

Mendelian genetics: not for right wing fanatics

There are some statements in Noel Weeks' paper *Darwin and the search for an evolutionary mechanism* which need clarification. Darwin was a racist, regardless of any stated remarks against slavery: the natural selection hypothesis saw to that, as he had no knowledge of Mendel's experiments which were later confirmed by van Benedin under microscope (the fact of sexual, not somatic, cell transfer). It was evolution theory, using both Lamarck and Darwin, which completely undermined Russian agriculture, when Vavilov, the Mendelian geneticist, was silenced by Lysenko, the Darwinist/Lamarckian.

In my book *Genetics proves Genesis: Part 1. The union of science and religion*, it should be obvious that Mendel's laws of heredity could never develop into what Dr Weeks calls the ideology of 'Mendelianism', a term I never heard during 50 years as a plant breeder and geneticist. The reason is that every separately created species, *{each according to its kind}*, Genesis 1:12), as propounded by Linnaeus, experimentally proven by Kölreuter and Gartner and advanced by Mendel into scientific law, **shares a common gene pool**. Thus there are no genes for intelligence or criminal tendency in the human gene pool (see Monroe W Strickberger's *Genetics*, 1985, Macmillan Publishing Co., New York, pp. 172-173).

Genetic defects, both physical and mental, can be avoided by strict adherence to the Book of Leviticus, which forbids inbreeding. Australian Aborigines had 400 different languages and always married women from a different language group. Brothers and sisters faced away from each other as they spoke. Incest was forbidden and punished by immediate execution. A French expedition found only one deformed Aborigine: he was a hunchback but was the life and soul

of his clan. He was very witty and mentally superb. As he could not swim or attract a wife, everybody kept him supplied with fish and his parents were very proud of him.

Mendel's laws and the fixity of species (which Mendel failed to spell out, as courageously done by Kölreuter and Gartner, both plant breeders) have been further confirmed by the discovery of the DNA code, which is specific to every species. When the co-discoverer, Dr Watson, visited Australia, he was asked, *'did not DNA confirm Darwin?'* His answer was a decisive 'no': it was rather a confirmation of the work of Linnaeus and Mendel.

Patrick Guerin
Lithgow, New South Wales
AUSTRALIA



Gregor Mendel (1822-1884)

Noel Weeks replies:

I suspect that Mr Guerin is concerned that I have implied that Mendel was responsible for the use, which others have made, of his discoveries in genetics. That was not my intent. Rather, I was concerned to point out that the Left and Right Wings of political and social theory have found different approaches to hereditary to be congenial to their particular ways of thinking.

As for what I called 'Mendelianism', I suggest he look at Hans Günther, *The Racial Elements of European History* (tr. G.C. Wheeler, London, Methuen, 1927). This work provided the 'scientific respectability' for the Nazi program to preserve the purity of the 'Nordic race'. It appeals explicitly to Mendelian genetics. I am not arguing that the appeal is one that Mendel would have supported or that it is valid. However, in the absence of knowledge of what characteristics are under genetic control and what are not, it is possible for racists to claim that what they saw as the dangerous characteristics of other races are deeply embedded in the genetic make-up of those races and are therefore unchangeable by any superficial means. Let me stress again that I am not saying this argument is valid. I am saying that the argument was made. Mendel's genetics may be more scientific than Lamarck or Darwin's evolutionary theories but people will misuse good science as well as bad science.

Noel Weeks
Menai, New South Wales
AUSTRALIA

Biblical limits to geologic correlations

Andrew Snelling mentioned in passing that global scale correlations based on the geological column could assist creationist geologists to build their own models of global catastrophic processes.¹ I am concerned whether the traditional methods for global correlation and stratigraphy are accepted into the creationist framework without a clear theoretical basis. It is obviously desirable to be able to make correlations across the world as this enables a framework to be built. However, if the resultant correlations