Is the Pope an Evolutionist?

On October 22, 1996, the head of the "Catholic" church, who calls himself Pope John Paul II, made a statement about evolution that was commented on in much of the American press.

The atheists, ably represented at http://www.atheists.org, summarized their own comments with

"It's 'Bout Time: Pope admits Darwin Was Right... "Our Take: The Vatican can Afford To "Accept" Science... "Papal Statement Supports Evolution."

After misinterpreting what the Pope had said, the atheist statement rambled on with an attack on the "religious right," and "creationist-fundamentalists" who increasingly find themselves at odds with scientific finding and the secular world." To demonstrate their equal-opportunity bashing, the atheists also attacked Catholics for their reactionary and mediaevalist teachings on abortion, celibacy, "sin" and other issues. [I'll comment only on the "creationist-fundamentalist" statement above. I do not find myself at odds with scientific findings, but with "science, falsely so-called." I do find myself increasingly at odds with the secular world, which is further proof that the Bible is God's Word, since it clearly predicts that condition.

The Protestant, Cal Thomas weighed in with:

"The Evolution of the Pope. Pope John Paul II, who courageously stood against the tyranny of Soviet communism, has succumbed in his declining years to the tyranny of evolutionary scientists who claim we are related to monkeys... In a statement the pope said "fresh knowledge leads to the recognition of the theory of evolution as more than just a hypothesis... The gist of the pope's statement is that the human body can no longer be viewed as the unique creation of God but rather the product of a gradual evolutionary process.

Thomas made a few correct statements about the arrogance of evolutionary scientists and their efforts to supplant the Christian view of man with their own. Thomas is also to be credited with being the only one I have seen who has admitted he was wrong. In a subsequent article entitled "We're all fallible," he blamed his error on a faulty translation from the French in which the Pope wrote (he did not deliver it in person). However, Thomas wasted two columns without ever recognizing either the backhand the Pope had, in fact given to "evolution science." He also failed to comment on the silly statements the Pope had made or the real meaning of the statement.

Nobody really expects the secular press to get anything right, and they fulfilled our expectations. While their gloating was more subdued than the atheists, it was nonetheless gloating. And, every article I read (except the atheist one) indicated that the author probably had not even read what the Pope actually said, but probably had read what someone said he said.

The Catholic press I read went something like this: "Well, what the Pope said was simply consistent with what the church (sic) has been teaching for a long time."

What Did the Pope Really Say?

Ken Carlson found what the Pope actually said at the "New Advent Catholic Supersite," http://www.knight.org/advent/docs/jp02tc.htm, which reproduced the article from the October 30, 1966 English edition of L'Osservatore Romano. The Pope wrote to the "Pontificial Academy of Sciences, a group one of his predecessors "reappointed" 60 years ago to advise him on developments in science. A synopsis of the Pope's talk (paper) follows, [my comments in brackets]:

1 The title of the talk was: "Truth cannot contradict truth." [A good statement to start with]
2 He greeted his audience, and explained why that particular group exists. He reminded them that they were formed to "serve the truth."
3 He expressed pleasure they had chosen evolution as one of their topics for discussion, "an essential subject which deeply interests the church, since revelation, for its part, contains teaching concerning the nature and origins of man." He made other remarks about the importance of the topic and the role of the body, reminding them that "Truth cannot contradict truth."
4 He reminded them that his predecessor Pius XII, in "Humani Generis" (1950) stated "there was no opposition between evolution and the doctrine of faith about man and his vocation, on condition that one did not lose sight of several indisputable points." [Presumably he is saying that, the principal issue of the nature and purpose of man does not change, even if evolution is true.]
5 He pointed out the need for "a rigorous hermeneutic for the correct interpretation of the inspired word. It is necessary to determine the proper sense of Scripture, while avoiding any unwarranted interpretations that make it say what it does not intend to say." [Amen. It is important that we defend Biblical Truth, not false interpretations of it. He referred to other documents. We secured several of them, and found them to be largely acceptable to any true Christian.

The Pope claims to be the "Vicar of Christ," the head of The Church on earth. There is no equivalent office in most Protestant organizations. A rough analogy might be drawn to Protestant Councils, University Presidents, et al, who, at least purportedly are charged with defending and/or conveying the truth to laymen and children entrusted to them. In this, and some of the rest of the Pope's discussion he was better than many Protestant officials, as well as most Jesuit and other Catholic teachers and officials. But, the Protestants pretend to believe the Bible, while the Catholic officials have an excuse for ignoring the Bible as the source of truth. They simply claim, "the church gave us the Bible, so the church can interpret it any way it pleases." Whereupon they do just that. The Protestants who ignore or reinterpret Scripture have no real excuse]

6 Referring to "Humani Generis" he said, "Taking into account the state of scientific research at the time"... it considered... "the doctrine of "evolutionism" a serious
hypothesis, worthy of investigation and in-depth study equal to that of the opposing hypothesis. Pius XII added two methodological conditions: that this opinion should not be adopted as though it were a certain, proven doctrine... and... the condition on which this opinion would be compatible with the Christian faith [which he discussed later] [In accepting the 'equal' part, he revealed the poverty of Catholic scholarship regarding evolution, but jumped over the fence to say "its not proven doctrine"]

7 He then made the remark everyone misquoted and jumped on (some in glee, some in disgust), "Today almost half a century after the publication of the encyclical, new knowledge has led to the recognition of more than one hypothesis in the theory of evolution. [The translation that contained the phrase Thomas quoted read, "evolution is more than a hypothesis" which was taken by all to be a blanket endorsement of evolution. While the claimed translation error did cause confusion, the rest of the speech should have caused postponement of commentary on what he meant by it.]

8 He then made a truly confusing statement: "It is indeed remarkable that this theory has been progressively accepted by researchers, following a series of discoveries in various fields of knowledge. The convergence, neither sought nor fabricated, of the results of work that was conducted independently is in itself a significant argument in favor of this theory." [The "indeed remarkable" phrase could mean "remarkable that anyone would believe such a silly notion." The 'argument in favor' portion is not really an endorsement. Such a phrase would normally mean, "I realize you've got some good arguments, but not good enough" But the convergence part seems to support evolution, while being a manifestly silly statement regardless of what it means. Unless the Pope is God, or receives detailed revelation about every researcher in the world, he cannot know that convergence was "neither sought nor fabricated." Furthermore, the simple fact that "all have sinned," should warn any normal person, certainly a Christian, that it is highly unlikely that "work" in evolution would ever be honestly carried out. In my 20 year study of it, I haven't seen any honestly carried out.]

9 He defined: "A theory is a metascientific elaboration, distinct from the results of observation but consistent with them [he should have said "supposedly consistent"]. By means of it [the theory] a series of independent data and facts can be related and interpreted in a unified explanation. A theory's validity depends on whether or not it can be verified; it is constantly tested against the facts; wherever it can no longer explain the latter, it shows its limitations and unsuitability. It must then be rethought." [He avoided mentioning that there is a vast body of facts that evolution does not "explain." Furthermore, his statement about validity is blatantly false. A theory's validity does not depend on whether it can be verified by testing it against facts. A theory's validity depends on whether it is true!!!! Its popularity may depend somewhat on whether it fits or can explain data. The Pope also completely missed the fact that a totally false theory can fit the available data. This is common in mathematical descriptions of the real world. They can be pretty good at fitting some or all the presently known data, or, more typically, all the data the salesman presents. But when more data is in, or known by the listener, the "theory" is often seen to be manifestly absurd. This is commonly the case with "evolution theory." But, I repeat, even if a theory does fit all the known data, it has not been verified! It remains a theory, not a fact (which he did allude to above). A theory is seldom, if ever "verified." All theories that you believe are believed on faith! The faith may be a reasonable one, e.g., Christianity, but it remains a faith! It will never be known with absolute certainty until it is too late!]

10 Now comes the passage everyone seems to have overlooked [willfully suppressed?]: "Furthermore, while the formulation of a theory like that of evolution complies with the need for consistency with the observed data, it borrows certain notions from natural philosophy. [This sounds good, but actually he blew it here. True, evolution is "natural philosophy," but is not consistent with observed data. It is consistent only with some data]. And to tell the truth, rather than the theory of evolution, we should speak of several theories of evolution. On the one hand, this plurality has to do with the different explanations advanced for the mechanism of evolution [the claim made by Harvard's most verbose atheist, Steven Gould] and on the other, with the various philosophies on which it is based. Hence the existence of materialist, reductionist and spiritualist interpretations. What is to be determined here is the true role of philosophy and, beyond it, theology. [He threw evolution a bone by saying they had some research supporting their beliefs. And he even granted them more than their due when he said it independently converged. But here he says that "to tell the truth... evolution is based on three (he could have safely added... "obviously silly") philosophies." Now consider, according to the Pope, is evolution based on research, or philosophy? I don't know for certain what he believes, or meant. But his words say: "research... provides a significant argument... in favor of evolution," but evolution is "based on" philosophy.]

11 He quoted "Gaudium et Spes" that man is "the only creature on earth that God has wanted for its own sake (No.24)." [a marginal theology] For two rather lengthy paragraphs, he rambled on considering the notion that evolution may be right about the body, but not the spirit or soul. He cited "Humani Generis" saying that it had taken the position that, "If the human body take [sic] its origin from pre-existent living matter, the spiritual soul is immediately created by God." [a human theology, certainly not from Scripture, which says man was created from dust and became a living soul in one day]

12 He closed with some thoughts on life, the Bible and man, and this: We are called to enter into eternal life... To warn us against the serious temptations threatening us, our Lord quotes the great saying of Deuteronomy: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God" [Am] (Dt 8:3; cf. Mt 4:4) Even more, "life" is one of the most beautiful titles which the Bible attributes to God. He is the living God. [And so He is.]

Space does not permit, nor does the subject warrant a detailed response to these various articles. Some comments follow:

1 The Pope did not endorse evolution! While he did walk the fences, I think the his actual words gave evolution a few crumbs, but more spanking. Not the public execution that evolution deserves, but nonetheless, a spanking.

2 The atheist and secular press did their usual... they didn't get it right but the atheists were clearly the better
The Catholic press seemed to agree with the atheist: “We've known that all along.” They probably represented more accurately what their educational institutions, bishops and priests teach, than did the Pope. But then, the atheist press represented best what most Protestant "institutions of higher learning" teach, both in "liberal" and "conservative" denominations.

Cal Thomas flubbed it too, but was virtually alone in publicly confessing it. He still missed the real meaning (see below). And, he blamed his error on a trivial two word translation error. At CSA, we're not always right, but fortunately we read some poor copies, smelled a skunk, and waited until we had read all the Pope said before commenting. We even read some of his references. If Thomas had read even a little more, he should have seen a conflict between the one sentence he didn't like and the rest of the talk. Cal deserves some rebuke... and some honor. Thanks, Cal, for the integrity to admit a mistake, and for reminding us of one more Scriptural truth: "Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." -1Cor 10:12

What does it all mean?

I think the Catholic press was unintentionally closest to right. Throughout the history of "Popeism," politics and money have been of more importance than Christ. The leadership of this group has arranged and condoned the execution of some 60 million Christians because they disagreed with ideas like eating Jesus weekly, bowing to statues, and deifying Mary. Their "protests" were always with sufficient conviction that they served to reduce "church" revenues and political power. The "church," as long as they had the political power, responded decisively... death.

In contrast, the same organization permitted and even encouraged pagan rites of all sorts as a means of "evangelism." The results of these seemingly contradictory actions (one "intolerant," one "tolerant") were compatible: More pagan members still mean more political power... more money.

But, walking a "political/money" tightrope, leaves you with difficult decisions as to which choice will yield most "results." Opposing communism was easier. Communists didn't have much money to give, but anti-Communists did. Furthermore, communists are equal-opportunity killers. Evolution simply forces another "results-oriented decision." You try to keep the pagans and the Christians sending money. Being a true Christian is, as Jesus said, a lighter yoke. You simply decide what is right and proceed on faith. In His time, He will vindicate you.

Tom Willis
CSA Meeting Tuesday, May 6, 1997
The Basic Institute in Creation Science
Catastrophic Plate Tectonics
A Comprehensive Biblical Model of Geology
by: Glenn Kailer

Six leading creation scientists with varied Ph.D. specialties presented this powerful model at the International Conference on Creationism in Pittsburgh, PA in 1994. Glenn quickly acquired a copy from Dr. Steve Austin and has found it beneficial to audiences around the country. Many who believe in a global flood in Noah's time, cannot really visualize how it occurred and what effects it had. An enormous computer model, sedimentation experiments, Mt. St. Helens, and field geological research show how a catastrophic, rapid breakup of Pangea and movement of continents to their present location. Many geological features and a rapid ice age within the last few thousand years are explained.

CSA Meeting Tuesday, Jun 3, 1997
The Basic Institute in Creation Science
Relevance of Creation
by: Bob Farwell

Bob used to teach evolution and even pyramid power in his science classes. When he repented of that and began to teach the truth, he was threatened with dismissal. He was told to think over his alternatives, but before giving an answer, was transferred from science to math. He now has empirical as well as Biblical information to share on "The Relevance of Creation."

The Advanced Institute in Creation Science
The Origin of Atomic Structure
A Video from the International Conference on Creation
by: Charles Lucas, PhD

A small group of physicists have been working for many years on a new model of the atom, which they feel will not require Relativity or Quantum Mechanics. Lucas is a member of this group. When I was in school, most physicists were uncomfortable with these concepts. This topic is at the heart of the question, but does not fully develop the model. (T94038)

CSA meetings are free, educational, useful in evangelism, and even entertaining. Join us