



BOOK REVIEW

OF A FORTHCOMING TITLE FROM

Preserving Christian Publications

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION JUDGED BY REASON AND FAITH

by Cardinal Ernesto Ruffini (Translated by Fr. Francis O'Hanlon)

Foreword by Archbishop Thomas A. Boland of Newark, New Jersey

Introduction by Msgr. John Steinmueller, Consultor of the Pontifical Biblical Commission

EVOLUTION: REFUTED BY REASON AND FAITH

A review of *The Theory of Evolution Judged by Reason and Faith*, Cardinal Ernesto Ruffini, New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1959.

Available after December 15, 2008

205 pages, cloth hardcover, sewn binding, and dust jacket, #55674. \$19.00

Christoph Cardinal Schönborn, Archbishop of Vienna, had an op. ed. piece, critical of Darwinism, published in the New York Times July 7, 2005. [1] The most uninformed response encountered, of the many found on the internet, was the ZNet Blogs posting, "Devolution at the Church of Rome." David Peterson wrote, "So, the Church of Rome is in the process of reversing course on evolution..." [2] Card. Schonborn did not reverse the Church position on evolution but, reiterated consistent Church teaching. This was clearly expressed in the book herein reviewed.

Part I - ORIGIN OF LIVING BEINGS IN GENERAL

The first chapter is devoted to a brief history of the development of the evolutionary philosophy. It must be noted that evolution is not a scientific theory. That notion was demolished, however inadvertently, by evolutionary biologists L. C. Birch and Paul R. Ehrlich:

Our theory of evolution has become, as Popper (philosopher of science, Karl R. 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 science' but not necessarily false. No one can think of ways in which to test it. Ideas either without basis or based on 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. [3]

Card. Ruffini devoted a significant amount of commentary to an exposition of the anti-scientific work of Ernst Haeckel. His major claim to infamy was the proposal of the so-called "biogenetic law," according to which, 'ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny.' That's the discredited notion that the human embryo passes through the stages of human evolution during development. An excellent critique of Haeckel's nescience was written by Jesuit Frs. J. Assmuth and Ernest R. Hull. [4]

Chapter two is devoted to refuting the "proofs" of evolution from paleontological evidence (the fossil record). [5] One of the more interesting critiques is that of the familiar fossil series allegedly showing the evolution of the horse in North America. Evolutionist paleontologist, Prof. George Gaylord Simpson, discussed several of the widely-held misconceptions regarding horse "evolution" that would seem to lend little support to evolutionary claims:

There is a widespread impression that the so-called "speed ratios," proportions of lower to upper limb segments, showed a constant trend to increase in the Equidae. Romer [has]... demonstrated that this is decidedly false....The most famous of all equid trends, "gradual reduction of the side toes, is flatly fictitious....The Equidae had no trends that: (1) continued throughout the history of the family in any line, (2) affected all lines at any one time, (3) occurred in all lines at some time in their history, or (4) were even approximately constant in direction and rate in any line for periods longer than on the order of 15 to 20 million years at most (usually much less)...[T]rends were often quite different in rate and direction in different lines and in the same lines at different times...[6]

Interestingly, as late as 2002, the authors of a textbook were still promoting evolution of the horse: "Probably the best known of such series are the fossil horses..." [7]



Another interesting topic addressed by the cardinal is the field of genetics. One of the activities, which has been conducted in various laboratories for decades, is the use of x-rays, to cause mutations; one of a number of attempts to “demonstrate” evolution. Jesuit Fr. Howard Morrison seemed unimpressed:

In books which argue for evolution there is usually much qualitative and quantitative data on mutations within a species, and between species which are very similar (sibling species). Almost all those published in the last 30 years describe observed mutations (natural and induced by experimenters) in many of the 28 different species of fruit flies (*Drosophila*). But they are still fruit flies! No series of mutations have (sic, has) been observed from a common ancestor into such insects as fruit flies, house flies, and mosquitoes, to say nothing of the much longer series from a reptile to a bird. [8]

The third chapter is relatively short since it covers a subject that requires but little space; the “mechanism” of evolution. Eugenie C. Scott, Ph.D., executive director of the National Center for Science Education, stated the issue succinctly:

Scientists are very much united on what happened. Evolution happened—to modify a bumper sticker. But how it happened is something that we argue about a lot in science. How important is natural selection, how important are other mechanisms? [9]

The authors of the biology textbook noted above described four other “mechanisms” but, natural selection would seem to have been given pride of place:

Natural selection is not the *only* evolutionary force....Nevertheless, it is natural selection that shapes the evolution of populations as they adapt to their changing environment. For this reason, we will examine the mechanisms of natural selection in some detail. [10]

The existence of “other” mechanisms would seem to be a later discovery. Evolutionist Prof. James Gray would seem to have been unaware of them:

...[N]atural selection...is the only theory we have; but when judged as a working hypothesis it is disappointing to find so little advance in a hundred years....No amount of argument, or clever epigram, can disguise the inherent improbability of orthodox theory; but most biologists feel it is better to think in terms of improbable events than not to think at all. [11]

Chapter four is an overview of evolution as it relates to the Faith. The cardinal briefly defines what he describes as “A classification of the different attitudes...” regarding evolution; materialistic, absolute, biological, moderate and restricted. He briefly mentioned the French priest, Canon Henri de Dorlodot, who described himself as a moderate evolutionist. [12] There will be a subsequent reference to Fr. de Dorlodot’s writing.

The cardinal offered one opinion that can only be viewed as curious to those who, as myself, are militant young-Earth Biblical creationists:

Certainly the Faith has nothing against the theory of evolution so long as creation is admitted and man is excluded. On the contrary, the opponent of evolutionism, either absolute or simply biological, is science. (p. 59)

We of the militant stripe have no argument with the second sentence. The first, however, seems naive. According to biologist Thomas Henry Huxley, Darwin’s bulldog, the primary purpose of the evolutionary paradigm is to refute the Faith:

If (Jesuit Fr. Francisco) Suarez has rightly stated Catholic doctrine, then is evolution utter heresy. And such I believe it to be. In addition to the truth of the doctrine of evolution, indeed, one of its greatest merits in my eyes, is the fact that it occupies a position of complete and irreconcilable antagonism to that vigorous and consistent enemy of the highest intellectual, moral, and social life of mankind—the Catholic Church.

Let every man...if he be so inclined, amuse himself with such scientific implements as authority tells him are safe and will not cut his fingers; but let him not imagine he is or can be, both a true son of the Church and a loyal soldier of science. [13]

It’s most unfortunate, in my opinion, that someone in the Jesuit Order has not translated more of Fr. Suarez’ writings into English.

Cardinal Ruffini wrote a brief remark about the dispute among biologists (in particular, systematists) concerning the classification of species and even the very definition of the term. Interestingly, a number of evolutionists have taken creationists to task for the inability to define Genesis “kinds” (Hebrew, “*bara*”). [14] Yet, the species problem, for evolutionary biologists, is critical enough to have required a minimum of two symposia, the latter of the two, recently. [15] [16]

The fifth chapter is an analysis of what the cardinal describes as: “The different systems put forward to explain the Mosaic cosmogony...” (p. 68) Here is where this young-Earth Biblical creationist must part company with the cardinal’s position:

The...Strict Historical-Literal System...presents difficulties, so numerous and so grave, that scarcely anyone could be found, today, who would dare to defend it. Stratigraphy and palaeontology, with their distinction of geological times into eras and periods of very long duration, now admitted by the most illustrious scientists, disprove irrefutably the idea that the earth with its fauna and flora was formed in the space of a few days. (p. 71)

There exists a large number of evangelical Protestants and, sadly, only a remnant of Roman Catholics today who defend the Genesis Hexameron (Six Days of Creation). The moderate evolutionist, Canon Henri de Dorlodot, attested to the only reasonable sense of the Genesis account of the initial creation:

The only periods of time which the term (inserted Hebrew symbol) can signify are, therefore, either the day of twenty-four hours, or else the part of this period during which the sun remains above the horizon. There is, then, no doubt as to the meaning of the Six Days: the sacred text gives us the succession of six days properly so-called. God finishes His daily work each evening, and starts again on the morning of the next day, right up to the Seventh Day, when God rests. [17]

Yet, he did not accept the literal interpretation of the text. Rather, he agreed with Pere Joseph Brucker that each day must be treated as a period, based on geological data, but the succession of the Six Days must be held as documented. That position presents a serious problem for those who hold it. The current total of the “six periods,” based on evolutionary “development”, is currently 4.5 billion years. How much “time,” can be allowed for the Third Day when God created plant life, which requires the sun for survival, when the sun was not created until the Fourth Day?

Regarding the alleged 4.5 billion years for the age of the Earth, Prof. Gunther Faure, however inadvertently, rendered the notion untenable. He described no less than 12 radiometric (he prefers the term isotopic) dating methods, each of which is based on at least one unverifiable assumption (i.e.): “[...]In this case (Potassium/Argon dating) we assume that no ^{40}Ar (Argon) is present in the mineral at the time of its formation...” [18] As an aside, the “development” of the age of the Earth from 3.3 to 4.5 billion years was “accomplished” by a trio of researchers who employed no less than 10 assumptions. [19]

The situation for Roman Catholics is patently simple or, more complex, depending on one’s mindset. The chapter summary note for Genesis I reads: “God createth Heaven and Earth, and all things therein, in six days.” [20] Verse 1 reads: “In the beginning God created heaven, and earth.” Footnote “a” reads: “A. M. 1; Ante C. 4004.” [21] The date for creation, “9:00 am on the twenty-third of October, 4004 BC.”, was calculated by Anglican clergyman James Ussher (1580-1656) using Biblical chronology. [22]

The complexity of the issue for Catholics would seem to me to be in an admonition of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself in one of His teachings on adultery: “Have ye not read, that he who made man from the beginning, made them male and female?” [23] Those whom Jesus was teaching accepted the “the beginning” as “A. M. 1; Ante C. 4004.” If “the beginning” were billions of years ago, it would seem to me Christ had the obligation to tell His listeners: “I am the way, and the truth, and the life.” [24] One may argue that the object of that Scripture was moral, not chronological. However, if Jesus allowed His listeners to hold an opinion that was obviously in error, it seems to me He would have been guilty of deceit. We know, that as God Incarnate, that’s impossible.

Part II - ORIGIN OF MAN

Chapter one is an overview of “...the recent discovery of fossils that seem to show a close relationship between man and the animal species” (p. 99). This is the arena where evolution causes a severe problem for the Catholic evolutionist:

As an evolutionary biologist who is Catholic, I am troubled when Christoph Cardinal Schönborn, an advisor to Pope Benedict XVI, claims that Neo-Darwinian evolution is contrary to Christian faith (New York Times July 7, 2005). Particularly disturbing is the cardinal’s disregard of overwhelming scientific evidence that supports Neo-Darwinian evolution [25]

Prof. Belovsky’s reference to the paper read before the Pontifical Academy of Sciences was apparently intended to bolster papal support (John Paul II) for the evolutionist position. Yet, the statement does no such thing. Further, any Pope, acting in his capacity as a private theologian, cannot command the assent of the faithful to a particular view he happens to be espousing. However, such an attempt is not new. Fr. Patrick O’Connell wrote a stinging rebuke of a similar action over 50 years ago:

Catholic evolutionists, knowing the weakness of their case, try to bolster it up by appealing to the Encyclical *Humani Generis* which they misrepresent, as Pius XII, who issued it, complained on more than one occasion. [26]

Belovsky’s action may simply be ignorance of Roman Catholic tradition rather than misrepresentation. It could also be a situation in which an evolutionist, who is confronted with such lack of support at the highest level in the Church hierarchy, would be willing to grasp at any straw.

What is contained in *Humani Generis* that the evolutionists, accused by Fr. O'Connell, would be tempted to misrepresent? Two teachings come immediately to mind. First is the condemnation of polygenism, the evolutionary notion that the human race had more than one set of original parents. Polygenism is in opposition to monogenism, the dogma that the human race had only one set of original parents; Adam and Eve. That condemnation could not have been more explicit:

There are other conjectures, about polygenism (as it is called), which leave the faithful no such freedom of debate. 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 (cf. Rom. v. 12-19; Conc. Trid. sess. v, can. x-4). [27]

The second is more subtle if only because of literary logistics. The earlier part of the teaching seems to give away the ball game from the creationist point of view:

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 may be legitimately canvassed by research, and by discussion between those who are expert in both subjects. [28]

Yet, Catholic writer Paul H. Hallett would seem to have rendered untenable the notion of bodily evolution separate from creation of the soul:

To say that God created man's soul but that his body might have evolved from a lower life form, slips easily off the tongue but when analyzed makes no sense. Man's body does not exist before his soul. It is the soul that makes the body and the soul that contains the body, not the reverse. [29]

Interestingly, Pope Pius XII would seem to have agreed with Mr. Hallett in the final tally. However, in my experience, the second half of this papal teaching would seem to somehow have escaped the notice of the typical Catholic evolutionist:

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, as being entrusted by Christ with the task of interpreting the Scriptures aright, and the duty of safeguarding the doctrines of the faith. 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. [30]

Whether such oversight is accidental or deliberate is irrelevant. The final result is unchanged.

The second chapter is a brief review of some Catholic defenders of evolution (mostly clerics). He quoted the famous rebuke issued by the Fathers of the 1860 Provincial Council of Cologne, convened by the Cardinal Archbishop, Johannes von Geissel (1796-1864): [31]

Our first parents were created immediately 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 his body, is derived by spontaneous transformation from an imperfect nature, which improved continually until it reached the present human state. (p. 113)

The cleric most familiar to me, Holy Cross Fr. John Zahm, was a professor of physics at Notre Dame University. His literary technique would be adopted by Sulpician Fr. Raymond E. Brown. He did not deny any Church teaching. However, he called some teachings into question in such a manner that the seed of doubt would be planted in the mind of one whose discernment was weak:

We may for the nonce admit that the Fathers and Doctors, theologians and commentators for the first sixteen centuries of the Church's history, almost unanimously believed and taught that the Flood was universal. But, granting this to be true, are we obliged to regard their beliefs and teachings as anything more than the expressions of personal opinions concerning matters that anyone is free to discuss? Or are we to consider their consensus of opinion regarding the Flood as a part of that body of doctrine which cannot be impugned without scandal and danger to faith? [32]

The answer to Fr. Zahm's nuanced question is provided in the following chapter. An excellent critique of Fr. Zahm's notorious book, *Evolution and Dogma* has been written by Catholic writer Paula P. Haigh. [33] Card. Ruffini noted that, Fr. Zahm, to his credit, "...begged the Italian translator of his book (*Evoluzione e Dogma*) to use all his influence to withdraw his book from sale, as the Holy See objected to its continued circulation." (p. 115)

Chapter three is devoted to the teachings of the Fathers of the Church, as well as prominent theologians, on the specific issue of the formation of the human body. The cardinal disagreed with exegetes (and Fr. Zahm) who insist that St. Augustine supported evolution: "Now we maintain that in such a question it is not lawful to contradict the unanimous consent of the holy Fathers treating of matter in which they are witnesses and teachers of what must be believed." (p. 122) His rebuke of those who hold that Eve was created from Adam's body but, Adam could have evolved from a lower life form was no less forceful: "If we wish to stand by Holy Scripture, we must accept it in its entirety; then any repugnant differentiation between man and woman will cease." (p. 123)

Among the theologians quoted is Very Rev. Achilles Ratti, Doctor of the Amrosian Library. His dissertation was requested for inclusion in the dogmatic textbook of Msgr. Frederick Sala, Prefect of Studies of the Pontifical Theological Faculty of Milan. Fr. Ratti would later become Pope Pius XI. (p. 136)

The fourth chapter includes a quote from the 1909 decree of the Pontifical Biblical Commission confirming the historicity of the Genesis account of Creation. The cardinal also rejects accommodationism because it results in a departure from Catholic Tradition and, in spite of assumed good intentions, will be unacceptable to evolutionists.

Precious Blood Fr. William Kramer had the same understanding: "...[N]either side in the controversy (the Creation-evolutionism debate) has much use for *theistic evolution*, the intermediate position accepted by most Christian authors, including Catholics." [34]

Paula Haigh explained why "theistic evolution" is, or should be, unacceptable for Catholics:

[This essay is]. . .based on the conviction that "Theistic Evolution" is heresy, debilitating the Church today and causing more harm ultimately than atheistic evolution because of its reduction of God to a mechanism for the supposed natural processes of evolution, its lack of reverence for Holy Scripture as the revealing Word of God, and its insidious attack upon Catholic doctrine and tradition. [35]

In typically brilliant, erudite literary style Haigh develops her theme on the basis of traditional Roman Catholic teaching. Her work, based on Thomistic theology and the teachings of the Church Fathers is in direct opposition to the modernist paradigm of the "new theology" that was condemned by Pope St. Pius X. [36]

Verification of her charge was provided by Fr. Kramer:

The designer of a self-correcting machine has to be much more clever than a plodding one at a time designer. Theistic evolutionists maintain that the design of an evolving universe which achieves perfection through natural, even random, processes, is a much greater tribute to the divine Designer than piecemeal creationism. [37]

My practice, for many years, has been to avoid using the term, "theistic evolutionist." The reason is, in my experience, anyone who calls himself a theistic evolutionist seems to give pride of place to evolutionism, only bringing God into his discourse as an after thought. Fr. Kramer is only one of many. Prof. Kenneth R. Miller, a publicly professed practicing Catholic, is another:

The fossil record—and I can give you specific examples—is characterized best by sequences of appearances and disappearances. Now think what that means. What that means is that the characteristic that best describes the intelligent designer who would have designed this fossil record is incompetent because everything the intelligent designer designed, with about one percent exceptions, has immediately become extinct. Intelligent design has no explanation for the successive character in the fossil record, evolution has a perfect explanation... [38]

It seems to me, a far better description of such mindset would be the term, "evolutionistic theist." Miller is wrong on several points which are beyond the scope of this review. The one that will be noted is the alleged "creation" of the fossil record by the "intelligent designer." The fossil record is recognized by creationists as the result of the Genesis Flood. Thus, it was not created by Almighty God but, caused by Him in the exercise of His divine Will.

In chapter five the cardinal gives me pause for another concern. His brief emphasis here is on the alleged genealogical gaps in the Genesis and Matthean accounts in Scripture. Catholic apologist Robert Sungenis has exposed the "gaps" as illusory:

Regarding the genealogies, Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph in forty-two names, from Abraham to Jesus, leaving out three names and repeating two names for his own historical and spiritual reasons; whereas Luke (Lk 3:23-28) gives the genealogy of Mary in seventy-seven names, from God, through Adam and Mary, to Jesus, adding one name not in the genealogy of Genesis

11 (Lk 3:36). These additions or subtractions are deliberate, not accidental. As such, they illustrate the complexity and precision of Scripture, and not, as some suppose, literature subject to the frailties of human error. Scripture is not merely human words, but that which is inspired by the infinite mind of God, Who cannot lie (2Tm 3:16; Ti 1:2). [39]

The three appendices in the book are enigmatic. The first and second, reprints from the semi-official Vatican newspaper, *L'Osservatore Romano*, were published after the book. [40] The third is, by all appearances, part of the original text. If that is the case, the order is puzzling. However, it's a minor issue.

Appendix I is a critique of anthropology (the study of man) which necessarily reflects on a number of theological issues which the Catholic evolutionist seems to overlook. It matters not whether such oversight is inadvertent; the final result is the same. Defined dogmas of the Faith are called into question.

One of the more interesting points was made by quoting Prof. Sergio Sergi who declared himself an evolutionist but, candidly admitted: "Here, however, we go beyond science and enter into philosophy." (p. 160) That sentiment was echoed by Prof. Maciej Giertych: "Where things do go wrong (in science) is when someone claims to be an expert in evolution...because evolution is not a science, it is a philosophy." [42]

The cardinal chides those who call into question the Genesis narrative of the creation of Adam and Eve. He seems to target those who claim the "infusion of a soul" into some brute form: "We have enormous difficulty in understanding how the human soul could operate in a body which has the characteristics of a monkey." (p. 162) It would seem Pope Pius XII had the same difficulty. [41]

Appendix II is a brief exposition of some evolutionary deceptions. The first of the two familiar to me, Haeckel's embryos, was covered in chapter one. The other is the doctored skull "discovered" at Piltdown in England. Evolutionists are still attempting to play down the forgery as an example of how science is a self-correcting enterprise. Prof. Gertrude Himmelfarb (a pseudonym) was as unimpressed then as many of us are yet:

Nor can it be maintained, as some Darwinians have done, that the exposure of Piltdown man leaves them no better and no worse off than they were before. It does, in fact, weaken their position in regard to both their theory and their methods. The zeal with which eminent scientists defended it, the facility with which even those who did not welcome it managed to accommodate to it, and the way in which the most respected scientific techniques were soberly and painstakingly applied to it, with the apparent result of confirming both the genuineness of the fossils and the truth of evolution, are at the very least suspicious. However earnestly scientists may now disassociate themselves and their theory from Piltdown man, they cannot entirely wipe out the memory of forty years of labor expended on a deliberate and not particularly subtle fraud. And not forty years in the remote past, but forty years which came to an end only as recently as 1953. [43]

Appendix III is a Latin/English presentation of selected teachings from Saints Augustine and Gregory of Nyssa. The cardinal chose them because the evolutionists have adopted them as "patron saints." (p. 197) His evaluation of St. Augustine's teaching can be summed up quite simply: "...[I]t is an outrage—and worse, a real calumny—to attribute to him in any way the opinion of the transformists, however moderate they may be." (p. 190)

One of the more interesting teachings of St. Gregory quoted by the cardinal is: "...[U]niversal light existed together, then all kind of luminous things, each distinct with its proper differences, appeared, among which are the sun and the moon." (p. 200) That should put the death knell to the Catholic theologian who would argue against one of the literal readings of Genesis as did Vincentian Fr. (F.) Bruce Vawter:

To the authors of Genesis the heavenly bodies are merely items of God's creation. Perhaps it was to insist that they are in no sense lords or rulers that he did not even permit them to be the causes of light, whose creation he placed on the first day. Here again we have the non-scientific mind at work, of course, which did not necessarily see a causal connection between the sun and daylight, and which certainly was unaware that the light of the moon was a reflection... [44]

It seems to me patently absurd to claim the ancient people were unaware of the sun as a source of light when the Genesis account quite clearly states that very function (Genesis 1:14-19). Fr. Vawter's commentary was, for me, a new twist on the argument that Genesis is not a book of science.

The creation sequence is one of the classic arguments, in my experience, used by the Catholic evolutionist as an argument against "fundamentalism" (i.e., taking Genesis literally). After all, how could light have been created on Day One when the sun and moon were not created until Day Four? A reasonable answer would seem to be: Almighty God has no need of the sun and moon in order to create light. Simply because He later used them as transmitters of His created light, does not alter the fact that He is able to create in any order He deems appropriate.

Another question that comes to mind is: What is light? My research experience indicates that even in the third milenium physicists are still searching for an answer.

In conclusion, despite the two points of disagreement, His Eminence, Ernesto Ruffini, Cardinal Archbishop of Palermo, has provided a valuable tool to refute the notion that there can exist, in reality, a “Catholic evolution.” John Parrott is to be commended for republishing this important volume for Christ and His beleagured Church.

Bill Crofut, Founder
Catholic Apostolate for Creation
14th October, In the year of our Lord, 2005

AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY; IN HIS OWN WORDS...

Cradle Roman Catholic from an Irish Catholic paternal grandmother.

Introduced to the Creation/evolutionism debate in 1979 by a fallen-away Catholic in the workplace. Commenced a life-long commitment to research.

Motivated to found Catholic Apostolate for Creation

(originally Catholic Creation Ministries) in 1983 following the issue of a Syracuse diocesan position paper and cover letter favoring evolution.

Invited to participate in a symposium on the limits to biological change resulting in publication of a research paper in the March 1992 issue of CREATION RESEARCH SOCIETY QUARTERLY.

Joined the Traditional Latin Mass community at St. Stephen's Church in Syracuse in 1993.

Retired in 2003 after 20 years in the industrial/manufacturing engineering field followed by 20 years in territory sales.

Invited to participate in a mini-conference on Creation at St. Michael the Archangel Chapel on Long Island in 2005.

Plan to spend the remainder of my life in research and promotion of Biblical Creation through writing and speaking.

NOTES

[1] Kolbe Center for Creation website: <http://www.kolbecenter.org/>.

[2] <http://blog.zmag.org/> — click on July Archives.

[3] “Evolutionary History and Population Biology,” NATURE, vol. 214, p. 352.

[4] 1915. Haeckel's Frauds and Forgeries. Bombay: Examiner Press.

[5] The typical evolutionist, in my research experience, will deny anything is proved in science.

[6] 1953. The Major Features of Evolution. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 263, 264.

[7] Teresa Audesirk, Gerald Audesirk and Bruce E. Byers, Biology: Life on Earth, Sixth Ed., Prentice Hall, p. 277.

[8] 1982. The irrationality of biological evolution. HOMILETIC & PASTORAL

REVIEW, August-September, p.66.

[9] 1997. A FIRING LINE DEBATE. RESOLVED: THE EVOLUTIONISTS SHOULD

ACKNOWLEDGE CREATION, filmed December 4, transcript p. 5.

[10] Reference 7, p. 295.

[11] 1954. The Case for Natural Selection. NATURE, 6 February, p. 227.

[12] 1923. Darwinism and Catholic Thought. New York: Benzinger Brothers.

[13] 1896. Darwinia: Essays. D. Appleton and Company, pp. 147, 149.

[14] I.e., Dr. Scott, reference 9, transcript p. 10.

[15] Ernst Mayr, Editor. 1955. The Species Problem. Washington: AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, Publication No. 50.

[16] David N. Stamos, Ph.D. 2003. The species problem: biological species, ontology, and the metaphysics of biology. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

[17] Reference 12, p. 51.

[18] 1986. Principles of Isotope Geology. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.. p. 67.

[19] C. Patterson, G. Tilton and M. Inghram. 1955. Age of the Earth. SCIENCE vol. 121, pp. 69-75.

[20] THE HOLY BIBLE TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN VULGATE. 1899. Reprinted and republished, 1971. Rockford, IL: TAN BOOKS AND PUBLISHERS, INC.

[21] Ibid., p. 5.

[22] http://www.mnsu.edu/emuseum/information/biography/uvwxyz/ussher_james.html.

[23] Catholic Bible. 2000. Murray, KY: A production of Catholic Software, Douay-Rheims Translation, THE HOLY GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST ACCORDING TO SAINT MATTHEW, 19:4.

[24] Ibid., 14:6.

[25] Gary Belovsky. ND ReSource: Darwinism and Catholicism should be compatible, August 1, 2005. (<http://newsinfo.nd.edu/content.cfm?topicid=12468>).

[26] 1968. The Origin and Early History of Man. Houston: Lumen Christi

Press, p. 61.

[27] Pope Pius XII. 1950 (12th August). *Humani Generis*: Encyclical on False Trends in Modern Teaching. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1961, section 37.

[28] *Ibid.*, section 36.

[29] Evolution. NATIONAL CATHOLIC REGISTER, January 11, 1981.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Catholic Encyclopedia: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/06405a.htm>.

[32] 1893. The Noachian Deluge. Part I. AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW,

Vol. 8, Jan., p. 25.

[33] 2004. Canonized Heresies. A copy of 42 essays written by Paula Haigh is available on CD from this writer, free of charge, at bc081641@juno.com or, P.O. Box 997, Jordan, NY 13080.

[34] 1986. Evolution & Creation: A Catholic Understanding. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division, p. 5.

[35] 1976 (Revised 1999). THIRTY THESES AGAINST THEISTIC EVOLUTION. Originally published in booklet form under the auspices of Catholic Center for Creation Research, it is now available on the CD noted in reference 33.

[36] 1907. PASCENDI DOMINICI GREGIS: ENCYCLICAL ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE MODERNISTS. Papal Encyclicals Online: <http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius10/p10pasce.htm>.

[37] Reference 34, p. 120.

[38] Reference 9, transcript p. 20.

[39] 2003. The Gospel According to St. Matthew: The Catholic Apologetics Study Bible, Volume 1. Goleta, CA: Queenship Publishing, p. 161.

[40] Most Rev. Thomas A. Boland, Archbishop of Newark wrote in the Forword: "...[T]he book was written before the issuance of *Humani Generis*" (12th August 1950) Appendix I is dated June 3, 1950, Appendix II, March 22-23, 1954. The archbishop's comment brings to mind the distinct possibility that Cardinal Ruffini wrote the Encyclical *Humani Generis* or, significant portions of it.

[41] References 28 and 30.

[42] Evolution...Fact or Belief? CLP Video Interview produced in association with CESHE. El Cajon, CA: Master Books.

[43] 1959. Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., p. 378.

[44] 1956. A path through Genesis. New York: Sheed & Ward, p. 42.