# CREATION RESEARCH SOCIETY QUARTERLY

Volume I | OCTOBER 1964 | Number 2

## EDITORIAL BOARD



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

# THE HERITAGE OF CREATION CONCEPTS

## Selected Bibliography Showing the Continuity of The Creationist Viewpoint

JOHN N. MOORE, Ed.D.
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

### 1950-1959

J. L. Baldwin, (biologist), *A New Answer to Darwinism,* Mary E. Baldwin, Manhattan Building, Chicago 5, Illinois, 1957.

Presenting anew compound name, creo-evolution, the author tries to show a need for scientific creationism and special creation of species. His synthesis of ideas from biological and physical sciences merits attention though he seems to confuse evolution with variation.

M. Brongersma-Sanders, (oceanographer), Chapter 29, "Mass Mortality in the Sea," *Treatise on Marine Ecology and Paleoecology,* Memoir 67, Vol. 1, pp. 941-973, Geological Society of America, 1957.

This chapter surveys mass mortality in the sea, its causes, and its significance to paleoecology. Though not using the term "catastrophe" in the sense of Cuvier, investigation shows that catastrophic killing in limited regions "has played **a** part in geology."

H. G. Cannon, (zoologist), *The Evolution of Living Things,* Manchester University Press, Manchester. England, 1958.

A presentation for the view of "Balanced Evolution." Yet the author recognizes need for restraint of a Mendelian Philosophy. He suggests a Power behind the "inexorable physico-chemical law" of evolution, which he calls an "unfolding of one thing from another." Excellent historical chapter is basis for lucid treatments of Darwinism, Mendelism, Lamarckism, Deo-Darwinism, and Neo-Lamarckism.

J. K. Charlestworth, (geologist), *The Quaternary Era,* Vol. II, Edward Arnold Co., London, 1957.

Considerable attention is given to the topic of monoglacialism, though the authors favors multiglaciation commonly accepted by evolutionists. Extensive bibliography of mono-glacial geologists is given.

R. E. D. Clark, (chemist), *Scientific Rationalism and Christian Faith,* Third Edition, The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, London, 1951.

Dealing with the consequences of the thinking of Prof. J. B. S. Haldane and Dr. J. S. Huxley, the author relates evolution, dialectic materialism, and agnosticism while noting impact on and implications for religious faith. This book is a study of once-born and twice-born scientific rationalists.

R. E. D. Clark, *Darwin: Before and After,* The Paternoster Press, London, 1958.

This is a story of evolution presented in calm and lucid fashion by a regular contributor to the Inter-Varsity Christian work in England. After some history, he relates evolution to biological sciences and to physics, but concludes "there is no evidence that evolution can transform the fundamental structures."

R. E. D. Clark, "Evolution or Creation? The Heart of the Problem," *Christianity Today,* May 11, 1959, pp. 3-5.

Clark asserts that survival of the fittest cannot explain ordered nature of energy of the universe, properties of chemical elements, origin of first forms of life, appearance of complete and functional biological structures, or difficulties raised by increase in size. Holding that creativity of the human mind is not magic, and therefore God need not be a magician, Clark accuses evolutionists of postulating creation (spontaneously, magically) in direct opposition to the basic principle of all scientific thought,

J. Challinor, (paleontologist), Chapter 2, "Palaeontology and Evolution" in *Darwin's Biological Work: Some Aspects Reconsidered,* (many authors), Cambridge University Press, London, 1959.

Excellent statement on p. 53 about inconclusiveness of evidence either for continuous orderly change or for separate creation.

A. M. Calcq, (embryologist), *Introduction to General Embryology,* Chapter 13: "Development and Evolution," Oxford University Press, London, 1957.

While discussing problem of understanding the meaning of similarities between stages of embryonic development in different animals, the author, though more or less an evolutionist, concludes, "there is something more in the evolution of biological systems than this mechanism of mutation and selection" since universality of mechanism is a mere postulate.

G. de Beer, (biologist), *Embryos and Ancestors,* Third Edition, Oxford University Press, London, 1958.

An evolutionist presents up-to-date reasons for denial of Haeckel's theory of recapitulation. Valuable clarification of relation of ontogeny and phylogeny. Author presents no "explanation" of evolution which he seems to confuse with developmental variations within limits.

P. G. Fothergill, (botanist), *Historical Aspects of Organic Evolution,* Philosophical Library, New York, 1953.

This is a dispassionate effort to fill gaps in literature on history of evolution, to evaluate conflicting

meanings, and to present an unbiased account of evolution. Success of the author's purposes is realized and the epilogue presents a model form of suspended judgment and care of expression about "indirect and circumstantial" nature of classical "evidence" for evolution. Extensive bibliography includes references to biologists who either completely disagree with the idea of evolution or who doubt its general applicability.

L. C. Eiseley, (anthrologist), "Charles Darwin, Edward Blyth, and the Theory of Natural Selection," *American Philosophical Society — Proceedings,* Vol. 103, No. 1, 1959, pp. 94-114 (two appendices of Blyth's articles).

Excellent analysis of long ignored publisher of ideas on natural selection whom Darwin secretly knew but failed to acknowledge as was his habit regarding other forerunners.

L. C. Eiseley, "Charles Lyell," *Scientific American, August, 1959,* Reprint No. 846.

Discusses why founder of modern historical geology was reluctant to accept the idea of evolution and points out how Darwin used ideas of natural selection from Lyell and young zoologist Edward Blyth who had stressed conservative aspect of selection.

W. Friar, (scientist), "What Are the Possibilities for Original Kinds?", *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation,* Vol. 10, No. 1, March, 1958, pp. 12-16.

Four suppositions of evolutionists are listed and followed by specific consideration of six evidences in support of the title. Author concludes that small changes occur within limits, cross-breeding is limited, and unmistakable bridgeless gaps and discontinuities exist in geological record.

R. Goldschmidt, (geneticist), "Evolution, As Viewed by One Geneticist," *American Scientist,* January 1952, pp. 84-98 and 135.

Critical of neo-Darwinian views of evolution this scientist presents his position on systemic mutations and his thesis of sudden change (saltation) which is hardly distinguishable from special creation of distinct "kinds."

R. Goldschmidt, *Theoretical Genetics,* University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1955.

Part V on "Genetic Theory and Evolution" presents this evolutionists's cautious position on drawing definite conclusions regarding theory of evolution from views on the nature of genetic material and its action. He says, ". . . nobody has ever succeeded in producing a new species, not to mention the higher categories, by selection of micromutations."

R. Good, (botanist), *Features of Evolution in Flowering Plants,* Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1956.

A fresh and untrammeled examination of problems of evolution. Author discusses at length relations of changes in animals and plants with attention to comparative independence of latter forms. He makes a strong case about neglected importance of plants. A final summary and conclusion chapter itemizes the arguments of each chapter in brief terms. This study of neglected facts demonstrates that some "of the best-known speculations about organic evolution are seen to have a less general applicability than is usually claimed."

R. Good, "Natural Selection Re-examined," *The Listener,* Vol. 61, May 7, 1959, pp. 797-799.

Author reviews reasons for being critical of natural selection some of which are not new and still quite valid. Natural Selection depends on false parallels and it is not appropriate to present moral, social and educational climate today.

J. Gray, (zoologist), "The Case for Natural Selection," *Nature,* Vol. 173, No. 4397, February 6, 1954, p. 227.

This review of Huxley's *Evolution in Action, 1953,* remarks on the failure of natural selection to be substantiated through much research on function of organs and structures and the inherent improbability of Darwinian orthodoxy. Quotes Huxley as admitting man "is burdened with many more deleterious mutant genes" than any wild creature, which Biblical scholars would expect.

C. H. Hapgood, (science historian) in collaboration with J. H. Campbell (chemist, engineer), *The Earth's Shifting Crust,* Pantheon Books, New York. 1958.

Apparently accepting evolution, Hapgood discusses the problem of time in a chapter on "Life" which follows closely a chapter on "The Great Extinctions." Centrifugal forces due to accumulation of ice at the South Pole are part of Hapgood's theory of massive displacements of the earth's crust. He offers explanations for "missing links" and suggests means that might "accelerate the tempo of natural selection" uniformly.

C. H. Hapgood, "The Earth's Shifting Crust," *Saturday Evening Post,* Vol. 231, January 10, 1959, pp. 9, 66-69.

A brief resume of recently developed assumption of crustal displacements of the earth involving possible sudden continental shifts with compensating changes in living things, land and climate. Two cross-sectional diagrams and statement of impression of correctness of hypothesis as seen by Albert Einstein are included. Hapgood comments that his ideas supply the missing factor to accelerate the process of evolution (climatic change being recognized by biologists as the most powerful evolutionary force).

G. Hardin, (biologist), *Nature and Man's Fate,* The American Library, (Mentor Book #MT 338), 1959.

Easy reading attempt by probably confirmed evo-

lutionist to relate modern neo-Darwinian synthesis to problems of individual versus group, waste versus saving, nationalism, cooperation. Shows tendency of such writers to confuse evolution and variation.

T. S. Jacobsen, (astronomer), Book Review of ***Space, Time and Creation*** by M. K. Munitz (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1957), ***Science,*** Vol. 128, September 5, 1958, pp. 526-527.

In reviewing this book on philosophical aspects of scientific cosmology according to modern operational thinking, Jacobsen mentions a chapter, "The Age of the Universe" and comments on Munitz's position that current estimates of the expanding universe are not in any sense factual hence we know nothing certain about the age of the universe. Munitz also gives a thorough philosophical analysis of Hoyle's hypothesis of "creation" *ex nihilo* of matter.

F. W. Jones, (zoologist), ***Trends of Life,*** Edward Arnold and Co., London, 1953.

A short chapter on "The Trend of Evolution" is worth some note. Jones challenges the concept of progress through evolution though he accepts belief in evolution (without any discussion of methods). He sees a "degenerative bondage" in civilization. Two early chapters deal with vitalism which he says is a heresy, though not proved wrong by science.

J. Klotz, (biologist), ***Genes, Genesis and Evolution,*** Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, 1955.

Carefully written textbook prepared for teachers colleges which deals very well with the nature of the conflict between the scientific theory of evolution and the Scriptures. Last chapter includes over three dozen problems and subproblems for the evolutionist.

J. L. Kulp, (physical chemist), "The Carbon-14 Method of Age Determination," ***Scientific Monthly,*** Vol. 75, November, 1952, pp. 259-267.

While describing materials, techniques, calibrations, archaeological and geological samples, Kulp gives two basic assumptions in the carbon-14 method: 1) "the carbon-14 concentration in the carbon dioxide cycle is constant," and 2) "the cosmic ray flux has been essentially constant — at least on a scale of centuries" (p. 261). He mentions tests of these assumptions, also some problems, (Morris and Whitcomb add five more assumptions of this method in ***The Genesis Flood,*** p. 371).

E. Larrabee, (science writer), "The Day the Sun Stood Still," ***Harper's Magazine,*** Vol. 200, January, 1950, pp. 17 and 20-26.

An editor's compact outline of the remarkable theory of Dr. Immanuel Velikovsky published in the latter's book, ***Worlds in Collision*** (Macmillan, New York, 1950). Great physical catastrophes due to Venus and Mars are mentioned to underline Velikovsky's documented and detailed denial that the earth's history has been one of peaceful evolution.

J. Lever, (zoologist), ***Creation and Evolution,*** Grand Rapids International Publications, Grand Rapids 6, Michigan, 1958.

Essentially a theistic evolutionist presents a review of present state of affairs. Mentions three volumes by A. Wigand ( 1812-1886), ***Darwinism and the Science of Newton and Cuvier*** written from the Christian creation-motif.

R. J. Lougee, (geologist), "Ice-Age History," Sci***ence,*** Vol. 128, November 21, 1958, pp. 1290, 1292.

Writing in preview of a paper for the 1958 AAAS meeting, Lougee points out that: 1) only a single glaciation developed in America and Europe, 2) retreats of borders of the icecap explain how the concept of "older" and "'last" glaciation came about, and 3) geological history should be shortened and the terms "Nebraskan," "Kansan," "Illinoisan," "Wisconsin," and "interglacial" should be nullified.

R. J. Lougee, "Science and Public Education" (Letter), ***Science,*** Vol. 130, July 10, 1959, page 106.

A reply to rhetorical criticisms, in an accompanying letter by a geologist Morris M. Leighton, of Lougee's paper on "Ice Age History" presented at AAAS meeting in December, 1958. Lougee mentions his identification of water-laid deposits (for which he proposes the name "lyell") in the Kansan-Illinoian complex, overspreading a true till. He claims other so-called tills ("Jersian," "Iowan," "Valders," "Toronto," "Cochane" and Vashon") are lyells. Lougee denies claims of multiple glaciation in the Mississippi basin. Note: more rhetorical ramblings by a soil scientist intended apparently to ridicule Lougee appear in a letter in ***Science,*** Vol. 130, October 30, 1959, p. 1162.)

F. L. Marsh, (biologist), ***Studies in Creationism,*** Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington, D. C., 1950.

Beginning with the question, "Is man an animal ?", the author discusses a wide array of topics commonly associated with discourses on evolutionism and creationism.

F. L. Marsh, ***Life, Man and Time,*** Pacific Press Publishing Association, Mountain View, California, 1957.

Due to gross misunderstandings of the Bible and specific misconceptions of special creation by evolutionists, Marsh has considered in a positive way "the blueprint for the lives, past and present, of plants and animals as revealed by a literal reading of the Holy Scriptures ***and*** a study of nature."

F. L. Marsh, "Carbon-14 Dating," ***Review and***

*Herald*, Vol. 135, October 30, 1959, pp. 12, 13, 16 and 17.

Marsh points out speculative nature of using this "dating" method past limit of historical checks around 2800 B.C. Assumption of constancy of present proportion of carbon-14 to carbon-12 is criticized. Also the possibility of fluctuating magnetic field of the earth is related to effectiveness of cosmic rays. He concludes, "In the face of demonstrable evidence it appears unjustifiable to assume that carbon-14 dating can be even passably accurate when run on materials more than 5000 years old."

E. Mayr, (zoologist), "Agassiz, Darwin, and Evolution," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, Vol. 13, No. 2, Spring, 1959, pp. 165-194.

In discussing, in scholarly form, Agassiz's topological thinking, interpretation and refutation of evolutionary evidence, and other points, the author presents a most incisive appraisal of the background of Agassiz's natural philosophy.

E. A. Milne, (mathematician), *Modern Cosmology and the Christian Idea of God*, Oxford University Press, London, 1952.

Author of Preface states that the late mathematician's research on the structure of the physical universe and the origin of the laws of nature are summarized and brought into relation with his religious faith. This original natural philosopher deals with evolution in the last chapter on the second law of thermodynamics and argues for a sudden creation of the universe with a true zero of time.

R. L. Mixter, (zoologist), Editor, *Evolution and Christian Thought Today*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1959.

A comparison compendium by thirteen contributors including some theistic evolutionists. To weigh import of evolution and claims of proponents of the theory as well as examination of relevant Scriptural data are purposes of the authors who are mostly scientists.

J. C. Monsma, (editor), *The Evidence of God in an Expanding Universe, (Forty* American Scientists Declare Their Affirmative Views on Religion), G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1958.

Biological and physical scientists declare their belief in God; included are Drs. Klotz, Mixter, Lammerts, and Stoner.

E. Y. Monsma, (biologist), *If Not Evolution, What Then?* (Mimeographed by author), Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1959.

Contains a good chapter on history of evolutionary thought, meaning of evolution, some presuppositions, and critical analysis of supposed suppositions of evolutionists, author offers his reasoned faith in creation.

P. A. Moody, (zoologist), *Introduction to Evolution*, Chapter 19: "What of It? An Open Letter to Students," Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York, 1953.

Written by one who more or less accepts evolution, the chapter contains interesting illustration of handling relation of evolution and religion, admission of belief in a Creator, chance as lawful, and difficulties of the future.

H. M. Morris, (hydraulic engineer), *The Bible and Modern Science*, Colportage Library No. 322, Moody Press, Chicago, -951.

By the noted head of department of civil engineering at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, this book was forerunner of his book effort *The Genesis Flood*, and contains an excellent chapter on criticisms of theory of evolution. Evidences for evolution can better be interpreted by a law of deterioration.

H. Nilsson, (botanist), *Synthetische Artbildung*, Vol. I and II, Verlag CWK Gleerup, Lund, Sweden, 1953.

Author provides 105 pages of Summary in English, in which he points out absolute impossibility of building a current evolution on mutations or combinations, failure of a 40-year experiment on evolution, and concludes palaeobiological facts do not support evolution. He says, "The idea of an evolution rests on pure belief."

M. Polanyi, (physical chemist), *Personal Knowledge*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1958.

The author's equiry into the nature and justification of scientific knowledge leads him on to a wide range of questions. Essentially an evolutionist, he finds it necessary in his discourse on evolution in last chapter to assume "finalistic principles of evolution."

E. Sinnott, (geneticist), *Biology of the Spirit*, Viking Press, New York, 1955.

Though accepting evolution, the author acknowledges certain consequences of acceptance of neo-Darwinian theory and even modern cell chemistry. Therefore he accepts the unique task of finding for the reader those basic facts of biology which he finds form a common foundation for both mind and body. He has extended the thesis of his earlier book, *Cell and Psyche.*

E. M. Spieker, (geologist), "Mountain-Building Chronology and Nature of Geologic Time Scale," *Bulletin American Association of Petroleum Geologists*, Vol. 40, August, 1956, pp. 1769-1815.

A lengthy, hard-hitting and detailed paper which contains repeated mention of circular reasoning, assumptions, and cherished viewpoints of orthodox age determinations for famous events of orogeny or "geologic revolutions." Spieker presents his views in three sections: 1) Dating of Orogeny, 2)

Evidence in Central Utah, and 3) Nature of Time Scale. He closes with cautionary remark that "the way in which we [geologists] think about orogeny, the time scale, our stratigraphic sections strongly controls the actual nature of the practical facts we gather in the field, . . ."

A. Standen, (chemical engineer), *Science Is a Sacred Cow*, E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., New York, 1950.

Discusses acceptance of evolution as a faith; mentions positions of Prof. William Bateson and Prof. W. R. Thompson. He points out that animals are not descended from actual animals, but only from so-called hypothetical "ancestors."

P. W. Stoner. (mathematician), Science *Speaks,* Colportage Library No. 346, Moody Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1958.

Evaluations of Christian evidence are approached on the basis of thoroughly sound probability statistics. Scientific accuracy and scientific problems are discussed as well as prophetic accuracy.

W. R. Thompson, (biologist), "Introduction" to Everyman's Library (No. 811) issue of Darwin's *The Origin of Species,* E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., New York, 1956.

The expression of stringent criticism of theory of evolution which author considers has become a myth with which biologists explain everything and nothing at the same time.

Immanuel Velikovsky, (psychiatrist). *Worlds in Collision,* The Macmillan Company. New York, 1950.

Author gives extensive arguments to support his contentions that "wars" in the celestial sphere occurred during historical times! He presents an involved theory of dramatic changes of paths of Venus and Mars of catastrophic dimensions. Velikovsky also wrote *Ages in Chaos,* Vol. 1 (Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1952), wherein he uses these great physical catastrophes to synchronize the records of the ancient people of the Near East.

Immanuel Velikovsky, "Velikovsky and His Critics"? *Harper's Magazine,* Vol. 202, June, 1951, pp. 51-66.

Lengthy article of two parts: 1) "Answer to My Critics" by Velikovsky, and 2) "Disciplines in Collision" by Dr. John Q. Stewart, Princeton U. astronomical scientist, followed by rebuttal by Velikovsky to new points raised by Prof. Stewart. The former complains that some scientists are dogmatic and resist ideas that are revolutionary and schismatic. The latter cites unsympathetic authorities who oppose portions of Velikovsky's broad theory, though Stewart admits that provocative points have been brought forth from forgotten references.

Immanuel Velikovsky, *Earth in Upheaval,* Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1955.

Global catastrophes involving the surface of the earth and living things are specified during the author's discussion of a core problem: Did the earth change in a slow process? He clearly shows that uniformitarianism is sadly lacking as an explanation of geological and palaeontological phenomena. Supplement contains an address (1953) at Princeton University, "Worlds in Collision in the Light of Recent Finds in Archaeology, Geology and Astronomy." (Note: Many geologists are advising apparently rehabilitation of catastrophism. without recourse to a supernatural agent. according to comments in *Newsweek.* December 23 ,1963, p. 48, wherein these ideas were mentioned. )

C. H. Waddington, (geneticist), *The Strategy of the Genes,* Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, 1957.

Though written primarily from viewpoint of an evolutionist, Chapter 3 criticizes "recent advances" in mathematical theory, nature of differences between species or species groups, adaptation, and paleontology. A candid attitude is presented to the reader.

J. S. Wilkie, (scientist), Chapter 6, "Buffon, Lamarck and Darwin: The Originality of Darwin's Theory of Evolution," in *Darwins Biological Work: Some Aspects Reconsidered,* (many authors), Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Shows lineage of ideas of Buffon in eighteenth. Lamarack between the centuries, and Darwin in nineteenth century. Criticizes Deism of Lamarck in Conclusion.

A. Wolsky, (embryologist), "A Century of Darwinism in Biology," *Thought* (Fordham University Quarterly), Vol. 34, No. 133, Summer, 1959, pp. 165-184.

Cautious exposition typical of embryologist handling this topic; sees crucial question about extension of conclusions about micro-evolution to process of some macroevolution; questions universal application of mechanisms of neo-Darwinism.

P. A. Zimmerman, (biologist), Editor, *Darwin, Evolution and Creation,* Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, 1959.

Two other scientists and a theologian combine with the editor to analyze science and the evolutionary theory in relation to the Bible. Chapters on the case for evolution, age of the earth, and influence of Darwinism help the reader avoid confusion of "scientific fact, theory and just plain speculation."

C. Zirkle, (botanist), *Evolution, Marxian Biology, and the Social Scene.* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1959.

Author discusses ramifications of pernicious biology cult that dates from acceptance by Marx and Engels of Darwin's evolution of the 1860's. Modern effects are traced in success of Lysenko in present Marxian USSR. "Marxian biology" in the American culture has hindered the diffusion of real biological knowledge.

# THE PARADOX OF A CENTURY

By WILLIAM J. TINKLE
Professor Genetics (retired), Eaton, Indiana
A chapel address at Waterloo College, Waterloo, Ontario, November 1962

When the theory of organic evolution was young, and the known facts — few though they were — seemed to favor it, most people said the theory was absurd. With the passing of a century many facts have been learned, most of which oppose the theory, but now people say, "Science has proved evolution and we must agree." Has there been a greater paradox in a hundred years?

The boast of science is that it is founded upon ascertained facts; but it is evident that if the truth were known and appreciated this contradictory situation could not prevail. In the short time at our disposal let us look at some of the discoveries, bearing in mind that evolution does not mean simply change, but changing one-celled animals into vertebrates.

A common belief in Medieval times was that life arises of itself from non-living matter. People thought it was natural for weeds to grow from soil, for rags and corn to generate mice, and for meat to generate maggots. Of course if this were true it would help the theory of evolution for it would remove the necessity of a Creator to start the organic world. Charles Darwin, in the first edition of "The Origin of Species" suggested that God may have created the first germs of life. But he did not include this statement in the later editions, probably because he no longer believed it, for in later life he stated that he believed God never made a revelation. Most evolutionists were either very agnostic about the beginning of life or else thought that it generated itself spontaneously.

In the latter part of the Nineteenth Century some very thorough experiments were performed by Redi, Spallanzani, Schulze, Tyndal, Pasteur and others which convinced the scientific world that life comes only from pre-existing life.

Notwithstanding this careful experimentation, there is a present belief that life did arise by chance combination of conditions in an ancient shallow sea and that it arose only once. It is true that amino acids have been synthesized by Miller from ammonia, methane, hydrogen and water vapor, but amino acid is not alive. No one can predict what may be formed in the future but the accomplishments of highly trained men are very different from the results of chance. Since man has such great ability he must have been planned and formed by God, just as the Bible states. At any rate we should not forget that life has never been observed to arise of itself, even after much experimentation.

Another discovery which is unfavorable to the theory of evolution is that "acquired characters" are not inherited. These are changes in a plant or animal caused by the environment, by use or by disuse. Examples are increased size because of good nourishment or the reverse; firm muscles because of use; thick fur in response to cold; pale color of plants because of lack of light, etc. No one doubts that such characters occur, but J. B. Lamarck and Charles Darwin claimed that they are passed on to the next generation.

Many experiments have been conducted to test this theory and they have failed to give positive results. For instance, a race horse six years of age may have greater speed than he had at three years and this increased speed is an acquired character. The colts which he sired at six years of age have no greater speed than the ones he sired earlier. Regardless of changes in the parent, each young animal starts back at the base line of the hereditary potential of its parents.

A hundred years ago very little was known about genes, the hereditary factors which carry characters or traits from one generation to the next. Now, however, they are known to occur in each cell of a plant, animal, or person. They are the most important particles in the chromosomes; and if you have taken a course in botany or zoology you have looked at chromosomes under the microscope.

In the division of cells and in the formation of eggs and sperms it is necessary that new genes be formed from the old ones. A hundred years ago it was thought that the genes might be formed slightly different each time and so perform a gradual progressive change over a series of generations. But careful study has shown that nature takes great pains to make the new genes just like the old ones. This is a significant discovery which biologists know very well but others do not appreiacte. If a gene changes at all it is by an accidental reorganization called a mutation, which occurs very rarely.

Of course you can see that if mutations-were of all kinds, good, bad and indifferent, the changes might still occur as Darwin postulated, only more slowly. Mutation has been widely hailed as the method by which Amoeba might change to Homo if given plenty of time. But look at the following examples of this type of change: cattle without horns; calves with short legs, dying at birth; calves with abnormal jaws, living only a few hours; yellow mice, always dying as young embryos in the homozygous or pure form; creeper chickens, a mutation causing death in the pure form; in fruit flies. small wings, crumpled wings, no wings at all, black body, white eyes, eyes reduced to a bar, crooked spines and many others; seedless grapes; seedless oranges; stringless green beans; barley that must be staked up to make it stand; among people, lack of color in hair, eyes and skin; also lack of enamel

on the teeth. In addition to these changes in bodily form, mutation causes a lack of vigor in the plant or animal. Very, very few such changes have been found to confer any benefit upon an organism, and so you see that these recent studies have made it hard to visualize what kind of changes would transform a moss to an apple tree or an amoeba to man. Atomic fallout causes mutations in the human race and no one thinks such changes will be a benefit.

Another remarkable discovery is that the theory of recapitulation has no foundation of objective facts. It is a wonder that it was not given up long ago, for the so-called gill slits in the human embryo never are accompanied by gills or primordia of gills and they never break through to make slits. They are simply a series of furrows between arches. The theory did not apply to plants, and the experimental embryologists, an active group, never found it useful. Yet it may be ten years before some teachers will cease to reiterate this big blunder, which Ehrlich and Helm says is "biological mythology.'

The general form of a young embryo of man or pig or bird is far removed from the shape of a fish, for it has a large brain, a large heart but no arms, legs, fins. or any kind of appendage until a later stage of development. In fact the proportions are not like those of any mature, free-living animal. The heart is formed early because the embryo needs blood; the brain gets an early start because it is a complex organ and needs much time for its development. There still is purpose in the world and science is not harmed by recognizing it.

Still another anomaly for the doctrine of evolution is the fact that all the branches of the animal kingdom appear together in the Cambrian system of rocks. (Some geologists exclude the vertebrates but Dunbar says fish skeletons are present.) Below the Cambrian there are no fossils except a few worm burrows and seaweeds and even "they are doubted by some geologists. If all life developed gradually from simple cells there should be simpler and still simpler fossils in the deeper rocks, down to the spicules of sponges and shells of the one-celled plants called diatoms. This situation was partly known a hundred years ago but it was thought that such fossils would be found after further search. However, some geologists have spent the best years of their lives looking for fossils below the Cambrian, but all in vain.

When I visited the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River I was fortunate enough to hear a lecture on the formation of that "big gully" as the cowboy called it. The lecturer said that the deepest fossil which they had found was a trilobite. This was an animal with a hard exoskeleton and many legs, resembling a crayfish or crab. After the lecture I asked the speaker why such a complex animal was the deepest, instead of something simpler. He replied quite truly, that they are found just that way.

The last discovery which I shall mention has not received the publicity which it deserves but it is well recorded by different trained workers. It is that skeletons of the modern type of man, *Homo sapiens,* are fully as old as those of famous cave men and other peculiar types.

When Eugene Dubois found a skull cap, a femur, and three teeth in Java in 1891, naming the find *Pithecanthropus erectus,* this discovery received tremendous publicity. But the two skulls which he found at Wadjak, Java, of the same age, were not made public until twenty years later. Why ? "They were not what he was looking for "and did not fit his theory of evolution. These Wadjak people are described as much like the present black men of Australia, whose skill is widely recognized.

There is no scientific reason why we should not claim that Wadjak man is our ancestor and *Pithecanthropus* a degenerate, extinct type. For Wadjak man represents the rule rather than the exception. In China, in southern Africa, at Kanjera, Africa, at Swanscombe, England, and at Fontechevade, France, the story is repeated: men of *Homo sapiens* type are found who lived as long ago as the peculiar and so-called "primitive" types.

Here then, is the paradox: when the information — meager though it was — seemed to favor evolution, the masses of people shouted, "Absurd"; now that new discoveries make it a poor interpretation they bow their heads sedately and say, "Of course we agree." One is reminded of a cartoon illustrating the popularity of General Dwight Eisenhower. When he returned from the Second World War he was tired and wanted to rest but there was a popular demand that he run for President of the United States. The cartoon represented the boom as a tree: Eisenhower had taken an ax and cut the trunk quite in two, but still the tree stood erect. Likewise the factual support of evolution has been sundered, but still we hear that it is true. Certainly the theory is in unstable equilibrium, and how long will it stand?

Here is illustrated the power of repetition. For a hundred years the evolutionary story of impersonal, materialistic law has been reiterated in glittering generalities, omitting troublesome details, until people tired of making objections and acquiesced. Let us as Christians be just as persistent in proclaiming the truth that, "In the beginning God created the Heavens and the earth"; and "God so loved the world that he gave is only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life."

# CRITIQUE OF BIOCHEMICAL EVOLUTION

DUANE T. GISH, *Biochemist*
*Upjohn Co., Kalamazoo, Michigan*

In the field of biochemical evolution, we are in an area where the only debatable question is, could it have happened? There is no historical record available that may be examined to answer the question, did it happen? We must recognize, then, that one's conclusion on this matter will, most likely, be influenced chiefly by one's point of view rather than by the arguments presented. Indeed, we need have no illusion that evidence presented against the theory, no matter how powerful, will influence the conviction of avowed evolutionists that biochemical evolution has occurred. One of these avowed evolutionists, J. D. Bernal, has stated[1] that the earlier studies of the origin of life concentrated on establishing a case for it, but that now the case no longer needs to be made: it can be accepted. He says that what interests us now is not that it could happen, but precisely how it happened. Such statements as this may sound convincing to the uninformed, but even a quick survey of available information reveals how untrue and scientifically unsound such a statement is.

Melvin Calvin, who has engaged in considerable speculation on "evolution before life" has proclaimed "We have no proof of evolution. We can only postulate some possible mechanisms for some of the simple steps that might lead from the chemical elements to chemical compounds that might agglomerate 'just so' and then become basic to life and reproduction processes."[2] In his chapter on evolution and information transfer,[3] which attempts to deal with the evolution of the more complex molecular systems, Alexander Rich is forced to a liberal use of such terms as "we postulate," "we imagine," "we theorize," "we could imagine," "let us imagine" and "we might imagine." Stanley Miller, in a paper[4] widely publicized and acclaimed, described the formation of a variety of organic compounds, including amino acids, in an apparatus containing methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water and energized by an electric discharge. This demonstration has often been cited as evidence that early chemical evolution must have occurred, a chemical evolution that would have led to organic compounds which constituted the building blocks of complex molecules found in the living cell. It may be pointed out, first of all, that the significance of this demonstration is not really very great at all, it might even be termed trivial. Having placed a selected number of gasses in a closed system and supplied a source of energy we would rather be surprised had *not* such a variety of carbon, oxygen and nitrogen containing compounds been formed. Of considerable importance to the significance of this experiment is the answer to the question, did such a primitive atmosphere ever exist upon the earth? Such a reducing atmosphere has been postulated out of necessity, since it has been realized that reduced chemical compounds, which constitute the building blocks of molecules found in living systems, could not have arisen in an oxidizing atmosphere. It would have been thermodynamically impossible. Philip Abelson, Director of the Geophysical Laboratory, Carnegie Institution of Washington, in his paper[5] on the nature of the primitive atmosphere, has stated that an analysis of geologic evidence sharply limits the areas of permissible speculation concerning the nature of the primitive atmosphere and ocean. According to this evidence, the lowest oxidation state possible for carbon was carbon monoxide, and the evidence indicates further that the primitive atmosphere consisted chiefly of nitrogen and carbon monoxide, with hydrogen, carbon dioxide and water present in lesser quantities. It is evident, then, that the basis for Miller's experiment did not exist.

Even though a basis for the origin of simple organic compounds, such as amino acids, sugars, pyrimidines and purines could be established, the nature of processes that could have led to such complex molecules as proteins, polysaccharides and nucleic acids defies reasonable explanation. Oparin, in his book. "Origin of Life on the Earth"[6] has stated (p. 201 ) that "our knowledge of the primary formation of the lipids is therefore still scanty and unreliable." On p. 202, he states, concerning the origin of porphyrins, "certainly it is hard to tell at present to what extent analogous processes could have taken place under natural conditions independent of organisms." In reference to nucleic acids, on p. 205, he says "the question of the primary, abiogenic formation of compounds of phosphorus with organic substances is, however, extremely complicated and poorly understood." Finally, on p. 229, he has stated "the problem of the primary development of proteins is extremely perplexing." Since publication of this book, Fox and coworkers[7] have reported the polymerization of amino acids at temperatures of 170° to 180° and Schramm and coworkers[8] have reported the polymerization of nucleotides when heated with a syrup of a polyphosphate ester. It is rather amusing to read these accounts, in as much as evolutionists have always claimed that chemical evolution of the more complex molecules took place in the "primordial soup of the primitive oceans" where such high temperatures and anhydrous conditions must be excluded.

Any natural process that might be imagined for the origin of proteins and nucleic acids would give rise to an infinitely complex mixture, with

almost every conceivable sequence, stereoisomeric mixture, and chain length. Utter chaos would prevail. Any molecular species, once formed, would be subject to a wide variety of further reactions, and it is also certain that the rate of breakdown, such as hydrolysis, would exceed the rate of formation. For example, Howe[9] has pointed out that a pre-biologic earth, without a protective mantle of oxygen and ozone, would have been subjected to heavy doses of ultraviolet radiation in the region of 2700 to 3000 angstroms, radiation which breaks C-O, C-H, O-H bonds and others. Thus, amino acids, proteins and nucleotides, if formed, would have been disrupted by such radiation.

One can imagine the tremendous quantity of a single molecular species that would be required to constitute even a concentration as low as 0.001% in a large body of water. Under these conditions, it is inconceivable how a single molecular species could ever have gained ascendancy, let alone the complex mixture that would have been required for even the most primitive metabolism. The essential key to life is order and specificity. Each nucleic acid has a highly specific primary structure in the sequence of its component nucleotides. This specificity is the key to its function. It may dictate the structure of a protein, such as an enzyme, or it may regulate some biological activity. Before there was such specificity in structure, there could have been no function.

What natural processes could have brought such order out of chaos? What process could have selected a few nucleotides out of an almost infinite number of every conceivable sequence and chain length? What pressures could have forced their selection? In living processes, one way nucleotides express their function is by specifying protein structure, often stated in the terms, "one gene, one enzyme." What function then could nucleotides have had before proteins arose? Assuming that nucleotides arose before proteins, or proteins before nucleotides, presents us with a dilemma. Nucleotides dictate the structure of proteins, but the synthesis of nucleotides is catalyzed by protein enzymes. Which, then, came first? The only reasonable answer is, neither. They both must have been present in their highly specific structure in order to have functioned and survived.

To bridge the gap between the molecular stage of evolution and the cellular, evolutionists have often resorted to the claim that there once existed molecules which "were autocatalytic like the virus."[6] In fact, Lindegren has stated[10] that the possibility that something similar to the viruses we now study was a stage in the evolution of more elaborate organisms is ***"the basic hypothesis which directs the scientific activities of most of the foremost geneticists and biochemists of the present time."*** It is utterly amazing to see such widespread acceptance of this view in the scientific community.

It is a shocking display of ignorance concerning the nature and function of viruses and of their replication by the living cell..

Lindegren had the testimony[10] of N. W. Pirie, one of the world's authorities in the viral field, that viruses could never have played such a part. This has also been emphasized by Oparin[6] among others. To say that a virus has the ability to reproduce itself is absolutely wrong. It has no autocatalytic ability whatsoever. Outside of the living cell, a virus is completely inactive, subject only to reactions that lead to its destruction. Even in the environment of the living cell, we cannot say that the virus reproduces itself. ***The cell replicates the virus,*** using the information supplied by the virus to produce copies of the viral nucleic acid and protein. The replication of the virus requires the action of a complex mixture of enzymes supplied by the cell, and other key components of the cell, such as soluble RNA and ribosomes, must be utilized. The energy required for viral synthesis, of course, must also be supplied by the cell. Since the sole function exhibited by the virus is that of supplying information for its replication, this in itself must presuppose the existence of an entity capable of utilizing that information, ***an existence that must have predated the virus.*** It is possible that all viruses were at one time normal constituents of the cell, and which later suffered mutations. This mutation may have caused the exclusion of the constituent from its normal metabolic function in the cell, thus at the same time rendering it outside the control mechanism of the cell. Its structure, however, still remained capable of reproduction by the synthetic apparatus of the cell, this function of the cell being less discerning than the metabolic and control mechanisms of the cell.

No molecule capable of autocatalytic replication has as yet been discovered, although, as already mentioned, such a molecule is often postulated by evolutionists. In light of present day knowledge, it can be emphatically stated that no such molecule exists nor has any molecule ever existed. We are now aware, at least in part, of the complex mechanism in the cell that is called into play to synthesize protein. The ultimate source of the information necessary for the replication of a protein molecule is believed to reside in the gene. Information in the gene is used to produce a messenger RNA. This synthesis, of course, requires the cooperation of the appropriate enzyme system and energy sources. The amino acids are activated via an intermediate complex with an activating enzyme, specific for each amino acid, and AMP. This complex reacts with soluble RNA (s-RNA), again specific for each amino acid, to give a complex of the amino acid with s-RNA. The AA-s-RNA complexes move to the microsomes, where they are laid down in the sequence specified by the messenger RNA.

The final step in the synthesis, the release of protein from the template, requires ATP, certain cofactors and an enzyme. The picture outlined here, although a simplified one, gives some idea of the very complex system that must be called into play to synthesize a protein molecule. Furthermore, as Roberts has pointed out,[11] the system is quite sensitive to the spatial arrangement of the cellular structures. Disruption of the cell usually decreases the rate of protein synthesis by a factor of a thousand or more. *The organization of the synthesizing system appears to be of the greatest importance.* The protein synthesis accomplished with the reconstituted systems from *E. coli* and other cells represent only a residual trace of the protein synthesis occurring in the intact cell. These facts emphasize the tremendously complex and highly specific organization required to synthesize a single protein molecule in a living system. The abiogenic synthesis of a specific protein molecule is beyond the pale of our imagination.

The process by which correlated structures of an organism could have arisen by an evolutionary scheme has always been one of the insurmountable roadblocks in the theory of evolution. This roadblock would have been encountered far earlier in the evolutionary development of an organism, however. For on the gene level, itself, we see perfect and necessary correlation. This has been aptly stated by John Cairns [12]: "The bacterial chromosome has been shown to contain regions concerned solely with switching on and off the executive action of other regions; in turn, these 'operator' genes are controlled by 'regulator' genes. *It is the presence of such control mechanisms that converts what might be purposeless or even self-destructive activity into the ordered system we find in every living creature.*" We can see that the old saying, "one gene, one enzyme," can no longer apply, since for each enzyme several genes exist. Here again, as in the case of nucleic acid and protein, we can ask the question, which came first, the functional gene, the operator gene or the regulator gene ? How could the function of one be operative without the presence of the others? The conclusion must be that none ever existed independently, and that all must have come into existence simultaneously.

W. R. Hearn expressed his feelings, after attending a symposium on Genetic Mechanisms, that this was a poor time for the opposition to evolutionary ideas on the grounds that they 'are only theories without empirical evidence or plausible mechanisms to back them up.' [13] He pointed out that mutations are getting a lot less mysterious than they used to be and that the structures of biological macromolecules are now being determined. My reaction to recent advances have been just the opposite to that of Hearn's. As we begin to unravel the code of the DNA that constitutes the gene, and see there the tremendous degree of specificity in each tiny building block and the purposefulness of the overall plan, we see the opposite of Chaos and of purposeless, endless change. Indeed, what purpose, or what excuse for survival could such an organization have had without the presence of the living cell, in which its influence is expressed? And we must always remember that the DNA is not the master of the cell, it is the *servant* of the cell. Though we understand perfectly the chemical or physical basis of mutations, the nature of mutations remains unchanged. That is, as stated by W. R. Thompson [14], all mutations are either useless, harmful or lethal.

Even evolutionists admit that well over 99% of all mutations are harmful. Even if we were to admit that one out of every thousand mutations were useful, the stability of the genetic material would render the occurrence of a mutation so rare as to be incapable of effecting the change of one species into another. This is emphasized in the paper by W. J. Tinkle[15] in which the work of Muller is is cited. His work, based upon experiments in Drosophila, permitted the estimate that the mean life of a gene (that is, the average time elapsing without change in any particular gene and its descendants) approximates 100,000 years. One can soon calculate the wait necessary for a favorable gene change, with a mutational rate of that nature. and with a frequency rate of a favorable change being one in one thousand or less!

Whether it be in the cry of a new-born babe, the beautifully correlated structure of the humming bird, or in the marvelously correlated mechanism of functional gene, operator gene, regulator gene, messenger RNA, soluble RNA, ribosomal RNA. and the vast array of enzymes cooperating with them, we are witnesses to the fact that "the firmament showeth the handywork of God." (Ps. 19:1).

REFERENCES


[1] Bernal, J. D., "Horizons in Biochemistry," Ed M. Kasha and B. Pullman, Academic Press, N. Y., 1962, p. 11
[2] Calvin, M., as quoted in Time Magazine, Nov. 1958.
[3] Rich, A., "Horizons in Biochemistry," Ed. M. Kasha and B. Pullman, Academic Press, N. Y., 1962, p. 103.
[4] Miller, S., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 77, 2351 (1955).
[5] Abelson, P., Abstracts 133rd National Meeting, Am. Chem. Soc., April, 1958, p. 53 C.
[6] Oparin, A., "The Origin of Life on the Earth," Academic Press Inc., N. Y., 1957.
[7] Fox, S. and Harada, J., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 82, 3745 (1960).
[8] Schramm, G., Grotsch, H., and Pollmann, W., Angew. Chem., Inter. Ed., 1, 1 (1962).
[9] Howe, G., J. Amer. Sci. Affil., 15, 124 (1963)
[10] Lindegren, C., Nature, 197, 566 (1963).
[11] Roberts, R., Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci., 88, 752 (1960).
[12] Cairns, J., Endeavor, 22, 141 (1963).
[13] Hearn, W., J. Amer. Sci. Afil., 14, 87 (1962).
[14] Thompson, W., Intro., to "The Origin of Species," C. Darwin, E. P. Dutton and Co. Inc., N. Y., 1956, p. 2.
[15] Tinkle, W. J., J. Amer. Sci. Affil., 15, 15 (1961).

# WHEN WAS THE EARTH CREATED?

HAROLD W. CLARK
*Professor Emeritus of Biology and Geology,*
*Pacific Union College, Angwin, California*

This study is not directed to evolutionists; it is not an argument as to the relative validity of the evolutionary and creationistic philosophies. It is addressed to those who believe that the earth was created by the fiat of Almighty God. Its purpose is to discuss the question of the *time* when that event took place.

If we read the record of creation in Genesis One without bias of preconceived ideas as to time, we will find the following points:

(1) The earth was created, not evolved. Vs. 1.

(2) When it was created, it was in an unorganized state. Vs. 2.

(3) This unorganized mass was processed into a habitable globe, — the Spirit of God *moved* upon it. Vs. 2.

(4) This process took six literal days, — evenings and mornings.

Now, if we look for the time element, we find the beginning of the chronology in Chapter 5. Putting this with other Bible chronologies, we arrive at the date of creation as somewhere about 4000 B. C. We will find that some genealogies are obscure, so that the date of creation cannot be set exactly; nevertheless, it is a matter of a few hundred rather than millions of years that is involved.

Some theorists, with certain preconceived opinions regarding time, have attempted to separate verses 1 and 2 from the rest of the chapter, and to insert here long ages of time. We are not concerned now with the validity of any of these theories, but will merely state that as far as the record itself goes, it neither affirms nor denies such interpretations.

What is the source of the idea that the earth is older than about 6000 years?

Most, if not all, ancient cosmogonies attributed great age to the earth. Matter was assumed to be eternal, and to have gone through long processes of development. Without doubt some of these notions influenced the Hebrew people during the periods when they accepted pagan worship. However, we find little if any influence of these ideas on Christianity until about the 4th century A. D.

Augustine, who died in 430 A. D., was the leading theologian of the West, and he was one of the principal agents in introducing Greek philosophical concepts into Christianity.

"Plainly as the direct or instantaneous Creation of animals and plants appeared to be taught in Genesis, Augustine read this in the light of primary causation and the gradual development from the imperfect to the perfect of Aristotle." — Osburn, H. F. *From the Greeks to Darwin,* page 287. Macmillan, 1922.

"In the beginning, God created all the elements of the world in a confused and nebulous mass . . . and in this mass were the mysterious germs . . . of the future beings which were to develop themselves, when favorable circumstances should permit." — Catholic Encyclopedia, 1907. Article: *Augustine.*

When modern geological study began to develop, this teaching of Augustine's was so firmly entrenched in scientific thought that practically all scientists took for granted that the earth was very old, This attitude created a conflict between science and theology, but it was not many years before theology surrendered to the scientific philosophy of long ages. Before the close of the 19th century nearly all churches had incorporated the "long-age" viewpoint into their theology.

Within the past century various schemes have been proposed in an attempt to prove scientifically the approximate age of the earth, but none of them successful. Nevertheless, the fact that the stratified rocks apparently involved long periods of time for their deposition, led to a general acceptance of the theory of geological ages.

In recent years, however, one method has come forward with claims to a high degree of accuracy. and that is the radioactive theory, or the theory that the disintegration of uranium to lead and certain intermediate elements gives a true time scale for the rocks. I shall not describe the theory in detail, as I assume that all my readers are familiar with it. Rather, I wish to discuss some of its philosophical and logical implications.

In the first place, this, as well as other dating methods, is based on the Hutton-Lyell hypothesis of uniformitarianism. While the rate of disintegration of uranium is uniform as far as we can observe, there is no basis for the assumption that primordial uranium was created in a pure state. without any intermediate products between it and lead. It therefore follows that the various series of radioactive elements that eventually result in certain isotopes of lead cannot be proved to have come about by normal disintegration of primordial uranium, or any other substance.

It is impossible to prove the absence of these intermediate elements in the original substance of the earth. In fact, it may be that they were a natural product of the creative process.

How much does the record tell us of what was going on during the first day of creation? Practically nothing. All that it says is that "there was

light." Whether this light was reflected sunlight from the surface of the newly created earth or whether it was due to certain processes of creation, we have no way of knowing. However, certain ideas may be worthy of consideration.

For one, I have never had much use for the idea that there were six instantaneous creative acts. That is, it does not seem reasonable to believe that God should have commanded a certain thing to take place and then to have waited 23 hours, 59 minutes, and 59 and a fraction seconds before giving another command. Rather, I have thought of creation week as a continuous series of events. This is, I think, supported by the record. In Verse 4 we read that God ***divided*** the light from the darkness. In Verse 9 it says: Let the waters . . . be ***gathered.*** Verse 11 says: Let the earth ***bring forth.*** The same expression is used in Verses 20 and 24. All of these are indications of processes.

Now if we apply this idea to the record of the first day of creation, what do we have? The creative process was such that the writer of Genesis could understand nothing of what was taking place. All he could record was the presence of light. Perhaps if we, with our knowledge of atomic physics, had viewed the scene, we might have been able to give a more complete description.

The Creator, from all that we know of natural phenomena, uses orderly processes to accomplish His purposes. Why not in creation? Might it not be possible, or even probable, that the events of the first day involved a series of complex building processes of the elements and compounds?

With this idea in mind, what would we expect to find taking place when these building processes reached the higher and more complex elements ? Might not some of them, because of the very nature of their composition, prove to be unstable? At least, this is what the books on atomic physics assert to be the reason for atomic disintegration, — that is, the nature of their composition.

One more question: If the complex and intricate structure of a world could be accomplished in the course of a day, would it not involve vastly accelerated speeds beyond any ordinary chemical processes? It seems to me that changes taking place while the material substances were being organized would correspond to the speed of changes in atomic explosions of our day, — extremely short fractions of seconds. Now, with these changes taking place, would there not be a correspondingly rapid accumulation of disintegration products, until the creative process was completed and the material had reached a state of comparative stability?

If this were true, the result would be a series of disintegration products that would give the "appearance of age." That is, any physicist, examining the accumulated products and studying them in the light of the present rates of disintegration, would decide that it had taken billions of years for their production. On the other hand, the truth would be that they had been produced in one day.

Now all this may be regarded as pure speculation, and I must admit that it is. However, it is a possibility, and there is a rule of scientific interpretation, and that is that no conclusion can be considered as established as long as there is at least one other possible interpretation. It seems to me, therefore, that the theory of long ages of time for the history of this earth cannot be acceptable to the creationist until two criteria have been established, — (1) that there can be no reasonable doubt as to its authenticity, and (2) that there can be no other possible explanation.

On this point the words of the Apostle Paul are pertinent:

"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit." — Colossians 2:8.

The rendering in the New English Bible is even more forceful:

"Be on guard; do not let your minds be captured by hollow and delusive speculations, based on traditions of man-made teachings."

If there is any question at all as to the validity of the two views, billions of years as the earth's age or about 6000 years, is it not the part of wisdom to hold to the literal and time-honored interpretation rather than to follow the speculations of agnostic science ?

# THE CREATION VIEWPOINT

By G. **GORM RASMUSSEN**, *Geophysicist*

***Skodsborg, Denmark, Editor of "Natural Science" and "Kosmik Energi"***

The interest shown in the creation viewpoint in Europe is very insignificant. In many cases libraries and scientific institutions refuse to receive, to read, and to acknowledge publications, which indicate the creation viewpoint. However, it is possible to be successful in forwarding books such as:

Klotz: ***Genes, Genesis, and Evolution. 1955.***

Marsh: ***Evolution, Creation, and Science. 1949.***

Morris and Whitcomb: ***The Genesis Flood. 1961.***

However, there is a great interest in Europe as well as in the other parts of the world in regard to publications, which discuss the evolution probblem without a direct reference to the Bible. Literature as to cosmic energy concerning space and time in the history of the earth always creates interest.

The director of a botanical garden in Scandinavia received such publications. He delivered these to a botanical laboratory, which immediately asked for a regular sending of such issues.

Likewise a director of a botanical garden in Asia received such numbers. The result: A scientific library in Asia has received such publications about 10 years.

A scientific society in West Germany published an exchange report. In this report such publications were mentioned. The result: A request from East Germany for such issues.

A university library in U.S.A. received a publication, which mentioned the life history of the trilobites — interpreted without the evolution theory. This library showed the issue to another great library, which thereafter asked for a regular sending of such literature.

University libraries, polytechnic institutes, museums of geology, botany, and natural history in all parts of the world have shown interest in this respect.

Publications are forwarded to 1,297 universities and institutions of science in all parts of the world, to 251 gymnasiums in Scandinavia, to 225 teachers (gymnasiums t.) in Denmark, and to 140 students at University of Copenhagen.

We have accomplished the following:

Exchanged with 61 universities, museums, and societies.

Have-since July 1, 1959—received 930 letters from all parts of the world.

Lectures have been given at 19 gymnasiums in Denmark. At the same time literature was distributed to pupils and to some teachers.

***Kosmisk Energi*** — Cosmic Energy — is distributed to libraries, schools, and residential quarters in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. One result: A lecture delivered at a gymnasium March 13, 1964.

An university in Asia writes: "These materials will not only serve this University as an important source of information regarding natural history in Denmark, but help to strengthen the cultural relationship between us . . . We are deeply grateful for your continuous assistance to our University Library."

Our Society of research scientists representing various fields of successful scientific accomplishment is committed to full belief in the Biblical record of creation and early history, and thus to a concept of dynamic special creation (as opposed to evolution), both of the universe and the earth with its complexity of living forms.

We propose to re-evaluate science from this viewpoint. Beginning in 1964, we are publishing an annual yearbook of articles by various members of the Society and thereafter a quarterly review of scientific literature. Our eventual goal is the realignment of science based on theistic creation concepts and the publication of textbooks for high school and college use.

1. The Bible is the written Word of God, and because it is inspired throughout, all its assertions are historically and scientifically true in all the original autographs. To the student of nature this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
3. The great Flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
4. We are an organization of Christian men of science who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and woman and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Saviour.

Dues are $5.oo per year and may be sent to Wilbert H. Rusch, Sr., Treasurer, 4090 Geddes Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Active membership at present is limited to scientists having an M.S. (or equivalent in experience), Ph. D., D.Sc., Ed. D., or M.D. Degrees. Sustaining non-voting membership is open to those who subscribe to the above statement of belief at $5.00 per year and includes subscription to annual and quarterlies.



Annual $3.50, Quarterly $1.50

Subscription price $8.00