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

INTRODUCTION

As soon as Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published in 1859, criticisms and modifications plus alternative hypotheses and theories were presented by contemporary scientists in many countries. "Opposing" formulations on Mendelism, mutation and saltation occurred later and have led periodically to controversies in this post-Darwinian century.

Today, many persons think there is general and broad acceptance of evolution among scientists working in many specialties. This impression of acceptance explains the purpose of this work, namely to show that a substantial segment of scientists over a long period of time tracing back to Linnaeus, Newton and Copernicus have taken issue, and continue to take issue, with evolutionary ideas in what has been called correctly "The Unresolved Conflict."

Thus, this present formulation does not inaugurate an argumentative position or initiate enumeration of pertinent objections by well-educated scientists, science teachers, or laboratory specialists. Efforts of members of the Creation Research Society are not spontaneous and isolated, but belong in continuity with, and are common extensions of, efforts of previous scholars in other decades.

Yes, objections to Darwin's ideas have been continuous for more than one hundred years. Consistently, eminent scientists have written extensively about weaknesses, limitations, deficiencies, qualifications and consequences of evolution.

Responses published, during the close of the 19th Century, are not readily accessible now. Yet, full mention of early opponents of Darwinism is given in such works as *History of the Conflict Between Religion and Science* by John W. Draper (1875), *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* by Andrew D. White (1895), and *Landmarks in the Struggle Between Science and Religion* by James Y. Simpson (1924).

Therefore this bibliography, listing sources of qualifications, limitations, deficiencies and consequences of evolution, natural selection and some related topics, is selective and not offered as an exhaustive compilation. Admittedly, the compiler has not read or annotated the works of such scientists as L. Vialleton (1929), E. Guyenot (1930), A. Fleischmann (1931), L. Merston Davies (1935), Rendle Short (1935), J. Lefevre (1938), and W. Morley (1939).

And, as yet, literature search has covered neither known materials published by the Evolution Protest Movement of England (past presidents of which have included Sir Ambrose Fleming. F. R. S. and Sir Charles Marston, F. S. A.); nor the provocative *Doorway Papers* of Dr. Arthur C. Custance, F. R. A. I. (Box 1283, Station B, Ottawa, Canada).

Likewise unexamined are many excellent papers in the *Journal of Transactions of the Victoria Institute,* England, such as the following:

R. E. D. Clark, "Present Position with Regard to of Species," Vol. 68, pp. 172-179, 1936.

—— "Evolution and Entropy," Vol. 75, pp. 49-63 1943.

—— , "Modern Science and the Nature of Life," Vo1. 77, pp. 60-70, 1945.

—— , "Spheres of Revelation and Science—What Are Their Limitations in Relation to Each Other?", Vol. 79, pp. 138-163, 1947.

L. M. Davies, "Evolution," Vol. 58, pp. 214-236 1926.

—, "Scientific Discoveries — Bearing on Noachian Deluge," Vol. 62, 1930.

D. Dewar, "Limitations of Organic Evolution." Vol. 64, pp. 122-132, 1932.

—, "Critical Examination of Supposed Fossil Links between Man and Lower Animals." Vol. 67, pp. 157-170, 1935.

—— "What the Animal Fossils Tell Us," Vol. 74, pp:34-52, 1942.

—— , "Current Theories of Special Creation." Vol. 76, pp. 53-75, 1944.

—— , "Earliest Known Animals," Vol. 80. pp. 12-29, 1948.

—— "Genetics and Evolution," Vol. 82, pp. 151-173, 1950.

A. Fleming, "Creation and Modern Cosmology," Vol. 62, pp. 266-283, 1930.

—— , "Some Philosophical Conceptions of Modern Physical Science and Relation to Religious Thought," Vol. 68, pp. 230-247, 1936.

—, "On Some Methods of Determining Age of the Earth and Their Assumptions," Vol. 69. pp. 15-30, 1937.

—, "Influence on Human Conduct and Belief of Certain Scientific Hypotheses," Vol. 72. pp. 1-11, 1940.

——, "Some Arguments Against Hypothesis of Human Evolution from Any Animal Species," Vol. 74, pp. 212-215, 1942.

G. M. Price, "Geology and Its Relation to Scripture Revelation," Vol. 56, pp. 97-114, 1924.

—, "Revelation and Evolution: Can They Be Harmonized ?", Vol. 57, pp. 167-182, 1925.

There are arguments against evolutionary theories, which are applied, totally, today in such a degree of certainty as to give the general public and students no clear awareness of possible debate. In fact debate is kept out of public communication media and very generally out of high school, college, and university classrooms.

However, though space limitations prevent detailed review of all the basic arguments raised by authors whose works are annotated, typical points included are, as follows:

1) Theories of organic evolution do not explain adequately the recognizable gap between inganization and organic organization.
2) Theories of organic evolution do not explain adequately gaps between major groups of organisms, where intermediate forms are missing; or explain gaps between absence and presence of organs, where nascent organs are unknown.
3) Theories of organic evolution do not explain adequately gaps between animal and human behavior wherein the latter form alone knows, studies and reasons about itself and all the universe.
4) Theories of organic evolution are built upon fragile networks of assumptions and hypotheses characterized by circular reasoning by which taxonomists refer to palaentologists, who refer to geologists, who refer to taxonomists for supposed verification of each other's positions of argument. (As has been said: Uniformitarianism simply has been assumed, not proved; catastrophism simply has been denied, not refuted.)
5) Theories of organic evolution are founded on the illogical ground of equivocation of the terms "evolution" and "variation." By classical definition, evolution can only mean change from one animal form into another animal form, or change from one plant form into another plant form. Variation, then, is restricted to change *within* animal form or *within* plant form.

Since it can be shown that students in the classroom and adults through the public press, *do not hear or see* criticisms of theories of evolution, one can assert that they do not know what material is available to them. Thus, need exists for a Selected Bibliography such as constitutes the main body of this paper. The references are presented in chronological order.

However, so that the reader might be reminded of standard references to the modern neo-Darwinian, modern synthesis theory of evolution, the following list is provided:

T. Dobzhansky, (geneticist), *Genetics, and the Origin of Species,* Third Edition-Revised, Columbia University Press, 1951.

— *Evolution, Genetics, and Man,* John Wiley and Sons, N. Y., 1955.

B. Glass, (editor), *Forerunners of Darwin: 1745-1859,* The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md., 1959.

J. Huxley, (biologist), *Evolution, The Modern Synthesis,* Harper and Brothers Publisher, New York, 1943.

—— *Evolution in Action,* Harper and Brothers, N.' Y., 1953.

A. O. Lovejoy, (science historian), *The Great Chain of Being,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1961.

G. G. Simpson, (paleontologist), *The Meaning of Evolution,* Yale University Press, New Haven, 1950.

—— *Major Features of Evolution,* Columbia University Press, New York, 1953.

S. Tax, (editor), *Evolution After Darwin,* Vol. I, II, and III, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1960.

1860-1899

L. Agassiz, (zoologist), "Prof. Agassiz on the Origin of Species," *American Journal of Science,* Second Series, Vol. 30, November, 1860, pp. 142-154.

Devoted to pointing out Darwin's confusion and lack of facts, fallacies of reasoning, and ignoring of constancy of types. He closed by saying, "I shall therefore consider the transmutation theory as a scientific mistake, untrue in its facts, unscientific in its method, and mischievous in its tendency."

L. Agassiz, "Evolution and Permanence of Type," *The Atlantic Monthly,* Vol. *33,* January, 1874, pp. 92-101.

This was the last published work by a great, world-renowned naturalist in opposition to what he called the Transmutation Theory. He touches upon each of Darwin's works as he denies the conjectural theory of the *Origin of Species.*

L. Agassiz, *Methods of Study in Natural History,* James R. Osgood and Company, Boston, 1874.

Author states in Preface that this is a more popular presentation of his views in his *Essay on Classification,* and an opportunity to protest against transmutation (evolution) theory.

C. R. Bree, (physician), *Fallacies in the Hypothesis of Mr. Darwin,* Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1872.

Discussion of physico-psychical, variation and natural selection, and teleological arguments. Mivart's theory of evolution shown to be untenable. Chapters on eye and ear included to present difficulties of Darwin's theory.

J. W. Dawson, (geologist), *Modern Ideas of Evolution as Related to Revelation and Science,* The Religious Tract Society, London, 1890.

Discusses the apparition of species in geological time, monistic evolution, agnostic evolution, and theistic evolution. — 200 pgs.

1900-1919

W. Bateson, (geneticist), "Inaugural Address be-

fore Australian Meeting of the British Association," ***Nature,*** Vol. 93, August 20, 1914, pp. 635-642.

In talking about individual variation he discusses natural selection as only one factor delimiting species, misconception about "blood" descent, illusion of contemporary variability, and further stresses narrow limits of knowledge and need for caution in applying the theory of evolution.

F. Bettex, (scientist), ***Science and Christianity,*** Jennings and Pye, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1901.

In five scholarly chapters on "Progress," "Evolution and Modern Science," "Christians and Science," "Science," and "Materialism," a fine Christian gentleman expounds upon conditions at the turn of the century.

L. Burbank, (biologist), ***Luther Burbank: His Methods and Discoveries and Their Practical Application,*** Vol. 1, Luther Burbank Press, New York, 1914.

This is part of a 10-volume series on the practical work of this avowed evolutionist. Nevertheless all his research did not dissuade him from the statement in this volume that purposes in nature exist: 1) to produce endless combinations, and 2) to prevent combination of things out of kind. His work could be related to Dr. Frank Marsh's baramin kinds.

D. Dewar, (ornithologist) and F. Finn (zoologist), ***The Making of Species,*** John Lane Company, New York, 1909.

Two scientists endeavor to demonstrate weaknesses of pure Lamarckism, pure Wallaceism, and the theory of DeVries. They attacked Neo-Darwinism and show that the theory of natural selection is not sufficient to explain origins of variations.

V. L. Kellogg, (zoologist), ***Darwinism Today,*** H. Holt and Company, New York, 1907.

An excellent, dispassionate review of attacks and defenses of Darwinism and the theory of natural selection in that day. Names and quotations of opposing botanists, zoologists and palaeontologists are given in thorough appendices with notes at the close of each of twelve chapters. Author stresses that natural selection is not a sufficient explanation of species-forming.

J. P. Lotsy, (biologist), ***Evolution, By Means of Hybridization,*** M. Nijhoff, The Hague, Holland, 1916.

Contains extensive discussion of his work in producing "new species" from crosses of existing species. Lotsy felt that new classes and phyla have occurred ***suddenly*** from recombination of factors brought together in crosses (see pp. 119, 135, 147). He expressed skepticism of the existence of mu-

1920-1929

W. Bateson, (geneticist), "Evolutionarv Faith and Modern Doubts," ***Science,*** Vol. ***55,*** January 20, 1922, pp. 55-61.

Famous address before AAAS which was cautious and intellectually honest regarding problems of fitting genetics with Darwin's theory. He presented reasons for being "agnostic as to the actual mode and processes of evolution." Correspondence about this talk appeared in ***Science*** on February 22, April 7, and April 14 of 1922.

A. S. Berg, (biologist), ***Nomogenesis, or Evolution Determined by Law*** (with Introduction by d'Arcy Thompson), Constable and Co., Ltd., London, 1926.

Outspoken critic of Darwinism still writes about evolution (as if equated to variation within limits), but involving polyphyletic origin of similar forms. Conclusion chapter contains interesting schematic abstract of ten points to contrast evolution conceived by Darwin and evolution on the basis of Nomogenesis (origin from tens of thousands of primary forms, i. e. polyphylectically).

F. Bettex, (scientist), ***The Six Days of Creation in the Light of Modern Science,*** The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa, 1924.

This 64-page booklet contains a compact yet thorough expression of belief in creation with consideration of Darwinism, the phrase "After Its Kind," and creation of man.

L. T. More, (physicist), ***The Dogma of Evolution.*** Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1925.

Opening with a succint chapter on "Evolution as Science and Faith," the author examines Greek and medieval attitudes toward science so reader properly understands different uses of the word "change." There follows a discourse on paleontology and geology and chapters on the theories of Lamarck and Darwin. He traces the effects of the theory of evolution when applied to the broader fields of social life and religion where evolution clashes with the spiritual life of man.

G. B. O'Toole, (biologist), ***The Case Against Evolution,*** Macmillan Company, N. Y., 1925.

Dividing his work into two parts on evolution in general and the problem of origins, the author endeavors to show "that evolution has long since degenerated into a dogma, which is believed in spite of the facts, and not on account of them." A temperate and thorough treatment of the subject.

F. B. Sumner, (biologist), "Is Evolution a Continuous or a Discontinuous Process ?", ***Scientific Monthly,*** Vol. 29, July, 1929, pp. 72-78.

Much of the paper reviews controversy between proponents of mutationism and Mendelism which were offered as alternatives to the natural selection principle as conceived by Darwin. He gives six "objections to the natural selection theory which were supposed to be avoided by the theory of mutation." Also, he lists six objections to the mutation view. Sumner disagrees with Goldschmidt, T. H. Morgan, and Lotsy.

To be continued

END