



Daylight

Origins Science for Catholics

www.daylightorigins.com



No 53

December 2015

The Galápagos Islands — ‘Evolution’s Workshop’

Believed to have been accidentally discovered by the bishop of Panama in 1535, these equatorial islands lie 500 miles off the west coast of Ecuador. The 18 main islands are of volcanic origin, and feature many species and varieties unique to certain islands. Their location increasingly provided strategic advantages for adventurers and pirates, whalers and seal hunters over the ensuing centuries. Iguanas and giant tortoises provided fresh meat, but there were no indigenous mammals. The reptiles and birds showed no fear of man, so were easy to catch. The first scientific collection of species was made in 1795 by Menzies, naturalist on the *Discovery*. Robert Fitzroy, captain of the *HMS Beagle*, surveyed the islands in 1835, accompanied by Charles Darwin—his collections were to prove foundational to his theories as expounded in *Origin of Species*. However, despite exhaustive research and collecting thousands of specimens, there is still uncertainty over the mechanism of speciation, and no proof of macro-evolution.

[photo: View from Bartolomé Island © jkraft5 —Fotolia.com]



Patrons

**The Immaculate Conception
St Thomas Aquinas
St Oliver Plunkett (for Ireland)**

**St Michael
St Bonaventure**

Honorary Member

Professor Maciej Giertych, BA, MA (Oxon), PhD, DSc

AIMS

To inform Catholics and others of the scientific evidence supporting Special Creation as opposed to Evolution, and to show that the true discoveries of Science are in conformity with Catholic doctrines on Origins.

ACTIVITIES

Daylight Origins Society is a non-profit educational organisation funded by subscriptions, donations and sales of publications.

- ❖ Publishes the periodical *Daylight* for subscribers in 20 countries.
- ❖ Operates a website at www.daylightorigins.com
- ❖ Publishes and distributes pamphlets on Origins issues.
- ❖ Provides mail-order service for literature and audio-visual material.
- ❖ Promotes links with other Catholic Origins groups worldwide

Subscription Rates (three issues of Daylight)

UK: £12 Ireland & Europe: 15 euros Outside Europe: £15 (US \$25)

Editor & Secretary: Anthony Nevard
D.O.S, 19 Francis Avenue, St. Albans, AL3 6BL, England.
Cheques (in British Sterling only) to Daylight Origins Society
Cash acceptable in £ Sterling, Euros or US\$.

Website orders: Payment facilities on line e.g. via *PayPal* or credit card

CONTENTS

The Galapagos Islands – Evolution’s Workshop		front cover
Editorial – Galloping Population		1
The Immaculate Man	<i>Adrian Dulston</i>	3
Father Kircher SJ: Scientist, Orientalist and Collector	<i>James J. Walsh</i>	10
Transgender and Parenting – Recent ‘Research’	<i>Dr John Donnelly</i>	18
From a Jack to a King – from a dinosaur to a bird?	<i>Paul Spaine</i>	27
Report from the Kolbe Center – August 2015	<i>Hugh Owen</i>	29
Daylight website & ministry updates	<i>Paul Spaine</i>	33
Top Harvard zoologist rejected Darwinism		inside back cover
Notable Galapagos Creatures		back cover

Editorial

Galloping Population

Charles Darwin visited the Galapagos Islands in 1835, and in the following hundred years there were numerous expeditions to observe and collect specimens from their unique fauna and flora. Even after Darwin had published his theories in 1859, his arguments for evolution did not convince some scientists, including Louis Agassiz, zoology professor at Harvard and founder of its Museum of Comparative Zoology. Following his own visit in 1872, he concluded his report published in *Nature*, “Darwin’s hypothesis of gradual variation of species, and the natural selection for preservation of those whose variation were favorable to them in the struggle for life, seems to me to have few facts to sustain it, and very many to oppose it.”¹ It is still the case that those who visit the islands or study their geology and wildlife can discover the same facts but put completely different interpretations on them in regard to their origins. Consequently, as with the iconic Grand Canyon in the US, tourism is promoted both by those with evolutionist and creationist agendas who have their own ‘takes’ on the wonders they both observe.

¹ E. Larson, *Evolution’s Workshop*, Allen Lane [2001], p. 100.

Following the disruption of leisure travel by two world wars in the first half of the twentieth century, human life on the Galapagos until the late fifties was restricted largely to Ecuadorian convicts and a few struggling settlers. However, with the founding of the Charles Darwin Research Station in Puerto Ayora and the attention generated by the Galapagos International Scientific Project, the Ecuadorian government began to plan for its economic potential through tourism, with regular flights and cruises. A National Park enclosed 97% of the land, and UNESCO declared it a World Heritage Site in 1978.

The developing infrastructure, accommodation, resources and services led to a rapid increase in visitors from around 2,000 a year in the late sixties to 120,000 in 2005. Population grew from about 3000 in the sixties to 30,000 now – a average annual growth rate of 6.4%.² Not surprisingly, concerns were soon raised over the damaging effects that human population and activities could be having on the ecology of the ‘natural paradise’ of these now famous islands. A study published in 2007 reported:

Taylor et al. (2006) argue that immigration and inflation have negated increases in the average real per capita income of the majority of legal residents. It is obvious that economic growth has resulted in unsustainable population growth, socioeconomic stratification, civil unrest, strained public services and infrastructure, an increase in the number of invasive species, and a number of conflicts with conservation goals and authorities.³

As a consequence, in 2007 UNESCO included Galapagos on its ‘red list’ of endangered sites, with concerns about booming population and tourism, overfishing and the introduction of invasive species. This ‘explosion’ appears to be continuing – a full page advert in *The Daily Telegraph* [28.12.15] invited participants for five 7-night luxury cruises in 2018. Advice for the ecologically sensitive can be found at: <http://www.responsibletravel.com>.

Apologies to Subscribers

This issue intended for September has been delayed owing to me sustaining a heart attack on my retirement from full-time teaching. Following cardiac rehab. and on medication, I hope to restore our previous productivity in 2016. Many thanks for your patience, prayers and support. *Anthony Nevard*

² *Tourism, the Economy, Population Growth and Conservation in Galapagos*, B. Epler (2007). See: <http://www.galapagos.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/TourismReport1.pdf>

³ *Op. cit.* p. iii.

The Immaculate Man

By Adrian Dulston

The Forgotten Era – Pre Fallen Categories

In the debate on Evolution what is often not mentioned is the radical difference between Pre Fall Categories (PreFC) and Post Fall (PosFC) Categories. PreFC is the pre-suppositional approach to earth history pertaining to the era of Adam and Eve before the Fall or Original Sin which then lead to the Incarnation. What differentiates these two eras is the operation of the Preternatural Gifts which affected not only the anthropology of Adam and Eve but also their relation to the Environment. Preternatural gifts from *praeter natura* or ‘beyond nature’ are what they say they are – beyond nature. The gifts which elevated human nature comprised one supernatural gift and three preternatural gifts:

Sanctifying Grace which enabled (a) *Infused knowledge*, (b) *Immortality (and impassibility)*, and (c) *Integrity of passions*.

Adam had *knowledge* of all creatures and the environment, hence he ‘names’ at will those things around him (cf. Genesis 2:20). Adam and Eve were immortal under the shadow of the Tree of Life, thus they were not affected by illness or age (impassibility). Their passions were subject to reason, and their bodies subject to their souls. Such anthropology is ‘revealed’ to us and is not subject to scientific verification, except in so far as the Saints confirm this original holiness albeit in as far as they are conformed to Christ, Who restores that grace to them.

Thus Adam and Eve in their original state of holiness and justice were not subject to ‘survival of the fittest’ scenarios. Indeed the animal kingdom was subject to them in perfect harmony and peace. Locating this original period in scientific history is more than a challenge: although not impossible for Christian scientists,¹ it is near impossible for secular scientists as it



¹ The term ‘Christian scientist’ in this article clearly refers to scientists who accept essential Christian doctrines, not members of the so-called ‘Church of Christ Scientist’ sect. [Ed.]

entails being able to observe relationships which cannot be repeated. Christian scientists should study of the lives of the Saints who imitated their Immaculate Master and his being “with the wild animals” (Mark 1:13). Such propositions require the gift of faith which, once accepted, make reasoning on Creation that much easier! What many may consider ridiculously high ages for characters in the early Old Testament period are perfectly reasonable to a Christian scientist who acknowledges PreFC.

It is my belief that this PreFC of Original Holiness and Justice were being recalled with the appearance of Mary to St. Bernadette in 1858 at Lourdes, France where the ‘Lady’ confirms the Church teaching of 1854 that Mary is the ‘Immaculate Conception’. Charles Darwin had delayed publishing his *Origin of Species* until 1859; for me, the supernatural fight for our historical origins was set in these two separate but linked events, quite literally a supernatural battle to claim that inherent universal disposition of man to connect with the past, in this case either to link that to a Divine founder or nihilistic meaninglessness, to the Father of Truth or to the father of lies. Where Mary is, the Devil is soon bound to follow.

What is often not included in the truth behind Creation is the fundamental relationship between life in Creation and the Holy Spirit. Indeed the Holy Spirit is crucial to understanding that even Science will eventually acknowledge the connection when the scientific community lives by that Truth. Consider that Grace is that supernatural life from God, and that we ascribe to the Holy Spirit the role as the ‘Giver of Life’. The Sacraments restore that life of grace won by Jesus Christ, and enable Saints to reconnect with the world in a state of original holiness and justice, which in turn enables harmonious relationships with other creatures and nature. Thus we have to remember that the presupposition of scientists, even Christian scientists, is to work with the raw relationships we see in nature today or yesteryear but not always with PreFC.

The Immaculate Conception – recalling PreFC

The Catholic Encyclopedia states that:

...Mary's anthropology was in 'The state of original sanctity, innocence, and justice, as opposed to original sin, was conferred upon her, by which gift every stain and fault, all depraved emotions, passions, and debilities, essentially pertaining to original sin, were excluded. But she was not made exempt from the temporal penalties of Adam — from sorrow, bodily infirmities, and death...'

Mary's relationship with the Holy Spirit was so close that we refer to her as the 'Spouse' of the Holy Spirit. Although she continued to suffer the 'temporal penalties' not a little of the original holiness and justice meant that she had a peculiar relationship with the living environment. If we consider a Saint like St. Francis of Assisi who was well known to have harmonious relationship with creation, and if we then acknowledge that Mary's saintliness surpassed all other Saints, and that she gave birth to the One who sat with 'wild animals' (albeit as their Creator), the original relationship becomes apparent. If Faith is enough to calm storms, or to use one's cloak to float across the sea (St Francis of Paola), to befriend wild wolves or speak with birds, what does this do to the faithless presuppositions scientists approach human origins with? We either separate Faith and Reason or we accept they are one.



So it seems that the Immaculate Conception reminds us of an era lost in the mists of time but brought forth again by this luminous Lady, like a Lady Galadriel² coming to our rescue just before the onslaught of Darwinism with its atheistic overtures pushing human history further and further back into a meaningless universe over longer and longer eons of time.

The Immaculate Conception, though, points to something far greater – something at which evolutionists should lower their heads because it points to direct creation not evolution – the Incarnation.

Notice that the union of body and soul is integral to the creation of a human being. God did not add anything to the human act which brought forth Mary, the daughter of Joachim and Anne, but the soul ennobled once again with original holiness and justice is what makes Mary Immaculate – the union of body and soul. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception is opposed to the idea that the body of Adam came from an inferior (animal) father, who had a mortal soul which was not destined for union with God. Nor did the superior Adam therefore have to honour his father – again there is a dissonance in trying to

² A noble royal character created by J.R.R. Tolkien, appearing in his Middle-earth legendarium. She appears in *The Lord of the Rings*, *The Silmarillion*, and *Unfinished Tales*.

invent a plausible Theology of Evolution. Mary, the second Eve, honoured her parents according to the Law and Grace. Adam's nature was formed directly from the Father in Heaven – it was this Father whom He honoured, not some beast with whom he enjoyed intimate discourse. To believe in Adam from Ape is to believe in dualism, that the soul is separate from the body, indeed that the body is inferior to the soul and incidental to it – a Platonic dualism instead of the favoured and truthful Aristotelian unity of body and soul.

Saints as a reflection of PreFC

The following examples are further evidence of the radically different relationship with the Creation which is affected by the presence of sanctifying grace in a human being, and which gives proof for the type of relationship enjoyed by Adam and Eve as a PreFC.

In the Old Testament, Daniel was protected by an angel from the Lions but this shows his mystical closeness to God and points to Adam and Eve and their relationship with animals. Later legends from the lives of St Antony and St Jerome involved Lions. Jesus was in a harmonious relationship with the wild animals in the desert before he began His public ministry – interestingly, the Devil appears as wild beast in many stories from the lives of the Saints.

St Blaise, an Armenian Saint from the 2nd to 3rd Century, has many legends which tend to suggest that St. Blaise rendered wild animals mild, even tending to their illnesses. St Francis of Assisi, in the 12th Century, is well known for his familiarity with wild animals, particularly the curious story of the wolf who terrorised the village of Gubbio but which later became mild at the command of St Francis. Blessed Bernard of Corleone, a Franciscan, followed on from St Francis in the 17th Century curing animals. St Francis of Paola, from the 15th Century, was witnessed to have 'resurrected' animals. St Joseph of Cupertino communicated with animals. These stories simply show how 'survival of the fittest' is a PostFC and simply does not reflect a human being's relationship with creation as PreFC or in the lives pursued by Saints. They show us our true relationship with creation if our humanity is united with God. Human history constantly points to a period when:

“The wolf shall dwell with the lamb: and the leopard shall lie down with the kid: the calf and the lion, and the sheep shall abide together, and a little child shall lead them.” (Isaiah 11:6)

So it is apparent that we should consider scientific history in terms of PreFC and PostFC, and acknowledge a ‘sprinkling’ of PreFC has been manifest amongst those who attain union with God, and revealing the full splendour of sanctifying grace and its gifts won by Jesus Christ. Such PreFCs should become a presupposition on the part of Christian scientists, thus winning back to the Immaculate Conception those lost to Darwinism.

The Incarnation

Firstly it should be noted that Christ, the God-Man, was not a superior human being to those before Him except in the order of grace, neither was He inferior to those ahead of Him. He was not descended from apes, nor was He the product of a common ancestor, but in Revelation He is a direct descendant of Adam (Luke 3:38). Although He was superior in the order of grace as a sinless human being, and by virtue of His two natures being God-Man, He chose to take on fallen human nature (Hebrews 4:15).

The advancing superiority of human beings in the alleged evolutionary theory assumes intelligence as the measure of that advance; this contradicts atheist-materialist evolutionary theory, which actually assumes random not linear changes in creatures and the environment. Christian evolutionary theories, which suggest humanity advancing towards some future meeting point, also suggest a kind of inferior-to-superior humanity, thus placing the Incarnation at some inferior stage of evolution, which is of course contradictory to the Faith.

The Incarnation happened at a time in human history according to the perfect Wisdom of God the Father. “The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us” (John 1:14). Jesus was made flesh in the Immaculate Womb of Mary by the power of God’s Word, not by natural progeny but by Divine ordinance. What is significant here is that God directly intervened in normal generative human relations and by the power of His Word created the Hypostatic Union of two natures into one human and Divine Person – Jesus Christ. Those who follow strict evolutionary theory will most likely deny that God could directly create flesh at His Word but argue that His Word unfolds in time during an evolutionary process. Clearly the Incarnation is both at a definite point of time and in nature according to the female object, but is subject to the Direct Creation of God on the part of the male absence. The point is that creation occurs at the direct intervention of God as did the creation of Adam.

The miracles of Jesus occurred at His Word whether he tells a father his son will live (John 4:53) or the wind to abate (Mark 4:39). The Incarnation or the words of Consecration at Mass are demonstratively powerful enough to effect a material change; they do not rely on an evolutionary process but on a direct act of creation.

What is noticeable amongst evolutionists is a reluctance to accept the power of God's Word which is fundamental to an understanding of special creation. This reluctance encourages unbelief in God's Word, underpins a weakened view of God's Word, or even plainly denies God's creative Word. For Christians, evolution might be a screen for a lack of belief or faith in the origins of man and creation, which may then lead to doubts about the idea of miracles given at Jesus' Word. Of course, there is much evidence that evolution frequently leads to Atheism, but it also lends itself to a lukewarm approach to the supernatural, and God's omnipotent Word in particular.

Once again we have to acknowledge the role of the Holy Spirit in the direct creative act brought to effect in the Incarnation. Revisiting the words of the Angel Gabriel spoken to Mary:

“The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God.” (Luke 1:35)

Clearly there is a direct creative act in which the Holy Spirit is 'Giver of Life'. The Word 'hangs in the air' so to speak until Mary herself agrees to its creative power. Thus when she says:

“Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord; let it be to me according to your word” (Luke 1:37),

the conception of Jesus as God made Man begins. This is direct creation, not evolution; since Jesus is the New Adam, it reflects the creation of Adam himself – that is, a direct creative act by the power of God's Word at the beginning of human origins. The suggestion of evolutionists, Christians amongst them, is that Adam came from an ape or inferior humanoid, but this is to make the creation of Adam palatable to scientific theory, not Faith and Reason. It betrays a lack of trust in God's power to create directly – at the very least, Christian evolutionists should admit that God could do it that way.

Conclusion

We have shown that not all scientists acknowledge PreFC and PostFC in studying scientific history of which evolutionary science partakes. Evolution is theoretical because it is not ‘operative’ science which is demonstrative especially in our technological age. People are often confused into thinking that our technological science is proof of the power of science to suggest almost anything it wants, even if those theories actually pertain to historical science – the BBC use this confusion to suggest evolutionary theory as fact, using powerful technological means to support it. Theological teaching can help us to understand PreFC and PostFC in terms which can then be applied to studying scientific history, human origins, and human interaction when under the influence of sanctifying grace, thus uniting faith and reason.

The declaration of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception in the mid nineteenth century signalled an ideological battle for the hearts and minds of human beings over the issue of human genealogy and origins. It was also a battle between acceptance of the supernatural or purely natural, Catholicism or Atheism, Mary or the Devil. The 1950 infallible pronouncement of the Assumption of Mary’s body into heaven further strengthened the supernatural cause as it closed the argument from the Immaculate Conception to human fulfilment and destiny. Where do evolutionists see the body going? Back to lizards perhaps or into X-Men? There lies another problem. Evolution does away with Natural Law; there is no fixed human nature, therefore there is no objective morality, only survival. Jesus came to save a fluctuating biological mass whose only differentiation was determined by the introduction of an Immortal Soul, a dualism and heresy par excellence. The lives of the Saints afford scientists a view into the past PreFC, and forwards to the ultimate union of Heaven and Earth.

“Heaven and earth shall pass, but my words shall not pass.” (Matthew 24:35, Luke 21:33).

The Incarnation is an event which shows direct creation at work especially as it parallels the creation of Adam, supports the anti-evolutionary Church teaching about Eve coming from Adam, and is itself the beginning of a new creation. The new Adam and Eve, the Incarnation and Immaculate Conception are the result of direct creation and grace, not evolution and lies.

Many thanks to Adrian, our new contributor, who is an RE teacher in England.

FATHER KIRCHER, S.J.: SCIENTIST, ORIENTALIST, AND COLLECTOR

James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D.

From *Catholic Churchmen in Science* (1906)¹ [Part I of two]



Except in the minds of the unconquerably intolerant, the Galileo controversy has in recent years settled down to occupy something of its proper place in the history of the supposed conflict between religion and science. In touching the subject in the life of Copernicus we suggested that it has come to be generally recognized, as M. Bertrand, the perpetual Secretary of the Paris Academy of Sciences, himself a distinguished mathematician and historian, declares, that “the great lesson for those who would wish to oppose reason with violence was clearly to be read in Galileo’s story, and the scandal of his condemnation was

learned without any profound sorrow to Galileo himself; and his long life, considered as a whole, was the most serene and enviable in the history of science.” Somehow, notwithstanding, there is still left in the minds of many an impression rather difficult to eradicate that there was definite, persistent opposition to everything associated with scientific progress among the churchmen of the time of Galileo.

Perhaps no better answer to this unfortunate, because absolutely untrue, impression could be formulated than is to be found in a sketch of the career of Father Athanasius Kircher, the distinguished Jesuit who for so many years occupied himself with nearly every branch of science in Rome, under the fostering care of the Church. He had been Professor of Physics, Mathematics, and Oriental Languages at Würzburg, but was driven from there by the disturbances incident to the Thirty Years’ War, in 1631. He continued his scientific investigation at Avignon. From here, within two years after Galileo’s trial in 1635, he was, through the influence of Cardinal Barberini, summoned to

¹ Published by *American Ecclesiastical Review* – *The Dolphin Press* 1906.

Rome, where he devoted himself to mathematics at first, and then to every branch of science, as well as the Oriental languages, not only with the approval, but also with the most liberal pecuniary aid from the ecclesiastical authorities of the papal court and city.

Some idea of the breadth of Father Kircher's scientific sympathy and his genius for scientific observation and discovery, which amounted almost to intuition, may be gathered from the fact that to him we owe the first definite statement of the germ theory of disease; and he seems to have been the first to recognize the presence of what are now called microbes. At the same time his works on magnetism contained not only all the knowledge of his own time, but also some wonderful suggestions as to the possibilities of the development of this science. His studies with regard to light are almost as epochal as those with regard to

magnetism. Besides these, he was the first to find any clue to the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and yet found time to write a geographical work on Latium, the country surrounding Rome, and to make collections for his museum which rendered it in its time the best scientific collection in the world. It may very well indeed be said that visitors to Rome with scientific tendencies found as much that was suggestive in Father Kircher's museum—the '*Kircherianum*', as it came to be called—as artists and sculptors and architects found in the Vatican collections of the papal city.



The Kircherianum
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

All of this work was accomplished within the half century after Galileo's trial, for Father Kircher died in 1680 at the age of seventy-eight, having lived, as so many of the great scientists have done, a long life in the midst of the most

persistent activity. Kircher, more than perhaps any other, can be said to be the founder of modern natural science. Before anyone else, in a practical way, he realized the necessity for the collection of an immense amount of data, if Science was to be founded on the broad, firm foundation of observed truth. The principle which had been announced by Bacon in the "*Novum Organon*"—"to take all that comes rather than to choose, and to heap up rather than to register"—was never carried out as fully as by Father Kircher. As Edmund Gosse said in the June number of "*Harper's*," 1904,

“Bacon had started a great idea, but he had not carried it out. He is not the founder, he is the prophet of modern physical science. To be in direct touch with nature, to adventure in the unexplored fields of knowledge, and to do this by carrying out an endless course of slow and sure experiments, this was the counsel of the ‘*Novum Organon*.’ ”

Bacon died in 1626, and scarcely more than a decade had passed before Kircher was carrying out the work thus outlined by the English philosopher in a way that was surprisingly successful, even looked at from the standpoint of our modern science. Needless to say, however, it was not because of Bacon’s suggestion that he did so, for it is more than doubtful whether he knew of Bacon’s writings until long after the lines of his life-work had been traced by his own inquiring spirit. The fulness of time had come. The inductive philosophy was in the air. Bacon’s formulae, which the English philosopher never practically applied, and Father Kircher’s assiduous collection of data, were but expressions of the spirit of the times. How faithfully the work of the first modern inductive scientist was accomplished we shall see.

It may be easily imagined that a certain interest in Father Kircher, apart from his scientific attainments and the desire to show how much and how successful was the attention given to natural science by churchmen about the time of the Galileo controversy, might influence this judgment of the distinguished Jesuit’s scientific accomplishments. With regard to his discoveries in medicine especially, and above all his announcement of the microbic origin of contagious disease, it may be thought that this was a mere chance expression and not at all the result of serious scientific conclusions. Tyndall, however, the distinguished English physicist, would not be the one to give credit for scientific discoveries, and to a clergyman in a distant century, unless there was definite evidence of the discovery. It is not generally known that to the great English physicist we owe the almost absolute demonstration of the impossibility of spontaneous generation, together with a series of studies showing the existence everywhere in the atmosphere of minute forms of life to which fermentative changes and also the infectious diseases—though at that time this was only a probability—are to be attributed. When Tyndall was reviewing, in the midst of the controversy over spontaneous generation, the question of the microbic ‘origin of disease, he said:

“Side by side with many other theories has run the germ theory of epidemic disease. The notion was expressed by Kircher and favored by Linnaeus, that epidemic diseases may be due to germs which enter the body and produce disturbance by the development within the body of parasitic forms of life.”

How much attention Father Kircher's book on the pest or plague, in which his theory of the micro-organismal origin of disease is put forward, attracted from the medical profession can be understood from the fact that it was submitted to three of the most distinguished physicians in Rome before being printed, and that their testimony to its value as a contribution to medicine prefaced the first edition. They are not sparing in their praise of it. Dr. Joseph Benedict Sinibaldus, who was the Professor of the Practice of Medicine in the Roman University at the time, says that

“Father Kircher's book not only contains an excellent résumé of all that is known about the pest or plague, but also as many valuable hints and suggestions on the origin and spread of the disease, which had never before been made.”

He considers it a very wonderful thing that a non-medical man should have been able to place himself so thoroughly in touch with the present state of medicine in respect to this disease and then point out the conditions of future progress.

Dr. Paul Zachias, who was a distinguished Roman physician of the time, said that he had long known Father Kircher as an eminent writer on other subjects, but that after reading his book on the pest he must consider him also distinguished in medical writing. He says:

“While he has set his hand at other's harvests, he has done it with so much wisdom and prudence as to win the admiration of the harvesters already in the field.”

He adds that there can be no doubt that it would be a source of profit for medical men to read this little book and that it will undoubtedly prove beneficial to future generations.

Testimony of another kind to the value of Father Kircher's book is to be found in the fact that within a half-year after its publication in Latin it appeared in several other languages. It is too much the custom of these modern times to consider that scientific progress in the centuries before our own and its immediate predecessor was likely to attract little attention for many years, and was especially slow to make its way into foreign countries. Anything, however, of real importance in science took but a very short time to travel from one country to another in Europe in the seventeenth century, and the fact that scientific men generally used Latin as a common language made the spread of discoveries and speculations much easier even than at the present time. Our increased means of communication have really only served to allow sensational

announcements of a progress in Science—which is usually no progress at all—to be spread quite as effectually in modern times as were real advances in the older days.

There is no good account of Father Kircher's life available in English, and it has seemed only proper that the more important at least of the details of the life of the man who thus anticipated the beginnings of modern bacteriology and of the relations of micro-organisms to disease, should not be left in obscurity. His life history is all the more interesting and important because it illustrates the interest of the churchmen of the time, and especially of the Roman ecclesiastical authorities, in all forms of science; for Father Kircher is undoubtedly one of the greatest scholars of history and one of the scientific geniuses in whose works can be found, as the result of some wonderful principles of intuition incomprehensible to the slower intellectual operations of ordinary men, anticipations of many of the discoveries of the after-time. There is scarcely a modern science he did not touch upon, and nothing that he touched did he fail to illuminate. His magnificent collections in the museum of the Roman College demonstrate very well his extremely wide interests in all scientific matters.

The history of Father Kircher's career furnishes perhaps the best possible refutation of the oft-repeated slander that Jesuit education was narrow and was so founded upon and rooted in authority that original research and investigation, in scientific matters particularly, were impossible, and that it utterly failed to encourage new discoveries of any kind. As a matter of fact, Kircher was not only not hampered in his work by his superiors or by the ecclesiastical authorities, but the respect in which he was held at Rome enabled him to use the influence of the Church and of great churchmen all over the world, with the best possible effect, for the assembling at the Roman College of objects of the most various kinds, illustrating especially the modern sciences of archeology, ethnology, and paleontology, besides Egyptian and Assyrian history.

Athanasius Kircher was born 2 May, 1602, at Geisa, near Fulda, in South Germany. He was educated at the Jesuit College of Fulda, and at the early age of sixteen, having completed his college course, entered the Jesuit novitiate at Mainz. After his novitiate he continued his philosophical and classical studies at Paderborn and completed his years of scholastic teaching in various cities of South Germany—Munster, Cologne, and Coblenz—finally finishing his education by theological studies at Cologne and Mainz.

Toward the end of the third decade of the seventeenth century he became Professor of Philosophy and Mathematics at Würzburg. Here his interest in Oriental languages began, and he established a special course in this subject at the University of Würzburg. During the Thirty Years' War, however, the invasion of Germany very seriously disturbed university work, and finally in 1631 Father Kircher was sent by his superiors to Avignon in South France, where he continued his teaching some four years, attracting no little attention by his wide interest in many sciences and by various scientific works that showed him to be a man of very broad genius.

In 1635, through the influence of Cardinal Barberini, he was summoned to Rome, where he became Professor of Mathematics and Oriental Languages in the famous Roman College of the Jesuits, which was considered at that time one of the greatest educational institutions in the world. His interest in science, however, was not lessened by teaching duties that would apparently have demanded all his time; and, as we shall see, he continued to issue books on the most diverse scientific subjects, most of them illustrated by absolutely new experimental observations and all of them attracting widespread attention.

Father Kircher began his career as a writer on science at the early age of twenty-seven, when he issued his first work on magnetism. The title of this volume, "*Ars Magnesia tum Theorematica tum Problematica Proposita*," shows that the subject was not treated entirely from a speculative standpoint. Indeed, in the preface he states that he hopes that the principal value of the book will be found in the fact that the knowledge of magnetism is presented by a new method, with special demonstrations, and that the conclusions are confirmed by various practical uses and long-continued experience with magnets of various kinds.

Although it may be a source of great surprise, Father Kircher's genius was essentially experimental. He has been spoken of not infrequently as a man who collected the scientific information of his time in such a way as to display, as says the '*Encyclopaedia Britannica*,' "a wide and varied learning, but that he was a man singularly devoid of judgment and critical discernment." He was in some respects the direct opposite of the opinion thus expressed, since his learning was always of a practical character, and there are very few subjects in this writing which he has not himself illustrated by means of new and ingenious experiments.

Perhaps the best possible proof of this is to be found in the fact that his second

scientific work was on the construction of sun-dials, and that one of the discoveries he himself considered most valuable was the invention of a calculating machine, as well as of a complicated arrangement for illustrating the positions of the stars in the heavens. He constructed, moreover, a large burning-glass in order to demonstrate the possibility of the story told of Archimedes, that he had succeeded in burning the enemy's ships in the harbor at Syracuse by means of a large lens.

But Father Kircher's surest claim to being a practical genius is to be found in his invention of the magic lantern. It was another Jesuit, Aquilonius, in his work on optics, issued in 1613, who had first sought to explain how the two pictures presented to the two eyes are fused into one, and it was in a practical demonstration of this by means of lenses that Kircher hit upon the invention of the projecting stereoscope.

After his call to Rome our subject continued his work on magnetism, and in 1641 issued a further treatise on the subject called "*Magnes*" or "*De Arte Magnetica*." While he continued to teach Oriental languages and issued in 1644 a book with the title "*Lingua Aegyptiaca Restituta*," he also continued 'to apply himself especially to the development of physical science. Accordingly in 1645 there appeared his volume "*Ars Magna Lucis et Umbrae*." This was a treatise on light, illustrated, as was his treatise on magnetism, by many original experiments and demonstrations.

During the five years until 1650 the department of acoustics came under his consideration, so that in that year we have from his pen a treatise called "*Musurgia Universalis*," with the sub-title, "The Art of Harmony and Discord; a treatise on the whole doctrine of sound with the philosophy of music treated from the standpoint of practical as well as theoretic science." During the next five years astronomy was his special hobby, and the result was in 1656 a treatise on astronomy called "*Iter Celeste*." This contained a description of the earth and the heavens and discussed the nature of the fixed and moving stars, with various considerations as to the composition and structure of these bodies. A second volume on this subject appeared in 1660.

The variety of Father Kircher's interests in science was not yet exhausted, however. Five years after the completion of his two volumes on astronomy there came one on "*Mundus Subterraneus*." This treated of the modern subjects of geology, metallurgy, and mineralogy, as well as the chemistry of minerals. It also contained a treatise on animals that live under the ground, and on insects.

This was considered one of the author's greatest books, and the whole of it was translated into French, whilst abstracts from it, especially the chapters on poisons, appeared in most of the other languages of Europe. Part of it was translated even into English, though seventeenth-century Englishmen were loath to draw their inspiration from Jesuit writers.

Jesuits were, however, at this time generally acknowledged on the Continent to be leaders in every department of thought, sympathetic coadjutors in every step in scientific progress. Strange as it may appear to those who will not understand the Jesuit spirit of love for learning, two of the most distinguished scientists whose names are immortal in the history of physical sciences in different departments during this century, Kepler and Harvey, were on intimate terms of friendship with the Jesuits of Germany. Harvey, on the occasion of a visit to the Continent, stopped for a prolonged visit with the Jesuits at Cologne, so that some of his English friends joked with him about the possibility of his making converts of the Jesuits. These witticisms, however, did not seem to distract Harvey very much, for he returned on a subsequent occasion to spend some further days with his Jesuit scientific friends along the Rhine.

In the meantime Father Kircher was issuing notable books on his always favorite subject of the Oriental languages. In 1650 there appeared "*Obeliscus Pamphilius*," containing an explanation of the hieroglyphics to be found on the obelisk which by the order of Innocent X, a member of the Pamfili family, was placed in the Piazza Navona by Bernini. This is no mere pamphlet, as might be thought, but a book of 560 pages. In 1652 there appeared "*Oedipus Aegyptiacus*," that is, the revealer of the sphinx-like riddle of the Egyptian ancient languages. In 1653 a second volume of this appeared, and in 1655 a third volume. It was considered so important that it was translated into Russian and other Slav languages, besides several other European languages. His book, "*Lingua Aegyptiaca Restituta*," which appeared in 1644, when Kircher was forty-two years of age, is considered to be of value yet in the study of Oriental languages, and was dedicated to the patron, Emperor Ferdinand III, whose liberality made its publication possible.

[Part II to be concluded in next issue...]

Editor's Note

Most of Fr Kircher's works cited above are available as 'print on demand' copies e.g. via www.abebooks.co/uk, but few are in English.

Transgender and Parenting – recent “research”

Dr John Donnelly

Even biologists are confused about gender confusion. One thing they know from science: it is not biological. A study at the Children’s Hospital of Los Angeles resulted in a politically- incorrect finding: transgender identity is not due to hormone imbalance.



“We’ve now **put to rest the residual belief that transgender experience is a result of a hormone imbalance,**” said Dr. Johanna Olson, of Children’s Hospital Los Angeles. **“It’s not.”**

“Olson and her colleagues found that **transgender youth have sex hormone levels consistent with the gender they were assigned at birth.** So, a transgender youth who is assigned a female gender at birth, usually based on the appearance of external genitalia, **has the same female balance of oestrogen and testosterone pumping through her body as any other biological girl;** yet she

nevertheless **“feels” male.**”

The study, reported by [Live Science](#),¹ was based on 101 gender-confused individuals, ages 12 to 24, “from diverse backgrounds in terms of race, income, family structure and religion.” This reduced cultural influences from those factors. On average, they were at age 8 when feeling a divergence between their “assigned” or designated gender and their “self-perception” of gender.

The article comments, “Studies have revealed that transgender youth are **three times more likely to have suicidal thoughts,** and four times more likely to have attempted suicide, compared to nontransgender (also called

¹ <http://www.livescience.com/51652-transgender-youth-dont-have-hormonal-imbalance.htm>
[emphasis added in quotations in this article].

cisgender) youth.” Reporter Christopher Wanjek attributes this to the shame or embarrassment that society puts on them.

The study creates a clash between science and culture. As the transgender movement gains momentum (after the highly-publicized case of Bruce or “Caitlin” Jenner), LGBT individuals want to have it both ways. They want to be able to blame their biology, but they also want to maintain it’s a personal choice. This happened with homosexuality years ago when psychologists decided to do away with it as a “disorder.” Make a note of the cautious wording by Wanjek:

“ But searching for a biological explanation of gender identity **shouldn’t imply that being transgender is something that needs to be corrected.** “The idea that being transgender is a ‘disorder’ of any kind invalidates a specific human experience that has existed since the beginning of human experience,” Olson added.”

Olson just wants the gender-confused to “thrive” as a result of the findings. But if there is no biological basis for it, what is left as an origin other than personal choice? One way to avoid condemnation is to leave things indecisive:

“It **may be** that a transgender individual who feels male or female has a **brain structure similar** to those of other males or females, respectively, Olson said. **However, the data remain inconclusive.**”

There are exceptional cases where an individual is born with extra X or Y chromosomes that might sway their sexual identity. Apart from those, what is a transgender human being to think of himself, herself, or itself? If there is no biological foundation, it’s a choice. But if it’s a choice, the individual could choose to go back to its biological gender; so why should society give the person particular rights and safeguards, including access to opposite-sex bathrooms in America (to the harm of “cis-gender” [normal] people)? On the other hand, if it is biological, should it not be corrected as any other biological abnormality?

Scientists and reporters don’t appear enthusiastic to get into those questions.

The “identity” craze has already gone past ridiculous. If someone can decide what gender they are, regardless of genitalia, why can’t they decide what race they are, in spite of skin colour? How about the chubby man identifying as a skinny girl, or the short woman distinguishing herself as a basketball giant? Do we want to let a stocky bearded man enter a girl’s toilet or restroom to screams of panic from the girls, just because he declares he feels like a woman? Will women who identify as men be banned from all-female colleges? Will men who identify as women be allowed in, not only to be enrolled, but use the women’s halls of residence and showers? These concerns are already being raised. Where does the stupidity end?

Applause for the Texas Supreme Court judges who unanimously overruled a leftist city lawyer in Houston intent on punishing those who opposed his LGBT agenda (see FRC)²

Elsewhere, the outlook is not bright. First, it was LG (lesbian gay) demanding rights. Then, B (bisexuals) wanted in. Now it’s T for transgender. How many other groups will jump on the bandwagon? Are polygamists next? Most likely. In the limit, society breaks down when everybody wants special shelters for every choice they make. Maybe that would be the best way to stop the craziness; people with common sense forcing society to accept their identity as sensible on the grounds that they were born that way.

Everyone should be treated with respect and compassion; that’s not at issue. But true compassion helps a confused person become less confused. Each sex is beautiful in its own way. Wise people learn to accept the way they were born, and rejoice in it, finding additional pleasure in the attractions of the opposite sex. A good church counsellor can help a person work through an identity crisis. Just because some individuals struggle with feelings about their sexuality, that doesn’t mean they have to act on them. We don’t give free rein to sex addicts or drunkards, do we? Wisdom includes self-control.

Unfortunately, at the rate the world plummets down the LGBT slippery slope, it will be illegal to counsel someone out of their gender confusion, even though transgenderism appears to have no biological basis and puts the person at high risk for depression and suicide. Leftists will force taxpayers

² <http://www.frc.org/washingtonupdate/20150724/lone-star-supremes>

to pay for hormonal therapy and sex-change surgery, but forbid doctors or counsellors from trying to bring a confused individual's "feelings" into alignment with their biology. Disagreeing with these policies will bring on heaps of scorn and violence, all in the name of tolerance. We see that already happening.

Slippery slope arguments are sometimes vindicated by history, as seen in the case of *Roe v Wade* that began as "women's health" but has led to Kermit Gosnell and Planned Parenthood's sale of baby body parts. In the case of gay marriage, the dissenting American Supreme Court judges argued that there was no rational reason that Justice Kennedy's arguments could not be extended to polygamists and other special interest groups. I trust their logic and the lessons of history more than your gut feelings. If no barricades to a slippery slope exist, then threats must be taken seriously. It's easier to prevent an evil than repair the damage. For any law, we must not draw arbitrary lines, but ground our decisions on non-evolving morality – the kind found in the Scripture and the teaching of the Church.

Children are being told from a very early age (e.g. books for toddlers) that there is no difference between male and female... despite the fact this is untrue. This can't help but produce confusion. Children are confused because so many adults are confused (if confusion is really the problem). Many adults in this movement are self-consciously at war with traditional Christian society... and are using children to fight that war (e.g. the so-called war against masculinity and femininity.)



We have been told that God made them male and female from the start of the creation. That ought to settle it but it does not since men and woman

have strayed far away from their Creator and assigned themselves as master and mistress over all they survey.

Parenting

Father's Parenting is unique and valuable. According to an article on [Live Science](#)³ about research done at Washington State, the differences in parenting styles between moms and dads give children a more impartial development. Mothers are more apt to comfort and coo with baby talk, while dads will engage in horseplay with the kids and talk more like adults to them. In addition, dads train kids to take a hurt bravely, and prepare for the real world. “We think that maybe **fathers are doing things that are conducive to their children's learning, but in a different way,**” one of the researchers says. “**The parents are complementary to their children's language learning.**” The positive findings are affirmed on the father being occupied with the children.

“All these little tendencies add up to a big difference for kids as they enter the world. **The children of involved dads tend to have higher IQs by age 3,** according to a 1995 study in the Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. Kids with involved fathers also **tend to be happier overall with life, more tolerant of stress and, later on, experience less depression, anxiety, fear and guilt,** according to **dozens of studies.**”

“Children of involved fathers tend to **do better at school, tend to be more social and more comfortable** in social situations,” Schneider told Live Science.

Human fathers are not like animals. Evolutionary zoologist James Gilbert surveys some bizarre behaviors among animal dads on [The Conversation](#)⁴. “**This Father's Day, be grateful your dad is a human,**” he jokes before talking about male animals that eat their kids (e.g. some worms). Fatherhood in animals spans the range of involvement for good or harm, but many animal males take off after donating sperm. That kind of selfishness in human fathers is looked upon with contempt by most people, who would respond with righteous

³ <http://www.livescience.com/51284-fathers-mothers-parent-differently.html>

⁴ <https://theconversation.com/this-fathers-day-be-grateful-your-dad-is-a-human-43029>

indignation; e.g. *What are you, a man or an animal?* Gilbert can't help but commend good fatherhood in his last line: "As a new dad myself, this father's day, **I am thankful I belong to a species where fathers can make a valuable contribution** to their offspring's lives **beyond mere genetics.**" But that's the point: men don't just follow genetic instincts; they have a moral choice.



Toddlers understand justice, [Live Science](http://www.livescience.com/51261-toddlers-have-restorative-justice.html)⁵ says. Experiments with three-year-olds watching puppets acting unjustly shows they respond automatically to help the mistreated. "From a young age, babies are tuned into the intricacies of social interactions," the article says. The researchers at the University of Manchester conclude, "**Children, from a very young age, have some sense of justice**, in the sense that **they'll treat others as they expect themselves to be treated.**" [Science Magazine](http://news.sciencemag.org/biology/2015/06/even-3-year-olds-have-sense-justice)⁶ points out that chimpanzees do not routinely punish the unjust. They will take sides in a dispute, but not out of a moral sense. Justice is more than fairness. Children in the puppet experiments returned things to their rightful owners, even with no benefit to themselves.

Young kids understand stoicism. Kids as young as 18 months understand what it means to buck up and be brave, [Medical Xpress](http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-06-kids-young-months-stoicism.html)⁷ reports on work by Concordia psychologists. It's considered an adult thing to be able to hide one's

⁵ <http://www.livescience.com/51261-toddlers-have-restorative-justice.html>

⁶ <http://news.sciencemag.org/biology/2015/06/even-3-year-olds-have-sense-justice>

⁷ <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-06-kids-young-months-stoicism.html>

emotions. Even before they can talk, they can feel understanding toward others who are sad or have just had a negative experience.

Infant brains develop faster than thought, another article on [Medical Xpress](#)⁸ reports: in fact, years faster, researchers at the University of Louvain found. “**The way we perceive faces**—using the right hemisphere of the brain—is **unique and sets us apart from non-human primates**,” they said. “It was thought that this ability develops as we learn to read, but a new study published in the journal *eLife* shows that in **babies as young as four months it is already highly evolved**.” Sounds like babies are made in God’s image reflecting His thoughts after Him rather than reflecting evolution!

Body different from ape: In attempting to compare humans to bonobos and chimpanzees as “closest relatives,” some California anthropologists unsuspectingly accentuated the differences. Noteworthy is the fact that humans are naked, sweat, and walk upright, the article [PhysOrg](#)⁹ states, as if these traits “likely came about as early human ancestors began walking around upright, causing the need for more leg muscle and more fat—because a nomadic lifestyle would necessitate a fat store to prevent starvation during lean times, especially for females if they were to successfully bear offspring.” But which came first, the upright posture or the nomadic lifestyle? Either way, the explanation sounds Lamarckian (idea of acquired characteristics – proven wrong long ago). Some bonobos intermittently walk upright; they are still bonobos. Chimpanzees have supposedly had many more millions of years to try a nomadic lifestyle, but they remain knuckle-walkers to this day and are NOT upright. While it’s educational to measure differences in body mass, skin and musculature, such data can say nothing about how they got that way.

Brain different from ape: Wolfgang Enard in [Current Biology](#)¹⁰ seizes at a gene to try to explain how humans got their big brains. The size difference between chimpanzee and human brains is surprising. He makes a big deal out of a claim for that “**for the first time linked genetic changes in a regulatory element to human brain size evolution**” – i.e., “the human version of an enhancer regulating FZD8, a receptor of the Wnt pathway, causes a **faster cell**

⁸ <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-06-infant-brains-years-faster-thought.html>

⁹ <http://phys.org/news/2015-06-comparison-bonobo-anatomy-humans-evolutionary.html>

¹⁰ [http://www.cell.com/current-biology/abstract/S0960-9822\(15\)00346-2](http://www.cell.com/current-biology/abstract/S0960-9822(15)00346-2)

cycle in neural progenitors and an increased brain size in mice, **while its chimpanzee orthologue does not have such an effect.**” It’s simplistic to think, though, that more cells dividing faster would be better, unless they become organized in ways that can give rise to rational thought (including maths, science, and philosophy). All he can assume is that this enhancer “**contributed to human brain size evolution.**” In the end, though, human uniqueness is undeniable-

“We certainly are a special species (although it would be nice to get eventually some independent opinion on this point) and we certainly have pretty large brains.”

Misinterpreting tool use: *Science Daily*¹¹ tries to make the case that tool use in chimpanzees put them on an evolutionary pathway to humanity, but there’s a problem: bonobos, their closest relatives, do not have this ability. The University of Cambridge says that tool use is ‘innate’ in chimpanzees but not in bonobos (pygmy chimps). Even so, the tool use is very simple, like using a stick to fish insects out of a hole, or using a stone to crack a nut. Other news shows that crows are more advanced, using tools to solve problems. Based on the tool-use criterion alone, evolutionists should conclude that humans evolved from crows, who evolved from chimps, who evolved from bonobos. Humans are the only ones who use tools to make tools to make other tools. An engineer would likely be insulted by being told, as he designs a spacecraft apparatus, that his intelligent design is not involved.

Enard has independent thinking on the subject of human uniqueness. It’s right there in Genesis 1–2. He just doesn’t want to accept it.

We live in a day where cultural insanity is becoming normalized—even mandated by modern governments. For example, the Obama administration is requiring public schools to change their bathrooms for LGBT tolerance, against the wishes of the vast majority of parents. Secular materialists and PC leftists are redefining gender, family, and morality. We are being told that you can choose your identity independent of your biology, that intact families are unnecessary, and that same-sex couples can raise kids just as well as moms and dads. But reality has a way of defeating ideology. As these articles all show, the science demonstrates human uniqueness. No other primate looks, acts or thinks anything like a man, woman, or child. Thousands of years of experience show

¹¹ http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/06/1506160723_18.htm

that the biological differences between men and women are there for a reason: they were designed to complement one another, providing the best hope for the next generation to develop moral character and community reinforcement of godliness.

Since the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, anything less is stupidity. Our Darwin-drunk society is rejecting the Genesis foundation, the one true Christian church foundation, pretending that conscience and the innate moral sense are evolved strategies of blind evolutionary forces. But if the all-wise God is indeed our Creator, can anything less than stupidity result? Now the chickens are coming home to roost. Several have pointed out the tangled web of illogical thought inherent in the belief one can choose his or her identity apart from the biological systems God ordained. Currently, some race groups are decrying a white lady choosing to identify as a black, while supporting others who want to change their gender (look at the painful logic in [Live Science's](#) article ¹² on Rachel Dolezal; if she would be renowned for choosing an identity against her biological gender, why not against her biological skin colour?). The feminists particularly in USA are struggling to cope with whether to accept men identifying as women at all-female universities, or what to do about their female students who want to identify as men. We're watching the insanity destroy itself. This is the result of the tangled, self-defeating nature of identity politics when the Christian worldview is rejected.



But of course; there can be no logic in rejecting the Creator's plan. We should pray that its inward collapse will be quick and as painless as possible, so that the wise among us can mercifully lead the wounded back to the truth.

Lamarck got it wrong.

¹² <http://www.livescience.com/51245-what-is-ethnicity-racial-identity.html>

Daylight article for young people (by P. Spaine)

From a Jack to a King - from a dinosaur to a bird?

From a Jack to a King is a country music song, originally a music hit for artist Ned Miller back in the 1960s. The song is more like a musical fairy tale if anything. Yet this fairy tale seems to be more real than the idea of a dinosaur evolving into a bird. Many young people can see how unlikely a Jack will become a King, even though it might be possible with a lot of good luck. Young people however, are less likely to see how the idea of a dinosaur turning into a bird is crazy. Let us talk about dinosaurs, as we look to make more sense of things.



Dinosaurs are often depicted as giant land animals with big bodies, four legs, a long tail, and a narrow head on top of a short or long neck. Most dinosaurs however, were as small as large birds or big dogs. The Velociraptor is considered one of the most bird-like dinosaurs ever discovered. The name on this dinosaur is derived from the words "velox" (swift) and "raptor" (robber). The

Velociraptor was roughly the size of a small turkey. Velociraptor also had a prominent role in the "Jurassic Park" movies.¹

However when it comes to this dinosaur evolving into a bird, or having a common ancestor, let's take a closer look. Alan Turner is a paleontologist who digs around looking for fossils. Alan was part of a discovery team that inspected a Velociraptor fossil found in Mongolia's Gobi Desert in 1998. This desert is very barren as they are often vast and empty spaces by nature. The team discovered that the Velociraptor fossil's forearm had six regularly spaced bumps. This suggested the holding of what is called quill knobs. Now a quill knob holds the feathers on the birds of the air. The discovery team believed the Velociraptor could hold a total of 14 quill knobs and feathers along its arms.² When young people read this kind of information, it is natural for them to believe that dinosaurs did evolve into birds.



But what about this? The arms of Velociraptors are considered too short to allow them to fly or even glide. At best they could be considered similar to an ostrich. But that does not prove that dinosaurs evolved into birds. Finally, a scaly dinosaur is probably far too heavy to go through the many stages of evolution to end up being as light, and fluffy as a bird.

Therefore God must have created dinosaurs and birds around the same time. God can do this!

¹ See <http://www.livescience.com/23922-velociraptor-facts.html> for more details

² See <https://answersingenesis.org/dinosaurs/feathers/feathered-raptors-not-the-birds/> for more details

Report from the Kolbe Center August 2015

Dear Friends of the Kolbe Center,

Pax Christi!

I have just returned from almost four weeks of conferences and seminars in Singapore, Australia and New Zealand. In this newsletter I will give you a brief report on the trip and bring you up to date on our plans for a symposium in Rome on Saturday, September 26, on the creation of Adam and Eve as the foundation of the Church's teaching on Holy Marriage.

Retired research chemist Hugh Miller filed the following report on our participation in the Asia-Oceania Geoscience Conference in Singapore. To avoid confusion, he refers to me as "Hugh the Younger" and to himself as "Hugh the Elder":

The Light Comes from the East:

Hugh the Elder's Report from the AOGS Conference in Singapore

On the day of our poster session at the Asia-Oceania Geoscience Conference we set up posters at 10:00 AM ahead of the official 10:30 AM start-up time. Our posters were much too large, but the organizers kindly allowed us to put our posters on overlapping panels. This worked to our advantage, as in this case bigger was better!

We had made 100 two-page handouts which we handed out to all who stopped by to see our posters. Before leaving Columbus, I had made twenty color copies of each poster, and our most interested visitors received them. It was not practical to make any video recordings, but we have a beautiful photograph of two fascinated Malaysian students who had heard about our posters and just had to see them and ask questions. They asked for my picture and I got theirs for our Youtube report.

Contacts and Highlights

We received visitors from Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, India, the USA, China, Australia, Russia, Scotland, Taipei, Japan, and England. About 90% of the visitors were students; the rest were professional scientists of various backgrounds. Most of them displayed varying degrees of curiosity and/or shock

but most of them--especially the Asian visitors--tried to be objective and were receptive to our insistence that "science advances by addressing anomalies."

Some notable visitors included:

- two planetary and radio-telescope astronomers, a man and a woman--probably in their 50's--who were very cordial and supportive of the idea of reevaluating the risk of asteroid impacts in light of our evidence showing that the geological time-scale needs to be compressed
- a male geology student from the Philippines who laughingly threw up his arms and exclaimed: "All that I've ever learned – out the window!"
- a lone scoffer who laughed out loud continually, no doubt to disrupt Hugh the Younger's discussion with a lady-C-14 dating lab representative from the Philippines who works for a well-known radiometric dating company in Florida. She had heard about our display and had come to investigate. In the end, she was so impressed with our evidence that she assured Hugh TY that she would speak to the chief technical officer of her company about collaborating with us in doing further research.
- a fast-talking lady academic who insisted that we had not been thorough in our analysis since we had not identified the pollen on or around our specimens. I explained that we had C-14 dated the soil around one of our dinosaur skeletons which contained 1% carbon and got ages of 19,000 and 28,000 years. Her objection was interesting and worth exploring by a biologist, but it also evidenced circular thinking, since our critic apparently believed that she could date the fossils by the pollen at a burial site using dates for pollen based on accepted dates for fossils! She and the scoffer might attempt to have our posters struck from the official program, but it will be too late to have them dropped down the memory hole, as we have photographs of our exhibits and of the official record of our abstract on the conference website.
- Last but not least was an Aussie who has worked in an AMS lab in Australia for 45 years. He was very blunt but seemed to be honest in his appraisal. I think we passed muster as he only took issue with a few of our dinosaur dates.

In general, Hugh the Younger and I were deeply impressed with the openness and impartiality of the Asian students in contrast to the blind dogmatism of so many of the older North American, Australian, and European scientists. It is not hard to imagine that as the leaders of the decadent western world commit spiritual, moral and physical suicide – especially through the promotion of

sterile sexuality and hopeless materialistic philosophies--the young people of the East will continue to embrace the light of truth and turn away from the death-dealing anti-culture of the leaders of the once-great western nations.

From Singapore I flew to Brisbane where I enjoyed the hospitality of two wonderful Catholic families and was able to give a Kolbe seminar at Marian Valley, a beautiful retreat center run by the Hermits of St. Paul. Four priests and a religious brother attended the talk as well as about 50 lay people. The religious brother was so enthusiastic that he promised to contact his bishop in Papua, New Guinea, about inviting us to his country. From Brisbane I flew to Sydney, Australia, where I was able to give a seminar at Family Life International Headquarters and at a Coptic Orthodox church in the city. From Brisbane I flew to Christchurch for a number of talks and then on to Auckland for two more seminars. I am hopeful that our great local leadership teams in all of these places will be able to get into many of the schools and parishes in the Sydney area and on both islands of New Zealand in the near future.

In Auckland, New Zealand, I was privileged to participate in a Fatima conference in which I was able to set forth the thesis of my book *The Light Comes from the East*. I told the attendees that one of our contacts who is from Ukraine is undertaking an initiative right now that could persuade the Patriarch of the Ukrainian Catholic Church to ask the Ukrainian bishops to join him in asking Pope Francis to make the Consecration of Russia to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Pope Francis knows and likes the Patriarch and is acutely aware of the dire situation in Ukraine, so, if the Ukrainian bishops do this, I believe that the Holy Father will find it very difficult to say "no." Please keep this intention in your prayers and ask your children and grandchildren to pray.

I also urge you to pray with your families that the October synod on the family will uphold the Church's traditional teaching on Holy Marriage. Author James Larson recommends that all Catholics include this intention in the family Rosary and write to Pope Francis as follows:

Holy Father,

Our children, and our entire family, are praying the Holy Rosary with the following intention:

"For Our Holy Father, Pope Francis, that he might not promote a false mercy, but that he might do what is necessary to protect both the Holy Eucharist and the Sacrament of Marriage from sacrilege."

In keeping with this intention, on September 26 the Kolbe Center and Human Life International will hold a symposium in Rome on the theme " 'The Two Shall Become One': The Creation of Adam and Eve and the Foundations of Holy Marriage." This symposium will offer a powerful defence of the traditional Catholic doctrine regarding the special creation of Adam and Eve. Experts in theology, philosophy, and natural science will also demonstrate that the hypothesis of human evolution has utterly failed to find substantial support in any branch of natural science but has used its scientific 'disguise' to destroy the confidence of Catholics in "the sacred history of Genesis." The proceedings of the symposium will be published simultaneously and distributed to all of the delegates to the synod on the family when it resumes in October. For more information about the symposium, please visit the conference website, and please keep the Kolbe Center in your prayers.

Hugh Owen

P. S. If you would like to help us to defend the traditional Catholic doctrine of creation, the foundation of the Gospel, please go to our website, visit our donation page and sign up to become a regular contributor or to make a one-time contribution.

The printed transcript of the proceedings of the Roman Symposium is now available from the Kolbe Center for \$15, and as a downloadable pdf file at \$10.

New Book:

She Shall Crush Thy Head: Selected Writings of St. Maximilian Kolbe

by Hilda Elfleda Brown 182 pp ISBN 978-1-942190-19-6. \$14.95

In addition to his memoirs, letters, and articles, most of the selections are his apologetical articles in dialogue format. St. Maximilian Kolbe writes on the many issues confronting our modern day.

From: www.leoninepublishers.com or www.amazon.com



Daylight Origins Website & Administrative Updates

by Paul Spaine

It is a challenge to push out the boundaries in the internet world, to discover new technologies and overcome new obstacles. It is satisfying to look back and appreciate what has been achieved. Then there is the reading research that additionally inspires new ideas. It would be good if we could always present our Daylight website with more upward trend figures. But in this Daylight edition, we have something else in mind. We'll talk about the usual internet unique visitor traffic to the website, and also the social media activities. But we'll take it from a different perspective. Additionally we'll discuss some of the spin-offs from running this important Special Creation website apostolate.

Unique Website Visitors



The unique visitors per month this year is averaging out at about 1,700 unique visitors per month. That is good, even

though we could go higher. We have as of this early September about 15,000 unique visitors since the 1st of January 2015. Now what can happen in some cases, is unique visitors can go through the roof; such as happened with Life Site News website - www.lifesiteneews.com. Unique traffic builds up, and the ministry gains

a following. Then suddenly you get 100,000 unique visitors in a year, and the next you get 1 million. It would be quite an achievement if *Daylight Origins* were to emulate this Life Site News website feat. But having more traffic does not necessarily have the effect of increasing magazine subscriptions. Life Site News for example did highlight that even though their daily visitors climbed an impressive website high, their donations to maintain the business costs did not follow that same trend.

The Theory of Less is More

Daylight Origins have noticed a phenomenon out there in the web world. This we call a theory which can be tested and verified to a degree, unlike Darwin's pet theory of Evolution. The theory of 'less is more' underscores that, when it comes to the internet, publishing less creates more curiosity. The theory of 'less is more' particularly relates to magazines websites and basically works like this... We have this reasonably good publication called Daylight. We get subscribers via our Daylight website, and they subscribe to learn about the problems with evolution from a Catholic perspective. The Daylight web-master gets excited with every new subscription. He convinces the Daylight editor that if we get more web traffic, we will ultimately get more Daylight subscribers, which is good for the ministry. The web-master takes to regular blogging, in most cases once per week. He blogs (writes a post) on the website blog section. This helps to drive up internet traffic, and guess what happens... Magazine subscriptions fall! So the fact that we get 1700 unique visitors per month does not translate into higher magazine subscriptions. But we have stumbled upon something positive in the process of learning. When we pulled back from our regular weekly blogging, and made it an almost monthly commitment, we noticed subscriptions began to trickle back upwards. So from now on, we'll be posting on a less frequent basis.

Social media presence



Now that we have given less priority to blogging, it enables us to focus more time to social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Google+ and a handful of other sites. We have incorporated a like-and-share system on the Daylight website, and so we can now tell how many people are sharing our blogs on their social media page. This is where a lot of unique visitor traffic has come from. When you share our blog on your Facebook page for example, then a lot of your Facebook friends will see it on their time line. One particular blog we wrote had quite a positive reaction and was ‘like and shared’ by a few people. The result was that a lot of people came to the Daylight website curious about what the blog had to say. <http://www.daylightorigins.com/the-good-fruits-of-scientific-inquiry/> got shared 17 times on Facebook, which is a tidy number. It also was ‘tweeted’ 10 times, and that too was encouraging. The focus now is to begin building our Google+ support base. We have about 130 followers on our Google+ social media page. Now the reason for the Google+ focus is that we can increase our following at no financial cost to our ministry. We also won’t get penalised for seeking out new followers. On Facebook, we have to pay for followers, and if we seek them out, they [Facebook] sometimes appear to threaten to shut our Facebook page down. It is quite possible that sometime in the future, Google+ will ‘muscle out’ Facebook, particularly if Facebook user policy becomes too stringent and / or intrusive.

The admin side of Things

We receive occasional emails from supporters via our website contact form. It is always good to hear feedback. Sometimes we get a surprise

email. One such email was the offer of a free clergy cotton shirt from a clergy shop in the UK. The offer came with a clause, that being we provide a link to the clergy webstore. One subscriber requested a topic, and on reflection, it was a good suggestion. Perhaps you could email us at daylightorigins@hotmail.com if you have a topic that you might like considered for the next Daylight.

Recently we uploaded a video on Marriage given by Hugh Owen of the Kolbe Center for the Study of Special Creation in a Dublin parish last May. Since then this hour long video received over 425 unique hits and growing steady. One man came across it and wants to offer his web editing service for free. We also have increased steadily our e-news database which is great. This means we can send occasional emails to our Daylight supporters with the latest bulletins in relation to our Magazine.

Website overheads

Thankfully we've a new client using the Daylight web server, which will bring in further income to help pay our internet maintenance overheads as well as international postage fees for the Daylight magazine distribution. The area of finance is important to keep the ministry afloat, as we would not have sufficient donations to cover all our material commitments necessary to run our apostolate. With that in mind, please do consider donating to Daylight. Perhaps you could gift-subscribe a friend a year's cycle of Daylight magazines. It will help spread the word, and keep the funds going.

Many thanks for your support, encouragement and prayers!

Paul Spaine

Top Harvard zoologist rejected Darwinism

‘Genesis not only claims that a force, a power, outside of matter has given our world and its present furnishing their shaping, but it also claims that that power is an Intelligence, a personal Being, — God ; and science to-day, in its most authentic expounders, reiterates the Mosaic assertion. Will, Intelligence, a Person, gave this universe birth.



‘Says **Agassiz** ¹
(speaking of the
life furnishing of
the earth),



‘The combination
in time and space of these thoughtful
conceptions, exhibits not only thought, — it
shows premeditation, power, wisdom,
greatness, prescience, omniscience,
providence; in one word, these facts in their
natural connection proclaim aloud the one
God, whom man may know, adore, and
love: and natural history must in good time
become the analysis of the thoughts of the
Creator of the universe, as manifested in
the animal and vegetable kingdoms.’ ² ⁴



¹ Prof. Louis Agassiz (1807-1873), founder of Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology

² From *A Dictionary of Natural History* (printed by C. Whittingham, 1802)

³ From *A History of the Vegetable Kingdom*, William Rhind, (Blackie & Son, 1855), opp. p.487

⁴ E. Nisbet, *The Science of the Day and Genesis*, (W.B.Smith & Co., New York, 1881) p.16

Notable Galapagos Creatures

Giant Tortoise



“It is rather curious, and a striking instance of the short-sightedness of some men, who think themselves keener in discrimination than most others, that these tortoises should have excited such remarks as ‘well, these reptiles never could have migrated far, that is quite clear,’ when, in simple truth, there is no other animal in the whole creation so easily caught, so portable, requiring so little food for a long period, and at the same time

so likely to have been carried for food, by the aborigines who probably visited the Galapagos Islands on their balsas, or in large double canoes.”

Captain **Robert Fitzroy** *Narrative of the Beagle* [1839]

Giant Iguana

“These islands appear paradises for the whole family of reptiles. Besides three kinds of turtles, the tortoise is so abundant that a single ship’s company here caught 500-800 in a short time. The black lava rocks on the beach are frequented by large (two to three feet) most disgusting clumsy lizards. They are as black as the porous rocks over which they crawl and seek their prey from the sea. Somebody calls them ‘imps of darkness’. They assuredly will become the land they inhabit.” **Charles Darwin’s** *Diary*.



Blue Footed Booby



One of three varieties of these marine birds living on the Galapagos— the others are ‘red-footed’ and ‘masked’. They have different fishing and nesting sites so there is little competition between them. Although, like the finches, they are commonly cited as supporting Darwin’s theory, modern research [P. Grant, *Scientific American* 265(4): 60-65, October 1991] has shown that speciation from a common genus might occur within 200 years! Such natural selection and adaptation are expected from the scientific model of origins from created kinds.

[See <http://creation.com/book-review-the-beak-of-the-finch>]

£3.00