

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

are incorrect, the framework will mislead rather than assist our understanding.

For correlations to be scientific they must have a theoretical basis. The evolutionist has a theoretical basis in using fossils to correlate because he assumes that evolution is unidirectional. Of course this is a difficult case to defend, even from within their own assumptions. Correlations based on individual species are subject to change if the relative ranges of species are revised by further study. There are no known transitions in which one form is replaced by another similar one and there is a lack of theoretical basis for putting one form before another in time. But from a biblical perspective, all the animals buried by the Flood were alive at the same time. If fossils are to be used as a basis for worldwide correlation in a biblical model, a completely new construction is required.

What theoretical basis is there for expecting world-wide correlations during the Deluge? There is no event I would expect to be synchronous during the Deluge on a worldwide scale. There are likely to be similar processes in different regions, but I can see no reason why these could be correlated in either a one-year Deluge or in subsequent events. The best I would expect is to be able to distinguish early, mid, late and post-Deluge with vague boundaries between these.

In geology the most basic study is often a stratigraphic section or drill hole. Distinct events are evident at this scale. When one examines a formation or a basin, the temptation again is to correlate. At this scale, however, time correlation is flawed. Any erosional event would start in an area of uplift and result in local deposits. As the area of erosion grows, so does the area of deposition. Erosion in one place happens synchronously with deposition elsewhere. Obviously the start of the deluge should be a recognisable event at any location. However, the first deposits at any point on the pre-Deluge surface could be

months different in age.

Correlation may be possible if there were a similar pattern of events in the early part of the Deluge. For example, there could have been a continent-scale tectonic event resulting in deposition of predominantly non-fossiliferous sediments, then sediments with marine fossils and later still, sediments with terrestrial fossils. However, there seems to be no reason why deposits classified as Cambrian, Silurian or even Permian could not have been deposited simultaneously in different parts of the world as part of the same tectonic process.

If plate tectonics were a significant factor during the Deluge, its onset could provide a theoretical basis for correlation. Yet even here there is a problem. Why should plate tectonics have commenced simultaneously in all parts of the world? I would expect fragmentation of the crust to begin in one place and spread at different rates in different directions.

As creationists we need to build on the foundation of what God has revealed in the biblical record. Let us be careful not to build using assumptions that are not supported by clearly explained theoretical reasons. We may not agree amongst ourselves about the theories, but with the reasons explained they may be debated openly.

Robert Lawrence
Camden Park, South Australia
AUSTRALIA

References

1. Snelling, A. A., Book review of 'Ancient ice ages or gigantic submarine landslides' by Michael J. Oard, *CEN Tech. J.* 12(3):270, 1999.

The origin of languages

Before presenting any academic paper for publication, it is imperative

that one must carry out sufficient research for the given topic and base one's theories and assumptions upon what is generally acknowledged as fact. This obviously was not the case regarding Thomas C. Curtis' article, *The origin of languages: a synthesis*.¹ While Mr Curtis is to be commended for attempting to address one of the greatest puzzles of human history, I am afraid that sound scholars of the Bible and other disciplines would be compelled to agree with me in saying that many — if not most — of his hypotheses are based on little more than wishful thinking and guesswork.

So, while it is not expedient here for me to proffer corrective explanations for every point of Mr Curtis' article that I consider to be erroneous, I shall limit myself to address only a few.

1. Mr Curtis offered no evidence whatsoever to support his claim that Neolithic Europe was peopled by the descendants of Ham. On the contrary, it is generally accepted that the European peninsula was settled by the descendants of Japheth: the offspring of Javan throughout the Mediterranean region;² and central and northern Europe by Gomerites.³ To associate Javan with the Far East is surely a misinterpretation of Scripture, especially that of 1 Kings 10:22. The AV tells us that King Solomon '*had at sea a navy of Tarshish*' that once in three years brought exotic goods (including apes and peacocks) to Israel. Mr Curtis has rightly pointed out that these creatures are not native to the Mediterranean lands, and he thus presupposes that the land of Tarshish must have lain far to the east. However, the Bible does not say that these exotic species came from Tarshish, but merely that they were carried to Israel by ships of Tarshish. In fact, one interesting Hebrew translation of Scripture explains to us that Solomon had a large fleet of 'Tarshish' ships,⁴ implying that these vessels were similar in design to those built by the sea-going people of the land of Tarshish.⁵ Incidentally, if any further proof were required of the