

Evolution

?

By J. W. G. Johnson

SELECTED QUESTIONS ANSWERED

&

APPENDICES

1986

Evolution

?

By **J. W. G. Johnson**

SELECTED QUESTIONS ANSWERED & APPENDICES

Los Angeles: Perpetual Eucharistic Adoration Inc, 1986.

(Subsequently known as *The Death of Evolution*, Illinois: TAN Books and Publishers, Inc.)

NIHIL OBSTAT: J.A. Clarke, D.D., D.C.L., Censor Deputatus.

IMPRIMATUR: Francis Rush, Archbishop of Brisbane, 23rd November, 1981.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
ANY QUESTIONS ? SELECTED QUESTIONS ANSWERED	3
Q1. How could the Ark possibly have carried all the animals necessary ?	3
Q2. How could Noah round up all those creatures ?	3
Q3. How could the menagerie be managed and fed in the Ark for more than a year ?	4
Q4. Where would the water come from for a worldwide deluge ?	4
Q5. How did the races of man originate ?	5
Q6. Are we to believe that men lived for hundreds of years as Genesis says ?	6
Q7. Who was Cain's wife ?	7
Q8. Human and chimpanzee chromosomes differ surprisingly little, is this evidence of evolution of man ?	8
Conclusion	9
APPENDIX A: THE CHURCH'S POSITION	10
APPENDIX B: THE CHURCH AND FATHER TEILHARD DE CHARDIN	13
APPENDIX C: FERAL CHILDREN	15
APPENDIX D: ADDENDUM TO "HUMAN EVOLUTION" -- and a word on BIRDS	16

INTRODUCTION

Wallace Johnson produced a slide show lecture on evolution which was recorded and later converted into a booklet in 1976. Out of that booklet came the book *Evolution ?*, also printed as *The Crumbling Theory of Evolution*, published by Perpetual Eucharistic Adoration Inc, Los Angeles in 1986. Subsequently these books are known as *The Death of Evolution*, published by TAN Books and Publishers, Inc., Illinois. These books contain further details to the slide show lecture. The appendices and a separate section entitled "Any Questions? Selected Questions Answered" were added to the books and provide further information. These additions are presented here. Highly recommended books for further information are:

- Johnson J. W. G., *The Death of Evolution*, Illinois: TAN Books and Publishers, Inc.
- Keane G. J., 1999. *Creation Rediscovered: Evolution and the importance of the Origins debate*. Illinois: TAN Books and Publishers, Inc.

Available from TAN Books and Publishers Inc., P.O. BOX 424, Rockford Illinois 61105 USA.

ANY QUESTIONS ? SELECTED QUESTIONS ANSWERED

Q1. How could the Ark possibly have carried all the animals necessary ?

A. This question is handled at length in "The Genesis Flood" by Morris and Whitcomb. If we assume 17½ inches (44 cm) for a cubit, the Ark would have been 437 feet (133 m) long by 73 feet (22 m) wide and 44 feet (13 m) high built like an enormous barge and almost uncapsizable. Its gross tonnage would have been 14,000 tons. It was, by far, the biggest vessel ever built until very recent times. The three decks would give a carrying capacity equal to 522 standard American railroad vans.

The Genesis "kinds" would not include all species, and certainly not varieties of species. Thus, the animals on the Ark would be restricted to types or kinds. The Ark would not have carried fish or any aquatic creatures. The conclusion is reached, that, at the very outside, the Ark would need to carry not more than 35,000 individual vertebrate animals. Most animals are smaller than a sheep. The young of very large animals could have been carried instead of the fully grown. Even allowing the average to be the size of a sheep, it is estimated that the 35,000 could have been fitted into 146 railroad vans.

The Ark would have easily carried the animals on one deck, leaving one deck for the humans, and one deck for storage.

Q2. How could Noah round up all those creatures ?

A. He could not have done it. We have to acknowledge that God did the mustering. The Bible makes this clear. It says that Noah and his family went into the Ark, and that all the creatures "*went in to Noah into the Ark... And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him; and the Lord shut him in on the outside.*" (Genesis 7:13-16.)

If we wonder about kangaroos and polar bears and other far-flung animals making the journey to the Ark, we have to realise that the evidence shows the whole earth used to enjoy a fairly uniform and mild climate, with no extremes; therefore there were no specialised creatures adapted to extremes of heat or cold. There probably were no polar bears because there were no frigid zones for them. All the then existing species of animals could have lived in proximity to the Ark.

A number of competent scientists believe that the earth was probably surrounded by a transparent vapor canopy, high in the stratosphere (the waters above the firmament); and that the canopy caused a greenhouse effect on earth and gave a uniformly mild climate.

Q3. How could the menagerie be managed and fed in the Ark for more than a year ?

A. In the case of very large animals, and carnivorous animals, the difficulty could have been avoided by having only young specimens aboard. Alternatively, God may have used mechanisms like hibernation and estivation to quiet the creatures and make constant feeding unnecessary.

Morris and Whitcomb raise the interesting thought that hibernation, estivation and migration are the three methods of coping with inclement climatic conditions; but, if there existed a constantly mild climate, there would have been no reason for the existence of any of the three mechanisms before the Flood. They then suggest that it may have been on the eve of the Deluge that these abilities were first imparted to the animals. Certainly divine power could have kept the animals in a quiescent state in the Ark to minimise their feeding and other supervision.

The Bible does assure us that God was directing events. It tells us "*And God remembered Noah, and all the living creatures, and all the cattle which were with him in the Ark. . .*" (Gen. 8: I.) The Bible is not suggesting that God absentmindedly forgot, and then suddenly remembered that Noah and the Ark were still out there in the flood. The Bible passage makes sense if it means: "And God *protected* Noah, and all the living creatures, etc." Apparently the Hebrew word "remember" can mean "protect".

Morris and Whitcomb inform us: "*According to Hebrew usage, the primary meaning of 'Zakar' (remember) is 'granting requests, protecting, delivering' when God is the subject and persons are the object.*"

Q4. Where would the water come from for a worldwide deluge ?

A. Under our present conditions there is not enough water in the atmosphere to sustain 40 days and nights of global rain. In fact, if it were all precipitated, it would cover the ground to a depth of less than two inches (5cm).

There is compelling geologic evidence that a global flood did happen; and that the highest mountains have been submerged. We cannot dodge the problem by saying that the flood never happened. Where, then, did the water come from?

The vapor canopy referred to in answer to the second question would be part of the solution. Another source would be "*Juvenile waters,*" that is, waters which are added to the oceans through volcanoes, hot springs and other vents. Even today there is at least a cubic mile (1.6 km) of such water added to the oceans each year. The Deluge was an unprecedented upheaval with volcanic action unimaginable. This would have added vast amounts of juvenile waters to the earth's surface. Then, volcanic dust flung to the upper atmosphere could have provided nuclei of precipitation for the vapor canopy; whereupon its waters began raining on to the earth.

In the six hundredth year of the life of Noah, in the second month, in the 17th day of the month, all the fountains of the great deep were broken up (submarine volcanoes?) and the flood gates of heaven were opened (vapor canopy?) and the rain fell upon the earth forty days and forty nights. (Genesis 8:11-12.)

Yet, even those sources would not suffice to cover mountains like Everest [29,000 ft. (8839 m)] or even Ararat [17,000 ft. (5181 m)]. What we have to understand is that at the time of the Deluge there would not have been such high mountains for the Deluge to cover. Topography depends on the principle of "Isostasy" (equal weights). Somewhere, deep in the earth's crust, is a datum line; and, for equilibrium, the weights above the line have to balance. Areas of high topography must be of low density, and vice versa. Before the

Deluge, the amount of water was much less than now; therefore the weight of oceans could balance only relatively low mountains. "Mountains were relatively low and ocean beds relatively shallow as compared with present conditions." ("Genesis Flood" p. 268.)

Even though the mountains were fairly low, yet more water was needed to submerge them; and, from the oceans themselves came the greatest flooding. It is known that Europe was covered by the sea during man's history; and even the high plateau of Iran devastated by sea water. All the continents bear evidence of having been submerged by sea water. The great coal deposits were laid down under sea water. Geologists would explain continental inundation as due to depression of the land; and there is good reason to couple this with an accompanying elevation of the bottom of the sea as it heaved to great volcanism and earthquakes.

In the Noachic cataclysm, water came down from the skies, came up from subterranean depths, and the oceans rose to engulf the land, while volcanoes and earthquakes caused colossal tidal waves which came and went around the drowned planet. Eventually, all this water had to be got off the land.

The Bible specifically refers to "the fountains of the great deep", so we infer that the greatest volcanic activity was sub-oceanic. The ejected lavas and juvenile waters would leave behind them great voids in the earth's crust, deep below the ocean beds. The weakened ocean beds could not support the vast increase in surface water and the great sediments washed down from the land. The ocean beds would sink under the burden; and correspondingly the continental blocks would be forced upwards. This would have been the mechanism whereby the flood waters were removed from the land areas.

It is recognised by geologists that nearly all the great mountain areas of the world have Pliocene and Pleistocene fossils near their summits, which means that they were uplifted recently, and essentially simultaneously. (Ibid. p. 128.)

Geologists recognise that there have been "recent" rises of thousands of feet in mountain systems in Europe, America and Asia; and that high volcanic cones of the Pacific, Asia and eastern Africa are believed to have been built up in the recent past. It is worth mentioning that Mt. Ararat's lava was deposited under water.

It should be explained that Creationists do not accept Pliocene and Pleistocene in the "million-of-years" context; but, as designations, they refer to recent times. (Ref's. "The Genesis Flood"; "Scientific Creationism"; "Science of Today and the Problems of Genesis".)

Q5. How did the races of man originate ?

A. For races to begin, evolutionists and creationists both agree that the prerequisite is inbreeding in a small, isolated group of people.

Dr. Morris, in "Scientific Creationism", quotes Ralph Linton of Yale, a leading anthropologist, and evolutionist, who explained in 1955: *"Observation of many different species has shown that the situation of small, highly inbred groups is ideal for the fixation of mutations and consequent speeding up of the evolutionary process. In general, the smaller the inbreeding group, the more significant any mutation becomes for the formation of a new variety."*

Dr. Morris points out that mutations are harmful, not helpful, and would most likely destroy the population before effecting any imaginary benefits. However, if we change the word "mutations" to "recessive genes", creationists would then agree with Linton's statement.

In large populations, the population generally exhibits the characteristics of dominant genes. Only when a small group is isolated and interbreeds do the recessive genes have an opportunity to become typical.

Apparently there is no need for slowly developing racial distinctions over long periods of time. Rather, small inbreeding groups, exhibiting recessive gene characteristics, can effect distinct physical changes quite rapidly.

To produce the major racial divisions there is the question of what, in man's early history, caused mankind to disperse into small groups. The evolutionist cannot supply an answer, but creationists have an obvious explanation. Communication is a fundamental need in a group; and communication is by language. If a large group with a common language found that its language was suddenly fragmented into various languages, communication among the various sub-groups would become impossible. The large group would have to split into smaller groups according to language. Divisions of language would achieve the prerequisite of small, self-contained groups, whose inbreeding produced the races.

Dr. Duane Gish has commented that, when language was confused at the Tower of Babel, people would have dispersed in their lingual groups to different lands, probably in fairly small groups which would then inbreed in isolation. He suggests that God may have bestowed languages deliberately so as to marshal genetically similar individuals into the same language group. Thus, those individuals having a higher proportion of genes for Negroid features may have been given a common language, and similarly those who tended to Caucasian traits.

Q6. Are we to believe that men lived for hundreds of years as Genesis says ?

A. Evidence shows there was a prehistoric period when the whole earth had a temperate climate. Many believe that this was due to a vapor canopy above the stratosphere causing a greenhouse effect. Uniform temperateness would mean no strong wind currents, no storms. Plants and animals, including representatives of today's species, were giant sized; and there is evidence of large stature for at least some of mankind. It was a world vastly different from today's world. In that pre-Flood World the Bible records human lifespans of many hundreds of years.

In an article in "C.R.S. Quarterly" (June 1978), Joseph C. Dillow says that a vapor canopy of magnitude sufficient to produce (during the deluge) heavy rain for 40 days and nights would have caused a pre-Flood atmospheric pressure about double that of today, with about double today's oxygen pressure.

Higher oxygen pressure is beneficial to biological systems. In Florida, hyperbaric treatment using 2.5 atmospheres of pure oxygen has relieved effects of aging; helped treatment of strokes; improved memory and energy. Such pressurized pure oxygen is greater than the atmospheric oxygen pressure under the assumed pre-Flood canopy; but Dillow suggests that the latter, when extended over a whole lifetime, might have similar beneficial effects in retarding senility.

Kevin C. McLeod, in "C.R.S. Quarterly" (March 1981) points out that medical investigators have applied *electromagnetic fields* to a variety of patients with apparently beneficial effects including retarding of aging and stabilization of the genetic code, and also increased release of calcium into tissues. A relevant point is that disturbed calcium metabolism is a suspected factor in aging. With bone fractures that would not join, electromagnetic fields promoted bone growth and caused bone ends to unite and knit.

On the evidence, the earth's magnetic field is decaying exponentially. In the pre-Flood era it would have been very much stronger than now. People in that era would have enjoyed the benefits of a much greater electromagnetic field than people in later times, presumably with effects on longevity.

Donald W. Patten, in "C.R.S. Quarterly" (June 1982), looks at the role of *Carbon Dioxide (CO₂)*. In laboratory experiments, an atmosphere enriched in CO₂ produced beneficial effects on the blood of vertebrate animals. Also it caused dilation of blood vessels in the brain (and skin), making more oxygen available to brain cells. There is a small gland in the brain called the hypothalamus, a gland which affects aging for the neuro-endocrine system. Increased oxygenation in brain cells reduces the activity of this gland and thus reduces its influence for aging.

Patten proposes that the pre-Flood atmosphere was very much richer in CO₂ than was the atmosphere after the Flood. Why? Because cold oceans soak up much more CO₂ from the atmosphere than do warm oceans. Today's oceans average a chilly 38 degrees F (3.3 degrees C) compared with warmer pre-Flood oceans of perhaps 60 degrees F (15.6 degrees C). The warmer oceans meant the pre-Flood atmosphere was much richer in CO₂, which rendered the hypothalamus less active and thereby retarded the aging process.

In an interesting aside Patten says that, a century ago, CO₂ comprised 290 parts per million of the atmosphere. Since then, increasing burning of fossil fuels has raised the CO₂ ratio to 330 p.p.m. He thinks this increase in atmospheric CO₂ has some relation to recent generations' increase in height and/or lifespan.

Fossils show that, before the Pleistocene age the size of mammals was 30% to 40% greater than in today's world. This gigantism occurred worldwide. Then, with the Pleistocene, which we interpret as the post Flood world, there occurred a declining size of animals in all parts of the world. The fossils cannot reveal whether there was also a decline in lifespans of animals; but Genesis records a decline in man's lifespan.

Both Dillow and Patten draw attention to the fairly constant lifespans of the long-lived pre-Flood patriarchs from Adam to Noah; and then to the declining ages of men after the Flood. From Noah's son, Shem (600 years), through 17 generations to the contemporaries of Moses when 70 years became the ordinary lifetime, the lifespans plotted graphically against the generations show an exponential decline. Dillow comments that such a decay curve is common when a system in equilibrium is suddenly acted on in a way that shifts it to a new equilibrium. He says that *myths* could not produce such a neat mathematical result. It is most unlikely that such a curve could result from anything but an actual *historical* happening. The decay curve "*suggests that new factors were present in the post-Flood environment.*"

Oxygen, Carbon Dioxide, earth's magnetic field may all have played a part in longevity and in the mystery of aging. It is all in the investigatory stage; but these factors should persuade skeptics to think hard before dismissing the Genesis ages as myths.

Q7. Who was Cain's wife ?

A. This question is often asked, and sometimes in a tone that implies "Got ya' this time." The answer is simple: Cain's wife was his sister. Then comes the objection that the Bible makes no mention of other children of Adam and Eve at the time Cain killed Abel. The Bible names Cain and Abel because it recounts an event concerning them. Its silence regarding additional children cannot be interpreted to mean that there were not other children.

The Douay version of the Bible is unquestionably Catholic. In a footnote explaining Genesis 4:14, the Douay Bible says, regarding Cain: "*His guilty conscience made him fear his own brothers and nephews; of whom, by this time, there might be a good number upon the earth; which had now endured near one hundred and thirty years; as may be gathered from Gen 5:3, compared with Gen 4:25, though in the compendious account given in the Scriptures, only Cain and Abel are mentioned.*"

Another footnote in the Douay Bible explains Gen. 4:17 which refers to Cain's wife. The footnote says: "*She was a daughter of Adam, and Cain's own sister; God dispensing with such marriages in the beginning of the world, as mankind could not otherwise be propagated.*"

This usually provokes a further objection that God would not permit incest. However, the Bible clearly tells us that God started the human race with one couple, Adam and Eve. Unless God intended the human race to stop after one generation, God intended brothers and sisters to marry at this stage. Before we express disappointment with God for allowing this, let us look at the reason why we regard incest as reprehensible today. The basic reason is genetic risk to the offspring rather than the morality of it.

We humans carry what is called "the genetic load." This is the accumulation of bad mutations during the centuries. Fortunately for us, the genetic effect of these mutations is usually recessive. It remains latent,

unless both parents carry the particular recessive gene. In that case the offspring will probably exhibit the defect. If parents are closely related there is greater risk that both will carry a matching recessive gene from the genetic load; and so, the risk of defective children is greater.

Incest increases the genetic risk, but does not necessarily mean defective children. Ancient Egyptian ruling families practiced brother-sister marriages, and produced healthy kings and queens. This is mentioned by Ashley Montagu, author of "Human Heredity"; and he gives other examples, such as the inhabitants of the Pitcairn Islands, the Hindu community of Tengger Hills, and people of many small islands. All these seem to show no ill effects. On the other hand, inbreeding among the Nanticoke Indians of Delaware produced a drooping upper eyelid; and inbreeding in the population of Martha's Vineyard was the cause of deafness in the hill folk of New England and of considerable feeble mindedness. (Reference: Supplement to Bible Science Newsletter, April, 1975.)

Now we come to the main point of our answer. Adam and Eve were bodily perfect. In the early stages of the human race there was virtually *no genetic load*. When Cain took his own sister as wife, both were children of Adam and Eve. There was no genetic risk to their children.

Philosophically, let us add that God's plan was wise. He started humanity with one couple; thus the whole human race are brothers and sisters. In starting us the way he did, God was fully aware that there would be no genetic risk from marriages of close relatives among the early generations.

Q8. Human and chimpanzee chromosomes differ surprisingly little, is this evidence of evolution of man ?

In a High School class, a leaflet was distributed saying that new research on chromosomes shows that humans and chimpanzees differ surprisingly little; that the great apes have 48 chromosomes and humans have 46, that essentially every band and sub-band observed so far in man has a direct counterpart in the chimp chromosomes. The leaflet says that our common ancestor probably also had 48, but, during our evolution, two of these fused to form what is now chromosome No. 2 in humans.

The question is: Is this new evidence of evolution of man ?

A. The leaflet states some facts which are correct; but it adds assumptions which are only suppositions, e.g. the assumption that evolution is fact; and the assumption of some hypothetical, unidentifiable "common ancestor."

We have to keep in mind that man has 46 chromosomes in 23 pairs, the chimpanzee has 48 chromosomes in 24 pairs. Regarding chromosomes of chimp and man, Professor Jerome Lejeune, of Paris University, is a world authority. In Australia, in 1978, he stated: *"We now know, thanks to the work of one of my assistants, that the chimp has two chromosomes more than we have. The chimp has two chromosomes which are separated. Man has a big chromosome which is made by the joining of the analogous two chromosomes of the chimp."*

My interpretation is that, where Professor Lejeune mentions 2 chromosomes of the chimp, he is referring to 2 pairs. Then 2 pairs of ordinary chromosomes in the chimp have the equivalent of one big pair of chromosomes in man.

He explained that the joining of the two chromosomes is head to head, which, until recently, had been regarded as impossible. When they are thus joined, the genetic information of the second chromosome in the chimp is read in one direction, but its fused counterpart in man is read in the reverse direction. The reading of the information in the chimp's direction may give one sense, but, when read in the human way, it gives a different significance.

If a gene contains 1,000 or more nucleotides, and if a nucleotide directs the position of an amino acid, and if one amino acid out of position can cause biologic havoc, let us imagine the effect of a reversal of a chromosome containing thousands of genes. When such immensity of genetic information can be read forwards (for a chimp) and backwards (for man) without biologically wrecking the chimp or the man, it suggests clever design by a super-intelligence.

Professor Lejeune stated that chromosomal research clearly demonstrates that the genetic differences between man and each of the three great apes are so great as to provide conclusive evidence that man did not evolve from his closest kin, the apes. There are as many chromosomal differences between man and each of the apes, as there are between any one ape species and another.

He affirmed that research since 1971 has shown that the Darwinist idea of evolution by gradual change is genetically impossible. He is definite that the only way anything could have evolved is by sudden and complete breaks. That means evolution by big jumps, so we are looking at the "hopeful monster" idea again.

Having established that man, chimpanzee, gorilla and orang-outang are equally far apart, and none of them could have evolved into another, Lejeune concludes thus: *"A simplified theory might suppose that all four came from a common ancestor, through different species that were separated long ago, and that the common ancestor was not an ape at all, but some small mammal"*

The scientific position is clear: Science observes man and three species of ape, and science pronounces that man could not have evolved from any ape. That is all that science can tell us. Scientists can hypothesise all sorts of things, if they desire evolution. So some scientists (and some teachers) are hypothesising that evolution of man did happen, and that man and chimp have evolved along separate lines from a "common ancestor" unknown.

In body structure there is some rough similarity between man and chimp, so it is not surprising that there is a considerable similarity in chromosomes. However, even if the only difference is in that fused chromosome in man, that would involve some thousands of genes of human genetic information as opposed to chimpanzee information; and that constitutes a world of difference. Lejeune reminds us that our bodies are human because the genetic information that moulded our bodily material is human information. "Otherwise", he says, "we would be flies or chimpanzees."

Conclusion

If you want to believe in evolution, you have to abandon evolution by gradual steps. You must believe in sudden and complete breaks. You have to accept evolution by "monsters" which, (instead of dying as all monsters do), survive and launch new species; and that these "hopeful monsters" have been happening so frequently as to produce the innumerable species that have ever lived on earth.

So frequent a happening can't stop now. Your pet mare's expected foal might be something, not a foal, but a something never before seen on earth.

To be consistent, you must not be surprised if, some day, your own child is not the expected baby but something other than human, never before seen on earth, and that this little monster will survive, but be unable to breed with humans. Lejeune has said that, to start a new species, there has to be at least two of these. Before your own monster can breed a new species, a second monster has to be born about the same time, one of opposite gender, with complementary reproductive organs.

Evolutionists like to hypothesise back into the dim, untestable past. If you play that game, you must ask yourself: Might it not happen, just as easily, in my own suburb, in my own home, at any time?

I know, and you know, that it won't happen.

APPENDIX A

THE CHURCH'S POSITION

It is fundamental that we believe in Creation, out of nothing, of heaven and earth by one almighty personal God whose power now sustains His creation. (Fourth Lateran and First Vatican Councils.)

We may believe in evolution of the body (if convinced of it on the evidence) but not evolution of the soul; and, among the earthly race of man, polygenism is forbidden. (Humani Generis.) Any idea of a God evolving with the universe was condemned by the First Vatican Council.

In the 20th Century, with the growth of evolution ideas, Pope Plus XII made clear the Church's position: FIRSTLY, in 1941, in an ADDRESS TO THE PONTIFICAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, the Pope said that Genesis attested these certainties, with no possible allegorical interpretation:

- (1) Man's essential superiority to other animals because of his spiritual soul.
- (2) In some way the first woman was derived from the first man.
- (3) The first man could not have been generated literally by a brute beast in the proper sense of the term, without divine intervention.

SECONDLY, in 1950, Pope Plus XII issued the encyclical, HUMANI GENERIS, which dealt with various modern errors. He pointed out how evolutionism can lead to serious error:

"A glance at the world outside the Christian Fold will familiarize us, easily enough, with the false directions which the thought of the learned often takes. Some will contend that the theory of evolution, as it is called a theory which has not yet been proved beyond contradiction even in the sphere of natural science applies to the origin of all things whatsoever. Accepting it without caution, without reservation, they boldly give rise to monistic or pantheistic speculations which represent the whole universe as left at the mercy of a continual process of evolution. Such speculations are eagerly welcomed by the Communists, who find in them a powerful weapon for defending and popularising their system of dialectical materialism; the whole area of God is thus to be eradicated from men's minds."

"These false evolutionary notions, with their denial of all that is absolute, or fixed or abiding in human experience, have paved the way for a new philosophy of error.. ."

He referred to reliance on *"the positive sciences (as they are called) "* and said that it is *"an excellent principle"* to do so when they deal with *"really ascertained facts"*, but we must be cautious when they are *"hypotheses, based to some extent on natural science"* which affect Church doctrines.

He continues, and applies this to MAN'S BODY AND SOUL:

"Thus, the teaching of the Church leaves the doctrine of evolution an open question, as long as it confines its speculations to the development, from other living matter already in existence, of the human body. (That souls are immediately created by God is a view which the Catholic faith imposes on us.)"

"In the present state of scientific and theological opinion, this question " (evolution of the body) "may be legitimately canvassed by research, and by discussion between experts on both sides. At the same time, the reasons for and against either view must be weighed and adjudged with all seriousness, fairness and restraint: and there must be a readiness on all sides to accept the arbitrament of the Church. . ."

He then deplores the rashness of those who abuse this liberty of debate by treating evolution of the body as if proved beyond doubt.

Next he moves to POLYGENISM: *"Christians cannot lend their support to a theory which involves the existence, after Adam's time, of some earthly race of men, truly so called who were not descended ultimately from him, or else supposes that Adam was the name given to some group of our primordial ancestors. It does not appear how such views can be reconciled with the doctrine of original sin, as this is guaranteed to us by Scripture and tradition, and proposed to us by the Church. Original sin is the result of a sin committed, in*

actual historical fact, by an individual man named Adam, and it is a quality native to all of us, only because it has been handed down by descent from him." (A footnote reference to Romans V, 12-19, and Council of Trent, sess. V, can. 1-4, indicates that this is well established Church teaching.)

Note: Father McKee (in "The Enemy Within The Gate") summarises that the clear intention of the encyclical is to exclude polygenism from theology. He adds that this part of the encyclical teaches that Adam was an individual man, not a group; his sin was an actual historical sin which is passed on to us by blood descent.

Further note: "Humani Genicis" expressly states that, in encyclicals, a Pope is teaching as Vicar of Christ, clarifying what the Church already teaches, and this removes the subject from free debate among theologians. Despite this, many theologians still strive to outflank "Humani Genicis" in efforts to reconcile original sin with polygenism.

"MYSTICI CORPORIS" (1953): Pius XII reinforced "Humani Genicis" with this encyclical. Part of its teaching is summarised by Father McKee: It includes (1) Adam was the father of the whole human race; (2) he was created in perfection; (3) all mankind inherited the stain of his sin.

ADDRESS BY POPE PAUL VI (1966): Paul VI addressed a group of theologians and reminded them that *"Catholic doctrine on original sin was reaffirmed in the Second Vatican Council"* (in "Lumen Gentium" and in "Gaudium et Spes") *"in full consonance with divine revelation and the teaching of preceding Councils of Carthage, Orange and Trent."* (Refer 'Lumen Gentium' section 2. 'Gaudium et Spes' sections 18 and 22 and 24.)

He reproved some modern authors whose explanations of original sin seem *"Irreconcilable with true Catholic doctrine."* He affirmed Church teaching *"according to which the sin of the first man is transmitted to all his descendants, not through imitation but through propagation"* (i.e. through blood descent.)

He also reaffirmed the special creation of each human soul by God. "The Catholic Catechism" (Fr. J.A. Hardon S.J.) on page 106 states: *"While never formally defined, the fact of a direct creation of each individual soul belongs to the deposit of the Christian faith. Implicitly taught by the Fifth Lateran Council ... it is part of that vast treasury of revealed truths which are jealously safeguarded by the Church. This was brought to the surface in 'Humani Genicis' in 1950. . ."*

"CREDO OF THE PEOPLE OF GOD" (1968): Pope Paul VI again clarified the Church's position that our first parents were established *"in holiness and justice and in which man knew neither evil nor death,"* but that Adam's sin caused *"human nature, common to all men, to fall into a state in which it bears the consequences of that offence, and which is not the state in which it was at first in our first parents. . ."*

He explains ORIGINAL SIN: *"It is human nature so fallen, stripped of the grace that clothed it, injured in its own natural powers and subjected to the dominion of death, that is transmitted to all men, and it is in this sense that every man is born in sin. We therefore hold, with the Council of Trent, that original sin is transmitted with human nature, 'not by imitation, but by propagation' and that it is thus 'proper to everyone'."*

And REDEMPTION: *"We believe that Our Lord Jesus Christ, by the sacrifice of the Cross, redeemed us from original sin and all the personal sins committed by each one of us. . ."*

THE FALL: The "Catholic Catechism" (pp. 100-101) states:

"Since the beginnings of Pelagianism and up to the most sophisticated theories of rationalism, the Church has never wavered in her essential doctrine about man's original condition as he left the creative hand of God, and of what happened when the first man disobeyed his creator."

It explains that *"Augustine's doctrine on original justice, the fall, and original sin was many times confirmed by successive Popes."*

It refers to the Second Council of Orange and then says:

"A thousand years later, the Council of Trent returned to the same subject. . ." and ". . . the Church's doctrine at Trent becomes more sharply defined. Thus 'the first man Adam immediately lost the justice and holiness in which he was constituted when he disobeyed the command of God in the Garden of Paradise.' "

The Catechism says that Trent wished *"to carefully distinguish between two states of man's existence, before and after the fall. Before the fall, Adam enjoyed the gift of integrity, which meant absence of the conflict we now experience between our natural urges and the dictates of right reason. After the fall Adam lost this gift for himself and his posterity, since even those who have been regenerated in baptism are plagued by an interior struggle with their unruly desires and fears."*

So, too, Trent repeated in more explicit terms what earlier Councils had taught. Adam was to have remained immortal in body, but, when he sinned, he became subject to death.

Trent confirmed St. Paul's doctrine that Adam's sin injured not only Adam himself but also his descendants. The consequences of Adam's sin were not only death of the body, but also the loss of grace the death of the soul which passed from one man to all the human race.

What is Original Sin?: *"As Aquinas was later to explain, the essence of original sin is the deprivation of what God would have conferred on all Adam's descendants if the first man had not sinned. It is not some inherent evil in what God produces."* ("Catholic Catechism," p. 105.)

Trust in Bible truth has been eroded lately. The point of entry of the erosion is Genesis, particularly regarding Adam and Eve. From there it has spread through the Bible. We conclude with the warning of Pope Leo XIII, which should be heeded by today's teachers of young minds:

" . . . for the young, if they lose their reverence for the Holy Scripture on one or more points, are easily led to give up believing in it altogether."

APPENDIX B

THE CHURCH AND FATHER TEILHARD DE CHARDIN

There is one writer who has exercised such an influence upon Liberal Catholic thought, particularly since Vatican II, that we must single him out for particular attention. This writer is Teilhard de Chardin. (Hugh J. O'Connell, C.S.S.R., Ph.D. in "Keeping Your Balance In The Modern Church".)

The Catholic Priests' Association of England, in their Newsletter (Jan.-Mar. 1972,) published an article titled "A Periscope On Teilhard de Chardin" by Mgr. John W. Flanagan. It summarised how Teilhard's case stands in the Church. The following is a condensation thereof.

Firstly, the sequence of official moves and edicts:

- 1926. Fr. de Chardin's Superiors in the Jesuit Order forbade him to teach any longer.
- 1927. The Holy See refused the "Imprimatur" for his book, "Le Milieu Divin".
- 1933. Rome ordered him to give up his post in Paris.
- 1939. Rome banned his work, "L'Energie Humaine."
- 1941. de Chardin submitted to Rome his most important work, "Le Phenomene Humaine."
- 1947. Rome forbade him to write or teach on Philosophical subjects.
- 1948. de Chardin was called to Rome by the Superior General of the Jesuits who hoped to get permission from the Holy See for the publication of his most important work, "Le Phenomene Humaine" ("The Phenomenon Of Man"). Publication had been prohibited in 1944, and the prohibition was renewed in 1948 de Chardin was also forbidden to take a teaching post in the College de France.
- 1949. Permission to publish "Le Groupe Zoologique" was refused.
- 1955. de Chardin was forbidden to attend the International Congress of Palaeontology. Fr. de Chardin died suddenly his year
- 1957. In April, all Jesuit publications in Spain carried a notice from the Spanish Provincial of the Jesuits that de Chardin's works had been published in Spanish without previous ecclesiastical examination and in defiance of decrees of the Holy See.
- 1962. The Monitum (or warning): A Decree of the Holy Office under the authority of Pope John XXIII warned that Teilhard's works are replete with ambiguities, or rather with serious errors, which offend Catholic doctrine. It urged those in authority to effectively protect, especially the minds of the young, against the dangers of the works of Fr. Teilhard de Chardin and his followers.
- 1963. The Vicariate of Rome, (a Diocese ruled in the name of Pope Paul VI by his Cardinal Vicar) in a decree, required that Catholic bookshops in Rome should withdraw from circulation the works of de Chardin, and also those books which favor his erroneous doctrines.

Conclusion: Popes Pius XI, Pius XII, John XXIII, and Paul VI, endeavoured to prevent the spread of the modernistic errors of Teilhard de Chardin.

Secondly, the "Periscope" article explained how Teilhard's works were published after his death by "progressive" elements within the Church, and some outside it, in disobedience to Teilhard's superiors and the Holy See.

Thirdly, the "Periscope" says that the Modernists in the Church set in motion a systematic campaign to spread Teilhard's doctrines into seminaries, schools, colleges, convents, etc. The campaign hinged around three points:

- (1) That the decree of 1957 and the Monitum of 1962 have been misunderstood, and are now disregarded by the Holy See.
- (2) That Pope Paul VI made a statement praising the works of Teilhard as "indispensable."
- (3) That, while certain points of Teilhard's works may be contested, on the whole his works are perfectly reconcilable with the Church's teaching, and give a new, deep and exciting "insight" into Catholic theology.

The Answer To (1):

- (a) The edict and the Monitum are crystal clear and cannot be misunderstood.
- (b) In reply to a formal query, the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith stated: "*The judgment and dispositions made by the Congregation concerning the writings of Teilhard de Chardin have not been changed. Thus the Monitum of 30th June, 1962, continues in effect.*" (8th March, 1967.)
- (c) Further re-affirmations (20th October, 1967, 23rd March 1970 and 4th August 1971) coming from Apostolic Delegations, but on the instructions of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, remove all possibility of doubt on this matter.

The Answer To (2):

To clear up this point, the question was put to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. The following reply was given by the Congregation through the Apostolic Delegation to Washington (5th March, 1967): "*I can authoritatively inform you that the Holy Father has never, in public or private, made this statement, that Father de Chardin is good and very necessary for our times.*"

The Answer To (3):

One of the greatest scholars on de Chardin, respected theologian, Cardinal Journet, gave his verdict on the works of Teilhard as follows: "*de Chardin's works are disastrous . . . his synthesis is logical, and it must be accepted or rejected as a whole, but it contradicts Christianity. . . If one accepts de Chardin's explanation one must reject the Christian notion of Creation, Spirit, God, Evil, Original Sin, the Cross, the Resurrection, Divine Love, etc.*" ("Nova et Vetera," October-December, 1962.)

APPENDIX C

FERAL CHILDREN

Evolutionists, who propose that some primates walked upright because they were "nearly man" or "just man", are presuming that a degree of humanness makes an animal stand up. The feral children teach a different lesson. Amala and Kamala, with many generations of true humanness in them, but reared in the wolf den, did not stand up. They walked on hands and knees; they ran on all fours with alternate rising of rump and head.

When captured in 1920, and cared for by missionaries at the Orphanage of Midnapore (India), they behaved like frightened, caged animals. They ate on all fours, lapping liquids, grabbing food with their mouths. For some time after capture, they disturbed the orphanage at night with their eerie howling at 10pm, 1am and 3am, the times when wolves howled to neighbouring packs.

Kamala was about eight, and Amala was one and a half years old when they were taken to the orphanage, but Amala died less than a year later. She showed promise of learning language and human ways with somewhat less difficulty than the older Kamala, which is a point of some significance.

After about two years, Kamala stood on her knees supported by a table and used both hands to bring a bowl of rice to her mouth. It was considerably later that she learned to stand on two feet. She never ran on two feet. Even after several years of human care, she reverted to quadrupedal running when speed was necessary, and by this method she ran so fast it was hard to overtake her.

After six years she was fitting in with orphanage life. She had increased her vocabulary to 45 words, 50% better than it was twelve months before. She understood verbal instructions. She could say small sentences like "Dolls inside box", involving a preposition, and suggesting a maturity in language better than a normal 2 year old.

A year later, she was responsible enough to take care of the orphanage babies for short periods. She had come to love the children and they all loved her. She was then about 15 years old. Apparently she continued to make progress in speech. Two years later she became ill. It is recorded that, although she became very weak and suffered long, she talked a great deal, and "with the full sense of the words used". She died in November, 1929, nine years after leaving the wolf den.

This shows progress in Kamala's regeneration. When Kamala and Amala were rescued from the wolfs' lair, their only vocabulary was a howling. At the orphanage they crouched in a corner of their room. Food had to be left on the floor, and they would take it in their mouths. Kamala would roll her eyes and growl if anyone approached when she was eating.

It took more than six months before they ventured to take a biscuit from the hand of Mrs. Singh, snatching it by mouth and darting back to their corner. Some real progress had been attained by the time of Amala's death. The loss of Amala brought the first tear to Kamala's eyes. She would not eat; and reverted to the wild state. Special attention by Mrs. Singh won Kamala back.

Further reading:

"Wolf Children and Feral Man" by Rev. J.A.L. Singh and Robert M. Zingg. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, The Shoe String Press, 1966.

"Biography Of A Wolf Child" Article by Arnold Gasell, M.D. Harpers Magazine, January, 1941.

"The Wild Boy of Aveyron" by Harlan Lane. Harvard University Press, 1976.

"Philosophy In A New Key" by Susanne K. Langer. (Chapter V. Language) Harvard University Press, 1951.

APPENDIX D

ADDENDUM TO "HUMAN EVOLUTION" -- and a word on BIRDS

Section FOUR of this book (*listen to 2. Ape Men - MP3 audio*) discussed, among other matters, two recent discoveries by the Leakey/Walker team which have shaken the evolution story.

Firstly: The July, 1986 finding of a skull of A.BOSEI (or *Zinjanthropus*). Its dating of 2½ million years made it too old to fit the story. It wiped the slate of "hominid" evolution fairly clean.

Secondly: the finding in 1984 of the skeleton of "THE BOY": The skull suggested Neanderthal (*sapiens*). The postcranial skeleton (which is the skeleton below the skull) essentially resembled modern man. However, the dating was 1.6 my. (million years) and this made The Boy too old to be classed *Homo sapiens* in evolution theory framework. The dilemma was skirted by classing him in the convenient group of *Homo Erectus*.

Now let us look at a third discovery, which was not discussed in Section Four -- a recently reported discovery by a Johanson expedition. In July, 1986 they discovered parts of the skull and some limb bones of an individual. The find is labelled OH62. It was reported in "Nature" (21 May, 1987; Pg. 205 et seq.). Teeth and skull parts indicated that OH62 is *Homo Habilis*.

Problems arose with the limb bones. "Nature" stated: "This represents the first time that limb elements have been securely assigned to *Homo Habilis*" (Pg. 209).

Homo Habilis had been regarded as an advanced hominid. But these bones show a very small creature barely 3 feet (91 cm) tall. This is as small as, or smaller than Lucy (*A. Afarensis*). Its long arms, with fingers reaching almost to the knees showed it to be as ape-like as Lucy. Yet this *Homo Habilis* was dated 1.8 m.y. which is 2 m.y. after Lucy. Here was evidence that, in the supposed 2 million years from Lucy to *Habilis*, nothing had happened. Evolution had stood still.

As we pause and contemplate the above three discoveries, we note firstly that the A. Bosei fossil (*Zinjanthropus*) wipes the slate clean of evolutionary ancestors. Next, if we use Lucy as a datum point 3.8 m.y. ago, we go forward 2 million years to *Homo Habilis* (OH62) and we note that there is no evolutionary progress at all. However, a brief 200,000 years later, in a miracle of evolutionary speed, The Boy suddenly appears, and he looks like *Homo sapiens*.

After The Boy, we go forward a long 1.6 million years to our own time, and we find our own postcranial skeletons are essentially the same as that of The Boy. This means that there was no real evolution in 1.6 m.y. from The Boy to us.

Therefore, as we look across nearly four million years from Lucy to us, there has been no evolution except for that one miraculous burst which produced The Boy. This wrecks the evolution story, and evolutionists have yet to explain it.

The facts and significance of the OH62 find are set out clearly in an article in "Impact" No. 171 (Sept. 1987) by Duane T. Gish, Ph.D.

It is of further interest that the article also discusses the finding of two fossil BIRDS dated 225 m.y. old which was announced in "Nature" 322:677 (1986). On such dating, these very real birds would have lived 75 m.y. before *Archaeopteryx*. That should effectively refute any lingering claims about *Archaeopteryx* being a link between reptiles and birds.

Of course, we do not accept evolutionists' datings and great ages on which they have woven evolution's story, but it seems that every recent discovery has made the evolution story more impossible.
