

## *Why Has Evolution Been Widely Accepted?*

*Neo-Darwinism has become an established orthodoxy, any criticism of which is regarded as little less than lèse-majesté.*<sup>1</sup>

—C. H. Waddington

IN THIS CHAPTER, we will briefly examine a persistent question: If evolution is not true, why does it occupy such a dominant place in modern education and how has it gained such wide acceptance? (The reader is referred by way of review, to thoughts on this subject at the beginning of chapter 6, pages 95-98.)

The domain of science involves accurate observation of evidence and controlled experimentation. Of the latter, Aimé Michel wrote, "Experimental science is completely based on one single principle. In its entirety, and by definition, it proceeds from one single process, *which is the reproducible experiment with a single solution*"<sup>2</sup> (Michel's italics).

In dealing with the subject of evolution, most proponents in the field of science have been *endeavoring to sell a philosophy rather than to present scientific evidence*. The harm is done when this philosophy is proclaimed as if it were scientific fact backed by experimental or observational evidence.

### *Scientists Are Fallible Human Beings*

The public tends to believe that *every* scientist is 100 percent

---

<sup>1</sup> C. H. Waddington, "Towards a Theoretical Biology," *Nature*. Vol. 218 (1968), p. 527. Note: *lèse majesté* means crime against the sovereign; treason.

<sup>2</sup> Aimé Michel, in preface to André de Cayeux' *Three Billion Years of Life* (New York: Stein and Day, 1969), p. 23.

correct in *every* pronouncement. It is almost unbelievable to some people that scientists could be subject to human errors. James Watson, who discovered the pairing mechanism of DNA, made the following observation (which he has no doubt regretted because of its impolitic nature): "In contrast to the popular conception supported by newspapers and mothers of scientists, a goodly number of scientists are not only narrow-minded and dull, but also just stupid."<sup>3</sup> (Watson may have been facetiously attributing this viewpoint to his colleague.)

This extreme appraisal is certainly not correct for most scientists. In the field of science are some of the finest people on earth. Watson's comment may serve to alert us, however, to the fact that scientists, being human, show a great variety of beliefs, attitudes, and character, just as do politicians, teachers, and salesmen.

"Modern man," said George Charles Roche III, "does not seem to understand that science can harbor illusions on the image of nature and thus mislead."<sup>4</sup>

Any scientist will try to fit the evidence into his general philosophy of the nature of things. Sometimes this natural tendency overrides logic and leads one to look at only the favorable evidence. Take the study of proteins that do the same job in various organisms. The idea is that in closely related organisms, the sequences of the amino acids in such proteins should match more closely than sequences from organisms which diverged farther back on the "evolutionary tree." Enthusiasm for this popular idea easily leads to ignoring sequence data which contradict evolution.<sup>5</sup>

### *Degrees of Commitment to Evolution*

There is great variety among scientists and others who believe evolution. Some, like Simpson, Wooldridge, and Oparin, are crusaders for the doctrine. This is logical—if a person really believes in a philosophy, he likely will spread it.

Others echo it gladly, and a great multitude simply go along because it seems to be the thing to do. Many of the latter

---

<sup>3</sup> James D. Watson, *The Double Helix* (New York: Atheneum Press, 1968), p. 14.

<sup>4</sup> George Charles Roche III, *Legacy of Freedom* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1969), p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> This important subject will be discussed briefly in the next chapter, and some such sequences will be compared.

have serious doubts about evolution, but they keep their reservations to themselves. And, of course, a great many people are honestly confused on this question.

*Not because of evidence, but because of presumed evidence*—this is a major explanation for the prevalence of evolutionary belief. It is the subject of the next chapter, where the assumed proofs will be examined briefly.

### *A Fashionable False Idea*

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., once wrote about pressures from “fashionable ideas . . . which are advanced with such force that common sense itself becomes the victim.” A person under such pressure may then act, he said, “with an irrationality which is almost beyond belief.”<sup>6</sup>

It is exactly thus with the overwhelming pressure to accept evolution.

“I regard evolution as a major myth of our time,” said John G. Read, “—a myth in the name of science.”<sup>7</sup> An aerospace engineer for Hughes Aircraft, and a former evolutionist himself, Read made this comment after he cited the uncertainties and assumptions involved in accepted radiocarbon dating techniques. The power that the “myth” of evolution has gained over the public, through the human desire to conform, amounts almost to mass hypnosis. It has its effect because people have been led to think that it is the “orthodox” view among those whom they consider to be scientific and worldly-wise.

An individual thus affected is reluctant to examine the evidence open-mindedly. The problem is emotional. One can easily become committed to what appears to be a fashionable philosophy, the “in” thing among his peers. The deciding factor is the pressure to conform, right or wrong. It always takes courage and intentional honesty to seek truth in the face of the compulsion to be considered “in” because of being “like.”

Even some who profess faith in God tend to shy away from looking into evidence such as that to which attention has been called in these pages, lest the facts, if accepted, cause them to lose favor with nonbelievers in Christianity whose approval they value. Seldom would such a person venture far into a book on a theme like this.

<sup>6</sup> William Randolph Hearst, Jr., “Editor’s Report,” *The Herald-Examiner* (Los Angeles, Nov. 14, 1971), p. A-4.

<sup>7</sup> John G. Read, interviewed on “And God Created,” KBBI-FM Radio, Los Angeles, February 7, 1971.

When a fashionable idea has the center of the stage in a society, it tends to drive off opposing viewpoints. Some readers may find, as we have, that it is difficult to locate in some university libraries certain serious scientific works critical of evolution. Books of this type have a way of ending up not in the science section but in the religious section of city libraries! Many inquiring students thus never hear the other side as part of their scientific studies. While most universities perhaps try to be fair to all thoughtful viewpoints logically deriving from the evidence, occasionally a school will refuse a degree apparently as a result of prejudice against nonconformity, with regard to belief in this popular doctrine. These factors contribute to an understanding of why evolutionary belief is so widespread.

Scientific works which fail to support evolution may sometimes run into difficulty getting into print. When Immanuel Velikovsky's controversial theories, which threatened orthodox solar system evolutionary dogma of the time, were scheduled for publication by a major textbook house, even prominent scientists were involved in the storm of protest that caused the publisher to back down. This display of human prejudice and efforts to stifle true academic freedom resulted in a book entitled *The Velikovsky Affair* which documents the whole story.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Columbus and the Indians: the Matter of Overview*

Columbus sailed with the outlook of discovering India by a new route. When he reached the new world, he did not recognize it as such, but thought it must be part of India, or islands near India. He named the natives "Indians."

It is like that with some evolutionists. They have their minds set with the idea that there is no Creator. Things had to happen *without supernatural intervention*. Having determined this in their thinking, nothing—*nothing*—can cause them to consider anything that is not a materialistic explanation. No matter how

---

<sup>8</sup> Alfred DeGrazia, ed., *The Velikovsky Affair* (Hyde Park, N.Y.: University Books, Inc., 1966).

Quoting from page one of that book: "What must be called the scientific establishment rose in arms, not only against the new Velikovsky theories but against the man himself. Efforts were made to block dissemination of Dr. Velikovsky's ideas, and even to punish supporters of his investigations. Universities, scientific societies, publishing houses, the popular press were approached and threatened; social pressures and professional sanctions were invoked to control public opinion."

This was an extreme case and not the rule, of course, but it does indicate that radical prejudice for conformity is possible by some recognized scientific "authorities."

hard-pressed such a person may be for lack of evidence or logic, he must search around for some way to explain things without an intelligent inventor. This is a primary reason for the persistence of evolution. It is a chosen *overview* or philosophy of life, rather than science.

Without a strong advance commitment to the philosophy of evolution, would any reasonable person ever stretch logic so far as to believe, for example, that the ponderous jaw bones of reptiles evolved into the delicate, intricately matched bones of the inner ear, whose exact length and precise hinged motion transmit sound to the inner eardrum? Those who thus believe should at least refrain from ever criticizing the most unreasoning devotee of any religion for his persistence in finding explanations which fit his belief, even if his particular religion happens to be a false one.

The Christian may not now be able to give ideal answers to some questions, but the evolutionist is in far worse shape when it comes to solutions for difficult questions. In fact, only belief in an intelligent Creator can provide a really adequate world view or cosmic philosophy that can encompass the whole range of things. Although there are still problems, recent discoveries have, for the Bible believer, solved several that formerly had no explanation. For any mysteries remaining, consider this statement by Pierre Lecomte du Noüy:

Mystery for mystery, it seems wiser, more logical and more intelligent to choose the one which explains, thus satisfying our need to comprehend; the one which opens the doors to hope, rather than the one which closes those doors and explains nothing.<sup>9</sup>

#### *Fear of Teleology As a Threat to Human Conceit*

Many materialists seem to fear the idea that there may be purpose or design in nature (teleology). This fear appears to be based on aversion to considering that there may be *Someone in charge* of the universe, to whom we would be responsible.

Even intelligent people will sometimes resist the sensible but humbling knowledge "that they are parts and not masters of the awesome mystery called creation."<sup>10</sup>

The new company vice-president who likes to give the im-

---

<sup>9</sup> Pierre Lecomte du Noüy, *Human Destiny* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1947), p. 84.

<sup>10</sup> Hearst, "Editor's Report."

pression that he owns the company is an example. The night custodian who relaxes with his feet on the boss' desk exemplifies also this human tendency to want to exalt ourselves.

The pride of man is a well-known fact to all students of human nature. If there is no God, man can take all the credit or give it to something less than himself, such as "chance." He can then do as he pleases, without being limited by ideas of a future accounting, a judgment, heaven and hell.

Those who close their minds to considering God are like the small boy who shut his eyes and told others, "You can't see me." By deciding there is no God, man thinks he is rid of Him.

The loss is enormous. It is a poor substitute when man turns to chance as his god. To depend on mutations as the raw material of evolution, for example, is to postulate "creation by mistake," because the assumed development would arise from errors and injuries involving DNA. Evolutionary scientists, nevertheless, spend lifetimes searching for the reasons for various organs and life processes—never doubting that there are such reasons.

### *Evolution As a Religious Faith*

Robert T. Clark and James D. Bales have written an excellent small book entitled *Why Scientists Accept Evolution*. In it they show with careful documentation that Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, and other early evolutionists did not start in that direction primarily because of scientific evidence, but because of emotional and spiritual bias against God, the Bible, and Christianity. Holding such an attitude, it was easy for them to interpret physical evidence as favoring a materialistic explanation of things. Evolution became their substitute for God.<sup>11</sup>

Bolton Davidheiser was an evolutionist for many years. He received his Ph.D. in zoology at Johns Hopkins University, specializing in genetics. Eventually he turned from evolution to Christianity. His first book, *Evolution and Christian Faith* (1969), is one of the most complete and scholarly studies yet made and covers a wide scope.

Dr. Davidheiser goes into considerable detail on this subject of evolution as a faith. It is often overlooked that a logical faith

---

<sup>11</sup> Robert T. Clark and James D. Bales, *Why Scientists Accept Evolution* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Book House, 1966).

is involved in accepting some scientific precepts, but to believe evolution requires a different kind of faith without basis:

Many phenomena have been observed so regularly to occur under certain conditions that they are taken for granted, and it is not realized that faith in the uniformity of nature is being exercised. But the situation is quite different with regard to the theory of evolution, for many alleged phenomena in the evolution of life are mysterious, and to accept them requires faith.<sup>12</sup>

Evolution, it has been said, requires of its devotees a higher degree of faith in the unknown than does creation. Evolutionary doctrine is based on a long series of assumptions, many of them groundless and the others uncertain. Each of these assumptions is treated as if proved as soon as the writer or speaker goes on to the next step. The result is something like building a house at the top of a structure of straws.

#### *Bias Against the Supernatural*

A highschool textbook in wide use in public schools is entitled *Molecules to Man*.<sup>13</sup> Its *entire theme* is the theory of evolution. Around 1967, we searched an earlier edition of this textbook in vain for even a hint that anyone anywhere ever believed in creation. The authors did not hesitate to discuss other opposing theories, as long as these did not involve a supernatural being to be considered seriously. They spoke freely, for example, of spontaneous generation, an earlier belief that small mammals and insects originated from decaying matter.

The evidence of bias in that textbook was slightly modified in the edition in use in 1973. However, about the only mention of creation is in a couple of quotations, one of them from Darwin.

Francis Crick commented about British schools. He says, "Personally, I myself would go further, and think it is also regrettable that there is so much religious teaching." He disapproves the "tremendous institutional support given to religion by such a body as Cambridge University. . . ." One wonders, however, if the alternative he suggests would not in effect be *another religion*: "I think it is difficult to overemphasize the importance of teaching natural selection, both in schools and

<sup>12</sup> Bolton Davidheiser, *Evolution and Christian Faith* (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1969), p. 153.

<sup>13</sup> *Molecules to Man*, Blue Version, Revised, Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968).

in universities, so that every member of our culture has a clear and firm grasp of the principle. . . .”<sup>14</sup>

He admits that there are “intelligent people who sincerely believe in vitalistic ideas,<sup>15</sup> even though they are fully acquainted with the scientific knowledge on the subject,” but thinks it “highly unlikely that there is anything that cannot be explained by physics and chemistry.” Regarding those who disagree, he has this comment: “A lunatic fringe always remains. There are still people alive today who believe that the earth is flat. . . .”<sup>16</sup> It is always a good idea to be alert when ridicule like this is used, to find if it is unconsciously employed as a substitute for proof or logic.

“Holding to evolution is unbelief, faith only in a negation,” wrote T. Robert Ingram. He says that while materialistic evolution is often characterized as a religion, by looking deeper, one finds that it is more accurately an “unfaith.”

Evolution is properly categorized as systematic denial that God has Created us. The evolutionist cannot agree with anyone as to what he believes: but all are at one as to what they don't believe.<sup>17</sup>

### *Theistic Evolution a Compromise?*

Since this book is primarily on probability and evolution, we are not going deeply into other subjects, including theistic evolution (evolution involving God). The reader is referred to the excellent and complete study of this theory by Dr. Davidheiser in his book mentioned earlier (footnote 12, page 175).

We have seen before that the pressure of the *assumed* evidence forces many to come to terms with evolution. They don't want to be “unscientific,” and they give undue credit to the proofs evolutionists claim. Some of the evidence which we now have was not known earlier. Adjustment to evolution is unnecessary after all.

It is regrettable that some scientists who believe strongly in God make this same weakening accommodation to evolution. They do not do this because of evidence. Doubtless the explanation lies in the following causes:

<sup>14</sup> Francis H. C. Crick, *Of Molecules and Men* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1966), pp. 89-91.

<sup>15</sup> vitalistic: involving more than just material factors

<sup>16</sup> Crick, *Of Molecules and Men*, pp. 97-99.

<sup>17</sup> T. Robert Ingram, Letter to Editor, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 8 (September, 1971), p. 116.

(1) Scientists can easily overestimate the supposed evidences of evolution outside their particular field. A physicist, for example, may be persuaded that the biologists have real proof of evolution, and as a scientist he respects the reports of other scientists.

Like the theologian described earlier (page 29), many professional people including scientists in other specialties may be mistakenly led to believe “that the scientists have proved evolution to be true, and they have to do the best they can with it.” Doing the best they can, in such a case, they espouse the idea that God did it, but through gradual, natural processes.

(2) Some believers in God are not clearly aware that the Bible and evolution are not compatible. They suppose that theistic evolution is a philosophy acceptable to the Christian faith, not having thought through the contradiction involved. Among these are some great souls who started out as unbelievers, and have gotten as far as faith in God, but have not yet encountered or fully considered the Bible’s teachings on this subject.

(3) Difficulties with the “geologic time scale,” descriptions of early man, and astronomers’ recounting the vastness of the universe—these may lead one to an unadvisable reinterpretation of the Bible account. In the next chapter, these subjects will be dealt with briefly.

Thomas Huxley said, “It is clear that the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of Creation. . . . Evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to believe the Bible.”<sup>18</sup>

### *Why God Didn't Make Things Unmistakably Clear*

Why did the Creator leave room at all for anyone to doubt as to the truth about Himself?

If each of us is in this life as an opportunity to develop into a person—to develop character—then there must be the chance to choose. God therefore leaves room for personal decision.

There is plenty of evidence. God does not, however, grasp a person by the neck and force him to believe. We choose to open our eyes to the implications of the evidence or to ignore them. That’s part of the plan, because character comes only by choice. Choice shapes one’s character, and character determines

---

<sup>18</sup> In: Fred John Meldau, *Why We Believe in Creation, Not in Evolution* (Denver: Christian Victory Publishing Co., 1959), p. 8.

personal destiny. Choices that a person makes regarding the Creator are logically the most important of all choices.

The business manager who wants to get rid of the owner of the business is in trouble. The same is true of a human being who chooses to ignore his Creator. Unless we really want to find Him, we won't. "I have come in recent years," wrote Louis Cassels, "to the suspicion that God deliberately hides His reality from the casual inquirer."<sup>19</sup> *Casual* seeking is an insult to such a Being as the Creator, whose patent is on every blade of grass, on the nucleus of every atom, and throughout nature.

If Cassels' statement is true, consider how unlikely it is that the deliberate ignoring of God will produce evidence convincing to the skeptic. Henry Fairfield Osborn, a crusading evolutionist of the early twentieth century, expressed the rebellious spirit of human beings thus: "In truth, from the earliest stages of Greek thought man has been eager to discover some natural cause of evolution, and to abandon the idea of supernatural intervention in the order of nature."<sup>20</sup>

It is too bad that man—made in the image of God, given dominion over the earth, offered the privilege of sonship and co-creative work together with God—should abandon this high honor and the freedom that goes with so exciting an adventure, and instead rebel and try to get rid of the Owner by deciding He isn't there.

A character in one of Shakespeare's plays gave an incisive picture of a universal human tendency in these familiar words:

But man, proud man,  
Drest in a little brief authority,  
Most ignorant of what he is most assured. . . .  
Plays such tricks before high heaven  
As make the angels weep.<sup>21</sup>

### *True Science Requires Courage*

Scientists are often fearless in proclaiming new ideas as long as these do not question evolution. For one example, Dr. J. V. Smith of the University of Chicago, according to an Associated Press dispatch, announced some revolutionary views concerning the moon at a 1970 lunar conference. "Smith's theories were

<sup>19</sup> Louis Cassels, *The Reality of God* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1971), p. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Henry Fairfield Osborn, *The Origin and Evolution of Life* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917), Preface, p. ix.

<sup>21</sup> William Shakespeare, "Measure for Measure," Act II, Scene II.

greeted with gasps from some of the scientists attending," said the news report.<sup>22</sup>

"Physics often advances by shattering theories," said two physicists in an article in *Scientific American*.<sup>23</sup> Consider how much faster biochemistry, for example, might progress if the "cerebral horsepower now being wasted" in trying to support outmoded evolutionary doctrine were instead put into productive research on the challenging gaps in our knowledge of molecular biology.

As it is now, most biochemists seem to feel that they must relate all research to the evolutionary scheme of things. It will take courage on the part of individual scientists to break out of this inhibiting and restrictive straitjacket. Involved in this problem is the scientific integrity of those who advocate protecting the evolutionary viewpoint from an objective evaluation alongside creation.

Charles Darwin once accused some opponents of "the blindness of preconceived opinion."<sup>24</sup> One might wonder if those words fit some present-day scientists who have unwittingly been influenced to accept the unscientific notion that a purely material explanation must be found for all that exists.

If we may be permitted a sociological generalization, such a belief is not merely academic, but carries certain practical connotations as it reaches the public. The average person would reason that if all can be materialistically explained, it would mean that there is no God. If there is no God, why should not one forget others and do as he pleases (except when others can help toward his own happiness)?<sup>25</sup>

It can easily be seen how such a view might play a part in undermining the moral and social foundations of western civilization. It might even appear that nothing but totalitarian authority would suffice to guarantee order in the absence of character in individual citizens—character with its inner controls,

---

<sup>22</sup> "Was Moon Once a 'Molten Blob'?" Associated Press Dispatch, *The Herald-Examiner* (Los Angeles, January 5, 1970), p. A-1.

<sup>23</sup> Frederick V. Murphy and David E. Yount, "Photons as Hadrons," *Scientific American*, Vol. 225, (July, 1971), p. 96.

<sup>24</sup> *The Origin of Species*, Mentor Edition (New American Library, 1958), p. 444.

<sup>25</sup> Alan Radcliffe-Smith described evolution as "a theory which results in a grovellingly debased view of human origins . . . and which helps to spawn such grotesquely distorted pieces of literature as Marx's *Das Kapital* and Hitler's *Mein Kampf* . . ." (*Nature*, Correspondence, Vol. 241 [January 12, 1973], pp. 150, 151.)

resulting from "the fear of the Lord," as the Bible calls it. Such a "fear" consists of reverence and awe for a good and just Creator and a fear of invoking His displeasure. It does not necessarily involve the idea of "dread," unless one refuses to yield to His claims, and it is a strong incentive for proper conduct toward other people as well as toward one's Maker.

The growing evidence against evolution will eventually force American evolutionists to face the fact that the position is untenable. Some will then open-mindedly explore the idea of creation, while others will doubtless persist in materialism at any cost, and will turn to forms of Lamarckism or follow Oparin in the communist belief that matter intrinsically will develop of its own accord.

At present (1973), the controversy between evolution and creation is frequently in print in the scientific magazines of both England and America. The prestigious British science journal, *Nature*, widely read by scientists of all English-speaking countries, has included a large number of items over several months. Here are some ideas expressed:

A professor in the Department of Anatomy, University of Western Australia, described evolution as a "time-honoured scientific tenet of faith—for this is what evolution has become to many of us—rather like a theological doctrine, to be defended with some passion."<sup>26</sup>

Another professor, J. W. Fairbairn, of the School of Pharmacy, University of London, spoke of the highly speculative nature of evolution. He said, "It is now belatedly coming to be realized that evolutionary speculation has had a deleterious effect on practical taxonomy." On the subject of evolution's supposed help in shaping taxonomy, Fairbairn said: "There is a curious dishonesty about this in much biological writing." He said, "I treat the Genesis account of creation with as much respect as that of the biologist."<sup>27</sup>

Another correspondent delineated the problem facing non-conformists:

There are more anti-Darwinists in British universities than you seem to realize. Among them is a friend of mine who holds a chair in a department of pure science "in a field

---

<sup>26</sup> David Allbrook, *Nature*, Correspondence, Vol. 241 (January 12, 1973), p. 150.

<sup>27</sup> J. W. Fairbairn, *Nature*, Correspondence, Vol. 241 (January 19, 1973), p. 225.

bearing on the evolutionary question,” to use your phrase. If his friends ask why he keeps quiet about his unorthodox views, he replies in words very like those used recently in another connexion by Professor Ian Roxburgh: “. . . There is a powerful establishment and a belief system. There are power seekers and career men, and if someone challenges the establishment he should not expect a sympathetic hearing.”

The writer, A. T. J. Hayward, went on to say:

The majority of biologists accept the prevailing views uncritically—just as a great many competent Russian biologists were once brainwashed into accepting Lysenko’s quackery. Others have thought for themselves and come to realize the flaws in contemporary Darwinism. But for them to speak out would be to invite ridicule and would probably ruin their careers.

Hayward ended his letter by noting: “Anyone who thinks that only uninformed cranks reject Darwinism should read the whole of Thompson’s *Introduction*. It will make him think again.”<sup>28</sup>

He was referring to the noted entomologist, W. R. Thompson. Because of the high esteem in which he was held in the scientific world, Thompson was pressed to write an introduction for the Centenary edition of Darwin’s *Origin of Species* (printed in 1956), even though Thompson was not a Darwinist himself. The result was no help to the cause of evolution. Hayward quoted thus from that *Introduction*: “This situation, where scientific men rally to the defense of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigour, attempting to maintain its credit with the public by the suppression of criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science.”

Personal integrity is sometimes costly. This is true whether one is a scientist or not. To go where truth leads, however, has the advantage of yielding self-respect, as well as the feeling of being in tune with the real universe. Another value of being in step with true science is that it enriches those in one’s circle of influence who may thereby also find courage to line up with the preponderance of the evidence.

---

<sup>28</sup> A. T. J. Hayward, *Nature*, Correspondence, Vol. 240 (December 29, 1972), p. 57. (We are not implying that all of these writers would agree with our position in every detail, of course.)

