

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 (*continued*)

1930-1939

A. H. Clark, (zoologist), *The New Evolution—Zoogenesis*, the Williams and Wilkins Company, Baltimore, Md., 1930.

Though not adopting creationism, a type of polyphyletic formulation is offered as an explanation for the total absence of animal forms intermediate between major groups or phyla.

D. Dewar, (ornithologist), *Difficulties of the Evolution Theory*, Edward Arnold and Co., London, 1931.

The book was prepared to present facts that are difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile with the Darwinian conception of evolution even in modified form of the 1930's.

D. Dewar, *Man: A Special Creation*, Thynne and Co., Ltd., London, 1936.

Excellent source of qualifying statements by scientists plus very interesting data. Mentions scientific critics of Darwinism and/or Transformism: Bateson, Vialleton, Fleischmann, O'Toole, McCready Price, Berg, Carazzi, Dehaut, and D'Arcy Thompson.

A. Lindsey, (zoologist), *The Problems of Evolution*, Macmillan Company, N. Y., 1931.

Though accepting the fact of the occurrence of evolution, the author presents some reasoned considerations of the problem of inheritance of acquired characteristics. Concerned with origin of variations, he explores the possibilities of the Lamarckian view. On p. 109 he speaks of an evolutionist's "articles of faith."

P. Lemoine, (naturalist), "What Are the Theories of Evolution Worth?" *Encyclopedia Française*, Vol. V, Librairie Larousse, Paris, 1937.

Evidence of skepticism about evolution is found in the concluding essay which contains a detailed analysis of the difficulty of reconciling evolution with paleontology and biogeography. He states that specialists had come to the conclusion that the then current theories of evolution are inadequate and that evolution is impossible.

E. A. Milne, (mathematician), "Some Points in the Philosophy of Physics: Time, Evolution, and Creation," *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution*, 1933, pp.m 219-238.

Author presents some interesting thoughts on creation and wonders if it is ever-present. Relates concepts in title to admitted increase in entropy and to thermodynamics plus problems of existence of an observer.

H. Nilsson, (geneticist), "The Problem of the Origin of Species Since Darwin," *Hereditas*, Vol. 20, 1936, pp. 227-237 .

In an address at Lund University, Nilsson reviews contributions of Francis Galton and Hugo DeVries in correcting Darwin's acceptance of a Lamarckian view on origin of characters. Touching on conflict between Mendelism and evolution because genes were taken to be constant at first, he brings in T. H. Morgan's and Muller's contributions on mutation of genes. According to Nilsson, most mutants have not acquired new characters, but lost a gene; therefore, he concludes, ". . . investigations of the last three decades into the problem of the origin of species have not been able to show that a variational material capable of competition in the struggle for existence is formed by mutation."

G. M. Price, (geologist), *Modern Discoveries Which Help Us Believe*, Fleming H. Revell, New York, 1934.

Using a question and answer format all through the book, Price offers a summary of scientific facts used in many previous books to support his acceptance of the Flood theory of geology.

L. F. Spath, (zoologist), "The Evolution of the Cephalopod," *Biological Reviews*, Vol. 8, October, 1933, pp. 418-461.

An evolutionist admits loss of earlier optimism; calls for patient sifting of better evidence; relates recognition of many unsolved problems.

W. R. Thompson, (biologist), *Science and Common Sense*, Longman's Green and Co., London, 1937.

The author, both scientist and very competent philosopher, is mainly concerned about use and abuse of physics, mathematics and philosophy. His last chapter is devoted to concentrated criticism of evolution with which he has dealt to varying degrees in other chapters. He sees the concept of evolution as "an object of genuinely religious devotion" for most biologists; and says, "This is probably the reason why the severe methodological criticism employed in other departments of biology has not been brought to bear against evolutionary speculation."

1940-1949

L. DuNouy, (biologist), *Human Destiny*, Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1947.

Author presents view in support of telefinalism — some final goal of mankind. Discusses mathematical improbability of events happening according to evolution.

J. M. Gillete, (sociologist), "Ancestorless Man: The

Anthropological Dilemma," *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 57, December, 1943, pp. 533-545.

Gillette decries evolutionary dogmatism which he feels is behind genealogical trees of man printed in sociological, anthropological and biological works of that day. He calls for needed criteria of man as man. He proposes use of mutational concepts to explain man-like apes, and transitional fossil forms to "correct" the ancestorless nature of man in genealogical diagrams.

R. Goldschmidt, (geneticist), *The Material Basis of Evolution*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1940.

Author seems to accept evolution and discusses at length possible large step "macro-evolution" during embryonic development. He supposes new sudden changes can arise as a result of alteration of chromosomes. His view is an antithesis to slow, cumulative change of Darwin and Neo-Darwinists.

A. Lunn, (editor), *Is Evolution Proved?* (A Debate between Douglas Dewar and H. S. Shelton), Hollis and Carter, London, 1947.

Following an excellent introductory chapter by the editor defining the issue, arguments of two scientists are presented. Dewar and the editor quoted skeptical statements of scientists and show why evolution should not be presented as a proved and demonstrated fact.

F. L. Marsh, (biologist), *Evolution, Creation, and Science*, Second Rev. Edition, Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington, D. C., 1947.

Dedicated to openmindedness, the author does an excellent job in defining special creation and evolution plus clarifying common equivocation of latter term with variation by majority of biologists.

A. C. Morrison, (natural scientist), *Man Does Not Stand Alone*, Rev. Edition, Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1947.

Morrison marshalls an amazing array of arguments and new scientific facts from biological and

physical areas of study. He uses these to demonstrate his belief that an effective intelligence is behind the infinite adjustments of the phenomena of nature. The book is a challenge to the conclusion of *Man Stands Alone* by Julian Huxley.

G. M. Price, (geologist), *Genesis Vindicated*, Review and Herald Publication Association, Takoma Park, Washington, D.C., 1941.

Price examines an extensive number of statements by scientists for and against evolution. He gives much attention to "The Case Against the Evolutionary Ages," and in another chapter asks, "Was There an Ice Age?"

G. G. Simpson, (paleontologist), "The Problem of Plan and Purpose in Nature," *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 64, June 1947, pp. 491-492.

Extensive work treating on history, plea for accomplishments, and criticisms of Darwin's *The Origin of Species*. Mutations, nascent (?) variations, purpose are discussed before a summary of modern synthetic theory with "illustration" of creative natural selection. Illustration involved essentially recombination of truly "created" elements (origin of which is never explained). Admits possibility of a Purposer as still deeper problem on which scientists, *as scientists*, cannot speak.

F. B. Summer, (biologist), "Is Evolution Inscrutable?", *Science*, Vol. 93, May 30, 1941, pp. 521 and 522.

This short "Discussion" open with agreement by the author with a reviewer (Dobzhansky) of R. Goldschmidt's book, *The Material Basis of Evolution* (Yale University Press, 1940), that acceptance of Goldschmidt's central theory demands a "belief in miracles." He points out that St. George Mivart in 1871 referred to large "jumps" due to intervention of the Creator. He concludes that Goldschmidt has not shown that a new, complex, adaptive change has occurred in correlation with change in many other body parts of an organism.

(More coming)