



in the “talking cure” (as psychoanalysis was early labeled) quite unintentionally. Both men emphasized human physiology. Freud even did his doctoral thesis on “the physiology of the sexual behavior of eels in hopes of obtaining a professorship at the University of Vienna” — an appointment that was denied due to his being a Jew. Jones aspired to become a specialist in neurology who would be appointed to the faculty of University College Hospital — his alma mater affiliated with the University of London. Unfortunately, his acerbic staff relationships coupled with accusations of inappropriate relationships with child patients denied him this privilege and forced him, like Freud, into private practice.

Introduced to Freud’s writings several years after their publication, Jones claimed that he began practicing Freud’s method of free association two years before their first meeting in 1908. As a result of attending a congress on psychiatry and neurology in Amsterdam in 1907, Jones met Carl Jung — Freud’s heir apparent who, after the conference, wrote Freud enthusiastically about “a young man from London ... who is very intelligent and could do a lot of good.” Jones and Freud finally met in April 1908 in Salzburg at a “Meeting for Freudian Psychology” — a gathering of forty-two practitioners that turned out to be the first international congress of psychoanalysis. At the conference, Freud asked Jones to write a book on dreams in English.

Ernest Jones became, without doubt, the major voice of psychoanalysis for the next forty years. He mediated a number of the defections, debates, and developments that permeated the movement as it spread throughout the western world. His speaking ability and his winsome personality served him well. He wrote theoretical treatises, edited a number of journals, and was the publisher of the press that made psychoanalysis dominant.

Maddox has made a major contribution in writing this biography of the “man behind the scenes” whose life, heretofore, was relatively unknown. This volume is recommended for ASAers who have an interest in cultural history.

Reviewed by H. Newton Malony, Senior Professor, Graduate School of Psychology, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA 91100. ★



Letters

Coping with Bioethical Dilemmas in the Christian Community

Two articles have appeared over the past 2–3 years in *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* on embryonic stem cells, both purporting to espouse a Reformed Christian world view. The one by Robert Boomsma¹ allowed for embryo research and the derivation of embryonic stem cells; the other by Adrian Teo and Donald Calbreath² argued for a prohibition of both activities. In each case, the authors consider they can utilize Reformed theological principles to arrive at a well-defined position on a narrowly focused contemporary bioethical issue. However,

since the authors reach diametrically opposite conclusions, one has to question in what way these viewpoints are actually informed by a Reformed worldview. Indeed what does it mean to be informed by such a worldview when discussing embryo research and embryonic stem cells, since the conclusions arrived at in these two papers reflect well-known positions within general bioethical debate?

On reflection it appears that the respective authors have emphasized different facets of the Reformed tradition. While Boomsma sought to maintain a broad view encompassing dominant themes within the Reformed Christian worldview, Teo and Calbreath underscored what they saw as the all-encompassing importance of the human embryo. The challenge for the Christian community is to decide whether it is possible to choose between these approaches on theological grounds and to conclude that one of them is more in line with Christian thinking than the other. In my view it is not, but this may be regarded as a contentious conclusion.

My reason for reaching this conclusion is that there is ethical and theological uncertainty in this area, since distinctly Christian knowledge and understanding of these topics is limited. What is required are theologically-informed ethics, where theological principles are employed to throw light on perplexing ethical quandaries. These two contributions help throw light on important stipulations from a Christian perspective, all of which should be taken into account in reaching practical conclusions on embryo-related questions. Consequently, they should be viewed as complementing one another, each contributing important facets of a Christian perspective. They should not be expected to provide definitive knock-down answers.

It follows from this that there may well be no one exclusive, unerring bioethical Christian position on contemporary issues that traverse scientific, moral, theological, and social boundaries. Far from being a defeatist stance, this underlines the point that Christians should be characterized by commitment to the flourishing of personal life and by attitudes that seek to bring sustenance and hope.

The issues raised by these two articles bring us to the heart of the relationship between the church and science. Christians have to take seriously the insights of scientific investigations, even if these appear to question cherished Christian conceptions. If God is sovereign, as enunciated so effectively within the Reformed tradition, there is nothing in the scientific arena beyond the scope of his interest and concern. Christians are to rejoice in this and be committed to rigorous thinking and debate, always with an openness to new insights, if these appear to forward the kingdom of God.

Christian contributions to bioethical debate will always be circumscribed. Humility and an awareness of human frailty are crucial prerequisites for Christians as they are for everyone else. Nevertheless, Christian voices should be heard, with an emphasis on the range of basic (Reformed) Christian principles outlined by Boomsma, allied with a stress on human dignity at all stages of human existence and across all societies. If this voice is lacking, utilitarian and functionalist considerations may come to reign supreme. But we should not underestimate the hard work and challenging thinking required of all within Christian

communities. Looking back to well-trodden church and denominational pronouncements may prove less helpful than frequently thought, especially where these have not been informed by nuanced scientific input.

Notes

¹R. Boomsma, "Embryonic Stem Cells and a Reformed Christian World View," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 56, no 1 (2004): 38–48.

²A. Teo and D. Calbreath, "Embryonic Stem Cells and a Reformed Christian World View: A Response to Robert Boomsma," *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith* 58, no 3 (2006): 179–88.

D. Gareth Jones

ASA Fellow

Department of Anatomy and Structural Biology

University of Otago

Dunedin, New Zealand

gareth.jones@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Seeking the Emergence of Created Man and Woman

We continue to seek the emergence of created humans. It has been more than a year since the above article was published in this journal (*PSCF* 58, no. 3 [2006]: 196–215). This theory of human origin was presented, anticipating evaluation from experts in the human-origins fields of study. The article presents evidence for the extinction of *Homo sapiens* during and following the Last Ice Age; and for the repopulation of the earth since 10,000 BC by the descendants of God's created, biblical Adam and Eve. This theory is diametrically opposed to the popular theory that we are all descendants of the apes and *Homo sapiens*.

In the year since publication of the article (which combines evolution and God's creation), we have not seen criticism in favor or opposed (except for one expert who supports Young-Earth Creation; and Peter Rüst's consideration of this theory in his article about the nature of Adam in the September 2007 issue of *PSCF*). However, in the meantime, we have gained some related insight into the academic fields of human origins. That insight comes from writings published in *PSCF* as follows:

- The title of Dean Arnold's December 2006 article, "Why Are There So Few Christian Anthropologists? Reflections on the Tension between Christianity and Anthropology," is self-explanatory.
- Two related conference talks in the June 2007 issue are: "Warfare and Wedlock: Redeeming the Faith-Science Relationship" by Ian Hutchinson; applies the term wedlock to the faith-science relationship for the natural sciences, where reproducibility and clarity (universal agreement) prevail; but also suggests that theories in history (his example, and I would add origin fields) where singular discoveries or events from the past cannot be reproduced, do not always have clarity. In my reading in human-origins fields, discoveries can be interpreted by different theories, e.g., there does not seem to be agreement on what caused the drastic cultural changes that came in the Developed Neolithic (beginning c. 9000 BC) or on why they occurred at that time.
- "The Professor and the Pupil: Addressing Secularization and Disciplinary Fragmentation in Academia" by Calvin DeWitt; suggesting that secularization and frag-

mentation in a study field can detract from addressing the big questions in that field and can result in ignoring ethical and spiritual levels.

Can we conclude from the above insights that when considering a major shift in human origins theory that includes creation by God, it could be difficult and inconclusive to attempt to reject or accept the theory and it would be more practical to ignore the theory?

The essence of "Seeking the Emergence of Created Man and Woman" acknowledges God's creation of the universe taken from Gen. 1:1 and God's creation of first life billions of years later; and accepts the theory of evolution combined with God's creation events of first life and a later creation of Adam and Eve. Extinction of *Homo sapiens* was derived from a different interpretation of published discoveries and theories concerning origins covering the last 15,000 years. The usual interpretation of that period supports cultural continuity of *Homo sapiens*. Support for the timely repopulation of the Earth by God's created humans is taken from convincing indications of God's Spirit being present, as seen in the first art works in different regions around the world beginning c. 8000 BC.

The article has now been placed on the ASA website along with the other 2006 journal articles (www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF/2006/PSCF9-06dyn.html). We continue to seek expert evaluation from origins and faith sources, but with the assumption of silent approval, the next step is promoting internet exposure of this theory of God's creation to an interested public. Discussion seeking the truth about God's creating acts is needed for comparison to the theory that we humans are descendants of the apes and *Homo sapiens*.

Robert C. Schneider

ASA Member

66 St. Andrews

Hattiesburg, MS 39401

banddschneider@msn.com

The Gap in Creation

As an old earth creationist, I respond to certain issues raised in the Seely-Ross exchange (*PSCF* 59, no. 1 [2007]: 37–54). My view that Gen. 1:1 refers to the creation of the universe and a global earth (cf. e.g., Pss. 121:2; 124:8),¹ on which there was a succession of different "worlds" (Gen. 2:4; Heb. 1:2; 11:3); that there is then an undisclosed gap in time between the first two verses of Genesis (cf. the gap in Isa. 61:1,2 till "the day of vengeance," Luke 4:18,19); that Gen. 1:2a describes a destruction event (cf. similar phraseology in Isa. 34; Jer. 4); and that this was followed by the creation of a new world in six literal 24-hour days (Exod. 20:8–11); accords with the majority gap school interpretation (Thomas Chalmers, et al.). However, my view that the flood of Gen. 1:2 was a local deluge, which was then followed by a local creation on the local earth (Gen. 41:56; Matt. 12:42) under the local heaven (Deut. 2:25; Col. 1:23) of Eden's world (Luke 2:1; Rom. 1:8) in six 24-hour days (Gen. 2:10–14), is a minority gap school view (Pye Smith, Henry Alcock, et al.).² The better known majority gap school view, which is contrary to established scientific facts, is that of a global flood and global creation in Gen. 1:2ff.