a new type of criticism called form criticism, came to the conclusion that “we really know nothing for certain about these hypothetical documents of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis.”³⁸⁰ In other words, he declined to accept the several authors for the Pentateuch, particularly the J, E, and P sources, that had been reflected on by scholars for decades. There are too many critics to mention by name, but the snowballing effect has been substantial.

Where does this leave us today? In one sense it has left the academic community in search for new foundations. But even for those who reject the possibility of supernatural revelation, the evidence from archeology, the Dead Sea scrolls found at Qumran and information about the languages of the ancient orient are making reliance on the Wellhausen theory unjustifiable.

There is an inclination among scholars to view the Pentateuch as a literary unit again. Scholars are admitting that the way the books use familiar words, phrases and motifs, parallel narrative structure, and planned theological arrangement of literary units for teaching and memorization support viewing the five books as a literary whole.³⁸¹

Conclusion

To begin to understand the importance of this means to consider the relevance of creation in Genesis. In John 5:46-47 Jesus says, “For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?” Then in Luke 16:31 Jesus quotes Abraham as saying, “If they hear not Moses and the prophets neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead”. Both references show the importance placed on the writings of Moses, beginning with Genesis. In Luke 24:44 Jesus refers to the “Law of Moses” (the Pentateuch) and accepts Moses as author. In Acts 28:23 Paul preaches about Jesus from Moses and the prophets. These are all references to the writings of Moses. Genesis is the one book of Moses that is referred to more often in the Bible than any other book. The biblical doctrine of origins found in Genesis is foundational to all other doctrines of Scripture. Attack

³⁷⁹ Archer, 94

³⁸⁰ Ibid, 95

³⁸¹ Hill & Walton, 1991, p 81

the biblical doctrine of origins, and the whole structure of the Bible is undermined. That is why the proponents of the Documentary hypothesis like it so much.

There are 11 verses in Genesis which read, ‘These are (or ‘This is the book of’) the generations of ...’ The Hebrew word *toledoth* translated ‘generations’ can also mean ‘origins’, ‘history’, or even ‘family history’, and each verse comes either before or after a report of historical events that involved the person named. The most probable explanation is that Adam, Noah, Shem, etc. each wrote an account of the events that occurred either right before or during his lifetime, and Moses, under the infallible inspiration of the Holy Spirit, selected, compiled, and edited these to produce Genesis in its present unified form.

Genesis does not show a development from idolatry to monotheism, as Wellhausen’s evolutionism requires. Rather, the Bible begins with a unique revelation of God, which was later rejected to the point that the Hebrew nation itself descended into idolatry and so was given over to captivity by God.

Ultimately, the author of Genesis was God, working through Moses. This does not mean that God used Moses as an automaton. Rather, God equipped Moses for his task from the day he was born. When the time came, Moses had all the necessary information, and was infallibly led by the Holy Spirit as to what he incorporated and what he left out. This is reliable with what is known historically, and with the claims and principles of Scripture.”(2 Timothy 3:15-17)

On the other hand there is no historical evidence, and no spiritual or theological basis whatsoever for the deceptive JEDP hypothesis. The ‘scholarship’ that promotes it is completely spurious. Supported by the theory of evolution, it exists exclusively to undermine the authority of the Word of God.

Chapter 10: Two Different Accounts in Genesis?

Genesis chapters 1 and 2 provide accounts of what God did during creation. But these two chapters don't seem to agree. Are there two different accounts of creation under discussion in Genesis 1 and 2?

It is common for liberal critics of the Bible to assert that the book of Genesis contains two accounts of the creation of the Earth and mankind. Allegedly, these two accounts reflect different authors, different time periods, etc. It further is charged that the narratives contradict each other in several particulars.

The two records are supposed to involve Genesis 1:1-2:3 and Genesis 2:4-25. One author has written: "It is evident that the Pentateuch cannot be the continuous work of a single author. This is shown by the existence of **two differing** accounts (doublets) of the same event: thus e.g. the story of the creation in Gen. 1 and 2:4ff..."³⁸² This view of Scripture is not the exclusive property of the radically liberal theologians; it has made its presence felt in "conservative" circles as well. Some enthusiasts speak of the "two different creation accounts"³⁸³, or the two 'creation hymns'.³⁸⁴

One of the foundational assumptions of this so-called viewpoint is that the Pentateuch (first five books of the Bible) was not written by Moses. Supposedly, several ancient writers contributed to this collection. These authors are referred to as J, E, P, and D. The critics claim that all of these writings eventually were collected and combined by a "redactor" (editor). This theory is known as the Documentary Hypothesis (see Chapter 9). In the case of the "two creation accounts," Genesis 1 is said to be a "P" document (dating from the Babylonian or post-Babylonian captivity period), while Genesis 2 is supposed to be a "J" narrative from the ninth century B.C.

The arguments in support of this radical viewpoint are twofold. (1) It is claimed that the two creation stories show evidence of **different styles** of writing. (2) It is argued that the **accounts conflict** in that they reveal divergent concepts of deity and a mismatched order of creation. Let us give these contentions brief deliberation.

³⁸² Weiser, 1961, pp. 72-73 (emp. in orig)

³⁸³ Murray and Buffaloe, 1981, p 7

³⁸⁴ see Manis, quoted by Thompson, 1986, p 16

Stylistic Dissimilarity

Professor Kenneth Kitchen of the University of Liverpool has observed, “stylistic differences are meaningless”.³⁸⁵ Such differences may as much indicate a variation in the subject addressed as the suggestion of multiple authors. On the basis of archaeological evidence, Kitchen has shown that the “stylistic” theory simply is not credible. For example, a biographical inscription of Uni, an Egyptian official who lived about 2400 B.C., reflects at least four different styles, and yet no one denies the unity of its authorship.³⁸⁶

The plural authorship of the “creation accounts” is supposed to be indicated by the use of two names for deity in these sections. “God” (Elohim) is utilized in Genesis 1, whereas “Jehovah” (Yahweh) is located in 2:4ff. In reply it may be observed, first, that concrete biblical research has clearly shown the use of different names for deity to possibly reflect a purposeful theological emphasis. For example, Elohim, which suggests “strength,” exalts God as the mighty Creator. Yahweh is the name that expresses the essential moral and spiritual nature of deity, particularly in terms of His relationship to the nation of Israel.³⁸⁷

Since the meaning of *elohim* stresses God’s omnipotence, it was a particularly appropriate word for Moses to have used to describe the Creator God of Creation Week. His power is seen much more clearly in creating many various objects and beings in a short time than in the long drawn out evolutionary schedule. *Elohim* is a graphic expression or a title rather than a name for God. The truly personal name of God is the one revealed to Moses at the burning bush (Exodus 3:15) *YHWH* which is often transliterated *Yahweh* or *Jehovah* and written in capitals as LORD. It means ‘I am who am’ and means ‘the self-existent one’ or ‘the one who causes to be’. It is used of God’s personal relationship with Adam and Eve in Genesis chapters 2 and 3, where Moses uses the collective term *Yahweh Elohim*, which the translators have given to mean Lord God.

³⁸⁵ Kitchen, 1966, p 118

³⁸⁶ Ibid,125

³⁸⁷ Stone, 1944, p 17

The God of Genesis is not the same God of Islam, modern-day non-Messianic Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jehovah's Witnesses, Unitarians or any other belief system which rejects the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Rather Genesis portrays the God of Christianity to be the God who is not only one, but is also more than one. The very first verse of the Bible reads: "In the beginning God (plural, *Elohim*) created (singular) the heavens and the earth" (Genesis 1: 1). Moses, the author of Genesis under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, chose to use the Hebrew plural term *Elohim* for God rather than the singular *El*. He *does* use the singular form of the verb 'created' however! *Elohim* is a plural noun with a singular meaning. The Old Testament writers used it over 2500 times, usually with singular verbs and adjectives (as in Gen. 1: 1), implying that God is one and yet God is more than one. This is the uniplurality of the Godhead. The Trinity can be *found* in Genesis 1 (Jesus, the Son of God creates everything (Colossians 1: 16), was with God in the beginning (John 1: 3) and the Holy Spirit "was hovering over the face of the waters" (Genesis 1: 2).

Second, the multiple employment of titles was common in the literature of ancient times as a device of literary variety. Archaeological discoveries have amply illustrated this point. Mull over Genesis 28:13. The Lord speaks to Jacob and says: "I am Jehovah (Yahweh), the God (Elohim) of Abraham, the God (Elohim) of Isaac." Would one argue for the multiple authorship of this single sentence upon the basis of the use of two Hebrew names for the Creator? Hardly. One scholar pointedly observed:

To conclude that differences in style or vocabulary unmistakably indicate different authors is invalid for any body of literature. It is well known that a single author may vary his style and select vocabulary to fit the themes he is developing and the people he is addressing. It goes without saying that a young graduate student's love letter will vary significantly in vocabulary and style from his research paper.³⁸⁸

It must be concluded that arguments for "two creation accounts" in Genesis, based upon a personal view of "style," are speculative and feeble.

Alleged Contradictions

³⁸⁸ Davis, 1975, p 23

As mentioned earlier, the alleged discrepancies between chapters 1 and 2 involve an imagined difference in the perception of God on the part of the hypothetical “authors,” and the alleged contradictory order of events mentioned in the respective records.

First, it is supposed that in Genesis 1 the Creator is a transcendent Being, majestically and distantly bringing the creation into existence. In Genesis 2, however, He is characterized by naive anthropomorphisms (human terminology applied to deity) which imply an inferior status. For example, in Genesis 2 the writer says that Jehovah “formed,” “breathed,” “planted,” etc. (7-8).

While it is true that such expressions are found in chapter 2, what the critics have failed to notice is that anthropomorphic terminology also is employed in Genesis 1:1-2:4. In that section, God “called,” “saw,” “rested,” etc. (1:8,12; 2:1). There is no validity in this argument, and one is not surprised that serious scholars have branded it “illusory”.³⁸⁹

Second, as indicated above, some reversed language order, as seen in the two chapters, is also supposed to display conflicting creation accounts. E.A. Speiser has written:

The first account starts out with the creation of ‘heaven and earth’ (1:1). The present narrative begins with the making of ‘earth and heaven’ (2:4b).” Speiser goes on to emphasize that in the first record heavenly activity is in focus, while in the latter account man is the center of interest. He thus concluded: “This far-reaching divergence in basic philosophy would alone be sufficient to warn the reader that two separate sources appear to be involved, one heaven-centered and the other earth-centered .”³⁹⁰

This argument for a dual authorship of Genesis 1 and 2 is truly unconvincing. Let us carefully note Genesis 2:4. “These are the generations of the **heavens and the earth** when they were created, in the day that Jehovah God made **earth and heaven**.” In this one verse there is contained the heaven/earth and earth/heaven motif. Does this mean that two people must have written this one sentence? That would be ludicrous! Even the critics do not argue thus.

³⁸⁹ Kitchen, 1966, p 118

³⁹⁰ Speiser, 1964, pp. 18-19

Third, the claim is made that in chapter 1 man is represented as having been made “in the image of God” (27), yet in chapter 2, he is merely “formed...of the dust of the ground” (7), thus symptomatic of a distinct contrast. The point of comparison is too limited, hence, unwarranted. As professor John Sailhamer observed:

...we should not overlook the fact that the topic of the “creation of man” in chapter 2 is not limited merely to v. 7. In fact, the topic of the creation of the man and the woman is the focus of the whole of chapter 2. What the author had stated as a simple fact in chapter 1 (man, male and female, was created in God’s likeness) is explained and developed throughout the narrative of chapter 2. We cannot contrast the depiction of the creation of man in chapter 1 with only one verse in chapter 2; we must compare the whole of the chapter³⁹¹.

Fourth, Genesis 1 and 2 are said to disagree with each other in the relative creation-order of plants and man. In chapter 1, it is argued, plants were created on the third day of the initial week (11-12), and man was made on the sixth day (26ff.), whereas in chapter 2, plants and herbs seem not to appear until after the formation of man (5ff.). The real problem exists only in the mentality of the critic. There are possible means by which to answer the alleged difficulty.

Some suggest that in Genesis 1 the original **creation** of the botanical world is in view, while in Genesis 2 the emphasis is upon the fact that plant **reproduction** had not commenced, for as yet there was not enough moisture, nor a cultivator of the ground, which factors are taken care of in verses 6-7.³⁹²

Others agree that entirely different matters are in view in these respective accounts. In Genesis 1:11-12 vegetation in general is under consideration, but in Genesis 2:5ff. the writer is discussing the specific sort of vegetation that requires human cultivation. . Notice that the plants and herbs are described as ‘of the field’ in Genesis chapter 2 (compare 1:12) and they required a man to tend them (2:5). These are clearly cultivated plants, not just plants in general.

³⁹¹ Sailhamer, 1990, 2:40-41, parenthetical comment in orig.

³⁹² Jacobus, 1864, 1:96

It has been observed “that the words rendered **plant, field, and grew**, never occur in the first chapter; they are terms expressive of the produce of labour and cultivation; so that the historian evidently means that no cultivated land and no vegetables fit for the use of man were yet in existence on the earth”.³⁹³

Another view is that Genesis 2:5 does not refer to the condition of the Earth in general; rather, the writer basically is discussing the preparation of the beautiful garden in which man was to live³⁹⁴ (the trees (2:9) are only the trees planted in the garden, not trees in general).

In any event, we must highlight this point: whenever there is the possibility of genuine reconciliation between passages that supposedly appear to conflict, no contradiction can be charged!

Fifth, it is claimed that Genesis 1 represents animals as existing before man (vv.24-26), yet Genesis 2 has Adam created before the animals are formed (v.19). The text of Genesis 2:19 merely hints that the animals were formed before being brought to man; it says nothing about the relative origins of man and beast in terms of chronology. The critic is reading something into the text that simply is not there. William Green pointed out that when noted scholar Franz Delitzsch (1813-1890), a supporter of the Documentary Hypothesis, first authored his well-known commentary on Genesis, he employed this argument as a proof of an incongruity between Genesis 1 and 2. However, in the last edition of his work, after his knowledge had matured, he repudiated this hair-splitting and argued for the harmony of 2:19 with chapter 1.³⁹⁵

Sixth, Genesis 2:4 says, ‘These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens’. According to some Creationists, this marks a break with chapter 1. This wording next occurs in Genesis 5:1, where it reads ‘This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man’.

‘Generations’ is a translation of the Hebrew word *toledoth*, which means ‘origin’ or ‘record of the origin’. It identifies an account or record of events. The phrase was apparently used at the end of each section in Genesis identifying the patriarch (Adam, Noah, the sons of Noah, Shem, etc.) to whom it mainly referred, and possibly who was responsible for the record. There are 10 such divisions in Genesis.

³⁹³ Browne, 1981, 1:39, emp. in orig

³⁹⁴ Young, 1960, p. 61

³⁹⁵ Green, 1979, p 26

Each record was most likely originally a stone or clay tablet. There is no one identified with the account of the origin of the heavens and the earth (Genesis 1:1-2:4), because it refers principally to the origin of the whole universe, not any person in particular (Adam and Eve are not mentioned by name, for instance). Also, only God knew the events of creation, so God had to disclose this, possibly to Adam who recorded it. Moses, as ‘author’ of Genesis, acted as a compiler and editor of the various sections, adding illustrative notes under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The toledoths acknowledge the sources of the historical records Moses used. This understanding stresses the historical nature of Genesis and its status as eyewitness history, contrary to the defunct ‘documentary (JEDP) hypothesis’ still taught in many seminaries and Bible colleges.

An Authentic Explanation

Are there differences in the inspired accounts of Genesis 1 and 2? Of course there are. But differences do not necessarily imply contradictions, much less multiple authors. The real question is this: Is there a purpose to these variations? Indeed there is. Furthermore, there are a number of factors that militate against the impression that Genesis 1 and 2 are independent and contradictory accounts of the creation.

First, careful analysis reveals that there is deliberate purpose in the uniqueness of these two sections of Scripture. In Genesis 1 there is a broad outline of the events of the creation week, which reaches its peak with the origin of mankind in the very image of God. In Genesis 2 there is the particular emphasis upon man, the divine preparation of his home, the creation of a suitable mate, etc. Edward J. Young has a good statement of this matter:

There are different emphases in the two chapters...but the reason for these is obvious. Chapter 1 continues the narrative of creation until the climax, namely, man made in the image and likeness of God. To prepare the way for the account of the fall, chapter 2 gives certain added details about man’s original condition, which would have been incongruous and out of place in the grand, declarative march of chapter 1.³⁹⁶

³⁹⁶ Young, 1960, p 53

This type of procedure was not unheard of in the literary style of antiquity. Gleason Archer observed that the “technique of recapitulation was widely practiced in ancient Semitic literature. The author would first introduce his account with a short statement summarizing the whole transaction, and then he would follow it up with a more detailed and circumstantial account when dealing with matters of special importance”.³⁹⁷ These respective sections have a different literary theme. Genesis 1 is **chronological**, revealing the sequential events of the creation week, whereas Genesis 2 is **topical**, with special concern for man and his environment. This procedure is not unknown elsewhere in biblical literature. Matthew’s account of the ministry of Christ is more topical, while Mark’s Gospel is more chronological.

Second, there is clear evidence that Genesis 2 was never an independent creation account. There are simply too many key essentials missing for that to have been the case. For instance, there is no mention in Genesis 2 of the creation of the Earth, and there is no mention of the oceans or fish. There is no talk about the Sun, Moon, and stars, etc. Archer has pointed out that there is not an origins record in the entire literature collection of the ancient Near East that excludes the creation of the Sun, Moon, seas, etc.³⁹⁸ Obviously, Genesis 2 is a sequel to chapter 1. The latter presumes the former and is built upon it.

Even Howard Johnston, who was (at least in part) sympathetic to the Documentary Hypothesis, conceded:

The initial chapter [Genesis 1] gives a general account of the creation. The second chapter is generally declared by critics to be a second account of the creation, but, considered in the light of the general plan, that is not an accurate statement. Evidently the purpose of this chapter is to show that out of all the creation we have especially to do with man. Therefore only so much of the general account is repeated as is involved in a more detailed statement concerning the creation of man. There is a marked difference of style in the two accounts, but the record is consistent with the plan to narrow down the story to man.³⁹⁹

The following summary statement by Kenneth Kitchen is worthy of notice:

³⁹⁷ Archer, 1964, p 118

³⁹⁸ Archer, 1982, p 69

³⁹⁹ Johnston, 1902, p 90

It is often claimed that Genesis 1 and 2 contain two different creation-narratives. In point of fact, however, the strictly **complementary** nature of the “two” accounts is plain enough: Genesis 1 mentions the creation of man as the last of a series, and without any details, whereas in Genesis 2 man is the centre of interest and more specific details are given about him and his setting. There is no incompatible duplication here at all. Failure to recognize the complementary nature of the subject-distinction between a skeleton outline of **all** creation on the one hand, and the concentration in detail on man and his immediate environment on the other, borders on obscurantism.⁴⁰⁰

Conclusion

One final but vigorous point should be made. In Matthew 19:4-5, the Lord Jesus united quotations from Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. He declared: “He who made them from the beginning made them male and female [1:26], and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh [2:24].” If the liberal stance is true, how very strange that Christ should have given not the least hint that the two accounts involved multiple authorship and contradictory material! Obviously, the Son of God did not support the modern Documentary Hypothesis. When the texts of Genesis 1 and 2 have been well thought-out carefully, one thing is obvious: an objective assessment reveals no discrepancies, nor is a dual authorship to be inferred. Committed students of the Bible should not be distressed by the whimsical, ever-changing hypotheses of the liberal critics. It is sensible to bear in mind that the Word of God was not written for the benefit of “scholars,” but for the ordinary person.

⁴⁰⁰ Kitchen, 1966, pp. 116-17, emp. in orig

PART 4
CONCLUSION

Chapter 11: Evolution, Catholicism and Fundamentalism

Evolution and Origins: Still Awaiting Clarification

Prior to the modern era there was little need for Magisterial declarations on Origins, therefore many Catholics have concluded that evolution beliefs create little danger for Catholicism.

In Parts 1 and 2, I have produced a consistent analysis showing how human evolution is irreconcilable with Catholic doctrine and in Part 3, I have sought to establish what God has revealed about the beginning of the world and the origin of mankind from the Bible. I have documented that science cannot support evolution with proof of the ever-elusive process of evolution is missing ('molecules to man' or 'particles to people' evolution). I wish also to state the role of the Catholic Church, defined by Ruffini, as personally commissioned by Jesus Christ, to teach His doctrine until the end of time:

Christ established an organisation to continue, until the end of the world, the bringing of men to eternal happiness. This organisation is the Catholic Church. He endowed His Church with the prerogative of infallibility so that it cannot err in teaching and interpreting His doctrine. God's revelation to man, which is called a Deposit, is found in the Bible, written under divine inspiration, and in Tradition. By Tradition is meant not something vague or legendary, but the actual living teaching of the Church itself which, under the abiding assistance of God promised by Christ, ever continues to transmit to men the doctrines received from Christ and His Apostles.

Important witnesses of this Tradition are those ecclesiastical writers of the early centuries who are called Fathers of the Church. Divine revelation is so vast in extent and so profound in content, that sometimes its meaning can be determined only after study and discussion. Progress in this field consists in the deeper understanding by men of what is contained in revelation. The knowledge given to us by God is as unchangeably true as are the truths of mathematics.⁴⁰¹

While much of the above may be true, there is still a problem in that far too much assurance is given to The Catholic Church as an organisation. Tradition is *always* on a par with Scripture and very few members of

⁴⁰¹ Ruffini, 1959, p 64

the Catholic hierarchy seem to notice the danger it poses. Tradition must submit to Scripture because if it does not, one will end up in the quagmire of following the uncertain philosophies of men, i.e. the philosophy of evolution, which dictates the terms and reinterprets Scripture. Ruffini does not see the danger. Belief in a creation period of six 24-hour days about 6000 years ago has been the teaching of the Church for most of its history. I am not saying that those who do not hold to a literal Adam and Eve position are not Christian and therefore not saved in Christ, but there has to be a consistency in Catholic doctrine and apologetics. To deny this belief is fundamentally the effect of imposing outside ideas on Scripture. It has also terrible consequences, which affect many areas as I have shown in Part 2 on philosophy and the dangers of evolution theory.

The Origins debate is essentially a fairly modern controversy within Christianity. Apart from speculation by ancient Greeks some 600 years before Christ, the evolution theories of Naturalists (which were supposedly based on phenomenal data) only began to substantially impact peoples' thoughts from the early nineteenth century. In the Catholic Church the idea that Scripture contains true history was first explained by Pope Leo XIII as recently as 1893. Thus, various Origins aspects have not been fully addressed in Tradition and still await clarification by the Magisterium.

Many Catholics incline toward generalised concepts of Theistic evolution and argue that "evolution" could have been the method of creation used by God. (The issue, however, is what God actually chose to do when creating the Universe and all creatures and plants, and not what He could have done.) Many are unwilling to accept as literally true any passage in the Genesis Creation accounts, and appeals to Tradition tend to be dismissed as irrelevant because Tradition itself has paved the way for an undermining of the Bible. The Pentateuch can be read literally, as I have shown in Part 3 but tends to be seen as primarily applicable in a poetic sense, as if it were known with certainty that the Divine Author did not intend to convey real history. At stake in the Origins debate is nothing less than the integrity and reliability of Genesis, so fundamental to the Church founded by Jesus Christ.

The Reformation recovered the biblical teaching that the Bible was both sufficient and clear. This is the doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*. The contrary Catholic view was that Scripture required to be supplemented by Tradition, which had equal authority, and that the Bible could not be understood without the Magisterium.

However Catholicism placed Tradition and magisterial authority in a greater position than Scripture – the position in which the Catholic Church still stands. This position needs to be reviewed promptly.

In reality, where there is a perceived conflict with scientific consensus and the Bible, it is always Scripture which has had to yield. This places “science” in a greater authority over Scripture. Instead of *Sola Scriptura* it becomes *Scientia supra Scriptura* (Science above Scripture). This is demonstrated by the views of many evangelical and Catholic theologians who believe in long ages. They assert that a plain understanding of Genesis teaches six 24-hour days and a creation about 6000 years ago (by adding the dates in biblical genealogies up to time of Christ and from Christ till now, we get approximately 6000 years) but they cannot accept that view because “science” tells them otherwise.

All of this completely misunderstands the difference between Scripture and human nature. The Bible is the inerrant propositional revelation from God. It contains facts about how we got here. Its teachings can be comprehended by simple interpretation and is authoritative over nature. Human nature is not propositional revelation, in other words it does not always accord with objective truth. In nature i.e. science, propositions must be formulated from observation and then reinterpreted according to some model or paradigm. This model depends on assumptions of scientists. So many anomalies may occur that the paradigm becomes useless and a new one is developed to explain things. If you attack the traditional paradigm of Neo-Darwinian evolution you will find it difficult to get a hearing. This shows that there is a bias in scientific circles. That is because the alleged long age consensus emanates from interpreting the data according to an evolutionist framework or paradigm which ignores God’s special acts of Creation and the Flood. However many opposing scientists believe that evolution should be replaced with a new model. The correct procedure is to interpret nature in accordance with a model based on the infallible history revealed by God in the Bible. Therefore, if there is a conflict “science” ought to be reinterpreted not Scripture.

I have shown in Part 1 that Catholic proponents of evolution generally find little real comfort in official Magisterial/Papal teachings. But their openness to theistic evolution essentially involves a deviation from standard evolution theory, in favour of innumerable divine interventions, so that they can incorporate evolution within quasi-creationist scenarios. In addition, they now face another problem of authority. Not only was polygenism effectively prohibited in the 1992 Catechism of the Catholic Church (endorsed by

Pope John Paul II), but also various Creation aspects were reiterated in it. In contrast, the word “evolution” was not specifically mentioned even once in this catechism.

Many paragraphs in the Catechism of the Catholic Church relate to Creation themes, including the following: The existence of God can be known by reason; the Bible is totally free from error; the purpose of God in creating the Universe was to create human beings; God did not make death-death came as a result of man (Adam’s sin) as described in Romans 5:12; human nature is therefore wounded and the whole of creation groans as a result; the Flood is mentioned in covenant context.

A few sections that could vaguely be said to support evolutionary concepts are also explicable by Special Creation beliefs. For example,

The question about the origins of the world and of man has been the object of many scientific studies which have splendidly enriched our knowledge of the age and dimensions of the cosmos, the development of life forms and the appearance of man. . .⁴⁰²

The great interest accorded to these studies is strongly stimulated by a question of another order, which goes beyond the proper domain of the natural sciences. It is not only a question of knowing when and how the universe arose physically, or when man appeared, but rather of discovering the meaning of such an origin: is the universe governed by chance, blind fate, anonymous necessity, or by a transcendent, intelligent and good Being called ‘God’? . . .⁴⁰³

The Catholic Church is unlikely to enter into and make pronouncements on matters which belong only in empirical science; but where empirical science and theology overlap, the Church is entitled to and has declared on important matters which affect the salvation of souls (e.g., with regard to abortion, in vitro fertilization). Thus, it is entirely appropriate for the Church to speak out about Origins matters, such as the possibility of Adam and Eve being derived from previously living or non living matter, or upon the historical reality of the Flood, or upon other important Origins aspects in which the field of scientists, theologians and exegetes can overlap.

⁴⁰² CCC 283

⁴⁰³ CCC 284

In view of actual Magisterial teachings, Genesis cannot be written off as applicable only in fanciful “salvation history evolutionist scenarios”. Nor can it be written off as a “story” understood in existentialist scenarios, as proposed by many Catholic Scripture scholars in their quest to demythologise Scripture. Despite current widespread disobedience to its doctrinal teachings, the Catholic Church still officially forbids the teaching of evolution as though it were already proven. Nevertheless statements by John Paul II and the present pope, Benedict XVI, still leave room for concern in that they vaguely propound a theistic evolution which can cause confusion.

It is my contention that the Catholic Church is bound to prohibit belief in Godless Origins and Godless evolutionism. The teaching on Original Sin can never change because: 1) it is central to the Redemption paid by our great Creator/Redeemer, and 2) the Church cannot overturn even one doctrine already distinct in Scripture, otherwise, all credibility of Catholic Tradition would be lost. As the Catechism of the Catholic Church reminds us, “the Church, which has the mind of Christ, knows very well that we cannot tamper with the revelation of Original Sin without undermining the mystery of Christ”.⁴⁰⁴

In view of so many bizarre views on Origins constantly being advocated by so many scholars around the world – contradictory to doctrine and harmful to the church founded by Jesus Christ – one can only pray that the Magisterium of the Catholic Church will recognise the need for an updated Biblical encyclical on Origins, to bring clarification where now there is great confusion. One must also hope that a wide range of views will be consulted, not just those of the present Pontifical Academy of Sciences and the present Pontifical Biblical Commission, but also fundamentalist Christian organisations worldwide who have been fighting for orthodoxy and truth in this whole area, particularly over the last ten years.

The Doctrine of Original Sin

At the heart of the Origins controversy lies the doctrine of Original Sin, a teaching central to Christianity. As well as Pope Pius XII in *Humani Generis* (1950), Pope Paul VI endorsed its foundational importance in quite unmistakable terms in his *Credo of the People of God* (1968):

We believe that in Adam all have sinned. By that we mean that the original sin he committed affected human nature itself. In what way? Through his sin, human nature, common to all men, fell into a state in which it incurs the consequences of his act. This new state, then, is not the one

⁴⁰⁴ CCC 389

in which human nature first existed in our First Parents. They, in their origin, were set up by God in a state of holiness and righteousness. They had no experience of evil or of sin. But it is their fallen nature which has been passed on to all their descendants.

These are, in consequence, destitute of the gift of grace that once adorned human nature. They are wounded even in their natural powers. They have incurred a liability to death which Adam and Eve passed on to all their descendants. All that is what we mean when we say “Man is born in sin.” In accordance with the teaching of the Council of Trent, we likewise hold that original sin is transmitted along with human nature, and not acquired by imitation. We hold therefore that it is in each one of us as something proper to each person.⁴⁰⁵

The 1992 Catechism also reiterated the teaching on Original Sin in unmistakable terms:

How did the sin of Adam become the sin of all his descendants? The whole human race is in Adam “as one body of one man.” By this “unity of the human race” all men are implicated in Adam’s sin, as all are implicated in Christ’s Justice. Still, the transmission of original sin is a mystery that we cannot fully understand. But we do know by revelation that Adam had received original holiness and justice, not for himself alone, but for all human nature.

By yielding to the tempter, Adam and Eve committed a personal sin, but this sin affected the human nature that they would then transmit in a fallen state. It is a sin which will be transmitted by propagation to all mankind, that is, by the transmission of a human nature deprived of original holiness and justice. And that is why original sin is called “sin” only in an analogical sense: it is a sin “contracted” and not “committed” – a state and not an act.⁴⁰⁶

Human nature is wounded in the natural powers proper to it. It is subject to ignorance, suffering, death and inclined to sin – an inclination to evil that is called concupiscence. “Baptism, by imparting the life of Christ’s grace, erases original sin and turns a man back toward God, but the consequences for nature, weakened and inclined to evil, persist in man and summon him to spiritual battle.”⁴⁰⁷

⁴⁰⁵ Pope Paul VI, *Credo of the People of God*, Section 16, 1968, <http://www.cin.org/docs/credo.html>

⁴⁰⁶ CCC 404

⁴⁰⁷ CCC 405

Clearly, Adam was the one who committed the Original Sin, and all humankind is wounded and suffers in consequence. The Catholic Church does not officially accept the speculation that “we all have chosen sin”, a revisionist view which tries to accommodate polygenism by inferring that each one of us, being sinful, has rejected God as did early humankind. In such a view, Adam and Eve would be only symbolic representations of mankind. Rather the sin nature is in us and we are all flawed human beings because of Adam’s Original Sin.

There has been a massive dissent from Catholic belief which erupted openly in the 1960s (escalating when the Church still appeared doctrinally united, with the traditional Latin Rite of Mass still in use. In view of the ongoing remarkable decline in religious practice and the revisionist distortion of Original Sin, there is obvious concern.

If, in the question of man’s creation, the obvious meaning of the Bible is forsaken – a meaning which has been received and confirmed by history and constant Catholic Tradition – what attempt can be made to defend the account of the earthly Eden, of the fall of Adam and his punishment? If it be admitted that the body of an animal became fitted over the course of millennia to be infused gradually by the human soul, will the unity of the human race remain sufficiently established against many first parents? **If this unity collapses the doctrine of original justice and original sin, which is basic to Christianity, will be permanently lost.**

Catholic Tradition

Despite the vague, highly tenuous evolution scenarios proposed by modern Catholic evolutionists, how could the Catholic Church ever officially accept that the bodies of Adam and Eve were the product of natural evolution? How could Adam and Eve have evolved naturally from previously living matter when DNA will not allow it to happen? The only recourse for the evolutionist is to argue that God intervened and miraculously transformed non-human life into human beings, and instantaneously created their rational souls – but Genesis gives no hint that this actually happened.

Why not believe the Genesis revelation that God miraculously transformed some non-living “dust” (understood now as elementary particles) from the ground into the living body of Adam? Famous teachers throughout time, such as, Irenaeus, John Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Thomas Aquinas and Pope Pius XI all taught that Adam was directly created by God from the “dust” or “slime” of the earth. A strong case

can thus be made that truth known from Tradition effectively renders impermissible the idea of “evolution” of the human body:

To these authorities – Holy Scripture, the Holy Fathers, major and minor theologians – we must add the Christian sense (*sensus fidelium*, the faithful echo of the Church’s teaching), so universal on this question and so certain that almost no member of the faithful would be free from surprise and scandal if he heard the teaching that Adam was born of beasts, that the blood in his veins was the blood of animals, that the human race, as regards the flesh, is related to the brute beasts.⁴⁰⁸

If it is true that the body of woman was formed directly by God and thus does not come by way of evolution, who will be persuaded that man’s body comes from the brute beast? What an absurdity! . . . If we wish to stand by Holy Scripture we must accept it in its entirety. . . . She gets the name *Virago* (*ishah*: woman) because she is taken from the *vir* (*ish*: man); likewise the man is called Adam (=homo) because, as Genesis says, he is taken from the *adamah* (=humus). Whenever Holy Scripture speaks of the origin of the human body, it always names the Earth and only the Earth.”

⁴⁰⁹

In a learned analysis of Church doctrine in relation to the question of Origins, the first five chapters of this thesis show that Tradition demonstrates the Church’s constant opposition to evolution theory down the centuries regarding the origin of the world and, especially the human species (Chapter 5). As well as drawing on the teachings of the early Church Fathers and of various popes, the declarations of the Church Councils observe that evolutionary theories stress the continuity of development between the ‘species’ from the lower to the higher, within a sufficient time period to permit this. Catholic teaching stresses an essential discontinuity in the case of those kinds or types or species, whose limits were fixed by the Creator and which cannot be modified by the intervention of natural or artificial agents of a finite power. The Church has never pretended in any instance of observable species, on the basis of revelation, to know what those limits are. But there *are* limits, even at the level of inanimate existence, which genuine science and philosophy has confirmed. (See chapters 1 and 6.)

⁴⁰⁸ Ruffini, 137

⁴⁰⁹ Ruffini, 123

Evolutionism cannot, by definition, be accepted by the Magisterium, the teaching authority of the Catholic Church. Good arguments can actually be formed to show that evolution is simply not a scientific hypothesis (Part 2). It is a system of belief providing the context for all scientific endeavors. This assumption of evolutionism as the universal archetype directly conflicts with the teaching of the Church. The doctrine of creation, in general and in all its detail, is intimately bound up with the mystery of salvation. This is why no Catholic may call into question any aspect of the doctrine of creation without also doubting that latter history.

In the light of Tradition, there can be little doubt that Adam was directly created when God made his body using the “dust” or “slime” of the earth. Eve was also made instantly by God, using a portion of Adam’s body from which the rest of her body was formed. Their rational souls also had to be directly created at the same time as their bodies.

We record what is to all known, and cannot be doubted by any, that God, on the sixth day of creation, having made man from the slime of the earth, and having breathed into his face the breath of life, gave him a companion, whom He miraculously took from the side of Adam when he was locked in sleep. God thus, in His most far-reaching foresight, decreed that this husband and wife should be the natural beginning of the human race, from whom it might be propagated, and preserved by an unfailing fruitfulness throughout all futurity of time.⁴¹⁰

Nevertheless, many Catholics (both clergy and laity) still cling to evolutionary scenarios, hoping – against the voluminous evidence – that the mechanism of evolution will emerge. But there is no justification in resorting to highly fanciful, implausible, theistic evolutionary explanations for the origin of Eve. The Genesis account is specific; she was directly created when God shaped her body from a portion of Adam’s body, and this fact was affirmed by *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae* of Leo XIII above in 1880. Divine intervention scenarios for the “evolutionary” origin of Adam and Eve are really highly uncertain, unnecessary and ought to be dumped. Such scenarios have a feature in common with the highly far-fetched notion of “punctuated equilibrium” – that of being open to the charge of trying to prove something by the complete lack of proof.

⁴¹⁰ Pope Leo XIII, encyclical letter *Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae* para. 5

The Views of Pius XII

Pope Pius XII taught quite definitely in the encyclical *Humani Generis* (1950) that Adam and Eve were real human beings, the first parents from whom all of humankind has descended; they are not symbolic representations of humankind as a whole, and there were no other human races existing on the Earth from whom human beings could have descended. To hold otherwise, he declared, is to endanger the doctrine of Original Sin. He reiterated that the rational souls of Adam and Eve were divinely implanted by God in acts of Special Creation, and he reaffirmed the teaching of the Church on Original Sin: “Sin actually committed by an individual Adam and which through generation is passed on to all and is in everyone as his own.”⁴¹¹

Although he may have inadvertently left an opening through which modernist concepts could penetrate into Catholic consciousness, Pope Pius XII did not give the impression that he believed evolution to be compatible with the Faith. His encyclical *Humani Generis*, and appropriately subtitled, *On Certain False Opinions Which Threaten to Undermine the Foundations of Catholic Doctrine* was issued in response to the danger posed by evolutionists (such as Teilhard de Chardin) who were pushing pantheism. Perhaps the Pope did not anticipate the lengths to which modernists would go in trying to overturn official Catholic doctrine, but he certainly had no illusions about the danger of evolutionism:

If anyone examines the state of affairs outside the Christian fold, he will easily discover the principal trends that not a few learned men are following. Some imprudently and indiscreetly hold that evolution – which has not been fully proved even in the domain of natural sciences – explains the origin of all things, and audaciously support the monistic and pantheistic opinion that the world is in continual evolution. Communists gladly subscribe to this opinion so that, when the souls of men have been deprived of every idea of God, they may the more efficaciously defend and propagate their dialectical Materialism.⁴¹²

Notwithstanding the fact that he allowed discussion about the possible evolution of Adam’s body, how can it now be said that Pope Pius XII truly regarded evolution as a serious hypothesis? After all, it was well known in 1950 that the “crucial mechanism of evolution” was still truly missing. In a speech given only three years after *Humani Generis* was issued, long before exact details of discoveries in bio-chemistry and

⁴¹¹ *Humani Generis*

⁴¹² *Ibid*

molecular biology would be available, Pope Pius XII in fact expressed very serious reservations about the scientific credibility of evolution:

In recent works on genetics one reads that the connection between living things cannot be explained better than by supposing a common genealogical tree. It is, however, necessary to remark that what we have here is an image, a hypothesis, not a demonstrated fact. . . . If most research workers speak of genealogical descent as a fact, they are premature in doing so. Other hypotheses are possible [in addition to that of evolution] . . .

[Besides,] scientists of repute have pointed out that in their opinion one cannot as yet say what is the real and exact meaning of terms such as “evolution,” “descent” and “transmission”; that we know of no natural process by which one being can beget another of a different kind; that the process by which one species begets another is altogether unintelligible, no matter how many intermediate stages be supposed; that no experimental method for producing one species from another has been found; and finally that we have no idea at what stage in the evolutionary process the hominoid suddenly crossed the threshold of humanity . . . [In conclusion] one is forced to say that the study of human origins is only at its beginnings: there is nothing definitive about present-day theory.⁴¹³

A great deal of scientific research has taken place since the early 1950s, and the case against evolution is overwhelming (Part 1). Regarding the origin of Adam’s body, the most probable explanation is an resounding “Yes” to very rapid transformation/creation from “dust” (i.e. inorganic non-living matter) and “No” to evolution from living matter. However, there has been no fully comprehensive discussion of Origins between specialists within the Catholic Church. It seems that views favorable to evolution have tended to predominate, and equal attention has not been given to information critical of evolution.

Unfortunately, the papal permission of 1950 – for specialists to hypothesise only about man’s origin from living matter – was blatantly exploited after the death of Pius XII in 1958 by those who sought to have room for evolutionary concepts within Catholic doctrine (see Part 1, Chapter 5).

⁴¹³ Pope Pius XII, address to the First International Congress of Medical Genetics, 7 September 1953; quoted by Dr Michael Sheehan, *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine*, Part 11, 1962, p 55. Emphasis added. Originally published in French in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*.

Humani Generis was misrepresented to convey the widespread impression that belief in evolution is now accepted officially by the Magisterium. This distortion of truth about Origins has had a catastrophic effect among Catholics on their understanding of crucial Origins doctrines. The misrepresentation amounted to a debilitating assault on foundational doctrines such as Original Sin – an assault from which the Catholic Church is still reeling.

In spite of which pope is reigning, Catholics loyal to the office of the papacy (many of whom have experienced the extremely distressing effects of loved ones leaving the Church in the unprecedented collapse of faith since the mid-1960s) are entitled to expect rigorous, fully informed comments from their pastor on vital doctrinal matters which could affect the salvation of souls.

The Views of John Paul II

Pope John Paul II appeared to defer naively to his scientific advisers, especially to advice from the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, despite the possibility that some present members may be in two minds toward Christian doctrine, in spite of the actual standing of the Academy within the Catholic Church. I would say that this body has no authority in matters of faith and doctrine, expressing only the views of its own members who belong to different religious beliefs.

As of late 1996, the Academy had 86 members, over 20 of whom are Nobel prize winners, all apparently sympathetic to evolution. It seems that there is not one creationist opponent of evolution (Catholic or otherwise) in the Academy to give additional views of modern science. Paradoxically, one member, the famous British cosmologist Stephen Hawking, even promotes non-Christian views:

. . . in 1981 my interest in questions about the origin and fate of the universe was reawakened when I attended a conference on cosmology organized by the Jesuits in the Vatican At the end of the conference the participants were granted an audience with the Pope. He told us that it was all right to study the evolution of the universe after the Big Bang, but we should not inquire into the Big Bang itself because that was the moment of Creation and therefore the work of God. I was glad then that he did not know the subject of the talk I had just given at the conference – the

possibility that space-time was finite but had no boundary, which means that it had no beginning, no moment of Creation.⁴¹⁴

The reason for John Paul II's deference to the Academy, virtually as the exclusive scientific consultant, seems answered by himself:

I had long been interested in man as person. Perhaps my interest was due to the fact that I had never had a particular predilection for the natural sciences. I was always more fascinated by man . . . when I discovered my priestly vocation, man became the central theme of my pastoral work.⁴¹⁵

In a spirit of seeking the truth of Origins, the following comments are made with great respect for the late Pope who, despite his human frailty, many Catholics believe was chosen personally by our Creator and Redeemer to lead the Church on Earth.

At the Vatican symposium on "Christian Faith and the Theory of Evolution", in April 1985, Pope John Paul II made the following comments, which no doubt reflect the collective view of the Academy, but which nevertheless appear inconsistent with the actual findings of modern science:

Rightly comprehended, faith in creation or a correctly understood teaching of evolution does not create obstacles: Evolution in fact presupposes creation; creation situates itself in the light of evolution as an event which extends itself through time – as a continual creation – in which God becomes visible to the eyes of the believer as 'creator of heaven and earth.'⁴¹⁶

Unfortunately, the various private, non *ex cathedra* comments of Pope John Paul II on Origins have tended to be imprecise. What exactly did he mean by "a correctly understood teaching of evolution"? The word "evolution" can mean different things to different people, so a precise definition of terms is therefore desirable. Clearly, Darwin's general theory of evolution has failed under searching scrutiny, and natural evolution is in the midst of a deep crisis of credibility.

The objective truth is that rigorous scientific disciplines – such as molecular biology, biochemistry and genetics – have revealed mind-boggling complexity within very tiny cells, and the reality of irreducible

⁴¹⁴ Hawking, 1988

⁴¹⁵ Pope John Paul II, 1994, p 199

⁴¹⁶ Quoted by theistic evolutionist writer Fr William Kramer, C.P.P.S., in *Evolution & Creation: A Catholic Understanding*, Huntington, IN, Our Sunday Visitor Inc., 1986, p 114

complexity within even such tiny cells clearly speaks only of design. Numerous scientists have also shown that life forms are only capable of passing on the existing genetic information already possessed by them, and thus natural evolution cannot occur.(see Part 1 and in particular Chapter 1)

Modern research, therefore, suggests strongly that natural evolution cannot be historically true and that God chose to institute only variety within kind. This is not evolution; since truly new “higher” genetic information is not being transmitted, life-forms can only change within definite limits or boundaries. Nor can theistic evolution truly be defined as evolution (as argued in Part 2); when fully considered, it reduces down only to innumerable instances of divine intervention – in contradiction to the observable facts of all reality, namely, that God works on all created things through secondary causes.

Instead of generalised private statements, one looks for precise terminology from a pope, affecting vital related foundational Origins and Original Sin doctrine, which is not yet fully clarified. Addressing the Academy in October 1996, at the Rome conference on “Origins and evolution of Life”⁴¹⁷, John Paul II rightly pointed out that “truth cannot contradict truth”. He also stated that, “the exegete and the theologian must keep informed about the results achieved by the natural sciences”.

But he did not specifically define what he means by “evolution”, nor did he fully elaborate how objective truth known from Tradition and theological reality can differ from the relative truth known from ever-changing scientific theories, especially since theology and empirical scientific investigation can sometimes overlap (e.g. on issues such as abortion, in vitro fertilization, euthanasia and the global Flood of Noah; all of these are proper subject matter for both theologians and scientists).

Was John Paul II inaccurately informed by his advisers, to the detriment of truth? Some of his other scientific comments made at the conference, seem most inconsistent with the actual findings of modern science:

Evolution is more than a hypothesis...It is indeed remarkable that this theory has been progressively accepted by researchers, following a series of discoveries in various fields of

⁴¹⁷ Accessed online October 2005 at <http://www.ewtn.com/library/PAPALDOC/JP961022.HTM>

knowledge. The convergence, neither sought nor fabricated, of the results of work that was conducted independently is in itself a significant argument in favour of this theory.⁴¹⁸

What discoveries? In light of modern scientific information, how can natural evolution now be regarded as anything other than failed attempted hypotheses? The highly complex information encoded on DNA suggests that only “like begets like”. The missing mechanism of evolution is doomed to remain ever elusive and evolutionary “convergence” in various fields of knowledge never occurred because it cannot occur! (see Chapter 1)

Furthermore, was John Paul II also deceived, in an effort to persuade him that the biological aspects of Origins are somehow explainable by tying Naturalistic evolution to divine intervention, as the following extracts from the same speech imply: “ontological discontinuity...Consideration of the method used in the various branches of knowledge makes it possible to reconcile two points of view which would seem irreconcilable...correlate them with the time line...the moment of transition to the spiritual”?

In light of the pro-evolutionist scientific advice, is it accurate to say that, “In his encyclical *Humani Generis*, Pope Pius XII had already stated that there was no opposition between evolution and the doctrine of the faith about man and his vocation, on condition that one did not lose sight of several indisputable points”?

Two years later (September 1998), writing in the encyclical letter *Fides et Ratio* (Faith and Reason), Pope John Paul II lamented the crisis of meaning in the modern world and condemned the threat of scientism, which had accompanied the spectacular growth in modern scientific achievements. He described scientism as “the philosophical notion which refuses to admit the validity of forms of knowledge other than those of the positive sciences; and it relegates religious, theological, ethical and aesthetic knowledge to the realm of mere fantasy . . . science would thus be poised to dominate all aspects of human life through technological progress.”⁴¹⁹

John Paul II also wrote in praise of Pius XII, “In his encyclical letter *Humani Generis*, Pope Pius XII warned against mistaken interpretations linked to evolutionism, existentialism and historicism. He made it clear that these theories had not been proposed and developed by theologians, but had their origins “outside

⁴¹⁸ Ibid

⁴¹⁹ Section 88

the sheepfold of Christ.” He added, however, that errors of this kind should not simply be rejected but should be examined critically.”⁴²⁰

One would hope for further papal examination of many other crucial Origins aspects – such as polygenism, the origin of Eve’s body, the impact of Romans 5:12 and conceptual problems in theistic evolution – and rigorous addressing of the historicity of Genesis.

Following the publication of the strongly pro-creationist Catechism of the Catholic Church, a comprehensive and rigorous encyclical on Origins – given high Magisterial status – would be welcome news, as it would further help to clarify right from wrong and truth from error. More importantly a return to the foundational/fundamental principles in Scripture is an absolute necessity. Let us now look at those fundamentals, and the background of fundamentalism, which can aid the Catholic Church out of the present blind alley in relation to this whole topic.

Fundamentalism

It is necessary to define the word “fundamentalism”. I suggest that it is best to distinguish small “f” from capital “F” usages; fundamentalism as a generic or worldwide phenomenon versus Fundamentalism as a religious movement specific to Protestant culture in the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Generic **fundamentalism** refers to a global religious impulse that seeks to recover and publicly institutionalise aspects of the past that modern life has hidden. It typically sees the secular state as the primary adversary, for the latter is more interested in education, democratic reforms and economic progress than in preserving the spiritual dimension of life. Generic or general fundamentalism takes its cues from a sacred text that stands above criticism. It sees time-honoured social distinctions and cultural patterns as rooted in the very nature of things, in the order of creation itself. That means clear-cut and stratified roles for men and women, parents and children, clergy and laity

Historic **Fundamentalism** shared all of the assumptions of generic fundamentalism but also reflected several concerns particular to the religious setting of the United States, at the turn of the twentieth century. Some of those concerns stemmed from broad changes in the culture such as growing awareness of world

⁴²⁰ Section 54

religions, the teaching of human evolution and, above all, the rise of biblical higher criticism. The last proved particularly hurtful because it implied the absence of the supernatural and the purely human authorship of scripture.

At this time, the changes proposed by Christocentric Liberals and proponents of the Social Gospel were deeply disturbing to many Protestant evangelicals. There was a strong sense that in trying to accommodate Christianity to the changed situation, something important was being lost. In attempting to define those essentials of the faith that should not be compromised, a diehard movement was launched that would alter the religious landscape. That movement was Fundamentalism.

Many believe that the term “Fundamentalism” came into existence at the Niagara Falls Bible Conference which was convened in an effort to define those things that were fundamental to belief. The term was also used to describe “The Fundamentals”, a collection of books on five subjects published in 1910 by Milton and Lyman Steward. These two wealthy brothers were concerned with the moral and spiritual decline and sought to restore the historic faith with a collection of 12 volumes dealing with the subjects that would later become known as the *five fundamentals of the faith*:

1. literal inerrancy of the originals of each scriptural book of the Bible
2. the virgin birth and deity of Christ
3. the substitutionary view of the atonement
4. the bodily resurrection of Christ
5. the imminent return of Christ.

Misconceptions

Unfortunately, any discussion of Fundamentalism must deal with any number of misconceptions. It is often assumed that the Fundamentalist movement was Protestant, filled with unsophisticated rural country “rednecks”, and appealed to the uneducated. But the reality, at least in the early years, was different. Belief in the fundamentals was not exclusively Protestant. Roman Catholics also held a number of these beliefs. The principle centres of power for Fundamentalism were Philadelphia, Minneapolis, Fort Worth, Denver,

and Los Angeles. The movement was also closely associated with such famous schools as Princeton Theological Seminary.

In essence, three views of how the Church might address itself to a changed world had developed in the post-Civil War America. The first was that of the modernists who sought to adjust the inherited faith to the new intellectual climate. The second was that of the fundamentalists who rejected aspects of science, and embraced the worldview of the Scriptures, insisting the old ways must be preserved unimpaired. The third view was that of Henry Ward Beecher and other Christocentric liberals, who argued on behalf of the existence of two revelations from God – one in Scripture and one in the natural world – and argued these revelations are compatible with one another on some deeper level. Beecher pointed out that the Church had produced the Bible, rather than the Bible producing the Church, and as a product of human beings, its understanding of reality might be conditional. Certainly modern Catholicism agrees with this latter point but, in reality, it creates more problems than it solves. It means that Scripture always has to yield to what man thinks and it undermines the authority of the Word of God. If the authority of the Word is undermined then it is not necessary to believe what it says.

Fundamentalists also differed with their peers on the issue of social reform. Where many modernists and Christocentric liberals were drawn to the social gospel, Fundamentalists believed all the energies of the Church should be focused on converting individuals, as the world would soon end.

Weakness of Leadership

These ideas had wide appeal in the country at large. But the Fundamentalists encountered difficulties with the people who served as spokespersons for their movement. For one thing, no one in the Fundamentalist movement was quite as gifted as Beecher, although J. Gresham Machen came close. Machen was an affluent, well-mannered academic. His work was articulate, and he attacked Liberalism at its weakest point. According to Machen, his principle concern was to demonstrate that the liberal attempt at reconciling Christianity with modern science had really relinquished everything distinctive of Christianity, so that what remained was, in essence, only that same indistinct type of religious hope which was in the world before

Christianity came upon the scene. In trying to remove from Christianity everything that could possibly be objected to in the name of science, the apologist abandoned what he started out to defend.

But other spokespersons for the Fundamentalist movement were perfect targets for caricature. One such individual was Frank Norris of Fort Worth, Texas. Norris would announce sermon titles like: “The Ten Biggest Devils in Fort Worth with Names Given”, and draw large crowds. He also was of questionable morals. His church burned down under suspicious circumstances, he shot a man who objected to one of his sermons. Another spokesperson who helped discredit Fundamentalism, was Billy Sunday. A professional baseball player turned evangelist, his antics in the pulpit did much to undermine the public’s respect for the new movement. Sunday preached a “masculine”, “muscular” Christianity which equated salvation with decency and manliness. He had no use for the ‘bastard theory of evolution’. Sunday believed Christianity and patriotism were one and the same, just as “hell and traitors are synonymous.” He and those who sympathised with him helped make popular the slogan “Back to Christ, the Bible, and the Constitution”.

The Scopes Trial

But perhaps the most significant figure in fundamentalism was William Jennings Bryan, who imagined himself as one of fundamentalism’s greatest defenders.

In half the states, Fundamentalists had succeeded in pushing bills through to outlaw the teaching of Darwinian biology or the view of creation put forward by Darwin. It was against the law to teach any other view than that put forward in the Bible. To challenge these laws a test case was planned, and John Scopes became the defendant in what came to be known as the “Monkey Trial”. Clarence Darrow, a famous lawyer, volunteered to defend him. The focus of the trial should have been on the public’s right to insist on what and what not should be taught in the public schools. Instead, the debate came to be focused on whether the Bible was literally true, the position that William Jennings Bryan championed.

Darrow and H L. Menken, the most famous journalist of his day, helped to spread the image of the fundamentalists as ‘hicks’. And Bryan, their willing accomplice, has been referred to as the “Custer of fundamentalism”. He allowed himself to be tricked into taking the stand to defend God and the Bible, where Darrow mercilessly laid bare the flaws in Bryan’s understanding of Scripture. Although Bryan and

the Fundamentalists won, he lost the sympathy of many because he managed to make belief in the inerrancy of Scripture seem so foolish; most people were afraid that they would appear as silly as Bryan if they claimed to believe in it. Indeed, many Christians became indifferent to the issues Bryan and the Fundamentalists raised. Fundamentalism would not easily recover from this “victory”.

Social changes of the early twentieth century also fed the flames of protest. Drawn primarily from ranks of “old stock whites”, Fundamentalists felt displaced by the waves of non-Protestant, European immigrants flooding America’s cities. They believed they had been betrayed by American statesmen who led the nation into an unresolved war with Germany.. They deplored the teaching of evolution in public schools, which they paid for with their taxes, and resented the elitism of professional educators who seemed often to scorn the values of traditional Christian families.

Nonetheless, Fundamentalism continued to grow and eventually flourished. In the 1930s it moved underground, so to speak, where it built a network of day schools, colleges, seminaries and missionary agencies. More importantly, the movement soon established a print and telecast industry of its own. It also created a system of parachurch organisations aimed to meet the spiritual needs of numerous socially discrete groups (youths, unmarrieds, veterans). Above all, Fundamentalists found innovative ways to address the religious concerns of common people. Historic Fundamentalism, largely forged before World War I, helped to produce the massive evangelical, Pentecostal and charismatic revivals after World War II, as well as the Christian Right in the 1970s and 1980s America.

Guiding Young Minds

Few persons are neutral about Fundamentalism. Feelings run high. My experience with students suggests that many coming from the outside will try to dismiss the movement as narrow-minded, and even bigoted. Others, coming from the inside, will try to defend it as the only valid form of Christianity (or any religion for that matter). In working with adolescents I have found it helpful to frame Fundamentalism as a traditionalist movement fighting for all that is worthy in Christianity, i.e., that it was an effort by earnest folk to retain a place for old fashioned (or at least what they took to be old fashioned) values in a rapidly modernising world. The main point is that Fundamentalists proved similar to many other social and religious groups that looked backward to find resources for dealing with the troubling changes in the

present. Today they look forward to a recovery of Christian values and deep personal faith by honest endeavour and heavy missionary output. Catholics should try to understand these people and their beliefs which can surely enrich the culture. In fact there is so much concurrence with Catholic doctrine that it would be wise to forge links with so called “separated brethren”.

Agreement between Fundamentalism and Catholicism

Both affirm that Jesus Christ is Lord. That is the first and final affirmation that Christians make about all of reality. He is the One sent by God to be Lord and Saviour of all, “And there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4). Christians are people ahead of time, those who proclaim now what will one day be acknowledged by all, that Jesus Christ is Lord (Philippians 2).

They affirm together that we are justified by grace through faith because of Christ. Living faith is active in love that is nothing less than the love of Christ, for they together say with Paul, “I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; and the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me” (Galatians 2).

All who accept Christ as Lord and Saviour are brothers and sisters in Christ. Evangelicals and Catholics who do this are brothers and sisters in Christ. They have not chosen one another, just as they have not chosen Christ. He has chosen them, and he has chosen them to be his together (John 15). However imperfect their communion with one another, however deep their disagreements with one another, they recognise that there is but one church of Christ. There is one church because there is one Christ and the church is his body. However difficult the way, they must recognise that they are called by God to a fuller realisation of our unity in the body of Christ. The only unity to which they would give expression is unity in the truth, and the truth is this, “There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all” (Ephesians 4).

They affirm together that Christians are to teach and live in obedience to the divinely inspired Scriptures, which are the infallible Word of God. They further affirm together that Christ has promised to his Church

the gift of the Holy Spirit who will lead us into all truth in discerning and declaring the teaching of Scripture (John 16). They recognise together that the Holy Spirit has so guided his Church in the past. In, for instance, the formation of the canon of the Scriptures, and in the orthodox response to the great Christological and Trinitarian controversies of the early centuries, they confidently acknowledge the guidance of the Holy Spirit. In faithful response to the Spirit's leading, the church formulated the Apostles Creed, which they can and do affirm together as an accurate statement of Scriptural truth:

I believe in God, the Father almighty, creator of heaven and earth. (This is the first foundational tenet of the creed which Catholicism and Fundamentalism adhere to.)

I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord. He was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit and born of the virgin Mary. He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. He descended into hell. On the third day he rose again. He ascended into heaven, and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again to judge the living and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Spirit, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.

Creation: A Point of Agreement

Both Catholicism and evangelical Fundamentalism can agree that Genesis lays the foundation for all of Scripture. If its account of creation isn't reliable, then neither is the remainder of the Bible which rests upon it; and Christ is proven not to be God and Saviour, but a mere man who foolishly took a mythological story of Adam and Eve literally (Matthew 19:4, 5). Yet Pope John Paul II, as John Tagliabue writing for the *New York Times* reported, "has put the teaching authority of the Roman Catholic Church firmly behind the view that the human body... is the product of a gradual process of evolution".⁴²¹ Adam is mentioned about 30 times in nine books of the Bible. Discrediting the biblical account of Adam's creation punctures so many holes in the Bible, that it can no longer contain a consistent theology. For example, Luke 3:2-38 traces Christ's genealogy to Adam, and Christ is even called "the last Adam" (1 Corinthians 15:45). That title

⁴²¹ John Tagliabue, "Pope says God and Darwin can co-exist happily," in *The Times-Picayune*, 25 October 1996, p. A-3

would be debasing in the extreme if Adam were a prehuman creature that had evolved from lower life forms, as many within Catholicism (and Protestantism) affirm.

Christianity Today was not the only popular evangelical magazine to favour theistic evolution. So did *New Man*, at that time the official magazine of “Promise Keepers”, the men’s movement that sprang up a few years ago under the leadership of University of Colorado football coach Bill McCartney and has since grown incredibly. That periodical expressed its agreement with the Pope’s position on evolution even before he stated it. Furthermore, *New Man* argued:

Remember, however, that the debate over how God created the world-through millions of years of evolutionary work or through a few words spoken over a few days-is not the central tenet of Christianity.⁴²²

The truth is that Christianity is not an isolated development of the New Testament but is inextricably linked with all of the Old Testament and therefore stands or falls upon its accuracy or inaccuracy. Paul declared that the gospel which he preached was “the gospel of God” and that it had been foretold by the Hebrew prophets in the Old Testament (Romans 1:1-3) and was the fulfilment thereof. The Bible is one book. If any part contradicts any other part, then the whole of Scripture is undermined. If the Bible is wrong in its account of man’s origin, then why should we trust its teaching about man’s redemption?

To support evolution to any degree and in any form is in fact to demolish Christianity. Interestingly enough, the Satanic Bible declares, “Satan represents man as nothing more than another animal, sometimes better, but more often worse than those who walk on four paws, because by the pretext of his ‘divine intellectual and spiritual development,’ he has become the most vicious animal of all.”⁴²³

The American Atheist knows what is at stake:

⁴²²“Fathers, faith and fossils”, *New Man*, July-August 1996, p 54

⁴²³ Anton Szandor La Vey, *Satanic Bible*, Avon, 1969; from the nine satanic affirmations with which the book begins.

“Destroy Adam and Eve and original sin, and in the rubble you will find the sorry remains of the Son of God and take away the meaning of his death.”⁴²⁴ Catholics must realise this and return to the evangelical fundamental principles upon which the early church grew.

What Can Catholics Do?

Anyone who knows the history of how false evolutionist notions were devised and systematically propagated throughout the civilized world must surely be able to see that the Evil One has created a new false god in evolutionism. The evil fruits of this pseudo-science are plain for all to see. The Western world, which was formerly Christian, is now substantially agnostic, and an unbelieving “liberalism” pervades not only the Catholic Church but also most Protestant churches.

Evolutionists do not want to admit that evolution is a religion. **If there is no God and we are the result of chance random processes then it means that there is no absolute authority.** Then, if there is no one to make the rules, everyone can do what he/she likes and lawlessness abounds. This is already happening in modern society. **Evolution is a religion enabling people to justify their own rules.** However we must remember the sin of Adam was that he did not want to obey God’s rules, only his own. He rebelled against God and we now all suffer because of his sin. In one sense evolution is the “scientific” justification for people to continue in this rebellion against God. Catholics must be aware of this.

The book of Genesis is a simple but reliable account of the origin and early history of life on earth. Increasing numbers of scientists are realizing that when the Scripture is taken as one’s basis and models of science and history are built upon it, all the evidence from living animals, plants, fossils and cultures fits. This confirms that the Bible is the Word of God and can be completely trusted.

The secular humanists oppose this because they cannot allow the possibility of God being the Creator. Increasingly all over the world they fight to have prayer, Scripture readings, teaching Creation and religion

⁴²⁴The American Atheist, 1978, p 19, as cited in *The Christian News*, 11 November 1996.

in general, forced out of the public school curriculum. There is a view that an absence of religion leaves a neutral view. This is *not* true. They have displaced Christianity and replaced it with an anti God religion – humanism. Most state schools and quite large numbers of so-called Catholic schools have become institutions that teach generations of school children the religion of humanism. This is a world-wide phenomenon, although in Ireland a vestige of Christian teaching still remains. The Catholic Church has exerted influence, even in difficult times, so that religion is taught in our schools. This is not the case in every country.

There is a minority of Catholic/Christian teachers who do try to be faithful to Christ and the Gospel. However it has become increasingly difficult for them. Many are hiding their light under a bushel and are frightened of being regular Christians in a pagan environment. Some teachers have even been threatened with termination of employment if they continue teaching Christian philosophy in the educational system.

The basis for the evolutionists' philosophy is the non existence of God. If evolution is attacked and disproved, the only other alternative is Creation and they certainly do not want to have to admit that. That is why they will stick to their philosophy even if the evidence dictates the contrary. They *will not* believe. There is wilfulness on their part not to believe what is written in the Bible. It is not because the evidence is not there. They simply refuse to allow the evidence to speak for itself and would rather try to pick holes in it, never coming up with a single piece of evidence of their own to prove their theory.

Rebuilding the Foundations

The book of the Bible which is most mocked, scoffed at, allegorised and mythologised is the book of Genesis. The foundational knowledge upon which our moral framework is built has suffered greatly in the last number of years. Nations seem to have abandoned the basis of the law of God and indeed the Spirit of God Himself. **If you destroy the foundations of anything, the whole structure will collapse. In the same manner, if one wants to destroy Christianity, then destroy the foundations set in the book of Genesis.** Is it any wonder Satan attacks Genesis more than any other book? The biblical doctrine of Origins as contained in Genesis is foundational or fundamental to all other doctrines of Scripture. Refute the

biblical doctrine of Origins and the rest of the Scriptures are compromised. As the ministry of Ken Ham in *Answers in Genesis* keeps on telling us, “every single biblical doctrine, directly or indirectly, ultimately has its basis in the book of Genesis”. If we want to understand the meaning of anything, we must understand its origins, its foundation.

Genesis is the only book that gives us an account of the origin of the basic entities of the universe: the origin of life, of man, of government, of marriage, of culture, of nations, of the chosen people, of diet, of clothes, of the solar system, of deaththe list goes on and on. The meaning of all these things is dependent on their origin. In the same manner, the meaning of the Christian Gospel depends on the origin of the issue of sin and why Jesus died (redemption).

For instance the reason why Christians ought not to live with someone without bothering to marry or believing marriage is one man for one woman for life is based upon the book of Genesis. The book of Genesis gives us our basis for making decisions in our lives. On what basis or foundation do we decide that a particular action is right or wrong? Many people have the opinion that a homosexual lifestyle is wrong. However that is just an opinion which is just as valid as another opinion. The point is that morality is not a matter of one’s opinion. It is a matter of what does the Creator give us as a basis for the rules governing this area of life? Surely God is the highest authority in all of these issues? Christians have standards of right and wrong because they accept that there is an ultimate Creator who has direct ownership over His creation. He has absolute authority and because human beings are created beings they are under total obligation to the One who has absolute authority over them. He has authority to set the rules. It is in our best interest to obey because He is the ultimate authority. Right and wrong is not a matter of one’s own opinion but rather must be in agreement with the principles found in Scripture. Our Creator has given us all the instructions we need in order to live an abundant life. The Scriptures are like a manual for correct maintenance of a car and His rules are there for our benefit not because He is a spoilsport or is spiteful but because He loves us and knows what is best for us.

Some parents complain that their children have gone away from the Christian value system disobeying their parents’ rules. One major reason for this is that many Christian parents have not instructed their children from the basic fundamental/foundational perspectives regarding what should and should not be done. If children see rules as no more than parents’ opinions, then why should they obey them? It makes a

difference if children are taught from an early age that God is Creator and that He has decided what is right and wrong. The rules come from God and that is why they must be obeyed. Many parents have trained their children without the foundation of God in Christ as Creator who made the rules. If parents could see that it is not a matter of opinion but it is rather a matter of applying the teaching of God's rules to particular situations. It is not the church's or my opinion but God's. It is impossible to build a structure without a foundation, but that is what many parents are doing in the training of their children. They do not realize that they are not laying the proper foundation at home by putting emphasis on God as Creator. When many children go to school they are given another foundation: God is not Creator and we are simply products of chance. That is why so many children rebel- there is no foundation. Sadly many parents have not built upon the foundational understanding that Jesus Christ is the Creator.

Students are given an anti-biblical foundation: the foundation of evolution. This foundation will not allow the Christian structure of Creation to stand. Instead the structure that is being built in many schools is one built on a foreign foundation-humanism. This problem of a structure without a proper Christian foundation is reflected in how one looks at moral behaviour. Many Christians may be against abortion, sexual deviancy, and other moral problems in society, yet they cannot give proper justification as to why they oppose these. They do not understand why the Christian has to be opposed to them. The Christian position has been undermined because it is just an "opinion" and why should the Christian opinion be any more valid than anyone else's.

For example, in order to understand why living as a homosexual is wrong, one has to understand that the foundation for marriage comes from the book of Genesis. It is here that God set up the institution of marriage and declared it to be one man for one woman for life. So it is Adam and Eve not Adam and Steve! There are specific roles which God decreed for man and woman and that is why there are reasons for standing against legislation that destroys the family. The homosexual lifestyle is against God's commandment or decree and that is why it is wrong. It is not a matter of opinion. God's authority is supreme and it is His opinion which counts no matter how difficult this situation seems. (Note Lev. 18:22; Rom. 1:24; Gen 2:23-24)

Let us return to the fundamentals by emphasizing that the Scripture *is* the Word of God and that God has absolute authority over our lives. Let us listen to what He says in relation to the laws or principles we must

live by in every area of our lives no matter what anyone thinks of us. The issues of abortion, sex before marriage, discipline in schools etc. must be looked at in the light of God's opinion not ours. The basis for our thinking should be from the principles found in His Word. To understand this, we must also appreciate that Genesis is fundamental to the entire Christian philosophy, which has been overrun by evolutionist thinking.

If the Church is not to be accused of being deaf to people's longings, her members need to do two things: to root themselves ever more firmly in the fundamentals of their faith, and to understand the often-silent cry in people's hearts, which leads them elsewhere if they are not satisfied by the Church. There is also a call in all of this to come closer to Jesus Christ and to be ready to follow Him, since He is the real way to happiness, the truth about God and the fulness of life for every man and woman who is prepared to respond to his love.⁴²⁵

One huge problem in the Catholic Church today is that many people do not trust Genesis and the rest of the Bible. The Bible may be interesting but "it certainly *is not* true". This is what destroys the Church and society and we must wake up. By getting back to the truth of Scripture and by attacking the evolution philosophy we can again build the foundation. Evolution is a defunct belief system, which has adversely affected Catholicism, but the key to eradicate this is a return to the fundamental Doctrine of Special Creation found in the Scriptures.

⁴²⁵ Pontifical Council for Culture and Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, *Jesus Christ the Bearer of the Water of Life, a Christian reflection on the New Age*, 2003, 1. 5

Bibliography

- Aardsma, Gerald E., *Radiocarbon and the Genesis Flood*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1991
- Ackerman, Paul D., *In God's Image After All: How Psychology Supports Biblical Creationism*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1990
- Ackerman, Paul D., *It's a Young World after All*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1986
- Ager, Derek V., *The Nature of the Stratigraphical Record*, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1973
- Allen, Keith, & Briggs, Derek, *Evolution and the Fossil Record*, Washington, Smithsonian, 1989
- Allford, Dorothy, *Instant Creation – Not Evolution*, New York, Stein and Day, 1978
- Anderson, J. & Harold G. Coffin, *Fossils in Focus*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1977
- Anderson, Bernhard W. *Understanding the Old Testament*, NJ, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1966
- Andrews, E H; Werner, Gitt; Ouweneel, W J and European Creationist Congress, *Concepts in Creationism*, Hertfordshire, Evangelical, 1986
- Andrews, E H., *Christ and the Cosmos*, Hertfordshire, England, Evangelical Press, 1986
- Andrews, E H. *God, Science & Evolution*, Australia, Anzea Books, 1980
- Andrews, E H., *From Nothing to Nature: A Basic Guide to Evolution and Creation*, Hertfordshire, England, Evangelical Press, 1978
- Andrews, E H., *Is Evolution Scientific?* Hertfordshire, Evangelical Press, 1977

Ankerberg, John, and Weldon, John, *Darwin's Leap of Faith: Exposing the False Religion of Evolution*
Eugene, OR, Harvest House, 1998

Ankerberg, John and Weldon, John, *The Facts on Creation vs. Evolution*, Eugene, OR, Harvest House,
1993

Archer, Gleason , *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1982

Archer, Gleason *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, rev. ed., Chicago, Moody Press, 1974 (first
edition 1964)

Asimov, Isaac, and Montagu, Ashley, *Science and Creationism*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984

Asimov, Isaac, *Biographical Encyclopaedia of Science and Technology*, London, Pan, 1975, p 371

Austin, Steven A., *Grand Canyon – Monument to Catastrophe*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation
Research, 1994

Austin, Steven A., *Catastrophes in Earth History*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1984

Aviezer, Nathan, *In the Beginning: Biblical Creation and Science*, Hoboken, NJ, KTAV, 1990

Aw, S E., *Chemical Evolution: An Examination of Current Ideas*, San Diego, CA, Creation-Life, 1982

Awbrey, Frank, and Thwaites, William M, *Evolutionists Confront Creationists*, San Francisco, CA,
American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1984

Bailey, Lloyd R., *Genesis, Creation, and Creationism*, New York, Paulist Press, 1993

Baker, Mace, *Dinosaurs*, Redding, CA, New Century Books, 1991

Baker, Sylvia, *Bone of Contention: Is Evolution True?* Hertfordshire, Evangelical Press, 1976

Barbour, Ian, *Religion in an Age of Science*. San Francisco, HarperSanFrancisco, 1990

Barbour, Ian, *Science and Religion: New Perspectives on the Dialogue*. London, SCM Press, 1968.

- Barbour, Ian, *Issues in Science and Religion*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1966
- Barlow, Connie C. *Evolution Extended: Biological Debates on the Meaning of Life*, Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press, 1994
- Barnes, Thomas G., *Science and Biblical Faith: A Science Documentary*, El Paso, Author, 1993
- Barnes, Thomas G., *Origin and Destiny of the Earth's Magnetic Field*, El Cajon, CA, Institute of Creation Research, 1983
- Bartz, Paul A, ed., *Influencing Our Children: Darwin's Impact on Education*, Minneapolis, Bible-Science Association, 1992
- Bartz, Paul A., *Letting God Create Your Day, Volumes I-IV*, Minneapolis, Bible-Science Association, 1990-93
- Barzun, J. *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, rev. 2nd edn, Columbia University Press, 1958
- Baugh, Carl E., *Panorama of Creation*, Oklahoma, Hearthstone Publishing, 1989, NPR
- Bauman, Michael, ed., *The Christian Vision: Man and Creation: Perspectives on Science and Theology*, Hillsdale, MI, Hillsdale College Press, 1994
- Bauman, Michael. *Man and Creation: Perspectives on Science and Theology*, Hillsdale, Hillsdale College Press, 1993
- Beale, Graham. *Evolution and a Creator?* Bristol, Clinical Press, 1991
- Beechick, Ruth, *Adam and His Kin: The Lost History of Their Lives and Times*, CA, Arrow Press, 1990)
- Behe, Michael J., *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, New York, Free Press, 1996

- Bennetta, William J. *Crusade of the Credulous: a Collection of Articles About Contemporary Creationism and the Effects of That Movement on Public Education*, San Francisco, California Academy of Sciences Press, 1986
- Berghoef, Gerard and DeKoster, Lester, *The Great Divide: Christianity or Evolution*, Grand Rapids, The Christian's Library Press, 1988
- Bergman, Jerry and Howe, George, *Vestigial Organs Are Fully Functional*, MO, Creation Research Society Books, 1990
- Bergman, J, "Darwin's apemen and the exploitation of deformed humans", *TJ* 16(3), 2002
- Bergman, Jerry, "Some Biological Problems with the Natural Selection Theory", *The Creation Research Society Quarterly*, vol. 29, no. 3, December 1992
- Bergman, Jerry, *The Criterion*, Richfield, MN, Onesimus Publishing, 1984
- Berra, Tim. *Evolution and the Myth of Creationism: a Basic Guide to the Facts in the Evolution Debate*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1990
- Berry, R J., *God & the Biologist*. Leicester, Apollos, 1996
- Berry, R J., *God and Evolution*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1988
- Berry, R J., *Adam and the Ape: A Christian Approach to the Theory of Evolution*, London, Falcon, 1975
- Berry, W B N., *Growth of a Prehistoric Time Scale: Based on Organic Evolution*, Freeman, San Francisco, 1968
- Bessinger, Donivan, *Religion Confronting Science: And There Was Light*,(Greenville, SC, Orchard Park Press, 1991
- Biblical Creation Society, *The Creation Manifesto*, Rugby, England, British Creation Society, 1996

- Bigs et al., *Biology: The Dynamics of Life*, Merrill Publishing, Columbus, Ohio, 1991
- Binns, Emily. *The World as Creation: Creation in Christ in an Evolutionary World View*, Wilmington, Del, Michael Glazier, 1990
- Bird, Wendell R. *The Origin of Species Revisited: the Theories of Evolution and of Abrupt Appearance*. Nashville, Tenn, Regency, 1991
- Bird, Wendell, *The Origin of Species Revisited: The Theories of Evolution and Abrupt Appearance*, 2 vols., Nashville, Thomas Nelson, 1991 (originally published by Philosophical Library in 1988)
- Birx, H. James. *Interpreting Evolution: Darwin & Teilhard De Chardin*, Buffalo, N.Y, Prometheus Books, 1991
- Bishop, B.E. "Mendel's Opposition to Evolution and to Darwin," *Journal of Heredity*, 87, 1996
- Blackmore, Vernon and Page, Andrew, *Evolution: The Great Debate*, Batavia, IL, Lion Pub., 1989
- Bliss, Richard, *Origins: Creation or Evolution*, Green Forest, AR, Master Books, 1988
- Blocher, Henri, *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*, trans. by David G. Preston, Leicester, InterVarsity Press, 1984
- Blocher, Henri. *In the Beginning: The Opening Chapters of Genesis*, Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1984
- Bowden, Malcolm, *The Rise of the Evolution Fraud*, San Diego, Creation-Life Publishers, 1982
- Bowden, Malcolm, *Ape-Men: Fact or Fallacy*, Bromley, Kent, England, Sovereign Publications, 1977
- Bowler, Peter J. *Evolution: The History of an Idea*, Berkeley, University of California, 1984
- Bowler, Peter J. *The Eclipse of Darwinism: Anti-Darwinian Evolution Theories in the Decades Around 1900*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1983
- Boys, Donald, *Evolution: Fact, Fraud, or Faith?* Largo, FL, Freedom Publications, 1994

Bradshaw, A. D. "Evolutionary Significance of Phenotypic Plasticity in Plants," *Advances in Genetics*, vol. 13, 1965

Brand, Leonard, *Faith, Reason and Earth History*, Berrien Springs, MI, St Andrews Press, 1997

Brooke, John Hedley and Cantor, G N. *Reconstructing Nature: the Engagement of Science and Religion*. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1998

Brooke, John Hedley. *Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991

Brooks, Jim, *Origins of Life*, Belleville, MI, Lion Publishing, 1985

Broom, Neil. *How Blind Is the Watchmaker?: Theism or Atheism : Should Science Decide?* Avebury Series in Philosophy. Hants, England. Brookfield, Vt: Ashgate Pub, 1998

Brown, Arthur I, and Numbers, Ronald L. *The Antievolution Works of Arthur I. Brown*, Creationism in Twentieth-Century America, v. 3. New York: Garland Pub, 1995

Browne, Harold, *The Bible Commentary*, ed. F C. Cook, Grand Rapids, Baker, reprint 1981

Brown, Raymond; Murphy, Roland and Fitzmeyer, Joseph. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, NY, Paramount, 1989

Brown, Raymond. *The Virginal Conception and the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, London, Chapman, 1973

Brown, W T Jr., *In the Beginning*, 5th ed., Phoenix, AZ, Center for Scientific Creation, 1989

Brown, Walt, *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, 6th ed., Phoenix, AZ, Center for Scientific Creation, 1995

Bube, Richard H. *The Human Quest: A New Look at Science and the Christian Faith*. Waco, Word Books, 1971.

Buell, Jon and Hearn, Virginia eds., *Darwinism: Science or Philosophy?* Richardson, TX, Foundation for Thought and Ethics, 1994

Burke, Derek, and Andrews. E H., *Creation and Evolution: When Christians Disagree*, Leicester, Inter-Varsity Press, 1985

Cafferky, John. *Evolution's Hand: Searching for the Creator in Contemporary Science*, Toronto, East End Books, 1997

Cairns-Smith, A. G. *Seven Clues to the Origin of Life: a Scientific Detective Story*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985

Callender, L A. "Gregor Mendel: An Opponent of Descent with Modification," *History of Science*, 26, 1988

Cameron, Nigel M de S.. *Evolution and the Authority of the Bible*. Exeter, Paternoster Press, 1983a

Cameron, Nigel M de S., *Evolution and the Authority of the Bible*, Exeter, Paternoster, 1983b

Camp, Ashby L., *The Myth of Natural Origins: How Science Points to Divine Creation*, Tempe, AZ, Ktisis Publishing, 1994

Camp, Robert S., ed., *A Critical Look at Evolution*, Atlanta, Religion, Science, and Communication Research and Development Corporation, 1972

Camping, Harold, *Adam When?* Alameda, CA, Frontiers for Christ, 1974

Carroll, Robert L. *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Evolution*, Cambridge University Press, 1997

Catechism of the Catholic Church (also referred to as CCC), Dublin, Veritas, 1995; also online at http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/ccc_toc.htm. Accessed August 2005

Chestnut, D. Lee, *The Monkey's on the Run*, Phoenix, Author, 1969)

- Chittick, Donald E., *The Controversy: Roots of the Creation-Evolution Conflict*, Portland, Multnomah Press, 1984
- Chui, Christopher, *Did God Use Evolution to “Create”? A Critique of Biological Evolution, Geological Evolution, & Astronomical Evolution*, Canoga Park, CA, Logos Publishers, 1993
- Clark, Harold W., *New Creationism*, Nashville, Southern Publ. Assoc., 1980
- Clark, Harold W., *The Battle Over Genesis*, Washington, DC, Review and Herald, 1977
- Clark, Harold W., *Fossils, Flood, and Fire*, Escondido, CA, Outdoor Pictures, 1968
- Clark, Robert E D., *Darwin: Before and After*, Chicago, Moody Press, 1967
- Coder, S. Maxwell and Howe, George F., *The Bible, Science, and Creation*, Chicago, Moody Press, 1965
- Coffin, Harold G. and Brown, Robert H., *Origin by Design*, Washington, DC, Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1983
- Coffin, Harold G., *Earth Story*, Washington, Review & Herald Publishing, 1977
- Coffin, Harold G., *Creation: Accident or Design?* Washington, DC, Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1969
- Coghlan, Andy, “Suicide Squad”, *New Scientist*, 10 July 1999
- Cohen, I L., *Darwin Was Wrong – A Study in Probabilities*, Greenvale, NY, New Research Publications, 1984
- Conkin, Paul Keith, *When All the Gods Trembled: Darwinism, Scopes, and American Intellectuals*. Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998
- Cooper, Bill, *After the Flood*, Chichester, England: New Wine Press, 1995

Coppedge, James, *Evolution: Possible or Impossible*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1973, 1976

Corey, Michael Anthony. *The Natural History of Creation: Biblical Evolutionism and the Return of Natural Theology*, Lanham, MD, University Press of America, 1995

Corliss, William R., *Stars, Galaxies, Cosmos: A Catalog of Astronomical Anomalies*, Glen Arm, MD, Sourcebook Project, 1987

Corliss, William R., *Incredible Life: A Handbook of Biological Mysteries*, Glen Arm, MD, Sourcebook Project, 1981

Corliss, William R., *Unknown Earth: A Handbook of Geological Enigmas*, Glen Arm, MD, Sourcebook Project, 1980

Note: A number of other titles from Corliss on related topics are also available.

Corliss, William R., *Ancient Man: A Handbook of Puzzling Artifacts*, Glen Arm, MD, Sourcebook Project, 1978

Cottrell, Jack, *What the Bible Says About God the Creator*, Joplin, MO, College Press, 1983

Coyne, Jerry, "Not Black and White", *Nature*, 396, 1988

Craig, William and Smith, Quentin, *Theism, Atheism, and Big Bang Cosmology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995

Creation Science Fellowship, *International Conference on Creationism: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Creationism: Held August 4-9, 1986, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*. Pittsburgh, PA, Creation Science Fellowship, 1986-1987

Cremo, Michael A. and Thompson, Richard L., *Forbidden Archeology*, San Diego, CA, Govardhan Hill Publishing, 1993

Crick, Francis. *Life Itself: Its Origin and Nature*, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1981

Crick, Francis, *The Astonishing Hypothesis – the Scientific Search for the Soul*, London, Touchstone Books
1995

Criswell, W A., *Did Man Just Happen?* Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1972

Croft, L R., *How Life Began*, Hertfordshire, England, Evangelical Press, 1988

Culp, G. Richard, *Remember Thy Creator*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1975

Cupitt, Don. *The Worlds of Science and Religion*, London, Sheldon Press, 1976

Curtis, William M., *Specific Revelation: The Gospel Prior to Moses*, Columbus, GA, Brentwood Christian
Press, 1993

Custance, Arthur C. *Evolution or Creation?* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976

Custance, Arthur C., *Two Men Called Adam: A Fresh Look at the Creation-Evolution Controversy*,
Shrewsbury, MA, Doorway Publications, 1983

Custance, Arthur C. *Genesis and Early Man*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1975a

Custance, Arthur C. *Noah's Three Sons*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1975b

Custer, Stewart, *The Stars Speak: Astronomy and the Bible*, Greenville, SC, Bob Jones University Press,
1977

Daae, H. Donald. *Bridging the Gap: The First 6 Days*, Calgary, Genesis International, 1989

Daly, Reginald, *Earth's Most Challenging Mysteries*, Nutley, NJ, Craig Press, 1972

Darwin, Charles, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, The Modern Library, New York,
1998

- Darwin, Charles, *The Origin of Species: A Facsimile of the First Edition*, Harvard University Press, 1964
- Darwin, Charles, *The Origin of Species*, Introduction by W.R.Thompson,J.M.Dent and Sons,1956(reissue of 1928 edition)
- Darwin, Charles, *The Origin of Species, by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, Harvard Classics Edition, 1909. Online at www.talkorigins.org/faqs/origin.html, accessed August 2005
- Darwin, Charles, *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. New ed., revised and augmented ed., New York, Appleton, 1889
- Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection: or, The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*. 6th ed., Chicago, Rand McNally, 1872
- Darwin, Francis ed., *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. 11, London: John Murray, 1959.
- Darwin,(Major) Leonard, *What is Eugenics?*, Watts & Co., 1928
- Davidheiser, Bolton, *Evolution and the Christian Faith*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1969a
- Davidheiser. Bolton ,*Evolution and Christian Faith: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing*, 1969b
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence of Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design*, New York, Norton, 1996
- Davis, John, *Paradise to Prison – Studies in Genesis*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1975
- Davis, Percival and Kenyon, Dean H., *Of Pandas and People* 2nd ed., Dallas, Houghton Publishing Co., 1993
- Dawson, J. William. *Modern Ideas of Evolution*, New York, Prodist, 1977
- Day, David *Vanished Species*, Gallery Books, New York, 1989
- DeHaan, M R. *Genesis and Evolution*. Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1962

- Dembski, William A., and Kushiner, James M. eds. *Signs of Intelligence: Understanding Intelligent Design*, Grand Rapids, Mich, Brazos Press, 2001
- Dembski, William A. *Intelligent Design: The Bridge between Science and Theology*. Downers Grove, InterVarsity Press, 1999
- Dembski, William A. *The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance through Small Probabilities*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998a
- Dembski, William A ed., *Mere Creation: Science, Faith and Intelligent Design*, Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1998b
- Dembski, William A., *The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance Through Small Probabilities (Cambridge Studies in Probability, Induction and Decision Theory)*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998c
- Demick, David A., “The Blind Gunman”, *Impact*, no. 308, February 1999
- Dennett, Daniel Clement. *Darwin’s Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meanings of Life*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1995
- Denton, Michael J., *Nature’s Destiny: How the Laws of Biology Reveal Purpose in the Universe*, New York, Free Press, 1998
- Denton, Michael J., *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Bethesda, MD, Adler & Adler, 1986 (reprinted 1988)
- Denton, Michael J. *Evolution: a Theory in Crisis*, London, Burnett, 1985
- Denzinger, Heinrich, *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari, 30th ed. London: Herder, 1957
- DeYoung, Donald B., *Astronomy and Creation*, Ashland, OH, Creation Research Society Books, 1995
- DeYoung, Donald B., *Astronomy and the Bible*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1989

Dillenberger, John. *Protestant Thought and Natural Science*. Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame, 1960

Dillow, Joseph C., *The Waters Above*, Chicago, Moody Press, 1982

Dodson, Edward O. and Howe. George F., *Creation or Evolution: Correspondence on the Current Controversy*, Ottawa, University of Ottawa Press, 1990

Dodson, Edward O. and Howe, George F., *Creation or Evolution: Correspondence on the Current Controversy*, Concord, MA, Paul & Company Publishers Consortium, 1990

Dolphin, Warren D, and Wilson, David B., *Did the Devil Make Darwin Do It: Modern Perspectives on the Creation-Evolution Controversy*, 1st ed, Ames, Iowa State University Press, 1983

Drees, Willem B. *Religion, Science and Naturalism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996

Duce, Philip. *Reading the Mind of God: Interpretation in Science and Theology*, Leicester, England, Apollos, 1998

Dunbar, Carl, O., *Historical Geology*, 2nd edition, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1960

Duncan, Homer, *Evolution: The Incredible Hoax*, (Lubbock, TX, Missionary Crusader, 1977

Durant, John. *Darwinism and Divinity: Essays on Evolution and Religious Belief*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1985

Durant, Dr John, "How Evolution Became a Scientific Myth", *New Scientist*, 11 Sept. 1980

Dwight, Thomas, *Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist*, New York, Longmans, Green & Co, 1911

Eads, Buryl R., *Let the Evidence Speak*, Atlanta, Peachtree Press, 1982

Eckelman, Herman J, and Newman. Robert C., *Genesis One and the Origin of the Earth*. Downers Grove, InterVarsity Press, 1977

Ecker, Ronald L. *Dictionary of Science & Creationism*. Buffalo, N.Y, Prometheus Books, 1990

Edwards, Denis, *The God of Evolution: a Trinitarian Theology*, New York, Paulist Press, 1999

Ehrlich P., and Birch, L C., "Evolutionary History and Population Biology," *Nature* 114, 12 April 1967

Eiseley, Loren C., *The Immense Journey*, Vintage Books, 1958

Eldredge N and Tattersall I, *The Myths of Human Evolution*, Columbia University Press, 1982

Eldredge, Niles. *The Triumph of Evolution: and the Failure of Creationism*, New York, W H. Freeman, 2000

Eldredge, Niles. *Reinventing Darwin: the Great Debate at the High Table of Evolutionary Theory*, New York, Wiley, 1995

Eldredge, Niles, *Time Frames: The Rethinking of Darwinian Evolution*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1985, p 52

Eldredge, Niles. *The Monkey Business: A Scientist Looks at Creationism*, New York, Washington Square Press, 1982

Ellegard, Alvar. *Darwin and the General Reader: The Reception of Darwin's Theory of Evolution in the British Periodical Press, 1859-1872*, Chicago, University of Chicago, 1990.

Engel, Larry and Lucas, Thomas, *Darwin and the Dinosaurs*, cassette (58:00 min.) video recording, Northbrook, IL, Coronet Film & Video, 1989?

England, Donald, *A Scientist Examines Faith and Evidence*, Delight, A R Gospel Light, 1983

England, Donald, *A Christian View of Origins*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1972

Enoch, H. *Evolution or Creation*, London, Evangelical Press, 1966

Eve, Raymond A and Francis B Harrold, *The Creationist Movement in Modern America. Social Movements Past and Present*, Boston, Twayne Publishers, 1991

Ferguson, Kitty, *The Fire in the Equations: Science, Religion, and the Search for God*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1995

Fergusson, David. *The Cosmos and the Creator: an Introduction to the Theology of Creation.*, Cunningham Lectures, London, SPCK, 1998

Ferrell, Vance, *Evolution Disproved Series*, Altamont, TN, Harvestime Books, 1996. Twenty-five book(let) series consisting of:

- 1 – *The Origin of Matter*
- 2 – *The Origin of the Stars*
- 3 – *The Origin of the Solar System*
- 4 – *The Origin of the Earth*
- 5 – *The Age of the Earth*
- 6 – *Dating of Time in Evolution*
- 7 – *The Primitive Environment*
- 8 – *DNA, Protein, and Cells*
- 9 – *Natural Selection*
- 10 – *Mutations*
- 11 – *Fossils and Strata—Volume 1*
- 12 – *Fossils and Strata—Volume 2*
- 13 – *Ancient Man*
- 14 – *Effects of the Flood*
- 15 – *Similarities*
- 16 – *The Laws of Nature vs. Evolution*
- 17 – *The History of Evolutionary Theory*
- 18 – *Scientists Speak about Evolution*
- 19 – *Evolution and Society*
- 20 – *The Truth about Archaeological Dating*
- 21 – *Wonders of Nature—Volume 1*

22 – *Wonders of Nature—Volume 2*

23 – *Evolution Handbook*

24 – *Evolution is a Myth*

25 – *EDS: Resources and Indexes*

Ferrell, Vance, *Evolution Disproved Series*, Altamont, TN, Harvestime Books, 1992. Trilogy consisting of *Origin of the Universe*, *Origin of Life*, and *Other Evidence Against Evolution*

Field, A N., *The Evolution Hoax Exposed*, Rockford, IL, TAN Books & Publishers, 1992; originally published in 1982

Fields, Weston W., *Unformed and Unfilled*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1976

Fix, William R., *The Bone Peddlers*, New York, Macmillan Publishing, 1984

Ford, Adam. *Universe: God, Science and the Human Person*. Mystic, Conn., Twenty-Third Publications, 1987

Forsyth, Peter Taylor. *Christian Aspects of Evolution*, London, Epworth Press, 1950

Fothergill, Philip Gilbert. *Evolution and Christians*, London, Longmans, 1961

Fox, Sidney and Dose, Klaus, *Molecular Evolution and The Origin of Life.*, San Francisco, W.H. Freeman and Company, 1972

Frair, Wayne, and Davis Percival, *A Case for Creation*. 3rd rev. ed., Lewisville, TX, Accelerated Christian Education, 1994

Frair, Wayne and Davis, Percevil, *A Case for Creation* , 3rd. rev. ed., Chicago, Moody Press, 1983

Froede, Carl R., *Field Studies in Catastrophic Geology*, St. Joseph, MO, Creation Research Society Books, 1998

- Fry, C. George, and Fry, Jon Paul, *Congregationalists and Evolution: Asa Gray and Louis Agassiz*. Lanham, MD, University Press of America, 1989a
- Fry, C. George, and Fry, Jon Paul, *Pioneering a Theology of Evolution: Washington Gladden and Pierre Teilhard De Chardin*, Lanham, MD, University Press of America, 1989b
- Frye, Roland Mushat, *Is God a Creationist?: the Religious Case Against Creation-Science*, New York, Scribner's, 1983
- Futuyma, Douglas J., *Evolutionary Biology*, Sunderland, Sinauer, 1998
- Futuyma, Douglas J., *Science on Trial: The Case for Evolution.*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1982
- Gange, Robert, *Origins and Destiny*, Dallas, Word, 1986a
- Gange, Robert, *Origins and Destiny*, Waco, Word Books, 1986b
- Gastaldo, Robert A and Tanner, William Francis, *The Evolution-Creation Controversy: Perspectives on Religion, Philosophy, Science, and Education : a Handbook : Proceedings of a Symposium Convened by Robert A. Gastaldo and William F. Tanner* – Special Publication (Paleontological Society), no. 1., Washington, D.C, Paleontological Society, 1984
- Geisler, Norman and Anderson, J. Kerby, *Origin Science*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1987
- Geisler, Norman. *Knowing the Truth About Creation: How It Happened and What It Means for Us*, Ann Arbor, Servant Books, 1989
- Geisler, Norman L., *Cosmos: Carl Sagan's Religion for the Scientific Mind*, Sandy, OR, Acts 17, 1983
- Gentry, R V., *Creation's Tiny Mystery*, Knoxville, TN, Earth Science Associates, 1986
- Gilbert, Scott, Opitz, John and Rudolf Raff, "Resynthesizing Evolutionary and Developmental Biology", *Developmental Biology*, 173, Article no. 0032, 1996
- Gilfillan, Marjorie Mary, *The Bible May Agree With Evolution and Science May Agree With the Flood*, Long Beach, CA, Wenzel Press, 1995

- Gilkey, Langdon Brown, *Creationism on Trial: Evolution and God at Little Rock*, Minneapolis, Minn, Winston Press, 1985
- Gillispie, Charles Coulston, *Genesis and Geology: A Study in the Relations of Scientific Thought, Natural Theology, and Social Opinion in Great Britain, 1790-1850*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1996
- Gish, Duane T., *Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!* El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1995; an enlargement of Dr. Gish's *The Challenge of the Fossil Record*, and before it, *Evolution: The Fossils Say NO!*
- Gish, Duane T., *Creation Scientists Answer Their Critics*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1993
- Gish, Duane T., *Dinosaurs by Design* , El Cajon, Institute for Creation Research, 1992
- Gish, Duane T., *The Amazing Story of Creation*, El Cajon, Institute for Creation Research, 1990
- Gish, Duane. *Evolution, the Fossils Say No!* San Diego, Creation-Life Publishers, 1978a
- Gish, Duane, *Up With Creation! ICR Acts/Facts/Impacts, 1976-1977*, San Diego, Creation-Life Publisher, 1978b
- Gitt, Werner, *In the Beginning was Information*, Bielefield, Germany, Christliche Literatur-Verbreitung, 1997
- Gitt, Werner, *Stars and Their Purpose: Signposts in Space*, Bielefield, Germany, Christliche Literatur-Verbreitung, 1996
- Godfrey, Laurie R. *Scientists Confront Creationism*, New York, W W. Norton, 1983
- Gould, Stephen J, and Hamrum, Charles L., *Nobel Conference: Darwin's Legacy*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1983

- Gould, Stephen J. and Niles Eldredge, "Punctuated Equilibria: The Tempo and Mode of Evolution Reconsidered", *Paleobiology*, 3 (2), 1977
- Gould, Stephen J., *Rocks of Ages: Science and Religion in the Fullness of Life*, New York, Ballantine, 1999
- Gould, Stephen J., *Dinosaur in a Haystack: Reflections in Natural History*, New York, Crown Trade Paperbacks, 1997
- Gould, Stephen J., *Full House: the Spread of Excellence From Plato to Darwin*, New York, Harmony Books, 1996a
- Gould, Stephen J., *Life's Grandeur: the Spread of Excellence From Plato to Darwin*, London, Jonathan Cape, 1996b
- Gould, Stephen J., "Impeaching a Self Appointed Judge," *Scientific American*, July 1992, p 194
- Gould, Stephen J., *Bully for Brontosaurus: Reflections in Natural History*, New York, Norton, 1991
- Gould, Stephen J., *The Individual in Darwin's World*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1990
- Gould, Stephen J., *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle: Myth and Metaphor in the Discovery of Geological Time*, Jerusalem-Harvard Lectures, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press, 1987
- Gould, Stephen J., *Hen's Teeth and Horse's Toes*, Norton Paperback, New York, Norton, 1984
- Gould, Stephen J., "Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?" *Paleobiology* January 1980a
- Gould, Stephen J., *The Panda's Thumb: More Reflections in Natural History*, New York, Norton, 1980b
- Gould, Stephen J., "Evolution's Erratic Pace", *Natural History*, Vol. 86, No. 5, May 1977a
- Gould, Stephen J., "The Return of Hopeful Monster", *Natural History*, vol. 86, June-July 1977b, p 28
- Gould, Stephen J., *Ever Since Darwin: Reflections on Natural History*, New York, Norton, 1977c
- Gould, Stephen J., *Ontogeny and Phylogeny*, Cambridge, Mass, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977d
- Gould, Stephen J., "Catastrophes and Steady State Earth", *Natural History*, LXXX, no.2, 1975

- Grasse, Pierre P., *The Evolution of Living Organisms*, New York, Academic Press, 1977, originally published in French in 1973
- Greene, R M Jr., *Science and the Bible*, Riverside, CA, R M. Greene, 1990
- Green, William Henry, *The Unity of the Book of Genesis*, Grand Rapids, Baker, reprint, 1979
- Haigh, Paula, *What's Wrong With Evolution?* Louisville, KY, Catholic Center for Creation Research, 1975)
- Hall, Marshall and Hall, Sandra, *The Truth: God or Evolution*, Nutley, NJ, Craig Press, 1974
- Ham, Ken and Taylor, Paul S., *The Genesis Solution*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1988
- Ham, Ken, Snelling, Andrew and Wieland, Carl, *The Answers Book*, Green Forest, AR, Master Books, 1991
- Ham, Ken, *Genesis and the Decay of Nations*, Brisbane, Australia, Creation Science Foundation, 1991
- Ham, Ken, *The Lie: Evolution*, Green Forest, AR, Master Books, 1987
- Hanegraaff, Hank. *The Face That Demonstrates the Farce of Evolution*, Nashville, Word, 1998
- Harrison, R K., *Introduction To The Old Testament*, Grand Rapids, MI, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969
- Haught, John F., *God After Darwin: a Theology of Evolution*. Boulder: Westview Press, 2000
- Hawking, Stephen, *A Brief History of Time*, New York, Bantam, 1988
- Hayward, Alan, *Creation and Evolution: the Facts and the Fallacies*, London, Triangle, 1985
- Hegel, G W F. "The Positivity of the Christian Religion", *On Christianity*, trans. T M. Knox, New York, Harper Torchbooks, Cloister Library, 1961
- Hedtke, Randall, *The Secret of the Sixth Edition*, New York, Vantage Press, 1983

- Heinze, Thomas F., *Creation vs. Evolution*, 2nd rev. ed., Grand Rapids, Baker, 1973
- Helfinstine, Robert F. and Roth, Jerry D., *Texas Tracks and Artifacts: Do Texas Fossils Indicate Coexistence of Men and Dinosaurs?* MN, Authors, 1994
- Henderson, Charles P. *God and Science: The Death and Rebirth of Theism*, Atlanta, John Knox Press, 1986
- Henry, Carl F H. *God, Revelation, and Authority*, Waco, TX, Word, 1983
- Henry, Carl F H. *Horizons of Science: Christian Scholars Speak Out*, New York, Harper & Row, 1978
- Henry, Granville C. *Christianity and the Images of Science*, Macon, Smyth & Helwys, 1998
- Herbert, David, *The Key to Understanding Origins: The Underlying Assumptions*, London, Ontario, Hersil Publishing, 1993
- Herbert, David. *Charles Darwin's Religious Views: From Creationist to Evolutionist*, London, Ontario, Hersil Publishing, 1990
- Hill, Andrew and Walton John H. *A Survey of The Old Testament*, Grand Rapids, MI, Zondervan Publishing House, 1991
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*, Chicago, I.R. Dee, 1996
- Hitching, Francis. *The Neck of the Giraffe: Darwin, Evolution, and the New Biology*, New York, New American Library, 1987
- Hitching, Francis. *The Neck of the Giraffe: Where Darwin Went Wrong*, Tichnor and Fields, New Haven, 1982a
- Hitching, Francis, *The Neck of the Giraffe: Darwin, Evolution, and the New Biology*, New York, Mentor, 1982b
- Ho, M W. and Saunders, P T eds., *Beyond Neo-Darwinism*, New York, Academic Press, 1984

- Hodge, Charles. *What Is Darwinism? and Other Writings on Science and Religion*, Grand Rapids, Baker Books, 1994
- Holloway, Edward, *Catholicism: A New Synthesis*, Nottingham, Kyrios Books, 1969
- Holloway, Agnes, *God's Master Key: The Law of Control and Direction*, Wallington, NJ, Faith Keyway, 1988
- Hooper, E. Ralph, *Does Science Support Evolution?* Toronto, Defender Publishers, 1931
- Houston, James, *I Believe in the Creator*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1980
- Howe, George F ed, *Speak to the Earth: Creation Studies in Geoscience*, 2nd ed., St Joseph, MO, Creation Research Society Books, 1990
- Howe, George F. *Speak to the Earth: Creation Studies in Geoscience*, Nutley, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1975
- Hoyle, Sir Fred and Wickramasinghe, Chandra, *Our Place in the Cosmos: The Unfinished Revolution*, London, Dent, 1993
- Hoyle, Sir Fred and Wickramasinghe, Chandra, *Why Neo-Darwinism Does Not Work*, Cardiff University College Cardiff Press, 1982
- Hoyle, Sir Fred and Wickramasinghe, Chandra, *Evolution From Space*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1981
- Hoyle, Sir Fred, *The Intelligent Universe*, New York, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1984
- Hummel, Charles E. *Creation or Evolution? Resolving the Crucial Issues*, Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1989
- Hummel, Charles E. *The Galileo Connection*, Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1986

Humphreys, D. Russell, *Starlight and Time*, Green Forest, AR, Master Books, 1994

Humphries, Russell – *Evidence for a Young World* online at
<http://icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=type&ID=2>

Huse, Scott M. *The Collapse of Evolution*, 3rd. ed., Grand Rapids, Baker, 1997

Huxley, Thomas Henry and Barr, Alan P. *The Major Prose of Thomas Henry Huxley*, University of Georgia Humanities Center Series on Science and the Humanities, Athens, University of Georgia Press, 1997

Hyers, Conrad. *The Meaning of Creation: Genesis and Modern Science*, Atlanta, John Knox Press, 1984

Jackson, Wayne and Thompson, Bert, *In the Shadow of Darwin: A Review of the Teachings of John N. Clayton*, Montgomery, AL, Apologetics Press, 1992

Jackson, Wayne, *The Human Body: Accident or Design?* Stockton, CA, Courier, 1993

Jackson, Wayne, *Creation, Evolution, and the Age of the Earth*, Stockton, CA, Courier Publications, 1989

Jackson, Wayne, *The Mythology of Modern Geology*, Stockton, CA, Apologetics Press, 1980

Jacobus, Melancthon, , *Notes on Genesis*, Philadelphia, Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1864

Janssens, Laurentius. *Summa theologica ad modum commentarii in Aquinatis summam praesentis aevi studiis aptatam. Tomus VIII: Tractatus de homine seu de hominis natura, elevatione et lapsu*. Frieburg, Herder, 1919

Jeeves, Malcolm A, and Berry, R J. *Science, Life, and Christian Belief: a Survey and Assessment*, Grand Rapids, Baker Books, 1998

Jeeves, M A. *The Scientific Enterprise and Christian Faith*, London, Tyndale Press, 1969

Jeffreys, Harold, *The Earth: Its Origin, History, and Physical Constitution*, Cambridge University Press, England, 1970

John Paul II, *Salvifici Doloris*, 11 February 1984; Online at www.cin.org/suffer.html

Johnston, Howard Agnew, *Bible Criticism and the Average Man*, New York, Revell, 1902

Johnson, J W G., *Evolution?* Los Angeles, Perpetual Eucharistic Adoration, 1986

Johnson, Phillip E. *Objections Sustained: Subversive Essays on Evolution, Law, and Culture*. Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1998

Johnson, Phillip E. *Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds*, Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1997

Johnson, Phillip E. *Reason in the Balance: the Case against Naturalism in Science, Law & Education*, Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1995

Johnson, Phillip E. "Shouting 'Heresy' in the Temple of Darwin," *Christianity Today*, 1994

Johnson, Phillip E. *Darwin on Trial*, Washington, DC, Regnery, Gateway, 1991(2nd edition 1993)

Johnston, George Sim, *Did Darwin Get It Right? Catholics and the Theory of Evolution*, Our Sunday Visitor 1999

Kaiser, Christopher B. "Creational Theology and the History of Physical Science: the Creationist Tradition From Basil to Bohr", *Studies in the History of Christian Thought*, v. 78, New York, Brill, 1997

Kaiser, Christopher B. "Creation and the History of Science", *History of Christian Theology*, v. 3; London, Marshall Pickering; Grand Rapids, MI, W B. Eerdmans Pub, 1991

Kalthoff, Mark A. "Creation and Evolution in the Early American Scientific Affiliation", *Creationism in Twentieth-Century America*, v. 10, New York, Garland Pub, 1995

Kang, C H. and Nelson, Ethel R., *The Discovery of Genesis*, St. Louis, Concordia, 1979

Kautz, Darrel, *The Origin of Living Things*, Milwaukee, WI, Darrel Kautz, 1988

Keane, G J., *Creation Rediscovered*, Doncaster, Australia, Credis Pty Ltd., 1991

Keith, Bill, *Scopes II: the Great Debate: Creation Vs. Evolution*, Shreveport, LA, Huntington House, 1982

Kelly, Douglas F., *Creation and Change*, Fearn, England, Mentor, 1997

Kitchen, Kenneth, *Ancient Orient and Old Testament*, London, Tyndale, 1966

Klotz, John W. *Studies in Creation: A General Introduction to the Creation/Evolution Debate*, St Louis, MO, Concordia, 1985

Klotz, John W. *Studies in Creation* St Louis, MO, Concordia Publishing House, 1985

Klotz, John W. *Genes, Genesis, and Evolution*, St Louis, MO, Concordia, 1972

Klotz, John W. *Genes, Genesis and Evolution*, St Louis, MO, Concordia Publishing House, 1970

Kofahl, Robert E. and Segraves, Kelly L., *The Creation Explanation: A Scientific Alternative to Evolution*, Wheaton, IL, Harold Shaw, 1975

Kofahl, Robert E., *Handy Dandy Evolution Refuter*, rev. ed., San Diego, Beta Books, 1980

Korsmeyer, Jerry D., *Evolution and Eden: Balancing Original Sin and Contemporary Science*, New York, Paulist Press, 1998

Kramer, William. *Evolution & Creation: a Catholic Understanding*, Huntington, IN, Our Sunday Visitor, 1986

Kubicek, Frederick, *Evolution, Guilty as Charged*, Shippensburg, PA, Destiny Image Publishers, 1993

La Follette, Marcel Chotkowski, *Creationism, Science, and the Law: the Arkansas Case*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1984

Lammerts, Walter E. *Scientific Studies in Special Creation*, Nutley, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1971

Lammerts, Walter E. *Why Not Creation?* Nutley, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1970

Lammerts, Walter E, ed., *Why Not Creation?* Grand Rapids, Baker, 1970

Lamoureaux, Denis. *Darwinism Defeated? The Johnson-Lamoureaux Debate on Biological Origins*, Vancouver, Regent College, 1999

Lane, Henry Higgins. *Evolution and Christian Faith*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1923

LaViolette, Paul A. *Beyond the Big Bang: Ancient Myth and the Science of Continuous Creation*. Rochester, VT, Park Street Press, 1995

Lerner, Eric J., *The Big Bang Never Happened*, New York, Vintage Books, 1991

Lester, Lane P., and Raymond G. Bohlin, *The Natural Limits to Biological Change*, 2nd ed., Dallas, Probe Books, 1989

Levitt, Zola, *Creation: A Scientist's Choice*, Wheaton, Victor Books, 1976

Lewin, R., "Evolutionary Theory Under Fire", *Science*, vol. 210, 21 November 1980

Lewis, C S., *Christian Reflections*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1967

Lewontin, Richard, "Billions and Billions of Demons," *New York Review*, January 1997

Liebes, Sidney, *A Walk Through Time: From Stardust to Us: The Evolution of Life on Earth*, London, John Wiley, 1998

Lindberg, David C, and Numbers, Ronald L., *God & Nature: Historical Essays on the Encounter Between Christianity and Science*, Berkeley, University of California, 1986

Lindsay, Dennis G., *The Dismantling of Evolutionism's Sacred Cow: Radiometric Dating*, Dallas, Christ for the Nations, 1992

Lindsay, Dennis G., *Harmony of Science & Scripture*, Dallas, Christ for the Nations, 1991a

Lindsay, Dennis G., *The Origins Controversy: Creation or Chance*, Dallas, Christ for the Nations, 1991b

Lipson, H S., "A Physicist's View of Darwin's Theory", *Evolution Trends in Plants*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1988

Lisle Gibbs, H. and Grant, Peter R., "Oscillating Selection on Darwin's Finches," *Nature*, 327, 1987

Livingstone, David, N., Noll, Mark, A., and Hart, D G., *Evangelicals and Science in Historical Perspective*, Religion in America Series: Religion in America Series, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999

Livingstone, David N., *Darwin's Forgotten Defenders: the Encounter between Evangelical Theology and Evolutionary Thought*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1987

Locke, Simon. *Constructing "the Beginning": Discourses of Creation Science*, LEA's Communication Series, Mahwah, NJ, L. Erlbaum Associates, 1999

Lovtrup, Soren, *Darwinism: Refutation of a Myth*, New York, Croom Helm, 1987

Lubenow, Marvin L., *Bones of Contention: a Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker, 1992

Lubenow, Marvin, *From Fish to Gish*, San Diego, CA, Creation-Life, 1983

Lyell, Charles, *Principles of Geology* (1830–1833), vols. 1–3

Lyell, Mrs, ed., *Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, 12th ed., London, John Murray, 1881

Maatman, Russell, *The Bible, Natural Science and Evolution*, Grand Rapids, Reformed Fellowship, 1970

MacArthur, John. *The Battle for the Beginning : the Bible on Creation and the Fall of Adam*. Nashville, TN, W Publishing Group, 2001

Macbeth Norman, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, Harvard Common Press, Boston, 1971

Macbeth, Norman, *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, New York, Dell, 1973; originally published by Gambit, 1971

Macbeth, Norman. *Darwin Retried: An Appeal to Reason*, New York, Delta, 1971

Maddox, John, Duckham, Graeme, Lucas, Martin, Thames Television Ltd, and Linnean Society of London, *The Evolution of Darwin: a Series of Talks to Commemorate the Centenary of the Death of Charles Darwin*, 6 videocassettes, videorecording. sd., col., London, ThamesColour Productions, 1982

Major, Trevor J., *Genesis and the Origin of Coal & Oil*, 2nd ed., Montgomery, AL, Apologetics Press, 1997

Manly, Isaac V., *God Made*, Joplin, MO, College Press, 1994

Margenau, Henry and Varghese, Roy A., *Cosmos, Bios, Theos*, La Salle, IL, Open Court, 1992

Margulis, Lynn. *Symbiotic Planet: A New Look at Evolution*, New York, Basic Books, 1998

Margulis, Lynn. *Microcosmo : Four Billion Years of Evolution From Our Microbial Ancestors*, Berkeley, University of California, 1997

Marsh, Frank L., *Variation and Fixity in Nature*, Mountain View, CA, Pacific Press, 1976

Marsh, Frank L., *Life, Man, and Time*, Escondido, CA, Outdoor Pictures, 1967

Mayr, Ernst, and Provine. William B., *The Evolutionary Synthesis: Perspectives on the Unification of Biology*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1998

Mayr, Ernst. *Systematics and the Origin of Species, From the Viewpoint of a Zoologist*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1999

- Mayr, Ernst, *One Long Argument: Charles Darwin and the Genesis of Modern Evolutionary Thought*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1991
- Messenger E, *Evolution and Theology*, London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1931
- McCann, Lester J., *Blowing the Whistle on Darwinism*, Waconia, MN, Author, 1986
- McCoy, Michael L., *A Christian Perspective on Creation vs. Evolution*, St Louis, MO, Concordia, 1996
- McGowan, Christopher, *In the Beginning: a Scientist Shows Why the Creationists Are Wrong*, Toronto, Macmillan of Canada, 1983
- McGrath, Alister E. *Science and Religion: an Introduction*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 1999
- McGrath, Alister E. *The Foundations of Dialogue in Science and Religion*, Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishers, 1998
- McKown, Delos Banning. *The Mythmaker's Magic: Behind the Illusion of "Creation Science"*, Buffalo, NY, Prometheus Books, 1993
- McLean, G S., Oakland, Roger, and McLean, Larry, *The Evidence for Creation*, 3rd ed. Santa Ana, CA, Understand the Times, 1995
- McMullin, Ernan, "Evolution and Creation", *University of Notre Dame Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, no. 4, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1985
- Mebane, Alexander, *Darwin's Creation-Myth*, published in Australia, 1994; available from Sourcebook Project, P.O. Box 107, Glen Arm, MD 21057
- Midgley, Mary, *Evolution as a Religion: Strange Hopes and Stranger Fears*, London, Methuen, 1985
- Miller, Kenneth R., *Finding Darwin's God: a Scientist's Search for Common Ground between God and Evolution*, New York, Cliff Street Books, 1999

- Milner, Richard. *The Encyclopedia of Evolution: Humanity's Search for its Origins*, New York, Fitzhenry & Whiteside Ltd, 1990
- Milton, Richard, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, Rochester, VT, Park Street Press, 1997
- Milton, Richard, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, London, Fourth Estate, 1992
- Mitchell, Colin, *The Case for Creationism*, Alma Park, England, Autumn House, 1994
- Montenat, Christian, Plateaux, Luc, and Roux, Pascal, *How to Read the World: Creation in Evolution*, London, SCM Press, 1985
- Moody, Dale, *The Word of Truth*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1981
- Mooney, Christopher F., *Theology and Scientific Knowledge: Changing Models of God's Presence in the World*, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1996
- Moore, James, *The Darwin Legend*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1994
- Moore, James R., *The Post-Darwinian Controversies: a Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms With Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870-1900*, Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Press, 1979
- Moore, John Alexander., *From Genesis to Genetics: the Case of Evolution and Creationism*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2002
- Moore, John N and Schultz, H S eds., *Biology: A Search for Order in Complexity*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1970
- Moore, John N., *How to Teach Origins (Without ACLU Interference)*, (Milford, MI, Mott Media, 1983
- Moore, John N., *Questions and Answers on Creation and Evolution*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1976
- Moore, John N., *Should Evolution be Taught?* San Diego, Creation-Life Publishers, 1974

Moorhead, P S and Kaplan, M M eds., *Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution*, Philadelphia, Wistar Institute Press, 1967

Moreland, J P, and Reynolds. John Mark, *Three Views on Creation and Evolution*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1999

Moreland, James Porter, *The Creation Hypothesis: Scientific Evidence for an Intelligent Designer*, Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1994

Moreland, J P., *Christianity and the Nature of Science: A Philosophical Investigation*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1989

Moreland, J P., *Scaling the Secular City*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1987

Morris, Henry M. and Clark, Martin E *The Bible Has the Answer* 4th ed., El Cajon, CA, Master Books, 1998

Morris, Henry M. and Gish, Duane T, eds., *The Battle for Creation*, San Diego, Creation-Life Publishers, 1976

Morris, Henry M and Morris, John D., *Science, Scripture, and the Young Earth*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1983

Morris, Henry M and Morris, John D., *The Modern Creation Trilogy*, Green Forest, AR, Master Books, 1996. Composed of *Scripture and Creation*, *Science and Creation*, and *Society and Creation*, comes with CD-ROM.

Morris, Henry M and Parker, Gary E., *What is Creation Science?* rev. ed., El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1987

Morris, Henry M, and Parker. Gary, *What Is Creation Science?* San Diego, CA, Creation-Life Publishers, 1982

Morris, Henry M and Rohrer, Donald H, eds., *Decade of Creation*, San Diego, Creation-Life Publishers, 1981

Morris, Henry M., *Biblical Creationism: What Each Book of the Bible Teaches About Creation and the Flood*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker, 1993a

Morris, Henry M., *History of Modern Creationism*, Santee, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1993b

Morris, Henry M., *The Defender's Study Bible (KJV)*, Grand Rapids, Word, 1990

Morris, Henry M., *The Long War Against God: the History and Impact of the Creation/Evolution Conflict.*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker, 1989

Morris, Henry M., *Science and the Bible*, rev. ed. Chicago, Moody Press, 1986

Morris, Henry M., *Creation and the Modern Christian*, Green Forest, AR, Master Books, 1985a

Morris, Henry M, ed., *Scientific Creationism*, 2nd ed., Green Forest, AR, Master Books, 1985b

Morris, Henry M., *The Biblical Basis for Modern Science*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1984

Morris, Henry M., *A History of Modern Creationism*, San Diego, CA, Master Book Publishers, 1984

Morris, Henry M., *Science, Scripture, and the Young Earth: an Answer to Current Arguments Against the Biblical Doctrine of Recent Creation*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1983

Morris, Henry M., *Evolution in Turmoil*, San Diego, CA, Creation-Life, 1982

Morris, Henry M., *The Genesis Record*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1976

Morris, Henry M., *Many Infallible Proofs*, Green Forest, AR, Master Books, 1974a

Morris, Henry M., *Scientific Creationism*, San Diego, Creation-Life Publishers, 1974b

Morris, Henry M., *The Troubled Waters of Evolution*. San Diego, CA, Creation-Life Publishers, 1974c

- Morris, Henry M., *The Remarkable Birth of Planet Earth*, Minneapolis, Bethany House, 1972
- Morris, Henry M., *The Twilight of Evolution*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1963
- Morris, John D., *The Young Earth*, Colorado Springs, CO, Master Books, 1994
- Morton, Jean, *Science and the Bible*, Chicago, Moody Press, 1978
- Mulfinger, George Jr., and Snyder, Donald E., *Earth Science for Christian Schools*, Greenville, SC, Bob Jones University Press, 1979
- Mulfinger, George, Jr., *Design and Origins in Astronomy*, St Joseph, MO, Creation Research Society Books, 1983
- Murphy, George L., *The Trademark of God: a Christian Course in Creation, Evolution, and Salvation*, Wilton, CT, Morehouse-Barlow, 1986
- Murray, N. Patrick and Buffaloe, Neal D., *Creationism and Evolution: The Real Issues*, Little Rock, AR, The Bookmark, 1981
- National Academy of Sciences (US), *Science and Creationism: a View From the National Academy of Sciences*, 2nd ed., Washington, DC, National Academy Press, 1999
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*, ed. Oscar Levy, 18 vols, New York, Russell & Russell, 1964
- Nelkin, Dorothy. *The Creation Controversy: Science or Scripture in the Schools*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1984
- Nelson, Ethel R. and Broadberry, Richard E., *Genesis and the Mystery Confucius Couldn't Solve*, St Louis, MO, Concordia, 1994
- Nelson, Gareth V., "Origin and Diversification of Teleostean Fishes" *Annals*, New York Academy of Sciences, 1971

Nemesszeghy, Ervin, and Russell, John Leonard, *The Theology of Evolution*, Theology Today, No. 6, Notre Dame, IN, Fides Publishers, 1972

Nesbitt, Roger, "Evolution and the Existence of God," *CTS*, London, 1971, p 3

Nevard, A., "The Uniqueness of Man," *Daylight* 24, Summer/Winter 1997

Nevard, A., "October Revolution?" *Daylight* 22, Winter 1996-7

Nevard, A., "Open Question Not Papal Teaching," *Daylight* 12, July 1994

Neville George T., "Fossils in Evolutionary Perspective," *Science Progress*, vol. 48, January 1960

Newman, Robert C, and Wiester, John L., *What's Darwin Got to Do With It? A Friendly Conversation on Evolution*. Downers Grove, InterVarsity Press, 2000

Nordgren, Anders. *Evolutionary Thinking: an Analysis of Rationality, Morality and Religion from an Evolutionary Perspective*, Stockholm, Studia Philosophiae Religionis, 1994

Numbers, Ronald L., *Darwinism Comes to America*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1998

Numbers, Ronald L., *Creation-Evolution Debates*, *Creationism in Twentieth-Century America*, v. 2, New York, Garland, 1995a

Numbers, Ronald L., *Creationism in Twentieth-Century America: a Ten-Volume Anthology of Documents, 1903-1961*, New York, Garland, 1995b

Numbers, Ronald L., "Early Creationist Journals", *Creationism in Twentieth-Century America*, v. 9. New York, Garland, 1995c

Numbers, Ronald L., *The Creationists: The Evolution of Scientific Creationism*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1992

Oard, Michael, *Ancient Ice Ages or Gigantic Submarine Landslides*, St. Joseph, MO, Creation Research Society Books, 1997

Oard, Michael, *An Ice Age Caused by the Genesis Flood*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1990

- O'Connell, Patrick, *Original Sin in the Light of Modern Science*, Houston, Lumen Christi Press, 1973
- O'Gara, Bishop Cuthbert, "Darwinism, Secularism, Communism", *Daylight 16*, Summer 1995
- Olding, Alan, *Modern Biology and Natural Theology*, London, New York, Routledge, 1991
- Ong, Walter. *Darwin's Vision and Christian Perspectives*. New York: Macmillan, 1960
- Ott, Ludwig, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma: A One Volume Encyclopedia of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church, Showing Their Sources in Scripture and Tradition and Their Definitions By Popes and Councils*, 4th ed., Rockford, IL, Tan Books, 1960
- Overman, Dean L. *A Case Against Accident and Self-Organization*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield, 1997
- Overman, Dean L., *A Case Against Accident and Self-Organization*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield, 1997
- Overman, Richard H., *Evolution and the Christian Doctrine of Creation: A Whiteheadian Interpretation* , Philadelphia, Westminster, 1967
- Overton, Basil, *Evolution in the Light of Scripture, Science, and Sense*, Winona, MS, Choate, 1981
- Overton, Basil, *Evolution or Creation?* Nashville, Gospel Advocate, 1973
- Parker, Gary, *Creation Facts of Life*, Forest, AR, Master Books, 1994
- Parker, Gary, *What Is Creation Science?* California:Master Books, 1984
- Patterson, Colin, *Evolution* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1978
- Peacocke, A R and Andersen, Svend, *Evolution and Creation: a European Perspective*, Complementa Series of the Forum Teologi Naturvidenskab, Complementa, bd. 3. Aarhus, Denmark, Aarhus University Press, 1987

- Peacocke, A R., *From DNA to Dean: Reflections and Explorations of a Priest-Scientist*, Norwich, Canterbury Press, 1996
- Peacocke, A R., *Theology for a Scientific Age: Being and Becoming – Natural, Divine, and Human*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1993
- Peacocke, A R., *God and the New Biology*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1986
- Peacocke, A R. *Creation and the World of Science*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979
- Peacocke, A R., *Science and the Christian Experiment*, London, Oxford University Press, 1971
- Pearcey, Nancy and Thaxton, Charles B., *The Soul of Science: Christian Faith and Natural Philosophy* , Westchester, IL, Crossway Books, 1994
- Pennock, Robert T., *Tower of Babel: the Evidence against the New Creationism*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1999
- Peters, Ted, ed., *Cosmos as Creation: Theology and Science in Consonance*, Nashville, Abingdon, 1989
- Petersen, Dennis R., *Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation*, Vol. 1, South Lake Tahoe, CA, Christian Equippers International, 1987
- Peth, Howard, *Blind Faith: Evolution Exposed*, Frederick, MA, Amazing Facts, 1990
- Pinkston, William S Jr., *Biology for Christian Schools*, Greenville, SC, Bob Jones University Press, 1980
- Pitman, Michael, *Adam and Evolution: a Scientific Critique of Neo-Darwinism*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1987
- Pitman, Michael, *Adam and Evolution*, London, Rider & Co., 1984
- Pitman, Michael, *Adam and Evolution*, London, River Publishing, 1984
- Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, Rome, Vatican, 12 August, 1950

- Poirer, Jules H., *From Darkness to Light to Flight: Monarch – the Miracle Butterfly*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1995
- Polkinghorne, J C., *Science and Theology: an Introduction*, London, Minneapolis, MN, SPCK. Fortress Press, 1998
- Pontifical Council for Culture and Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, *Jesus Christ the Bearer of The Water of Life, a Christian reflection on the New Age*, London: CTS 2003
- Poole, Michael and Wenham. Gordon J., *Creation or Evolution: a False Antithesis?* Latimer Studies, 23-24, Oxford, Latimer House, 1987
- Popper, Karl, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, London, Taylor & Francis, 2002
- Popper, Karl, *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography*, London, Fontana Books, 1976
- Price, Barry, *The Creation Science Controversy*, Sydney, Millenium Books, 1990
- Price, Barry, *Genesis, Evolution and Creationism*, 2nd ed., Sydney, Catholic Education Office, 1986
- Pun, Pattle P T., *Evolution: Nature and Scripture in Conflict? Contemporary Evangelical Perspectives*, Grand Rapids, MI, Zondervan, 1982
- Ranganathan, B G., *Origins?* Pennsylvania, The Banner of Truth Trust, 1988
- Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal, *In the Beginning: A Catholic Understanding of the Story of Creation and the Fall*, trans. Boniface Ramsay, Huntingdon, IN, Our Sunday Visitor, 1990
- Ratzinger, Joseph Cardinal, *Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for Fundamental Theology*, trans. Mary F. McCarthy, Fort Collins, CO, Ignatius Press, 1987
- Ratzsch, Del, *The Battle of Beginnings: Why Neither Side Is Winning the Creation-Evolution Debate*, Downers Grove, InterVarsity, 1996
- Raup, David, "Geology and Creationism," *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, March 1983

- Raup, David, "Geology" *New Scientist*, Vol. 90, p. 832, 1981
- Rehwinkel, Alfred M., *The Wonders of Creation*, Minneapolis, BethanyFellowship, 1974
- Rehwinkel, Alfred M., *The Flood*, St Louis, MO, Concordia, 1951
- ReMine, Walter James, *The Biotic Message: Evolution Versus Message Theory*, St Paul, MN, St Paul Science, 1993
- Rendle-Short, John, *Man: Ape or Image – The Christian's Dilemma*, San Diego, CA, Master Books, 1984
- Reno, Cora A., *Evolution, Fact or Theory?* Chicago, Moody Press, 1953
- Ridderbos, N H., *Is There a Conflict Between Genesis 1 and Natural Science?* Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1957
- Riegle, D D., *Creation or Evolution*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1962
- Riley, W B, and Trollinger, William Vance, *The Antievolution Pamphlets of William Bell Riley*, Creationism in Twentieth-Century America, v. 4, New York, Garland, 1995
- Rimmer, Harry and Bradford Davis, Edward, *The Antievolution Pamphlets of Harry Rimmer*, Creationism in Twentieth-Century America, v. 6, New York, Garland, 1995
- Ritland, Richard M., *A Search for Meaning in Nature: A New Look at Creation and Evolution*, Mountain View, CA, Pacific Press, 1970
- Roberts, Jon H., *Darwinism and the Divine in America: Protestant Intellectuals and Organic Evolution, 1859-1900*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1988
- Rolston, Holmes, *Genes, Genesis, and God: Values and Their Origins in Natural and Human History*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999

Rosevear, David, *Creation Science: Confirming that the Bible is Right*, Chichester, England, New Wine Press, 1991

Ross, Dr Hugh, *Creation and Time*, Colorado Springs, Navpress, 1994

Roszak T., *Unfinished Animal*, New York, Harper and Row, 1975

Ruffini, Cardinal Ernesto, *The Theory of Evolution Judged by Reason and Faith*, New York, Joseph F. Wagner Inc., 1959; English translation by Fr. Francis O'Hanlon, Melbourne, Australia

Rusch, Wilbert H. and Klotz, John, *Did Charles Darwin Become a Christian*, St. Joseph, MO, Creation Research Society Books, 1984

Rusch, Wilbert H., *Origins: What is at Stake?* St. Joseph, MO, Creation Research Society Books, 1991

Rusch, Wilbert H., *The Argument: Creationism vs. Evolutionism*, St. Joseph, MO, Creation Research Society Books, 1984

Ruse, Michael, and Maienschein, Jane, *Biology and the Foundation of Ethics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999

Ruse, Michael, *Can a Darwinian be a Christian? The Relationship between Science and Religion*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001a

Ruse, Michael. *The Evolution Wars: a Guide to the Debates*, New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press, 2001b

Ruse, Michael, *The Darwinian Revolution: Science Red in Tooth and Claw*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1999a

Ruse, Michael. *Mystery of Mysteries: Is Evolution a Social Construction?* Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1999b

- Ruse, Michael, *Taking Darwin Seriously: a Naturalistic Approach to Philosophy*, Amherst, NY, Prometheus Books, 1998
- Ruse, Michael, *Monad to Man: the Concept of Progress in Evolutionary Biology*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1996
- Ruse, Michael, *Evolutionary Naturalism: Selected Essays*, New York, Routledge, 1995
- Ruse, Michael, *The Darwinian Paradigm: Essays on Its History, Philosophy, and Religious Implications*, New York Routledge, 1989
- Ruse, Michael, *But Is It Science? The Philosophical Question in the Creation/Evolution Controversy*, Buffalo, NY, Prometheus Books, 1988
- Ruse, Michael, *Darwinism Defended: a Guide to the Evolution Controversies*. Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley, 1982
- Sailhamer, John, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed Frank Gaebelin, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1990
- Sailhamer, John, *Genesis Unbound*, Sisters, OR, Multnomah, 1996
- Sailhamer, John, *Genesis Unbound*, Sisters, Multnomah Books, 1996
- Saint, Phil, *Fossils That Speak Out*, Phillipsburg, NJ, P&R Publishing, 1985
- Samuelson, Norbert M., *Judaism & the Doctrine of Creation*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995
- Schaeffer, Francis, *No Final Conflict*, Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1975
- Schmitz-Moormann, Karl, and Salmon, James F., *Theology of Creation in an Evolutionary World*, Cleveland, OH, Pilgrim Press, 1997
- Schonberg, David, *Ecology and Beyond*, Alexandria, MN, Caravan Books, 1995

Scopes, John Thomas, Allen, Leslie H., *Bryan and Darrow at Dayton: the Record and Documents of the "Bible-Evolution Trial"*, New York, A. Lee & Co, 1925

Sears, Jack Wood, *Conflict and Harmony in Science and the Bible*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1969

Segraves, Kelly L ed., *And God Created*, San Diego, CA, Creation-Science Research Center, 1973

Segraves, Kelly L., *Jesus Christ: Creator* San Diego, CA Creation-Science Research Center 1983

Selkirk, D R., and Burrows, F J., *Confronting Creationism: Defending Darwin*, Kensington, Australia, New South Wales University Press, in association with the Australian Institute of Biology, 1987

Shapiro, Robert, *Origins: A Skeptics Guide to the Creation of Life on Earth*, New York, Summit Books, 1986

Sharp, Doug, *The Revolution Against Evolution* 2nd ed., Lansing, MI, Decapolis Books, 1993

Sharp, G Thomas, *Science According to Moses*, Noble, OK, Creation Truth, 1992

Shute, Evan, *Flaws in the Theory of Evolution*, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed, 1961

Simpson G G., *Tempo and Mode of Evolution*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944

Sippert, Albert, *Evolution Is Not Scientific: 32 Reasons Why*, North Mankato, MN, Sippert Publishing Co., 1995

Slusher, Harold S. and Gamwell, Thomas P., *The Age of the Earth*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1978

Slusher, Harold, S. and Robertson, Stephen J., *The Age of the Solar System*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1982

Slusher, Harold S., *Critique of Radiometric Dating Methods*, rev. ed., San Diego, Creation-Life Publishers, 1981

- Slusher, Harold S., *Age of the Cosmos*, San Diego, Institute for Creation Research, 1980 a
- Slusher, Harold S., *Origin of the Universe*, San Diego, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1980b
- Smethurst, Arthur F. *Modern Science and Christian Beliefs*, London, James Nisbet, 1955
- Smith, John Maynard, and Szathmary, Eors, *The Major Transitions in Evolution*, Oxford, W.H. Freeman Spektrum, 1995
- Smout, Kary D., *The Creation/Evolution Controversy: a Battle for Cultural Power*, Westport, CT, Praeger, 1998
- Smout, Kary D, and Dept of English, Duke University, *Terminology Battles: Word Meanings As Rhetorical Tools in the Creation/Evolution Controversy*, Ph.D dissertation: Duke University, 1991
- Snelling, Andrew, *The Revised Quote Book*, Sunnybank, Australia, Creation Science Foundation, 1990
- Sober, Elliott, *Philosophy of Biology*, 2nd ed., Dimensions of Philosophy Series, Boulder, CO, Westview Press, 2000
- Southgate, Christopher, *God, Humanity, and the Cosmos: A Textbook in Science and Religion*, Harrisburg, Trinity Press International, 1999
- Spanner, D C., *Biblical Creation and the Theory of Evolution*, Exeter, Paternoster, 1987
- Speiser, E A. "Genesis," *The Anchor Bible*, New York, Doubleday, 1964
- Spetner, Lee, *Not By Chance!* New York, Judaica Press, 1996
- Sproul, R C., *Not a Chance*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1994
- Stanley, S M., *The New Evolutionary Timetable: Fossils, Genes, and the Origin of Species*, New York, Basic Books Inc., 1981
- Steidl, Paul B., *The Earth, the Stars, and the Bible*, Phillipsburg, NJ, Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979

- Steinmueller, John, *The Sword and the Spirit*, Fort Worth, Stellar Maris Books, 1977
- Stokes, William, *The Genesis Answer: A Scientist's Treatment of Divine Creation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1984
- Stokes, William Lee, *The Genesis Answer: A Scientist's Testament for Divine Creation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1981
- Stone, Nathan, *Names of God*, Chicago, Moody, 1944
- Stove, David, *Darwinian Fairytales*, Brookfield, VT, Ashgate Publishing Co., 1995
- Strahler, Arthur Newell, *Science and Earth History: the Evolution/Creation Controversy*, Buffalo, NY, Prometheus Books, 1987
- Sunderland, Luther D., *Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems* 3rd ed., Santee, CA, Master Book Publishers, 1984
- Taguchi, Cardinal Paul, *Study of Sacred Scripture*, Boston, MA, Daughters of St. Paul, 1974
- Taylor, Charles V., *The First 100 Words*, Gosford, Australia, Good Book Company, 1996
- Taylor, Charles V., *The Oldest Science Book in the World*, Slacks Creek, Queensland, Australia, Assembly Press, 1984
- Taylor, Gordon Rattray, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, Abacus, Sphere Books, London, 1984
- Taylor, Gordon Rattray, *The Great Evolution Mystery*, New York, Harper & Row, 1983
- Taylor, Ian, *In the Minds of Men*, 1st 2nd & 3rd editions, Toronto, TFE Publishing, 1984, 1987 & 1991
- Taylor, Kenneth, *Evolution and the High School Student*, Wheaton, IL, Tyndale, 1974
- Taylor, Paul S., *The Illustrated Origins Answer Book*, 5th ed., Mesa, AZ, Eden Communications, 1995

- Templeton, John, ed., *Evidence of Purpose: Scientists Discover the Creator*, New York, Continuum Publishing, 1994
- Thaxton, Charles B, Bradley, Walter L, and Olsen, Roger L., *The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories*, Dallas, Lewis & Stanley, 1992
- Thaxton, Charles B, Bradley, Walter L, and Olsen, Roger L., *The Mystery of Life's Origins: Reassessing Current Theories*, New York, Philosophical Library, 1984
- Thomas, J.D., ed., *Evolution and Faith*, Abilene, TX, ACU Press, 1988
- Thomas, J. D., *Evolution and Antiquity*, Abilene, TX, Biblical Research Press, 1961
- Thompson, Adell, *Biology, Zoology, and Genetics: Evolution Model Vs. Creation Model*, Washington, DC, University Press of America, 1983
- Thompson, Bert and Jackson, Wayne eds., *Essays in Apologetics*, Montgomery, AL, Apologetics Press, 1990
- Thompson, Bert and Jackson, Wayne, *The Revelation of God in Nature*, Montgomery, Apologetics Press, 1979
- Thompson, Bert, *Creation Compromises*, Montgomery, AL, Apologetics Press, 1995
- Thompson, Bert, *The Global Flood of Noah*, Montgomery, Apologetics Press, 1990
- Thompson, Bert, *Is Genesis Myth?* Montgomery, AL, Apologetics Press, 1986
- Thompson, Bert, *The History of Evolutionary Thought*, Fort Worth, Star Bible & Tract, 1981
- Thompson, Bert, *The Scientific Case for Creation*, Montgomery, Apologetics Press, 1979
- Thompson, Bert, *Theistic Evolution*, Shreveport, LA, Lambert, 1977

- Thomson, K S., *Morphogenesis and Evolution*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1988
- Thurman, L Duane, *How to Think About Evolution and Other Bible-Science Controversies*, Downers Grove, IL, InterVarsity Press, 1978
- Tiffin, Lee, *Creationism's Upside-Down Pyramid: How Science Refutes Fundamentalism*, Amherst, NY, Prometheus Books, 1994
- Tinkle, William J., *God's Method in Creation*, Nutley, NJ, Craig Press, 1973
- Tinkle, William J., *Heredity*, Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1970
- Toumey, Christopher P., *God's Own Scientists: Creationists in a Secular World*, New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1994
- Turner, Allen C, and House, Edwin W., *Evolution – Trials and Tribulations*, (Special Publication , Idaho Museum of Natural History, no. 7) Pocatello, Idaho Museum of Natural History, 1982
- Urey, Harold C., quoted in *Christian Science Monitor*, January 4 1962
- Utt, Richard H ed., *Creation Nature's Designs and Designer*, Mountain View, CA, Pacific Press Publishing Assoc., 1971
- Van Bebber, Mark and Taylor, Paul S., *Creation & Time: A Report on the Progressive Creationist Book by Hugh Ross*, Gilbert, AZ, Films for Christ, 1994
- Van Der Zee, William R., *Ape or Adam? Our Roots According to the Book of Genesis*, North Andover, MA, Genesis Publishing Co., 1995
- Van Dolson, Leo R ed., *Our Real Roots*, Washington, DC, Review and Herald, 1979
- Van Till, Howard, *Portraits of Creation: Biblical and Scientific Perspectives on the World's Formation*. Grand Rapids, MI, W B. Eerdmans, 1990

- Van Till, Howard, Young, Davis, and Menninga, Clarence, *Science Held Hostage: What's Wrong with Creation Science and Evolution*, Downers Grove, InterVarsity Press, 1988
- Van Till, Howard, *The Fourth Day: What the Bible and the Heavens Are Telling Us About the Creation*. Grand Rapids, MI, W.B. Eerdmans, 1986
- Vandeman, George *et al*, *God's Wonderful World*, Grantham, England, Stanborough Press, 1992
- Vardiman, Larry, *Sea-Floor Sediment and the Age of the Earth*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1996
- Vardiman, Larry, *Ice Cores and the Age of the Earth*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1993
- Vardiman, Larry, *The Age of the Earth's Atmosphere*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1990
- Varghese, Roy Abraham, ed., *The Intellectuals Speak Out About God*, Chicago, Regnery Gateway, 1984
- Velikovsky, I., *Earth in Upheaval*, London, Abacus Books, reprint 1973, pp. 31–35
- Von Fange, Erich A., *Noah to Abraham: The Turbulent Years*, Syracuse, IN, Living Word, 1994
- Von Fange, Erich A., *Helping Children Understand Genesis and the Dinosaur*, Syracuse, IN, Living Word, 1992
- Von Fange, Erich A., *Genesis and the Dinosaur*, Syracuse, IN, Living Word, 1990
- Von Fange, Erich A., *Spading Up Ancient Words*, Syracuse, IN, Living Word, 1984
- Von Fange, Erich A., *Time Upside Down*, Ann Arbor, Author, 1981
- Dietrich von Hildebrand, *Trojan Horse in the City of God: How Godlessness Crept into the Sanctuary and how to Thrust It out Again*, Chicago, Franciscan Herald Press, 1967, p 228

Walsh, Robert E and Brooks, Chris L., *International Conference on Creationism: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Creationism*, Pittsburgh, PA, Creation Science Fellowship, 1990

Walsh, Robert E ed., *International Conference on Creationism: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Creationism*, Pittsburgh, PA Creation Science Fellowship, 1998

Walsh, Robert E., ed., *International Conference on Creationism: Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Creationism*, Pittsburgh, PA, Creation Science Fellowship, 1994

Walsh, Robert E., ed., *International Conference on Creationism: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Creationism*, 2 Volumes, Pittsburgh, PA, Creation Science Fellowship, 1986

Ward, Keith, *God, Faith & the New Millennium, Christian Belief in an Age of Science*, Oxford, England, 1998

Watson, D M S. "Adaptation" *Nature* 124, p.231- 233. 1929

Watson, David C C., *Myths and Miracles: A New Approach to Genesis 1-11*, Woodridge, Australia, Triune Press, 1991

Weaver, Robert T and Norris, Shirley, *Unmasking the False Religion of Evolution*, Authors, 1996

Weaver, Warren *et al*, "Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation", *Science*, vol. 123, June 29, 1956

Webb, George Ernest, *The Evolution Controversy in America*, Lexington, KY, University Press of Kentucky, 1994

Weinberg, Stanley L, *Reviews of Thirty-One Creationist Books*, Syosset, NY, National Center for Science Education, 1984

Weiser, Arthur, *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*, New York, Association Press, 1961

Wells, Jonathan, *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach about Evolution is Wrong*, Washington, Regnery Publishing, 2000

Wells, Jonathan, *Charles Hodges' Critique of Darwinism: an Historical-Critical Analysis of Concepts Basic to the 19th Century Debate*, Lewiston, NY, E. Mellen Press, 1988

Wend, John, *Creation – Genesis, the Big Bang, & Evolution* 2nd ed., Dallas, TX, Churchill PC Systems, 1991

Wesson, R. *Beyond Natural Selection*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press 1991

West, Bob, *Evolution vs. Science & the Bible*, Brevard, NC, Bob West Graphics, 1994

Whitcomb, John C and DeYoung, Donald B., *The Moon: Its Creation, Form, and Significance*, Winona Lake, IN, BMH Books, 1978

Whitcomb, John C and Morris, Henry, *The Genesis Flood*, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1964

Whitcomb, John C., *The World That Perished*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1988

Whitcomb, John C., *The Early Earth* rev. ed., Grand Rapids, Baker, 1986

White, AJ Monty, *Wonderfully Made*, Darlington, County Durham, Evangelical Press, 1989

White, A J Monty, *How Old is the Earth?* Phillipsburg, NJ, Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing, 1985

Wieland, Carl, *Stones and Bones: Powerful Evidence against Evolution*, Acacia Ridge, Australia, Creation Science Foundation, 1994

Wiester, John L., *The Genesis Connection*, Nashville, Thomas Nelson, 1983

Wilder-Smith, A E., *The Scientific Alternative to Neo-Darwinian Evolutionary Theory*, Costa Mesa, CA, TWFT Publishers, 1987

Wilder-Smith, A E., *The Natural Sciences Know Nothing of Evolution*, El Cajon, CA, Master Books, 1981;
originally published in German in 1978

Wilder-Smith, A E., *The Creation of Life*, Costa Mesa, CA, Word for Today, 1988

Wilder-Smith, A E., *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*, Wheaton, IL, Harold Shaw Co., 1968

Williams, Emmett L and Mulfinger, George Jr., *Physical Science for Christian Schools*, Greenville, SC,
Bob Jones University Press, 1974

Williams, Emmett L ed., *Thermodynamics and the Development of Order*, Norcross, GA, Creation
Research Society Books, 1981

Williams, George C., *Adaptation and Natural Selection: a Critique of Some Current Evolutionary Thought*,
Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1966

Williams, Jon G., *The Other Side of Evolution*, LaVergne, TN, Williams Brothers, 1970

Wilson, A N., *God's Funeral*, London, John Murray, 1999

Wilson, Clifford, *Visual Highlights of the Bible, Volume I*, Borinia, Australia, Pacific Christian Ministries,
1993

Wilson, David B and Dolphin, Warren D., *Did the Devil Make Darwin Do It?: Modern Perspectives on the
Creation-Evolution Controversy*, 1st ed., Ames, Iowa State University Press, 1983

Wiseman, P J., *Clues to Creation in Genesis*, London, Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1977

Wonderly, Daniel E., *Neglect of Geologic Data: Sedimentary Strata Compared With Young-Earth
Creationist Writings*, Hatfield, PA, Interdisciplinary Biblical Research Institute, 1987

Wonderly, Daniel E., *God's Time-Records in Ancient Sediments: Evidences of Long Time Spans in Earth's
History*, Flint, Crystal Press, 1977

Woodmorappe, John, *Noah's Ark: A Feasibility Study*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1996

Woodmorappe, John, *Studies in Flood Geology*, El Cajon, CA, Institute for Creation Research, 1993,

Woodward, Tom. "Meeting Darwin's Wager: How Biochemist Michael Behe Uses a Mousetrap to Challenge Evolutionary Theory." *Christianity Today* 41, 1997, pp. 14-21

Worthing, Mark William, *God, Creation and Contemporary Physics*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1996

Wright, Richard, *Biology Through the Eyes of Faith*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1989

Wynne-Edwards, V C., "Self Regulating Systems in Populations of Animals, *Science*, vol. 147, 26 March 1965

Wynne-Edwards, V C., *Evolution Through Group Selection*, London, 1986

Wysong, Randy L., *The Creation-Evolution Controversy*, Midland, MI, Inquiry Press, 1976

Yaroslavsky, E. *Landmarks in the Life of Stalin*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1940

Yockey, Hubert P., *Information Theory and Molecular Biology*, Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Press, 1992

Young, Davis A., *Creation and the Flood: An Alternative to Flood Geology and Theistic Evolution*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1977

Young, Edward J., *Studies in Genesis One*, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed, 1973

Young, Edward J., *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1960

Young, Willard, *Fallacies of Creationism*, Calgary, Detselig Enterprises, 1985

Youngblood, Ronald F., *The Genesis Debate: Persistent Questions About Creation and the Flood*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker, 1990

Youngblood, Ronald, ed., *The Genesis Debate*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1990; originally published 1986

Youngblood, Ronald, *How It All Began*, Ventura, CA, Regal, 1980

Zabilka, Ivan L., *Scientific Malpractice: the Creation/Evolution Debate*, 1st. ed. Lexington, KY, Bristol Books, 1992

Zarr, Benjamin, *God Vs. Evolution*, Worcester, MA, B Zarr, 1982

Zeman, Tomas and Zeman, Shirley, *Genesis Geology*, Yreka, CA, Geo Genesis Publications, 1996

Zetterberg, J. Peter. *Evolution Versus Creationism: the Public Education Controversy*, Phoenix, AZ, Oryx Press, 1983

Zimmerman, Paul A., *Creation, Evolution, and God's Word*, St Louis, Concordia, 1972

Zimmerman, Paul A ed., *Darwin, Evolution, and Creation*, St Louis, MO, Concordia, 1959