

All protoplasmic components, complex organic compounds, and processes show much greater order and complexity. This is evidence for overall control, planning, and specificity of cellular structures. It is more logical and reasonable to accept the Biblical account of special planning and creation by the omniscient God, than it is to assume that the origin of life was inevitable.

References

- ¹Krauskopf, Konrad, and Arthur Beiser. 1966. *Fundamentals of physical science*. Fifth Edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, p. 568.
- ²*Ibid.*, p. 570.
- ³*Ibid.*, p. 570.
- ⁴Storer, Tracy I., and Robert L. Usinger. 1965. *General zoology*. Fourth Edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, p. 69.
- ⁵*Ibid.*, p. 46.
- ⁶Nelson, Gideon, Gerald Robinson, and Richard Boolootian. 1970. *Fundamental concepts of biology*. Second Edition. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, p. 75.
- ⁷Guye, Charles, as quoted in Coffin, Harold G. 1969. *Creation—accident or design?* Review and Herald Publishing Association, Washington, D. C., p. 393.
- ⁸Zimmerman, Paul A. 1956. *Darwin, evolution, and creation*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri, p. 96. as quoted from Lecomte duNouy. 1947. *Human destiny*. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, p. 34.
- ⁹Seb, Adrian, Ray Owen, and Robert Edgar. 1965. *General genetics*. Second Edition. W. H. Freeman and Co., San Francisco, California, p. 297.
- ¹⁰For additional papers regarding the unlikelihood of chemical abiogenesis, consult *Creation Research Society publications*: Gish, Duane T. 1970. The nature of speculations concerning the origin of life, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 7(1):42 ff. June; Parker, Gary E. 1970. The origin of life on earth, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 7(2):97-103. September; Zimmerman, Paul A. 1964. The spontaneous generation of life, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 1(1):13-17. June. Also see Smith, A. E. Wilder. 1970. The creation of life. (A cybernetic approach to evolution.) Harold Shaw Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois 60187.

YOUTH'S DILEMMA WITH ANSWERS FROM MODERN BIOLOGY

JOHN J. GREBE*

No thinking youth can fail to see that, man's mass behavior is most discouraging. A young person knows that man's history, according to ancient records up to the latest TV report, proves a general depravity that is replete with wars, sensuality, and plunder.

Many youths are faced with the stress of believing the generally expressed opinion that there is no guide and no truth for life; that we live under vicious competition which results in the survival of the fittest. Many youths thus have good reasons to put their hope in change alone, change for the better in the broadest and deepest sense.

As man's control over natural sources of energy increases—even to the point of tapping that potent source of energy used by the sun, the atom, the changes man can make become bigger and more pervasive. Thus young people learn that the most powerful nation of the world is forced to act not in obvious common law justice but in fear of the super bomb, the first release of which is now controlled by communistic sadists. They see that we, as individuals, must spend a large portion of our national and private resources of time and energy to protect ourselves against the negligence, the subversive cunning and the violence of man—even in our daily lives.

Youth Believe in "Try and Test"

In search of something new and better, youths turn to what they have been taught to be the source of all progress. They have been led to

believe in the inexorable drive of "spontaneous evolution." "Try and test." That is the way they have been told that evolution works—without a plan, without direction, without rules of the road and without specific objectives. This theory of naturalistic evolution has been taught in their books from the nursery and on through college. Unfortunately, evolution theory permeates the literatures of a majority of their churches too.

But the current indoctrination of our youth has failed. In a day when many religionists teach that the old moralist precepts are obsolete, it is the teaching of evolutionary faith instead that has become obsolete as a result of new and a million times as precise biological data. Top scientists in their fields have shown the errors of current evolution theory and youth can see the facts by turning to the field of biology.

"Evolution" Refuted by New Data

One of the most potent of the top scientists who testify to this is Dr. George Gaylord Simpson—head paleontologist of Harvard and American Chairman of the Darwin Centennial celebration of Chicago, 1959. Dr. Simpson and many other scientists have studied data gathered by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance instruments that measure the exact forces and distances between individual atoms in the DNA and which identify precisely the specific atoms, the kinds of bonds, their locations, and their interrelations.

They have seen that the DNA code of man, which determines his inheritance, is so far removed from that of any other mammal, that if man's flesh could have been "evolved" from that of any other living organism, it would more likely

*John J. Grebe is a distinguished scientist. See dedication article, this issue.

be the snake. Dr. Simpson has stated that man must have branched off far down in the evolutionary ladder because of this difference in DNA components, and Dr. Simpson even allows for possible creation by a Superior Power.

Implications of these new data are seldom discussed as professors, who know, realize that it makes their old suppositions, their life's work look ridiculous. It will take real work on the part of creationist scientists and independent citizens to convey correct implications of the new scientific findings of the new science of molecular biology. Or else we will have to wait another generation!

Simpson has explained also that the first human couple must have been produced by the equivalent of virgin birth from the same flesh. He acknowledges that the fantastically small changes favoring origin by evolution of one specific kind of life (man) could not be duplicated (at the same time and place) to yield the first mating pair. This is because the DNA of plants and man are all equally complex in their basic atom arrangement and sequential structure. Fantastic detail is built into them. Each atom carries many, points of information defining the inheritance of the offspring.

Dr. Bruce Wallace wrote a book in 1966 to bolster the shaky theory of evolution. He admitted that there is no proof of evolution; he admitted that there simply is no such evidence, nor can there ever be. He also unwittingly gave evidence for order, system, plan, direction and the utmost efficiency in the use of genetic material—all these being contrary to the basic tenets of evolution by chance and random actions. It is preposterous to believe, as evolutionists do, that organisms which are billions of times more complex and efficient than a jet liner were produced by random origin and assemblage of parts by hit and miss chances!

Evolutionary Improvement Impossible

In December, 1969, thirteen high ranking scientists each reported on what might be future evolutionary improvements of man.¹ None expected any improvements by chance! One scientist, Dr. Thomas H. Jukes, Assistant Director of the Space Sciences Laboratory at Berkeley, cast sly ridicule at the whole idea of chance improvements by proposing, in clever sarcasm, that population expansion be limited by mental control.

Human DNA contains about three billion base pairs on which random single points of mutation come about accidentally every one or two years. About 10,000 point mutations would be needed to allow for control of the discharge of semen by the mind. Accumulating about 10,000 point mutations by chance (all in the right places, directions, and kinds out of 10^{87} wrong ones—of

the three billion possible spots—without any undesirable changes elsewhere) would thus require at the very least 10,000 years. Furthermore, reproducing this variant in the mate would require virgin birth.

Dr. Jukes' point is clearly made! Most people know that doses of X-ray (which produce random mutation) can lead to the formation of deformity and imbecility but not to improved progeny. Thus actual improvement by mutation has been proven impossible during some 40 years of research studies on billions of fruit flies. One can then understand that the concept of evolution is a blind FAITH in random action.

Consequently, part of youths dilemma arises from the fact that evolutionary theory is the foundation for "the" one philosophy of life that is legal to teach in our public schools—naturalism. Even many church supported colleges teach Marx's and Lenin's assumptions as the supposed scientific basis for existence and behavior. With such educational training and philosophy, our youth cannot help but become aimless, drifting probers. At best they look for the subjective and undefined "common good." Some young people say, "Our test is what gets by—what survives." The question is not what is right, or wrong, but what can they get by with. Can you blame them? Remember they are taught that there are no absolutes, excepting the survival of the fittest. This has become their philosophy—their religion! They believe it is based on infallible science when in reality evolution was never more than an hypothesis, because it does not have the supporting evidence required to rate it as a possible theory. Nazis and Communists all live and act by this philosophy. Yet the concept of evolution precludes the comprehension of man as a fallen creation, in need of regeneration.

Important Personal Anecdote

I was fortunate to recognize that the haughty teacher who tried to teach evolution to me in grade school, in Germany, was a tool of materialistic thinkers. I do not know how many of Hitler's youths the teacher did inspire. But right here, in the United States, today, some of the nicest teachers, using government financed textbooks, dutifully expound random formation and survival of the fittest in the name of unfailling science.

This is in great contrast to what I found in the grade, high school, and college level upon coming to this country in 1914. Then I learned to share and enjoy the love of all natural things from inspiring teachers. I was left with a firm faith that all things are for the good of those who love the Creator. What a pity it is that youths are now brought to feel alone—even cut off from parents by the so-called "science" taught to them

by unwitting followers of materialistic philosophy.

It is here that personal action enters. Since this "evolutionistic bunk" called "science" has been totally discredited, we must see that the "inputs" of the educational process are changed. Computers have built-in barriers to inconsistent, incomplete and illogical inputs. The minds of our youth should not be expected to sort out the conflicting and internally incongruent idea of random chance beginning of fantastic order, lest they continue to respond with their nonsense probing of anything they please.

One Texas couple—the Mel Gablers—has been a stalwart example, showing what can be accomplished. They worked untiringly for eight years and wrought profound changes in the Texas state textbook situation, all because their son rebelled against evolutionary biases presented to him in

the classroom. This son is now an expert in computer logic.

The answer to youth's dilemma lies in the data of modern molecular biology. The complexity of cell structure and biochemical intricacy of DNA point unerringly to Divine special creation. Rather than pointing to an ethic of "survival of the fittest" by try this, try that, the knowledge of modern biology directs one back to the Bible, the "Wisdom of the Ages." Herein is direct knowledge gained about creation of life, the fall and history of man, personal salvation through Jesus Christ, and guidance for daily life.

Youth needs to experience this other knowledge—let's begin the task!

Reference

¹Jukes, Thomas H. 1969. Cerebral contraception. *The Sciences* (New York Academy of Science), 9(12):18. December.

ROCHE'S LIMIT AND THE PATTEN EPIC*

PHILIP H. HOFF†

The flood mechanism postulated by Patten¹ depends critically upon Roche's limit. Since Patten did not provide a reference to Roche, and since this writer is not an astronomer, a great deal of searching of the literature was necessary to establish that there indeed ever had been such a person as Roche who had calculated a limit.

Reference to E. Roche's work was found finally in the writings of J. H. Jeans.² The journal in which Roche published over 100 years ago is not available in the library of the University of California at Berkeley, if indeed it is still published.³ I am, therefore, indebted to Jeans for his re-derivation of Roche's limit.

Two Objections Raised

There are two aspects of Roche's formulation that combine to make it completely unsuitable for the purposes to which Patten tries to put it. The first aspect or objection is that the very involved mathematics required to compute Roche's limit are predicated on the presence of only two gravitationally interacting and perfectly spherical bodies.

Suppose that Mercury was indeed an "invader" from deep space. As it approached the earth, how many bodies would have a significant gravitational interaction? Of course the earth would be one and Mercury would be another. The sun would certainly affect the balance of forces sig-

nificantly, and the moon probably would also, depending on its position.

If the ice (which Patten postulates Mercury carried) were present as an icy satellite, it would be the fifth gravitationally interacting body. Thus on this basis alone it would be necessary to reject application of Roche's limit to the problem. If Mercury carried the ice in the form of rings, then the deep space invader would not be a perfect spheroid. This, combined with the multiplicity of interacting bodies, would invalidate the Patten hypothesis.

The second objection to Patten's use of Roche's limit is much more fundamental. To introduce this objection let us inquire whether or not physical intuition would suggest a dependence of the critical distance for fragmentation on the material of the fragmenting body and/or its size. If not, why do not our communications satellites fragment? Why doesn't everything on earth fragment?

All objects on earth are certainly within Roche's limit. Yet Roche's formulation shows no dependence on these factors. Is it in error then? The answer is that, as far as can be determined, it is not in error, since it was derived only for liquid bodies.

Other Aspects of Roche's Limit

This information answers the questions of dependence on material and size. The requirement that the bodies be liquid precludes the possibility that the fragmenting body has any tensile strength. It is because of differences in this quantity that we would intuitively expect one solid body to be harder to "tear apart" than an-

*EDITOR'S NOTE: See "The Ice Age Phenomenon and a Possible Explanation" by Donald Wesley Patten, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 3(1):63-72. May, 1986.

†Philip H. Hoff, Ph.D., is associate professor of electrical engineering, Chico State College.