

ON EVOLUTIONISTS AND THEIR CLOAK OF IDEAS

*** A PARALLEL ***

JOHN N. MOORE*

Many of you remember (the Hans Christian Anderson) story of **The Emperor's New Clothes**, a penetrating account of the **fraud** perpetrated upon a pompous Oriental potentate by a pair of astute confidence men.

Playing upon the strings of human vanity and conceit, these knaves represented themselves as skilled tailors, who at a monstrous price, fashioned clothing for the high-born from a magical fabric woven only by them and visible only to persons of noble character, unsmirched reputation, and superior intelligence. The scoundrelly tailors, of course, neither wove fabric nor made clothes, but they performed convincing motions of weaving, cutting, fitting and sewing.

And so persuasive were they that the emperor paid them richly with gold for clothes which did not exist, for he feared that his character, his lineage, and his intelligence would immediately be condemned did he admit his inability to see

these magical garments. After a lengthy period, during which the spurious tailors enthusiastically **swindled** the emperor, a royal procession was held to exhibit the magnificent new clothes,

The common people, dutifully watching the pageant, were startled by the near-nudity of the undraped ruler, but, like the uppercrust of nobles, fearing that expressions of doubt concerning these wondrous garments would expose them to ridicule, they cheered the king and admired his nonexistent raiment.

The **fraud** was exposed only when a smallurchin, unknowing of human vanity and conceit, cried out in a clear voice, "Why, he isn't wearing anything at all." (Emphases added)

-From Introduction in "The Emperor's New Clothes or Prius Dementat" by Professor Harry J. Fuller, **The Scientific Monthly**, 72:32ff. January, 1951.

* * *

Evolutionists, in many scholarly disciplines, have represented themselves to the general public as skilled scientists, who are capable of fashioning a complete, **supposedly factual**, explanation of the origins of the universe, the earth, life, man, and man's culture. Yet, at a monstrous price in scientific methodological accuracy, evolutionists have used only *imagined* phenomena, such as chance, favorable mutations and supposed transmutations by natural selection, as a consequence of their acceptance exclusively of a naturalistic-materialistic world-view of reality.

Of course, evolutionists have *never observed* the change of one animal kind (i.e., starfish-kind, snake-kind, bird-kind, dog-kind, or man-kind) into another animal kind (or change of one plant kind, i.e., moss-kind, fern-kind, rose-kind, grass-kind, or corn-kind, into another plant kind), neither through their study of the fossil record, nor by means of any breeding experiments for over 100 years.

Nevertheless, evolutionists have attempted to make convincingly persuasive their explanation of origins by use of so-called circumstantial "evidence" involving study of (a) vestigial or rudimentary organs, (b) biochemical blood analyses, (c) comparative studies of external characteristics of organisms, (d) comparative studies of embryological stages of development, (e) imagined "reconstructions" of fossil remains, and (f) extensive extrapolations of so-called radio-

logical dating methods as acceptable substitutes for direct observation and controlled experimentation.

But these circumstantial "evidences" involving degrees of similarity or likeness, *even when advanced with great honesty and scientific fervor*, **cannot** be considered as conclusive documentation of any **genetic** connections between any animal kinds, or plant kinds, either those mentioned above, or other kinds.

And, further, among evolutionists, there have been those so persuaded by their own patterns of thought, and evidently because of their deep devotion and conviction in support of the persuasive evolutionary explanations of origins, that **some** have been quite willing to perpetrate deliberate *fraud* and *hoax* for the benefit of the unlearned. This has been shown conclusively, for example,

(1) in studies of comparative stages of embryological development as found in the nineteenth century work of Ernst Haeckel, who *falsified* drawings to make embryos of dog and human being look alike; and,

(2) in imagined "reconstructions" offered for part of the supposed lineage of human beings by twentieth century researchers studying Piltdown "man," where clear *fraud* has been established.

It is true that many anthropologists, in the early 1900's, had questioned openly the validity of the Piltdown "find"; and *scientists* did finally expose the so-called evidence, but only after some 40 years of "fooling" the general public. Therefore, the unlearned might well be very

*John N. Moore, Ed.D., is Professor of Natural Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

reluctant to pay attention to evolutionists, today, because their claims of interpretations of data of blood analyses, radiological dating, and effects of gene mutations are under serious challenge in the 1970's.

Admittedly, leading evolutionists have been persuasive in presentation of their total evolutionary explanations of origins. So persuasive in fact that they have even intimidated, or "stampeded," many proponents of a theistic world-view of reality into accommodation. Some theists have attempted compromise of their logically consistent alternative explanation of origin of the universe, the earth, life, man, and man's culture involving the Creator God, in the persons of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Evolutionists have been so persuasive that some God-believing men have tried to reach compromise through the conceptual scheme of "theistic evolution". Some "theistic evolutionists" *imagine* even that the Creator God used death, disease, and expedient competitive survival of the "strong" over the "weak" as means for origin of diverse kinds of life and of man.

This high price of accommodation and compromise, to ideas about events and changes never actually demonstrated observationally or experimentally by evolutionists, has been paid by some God-believing men because of a sense of fear. Evidently they feared that their stature in academic circles, their very intellectual veracity, their high position as learned scholars before other men would be condemned and neutralized.

That is, many have feared loss of academic status if they explicated weaknesses, deficiencies, and inadequacies of the persuasive evolutionary explanation of origins; if they exposed evolutionists as most unsuccessful in their "study" of the cosmic past, when compared to physical scientists in their study of the cosmic present (i.e., mathematical, quantifiable work under the nuclear-atomic-molecular explanation of matter and changes associated thereto).

After a period of over 100 years since Charles Darwin made the evolutionary explanation of origins persuasively acceptable to the great majority of modern intelligentsia (during which time proponents of socialism, communism, existentialism, nihilism, humanism, and God-is-dead movements have vied for the minds of men and women of all ages), centennial celebrations in nation after nation have been held. Before great assemblies, spokesmen for the persuasive total evolutionary explanation of origins have assured their supporters that incontestable factual status can be given to evolution—from stellar and physical to biological and societal stages.

And the common people, the unlearned laymen, are presently recipients of consequences of

the ignominious compromises made by proponents of a theistic world-view of reality. The common people have dutifully watched the pageantry of meetings, watched television programs, read books, and listened to radio programs sponsored by evolutionists. Consequentially, children of the unlearned (and children of the learned as well) are accepting the belief that they are no more than animals, that is, matter in motion—and parents of these children are startled to see the lengths of sensuousness, licentiousness, and lasciviousness to which their offspring seem led by the "pied-piper" ideas taught in classrooms all over the world.

But the common people, like their intellectually learned peers, fear ridicule. Fearful that they have only limited capacity for veracity and understanding of the Word of God (from which many heard of and learned about the Creator God and His unchanging answers regarding origin of the universe, the earth, life, man, and man's culture), the common people have "cheered" the evolutionists. And most seem to accept unquestionably an imagined animal origin, and even admire the "beautiful" pictures in books, and on television, of actually nonexistent ancestors, and nonobservable changes between kinds of plants and kinds of animals.

Belatedly, the *fraud* of the persuasive total evolutionary explanation of origins is being exposed by a small remnant of scientists. They are true to inherent limitations of sound scientific methodology, *and* are kept firm in their acceptance of a theistic world-view of reality, which they heard of and learned about from the Holy Bible. The Holy Spirit has taught them, and Jesus Christ has redeemed them from condemnation for their sins.

These scientists, in spite of human vanity and conceit, are crying out to all who will hear, "Why the evolutionary explanation is totally without factual foundation." These remnant scientists are crying out boldly that the total evolutionary explanation is essentially a *fraudulently* perpetrated *hoax*, when presented as factual by those who follow, consciously or unconsciously, such men as Teilhard de Chardin and Sir Julian Huxley.

This is so because de Chardin and Huxley are just those men who have declared consciously *their desire* to persuade the learned and the unlearned into acceptance of their counterfeit, evolutionary humanistic substitute for the Word of God. (See Mark 13:5; II Tim. 4:3, 4; Col. 2:8; Rom. 1:25; and Eph. 4:14.) Yet, it is the Holy Bible, as the Word of God, that contains the only unchanging explanation for men of all centuries of the origin of the universe, the earth, life, man, and man's culture.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mimicry in plants and animals by Wolfgang Wickler. 1968. World University Library, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, Toronto. \$4.95.

Reviewed by Walter E. Lammerts.*

Here is a "must have" book for all biologists in our group who wish to get a detailed knowledge of the remarkable adaptations and complex correlations found in plants and animals. In his third chapter Wickler makes a categorical statement which denies our creationist position:

It is of course nonsensical to assume a gap exists in scientific thought and explanations and that this gap is proof of the existence of supernatural forces. In other words the teleologists—those who regard the strikingly refined adaptations of living organisms as proof of the existence of a purposive Creator—made a logical error; one can never prove or disprove the existence of a Creator in this way. (page 38)

Actually Wickler mistakes our case for it is not the "gaps" which convince us of a purposive Creator but the whole amazing universe from the intricacy of atomic physics on up to the relationships of the stars above us. Yet he confesses later regarding Müllerian mimicry:

All members of a defensive or inedible species should bear the same warning coloration. If, for example, some hornets were ringed in black and yellow, while others were in white and blue tartan, and yet others covered in silver spots, the predator would have to learn all three color patterns. The hornets would then have to sacrifice three times as many individuals as when all look alike and where the predator has to learn only one (coloration) pattern. If differences in warning coloration are senseless when different species are concerned, then it would be even more senseless within one and the same species. But just this ridiculous situation arises in the case of the polymorphic inedible butterflies of the genus *Heliconius* mentioned previously, (page 85)

Wickler presents in detail many remarkable examples of Batesian mimicry, i.e., edible animals looking very similar to an unpalatable or repulsive one. Such an edible animal has a false warning pattern or "acts a part," so is a mime. The first examples he illustrates are the harmless Diptera or flies which are mimics of wasps, bees, and bumble bees.

Polymorphism in butterflies provide many examples such as the beautiful *Papilio dardanus* in which many of the female morphs mimic various inedible butterflies in the genus *Danaus* and the Amauris group. The genetics of these remarkable morphs was worked out by C. A. Clarke and P. M. Sheppard. They found that the coloration patterns, whether mimetic or not, are genetically determined.

Furthermore, externally similar morphs can be developed in different ways genetically; that is by different combinations of genes. Modifier genes exist which can alter their functional level so as to improve the correspondence of mimic with the model. However, the effect of these modifier genes in one race is not carried over into crosses with another race. This means says Wickler, and I agree, that these genes were probably developed *simultaneously* in each gene complex.

Wickler makes an attempt to show how these remarkable mimics might have originated by natural selection by to appealing to mimetic weeds such as the gold-of-pleasure (*Camelina sativa linicola*), a Crucifer, which resembles the flax (*Linum usitatissimum*) in the family Linaceae.

But he starts out with a plant *already* superficially similar to flax as he admits, "and the gold-of-pleasure gradually developed this character (long stems), which is also occasionally present where it grows in isolation." (page 41) The really remarkable feature is the close resemblance of the seeds, such that a winnowing machine throws each kind of seed the same distance and so weed seed ends up with flax seed. Genetically the mimetic characters of the weed seeds are controlled by a complex of genes.

Does Wickler wish us to believe that this gene complex originated as a result of man's harvesting flax seed by a winnowing machine? I would be inclined to say that the gene variability potential already existed, and use of the machine merely acted as the agent to make this particular strain of gold-of-pleasure relatively homozygous for this special combination of genes allowing the seed to be thrown in with the flax seed.

Though selection is at work here as Wickler claims, *it by no means originated* the gene complexity making the selection possible. This is precisely the fault creationists find with natural selection generally—it cannot *originate* the *variation potential* making possible the presumed selection!

He also maintains that rye and oats were developed into useful grains by their mimicry of wheat. This is contrary to the rather detailed actual history of these grains.

*Walter E. Lammerts, Ph.D., is Research Editor and a noted rose breeder, Freedom, California 95019.

Under the heading, "Camouflage," he discusses a whole range of remarkable adaptations such as that of the mantid (*Hymenopus coronatus*) which looks so much like the pink flowers of a Malaysian orchid, that bees in search of nectar light on the mantid instead of the orchid, and so lose their lives.

Backward posturing is a favorite trick used by insects to avoid being caught by enemies. The Siamese lantern fly (*Ancyra annamensis*), shown on the cover of this issue, is a most striking example of this type of camouflage.

We are indebted to Mr. Edward S. Ross for this illustration. He is the photographer for the Academy of Science, in Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, California, and has many remarkable photographs of most unusual insects and other animals. Though Mr. Ross believes this animal developed as result of evolution by natural selection, he was most interested to know that a minority group of scientists no longer felt this explanation was adequate.

Another species which uses backward posturing most effectively is the hair streak (*Thecla linus*), which always squats on vertical surfaces with its head pointing downward, and the tail looking remarkably like a head, even to the point of moving the false antennae.

The whole book is most fascinating and it is amazing that men like Wickler cannot see that, as our Lord said,

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: And yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast in the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? (Matthew 6:28-31).

In other words God is not some remote control being, but "in him we (and all creation) move and have our being." His original creation, with all its remarkable adaptation, has a built in potential for variation adequate to take care of most changing circumstances, except those of calamitous nature. God is constantly at work caring for and maintaining His creation, even though the world is no longer perfect.

He is not a God of the "gaps" as Wickler implies. The marvelous creation we see around us is an expression of God constantly at work maintaining and providing for his creatures. There is evidence for a counter force of evil of great power attempting to corrupt and destroy all that was once perfect and still is by and large mighty good.

The marvelous adaptations so interestingly described by Wickler help us to see the amazing

intricacy of God's mind. They also show that much of what we see in nature was created simply for the sake of variety, beauty, and may I be so bold as to say whimsical humor!

* * *

Biology: A Search for Order in Complexity. Prepared by the Textbook Committee of Creation Research Society. Edited by John N. Moore and Harold S. Slusher. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1970. \$7.95.

Reviewed by John N. Moore.*

This is the type of book sought by Science Consultant Richard Bliss of the Unified School District #1, Racine, Wisconsin 53404, who has stated, "What do I propose as far as curriculum in Biology and the Life Sciences is concerned? If I could carry enough influence, I would like to see a text that deals, not in the centrality of evolution, but rather in the centrality of universal order and the diversity of all living things." (before a session on "The Teaching of Evolution," First National Biological Congress in Detroit, November 8, 1970).

This book is a scientifically accurate alternate to currently available high school biology texts that contain heavy emphasis on biochemical and physical science principles of abstract explanation of matter and energy. In this book teachers will find a more customary observational and descriptive approach to foster student understanding of biology.

Also the more familiar biological systems approach, accompanied by the more usual treatment of plant and animal classification divisions, will seem distinct advantages of this book. Teachers will be more confident that students will learn biology as biology through use of this book.

Most unique is the entire Unit 9 on "Theories of Biological Change." In this Unit, a careful evaluation of organic evolutionary thinking is provided in the five chapters of "Weaknesses of Geologic Evidence," "Evidences from Similarities," "Early Man," "Problems for Evolutionists," and "Limited Variation Versus Unlimited Change."

The indisputable fact of careful writing to avoid bias is evident to the reader in the Preface, and in the very balanced writing about evolutionists and creationists in pages 147 and 149; 154; 201; 236; 241, 242 and 243; 320 and 321; 394; 398; 429ff; 434; and 458ff. In addition the Index

*John N. Moore, Ed.D., is Professor of Natural Science, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

affords multiple references to evolutionary theory and creation theory.

In the sense of the discussion of "origins" in the Preface, the above pages provide ample basis for maintaining that the Bible is the *only* unchanging "textbook" on origins of life, of plants, of animals, and of man. The authors have shown clearly that modern scientific knowledge can best be fitted to the rational explanation of origins found in the Biblical account of Genesis kinds, rather than the interpretation of evolutionary thinkers like Sir Julian Huxley.

Since the contents of this book may well be considered as satisfying requirements for textbook writing established by the California State Board of Education, an author's comment in a national scientific journal is apropos. After reference to the Scopes trial of about 50 years ago, the editor wrote, "However, a new dimension was added in the 1970 version (the California School Board hearing) — *scientist versus scientist*." (Editor Walter G. Peter III, *Bioscience*, October 1, 1970, page 1067). Of equal relevance is the closing statement by Dr. Duane T. Gish in another national scientific journal,

What we are pleading for is a *balanced* presentation in our schools, with a full disclosure of the evidence, regardless of which theory it favors. The dogmatic fashion in

which evolution is usually taught in our schools and universities amounts to indoctrination and is as much the teaching of religion as if the theory of origins were restricted to the Book of Genesis. (*The American Biology Teacher*, November, 1970, page 497)

Commenting on this new high school biology textbook, Professor W. R. Thompson, F. R. S., has written, "This is certainly a splendidly produced work with an exposition so reasonable that only the most extreme evolutionists can oppose it." Dr. Thompson was formerly Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

And two articles containing references to possible educational impact of this biology textbook were published at the beginning of the year, namely, "Creationism" in *Scientific American*, 224(1):46 and 47, January, 1971; and "Darwin Shares with Eve and Adam" in the British journal *Nature*, 229:6 and 7, January 1, 1971.

As the publisher's circular concludes, "An exciting breakthrough for biological study in the classroom in the 70's." Or, as Dr. Thomas Barnes wrote in the "Acknowledgements," "Because of this cooperative effort, *Biology: A Search for Order in Complexity* is a distinctive contribution to the textbook field as a service to academic freedom in American education."

ERRATUM

Clifford L. Burdick has written the editors that he inserted the wrong quotation for James Van Allen in his paper, "The Structure and Fabric of Geology," *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 7(3):146 (December, 1970). Instead of the quotation beginning "The postulated environment . . ." the following quotation should have appeared:

At higher altitudes . . . up to the points at which the counter jammed, it showed counting rates more than 1000 times the theoretical expectation for cosmic rays. From the rate of the increase and the length of the periods of jamming, we judged that the maximum count probably went to several times this level.

(Continued from Page 54)

those who have studied the Old Testament in the "light" of modern scholarship. He seems not to realize that *all* modern science and scholarship is bedeviled by blindness at the fact of the Flood, so that they misinterpret *all* the phenomena—whether in geology, archaeology, or anthropology.

When quotes II Peter 3 (page 132) he actually omits verses 5 and 6 which state so clearly that the whole globe was inundated; and he makes no attempt to answer the other six Biblical arguments for a universal Flood as given in Chapter 1 of *The Genesis Flood*. This is not to deny that Filby's book has some value, but the strength of a chain is its weakest link. He traces the Flood *story* through many lands and many

peoples; but, because he never challenges the basic presuppositions of Darwinism, he gives no solid grounds for accepting the story as fact.

Taken as a whole, Dr. Filby's book shows how untenable is a middle position on the Flood: we must *either* accept Genesis 7-9 at its face value or agree with the critics that it is pure legend. Any other view is "mixing more or less Science with more or less of Scripture, to produce a result more or less absurd."

Yours sincerely,
DAVID C. C. WATSON
44 Deakin Leas
Tonbridge, Kent,
England