

## THE GENESIS KINDS AND HYBRIDIZATION: HAS MAN EVER CROSSED WITH ANY ANIMAL?\*

FRANK L. MARSH\*\*

*In the opinion of some, basic types of organisms have hybridized in the past, and certain modern races of men have resulted from a man-beast cross. A review of pertinent literature shows that it abounds with unreliable reports on the crossing of plants and of animals. With regard to man, modern anthropologists and geneticists agree in the opinion that human beings have never crossed with any animal.*

*Genetically the morphological differences between two basic types of organisms result from their different DNA's. The pattern of the nucleotides in the hereditary material determines the basic type of the organism. In order to hybridize, individuals must have the same general DNA pattern. All relevant laboratory data indicate that if the general DNA patterns are different, then a chemical incompatibility exists between these basic types which makes true fertilization, and resultantly hybridization, impossible.*

*In the light of modern findings, the fact that, according to Genesis 1 and 2, all basic types existing on the earth have been present since creation week, guarantees to Bible believers that every basic type of organism, including the human type, is 100% pure type in all its generations.*

### Introduction

Numberless written biological excursions into the wonderful realm of living plants and animals are possible, but the purpose of this discussion is to inquire into the problem of the extent to which hybridization can occur among basic types of organisms. Specifically, the goal before us here is to acquaint ourselves with the possibility or impossibility that man has ever formed a hybrid with any animal.

If a man has crossed with a beast and thereby produced a new race, some theological implications would immediately appear. Would the hybrid race have souls to be saved? Would such a race be included among those for whom Christ died? If they did appear and were included, then did Christ die in part to redeem animals? By crossing with men, could animals share in the plan of salvation? But before we get lost in speculation, what are the pertinent revealed and natural facts about hybridizing (sometimes called amalgamation) among basic types?

### Records Examined

One might say, "Well, that will be easy! Just go to the records." But only he who has gone to the records knows how soon such an inquirer is immersed in general confusion, even in the accounts given by assumedly reputable naturalists. Likewise in recent times have you heard that the grapefruit is a cross between a grape and either an orange or lemon, and that the wobbie is reported to be a hybrid between a carrot and a beet<sup>1</sup>—and on among plants until the false tales number almost *ad infinitum*?

\*Appreciation is expressed to editors of the *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, who had prior right to this article, for granting permission for an early publication at this time.

\*\*Frank L. Marsh, Ph.D., is professor of biology, emeritus, at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan.

With animals the reports are just as unreliable. Did you see in letters to the editor of *Time*,<sup>2</sup> a photograph of what was said to be a cross between a hare and a grouse-like bird, the capercaillie; and on the front page of *The Denver Post*,<sup>3</sup> the photo of what was said to be a cross between a Persian-Angora cat and a Pekinese dog; and in the *Live Stock Journal*,<sup>4</sup> did you read about the reported cross between pigs and sheep? And did you read in *Science and Scripture*,<sup>5</sup> about what has been done with cloning by Stanford's Lederberg, and of resulting surmizings which even included the prediction of a coming day when entire sub-human parts and even whole animals may be made to order?

During my many years of teaching college biology, I was told confidentially at various times by a number of students, of cases they had *heard about* where man and animal had produced a hybrid. However, I will insert briefly at this point, the fact that modern reputable geneticists agree that all these reports are completely groundless.

With this mingling of hearsay, gossip, imagination, inaccurate reporting, and efforts toward practical jokes, we find the records in a bad state of confusion even in modern times. What can we expect from earlier times, or even during the early days of our scientific age? Wild untruths were abundant and repeated for fact during the superstitious times of the Dark Ages when witchcraft and misinformation about nature abounded. During those days it was commonly considered to be possible for man to cross with beast.

We can only wish that the changes accompanying the Renaissance and the shift to the inductive method of reasoning had cleared all such unfounded accounts from the record. An illustration of the confusion among scientists of some over a century ago on the subject of crossing, is

furnished by the report of Samuel G. Morton, M.D., read before the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia in 1846, in which he fantastically, but soberly, records the production of offspring from a natural bull x sheep cross.<sup>6</sup>

It is of special interest to read the word picture which Uriah Smith gave of the beliefs of naturalists of the early 1800's with regard to the extent of crossing of man with beast. In his small booklet which commonly goes by the name of "Objections Answered," 1868, Smith wrote,

Moreover, naturalists affirm that the line of demarkation between the human and animal races is lost in confusion. It is impossible, as they affirm, to tell just where the human ends and the animal begins. . . . Whatever races of men we may take, Bushmen, Hottentots, Patagonians, (and on page 103, Digger Indians of the United States), or any class of people, however low they may apparently be in the scale of humanity, their mental capabilities are in every instance the basis on which we are to work, and by which we determine whether they are subjects of moral government or not.<sup>7</sup>

If this opinion of the naturalists in Smith's day regarding crossing were a correct picture, the "human" race would indeed present a perplexing problem for the personal worker. Which man had a soul and which was a soulless animal? Would the gospel commission urge the believer through steaming and dangerous jungles to bring the good news to a population of "men" who had no souls to save?

We are glad to be able to report that anthropologists, after over a century of study of these less civilized races since Smith's day, are now united in their opinion that every living race or breed of man is *entirely human*, having no mingled "blood" with the beasts. Of course the evolutionists hold that man developed upward through the beasts. But even they agree that *after he became a man* he has never been able to cross (back) with any animal. The special creationist is happy to *know* that *all* of man's ancestors have been human beings, and that all modern men are bona fide descendants of Adam who was the son of God (Luke 3:38).

#### Positions of Geneticists, Medical Scientists

The testimony on man's crossability, the unanimous opinion of all reputable genetic scientists, is exemplified by the geneticist E. C. Colin in the following words: "In ancient times various superstitious beliefs grew up around double monsters; some people even maintained that they were the hybrid offspring of man with some other mammal (hairy animal). As a matter of fact, there is no evidence of the origin of a hybrid between man and any other mammal."<sup>8</sup>

Colin has laid his finger on what was generally the origin of stories of man-beast crossing. By the geneticist, any offspring which is in any way abnormal in appearance is often referred to as a "monster." "Monster" in these cases does not necessarily refer to a dragon-like beast, but merely to a new-born which shows a variance in appearance from the normal. We will not agree with Pliny who said, "Nature created monsters for the purpose of astonishing us and amusing herself," but we do recognize the sad and not infrequent occurrence at birth of deformed infants.

Medical scientists believe that these malformations result from developmental failure, arrest, or excess, and from fusion or splitting and displacement before birth. However, in olden times before genetic and medical knowledge had hardly begun to accumulate, if the malformed infant in appearance gave some farfetched suggestion of a dog, for example, tongues began to wag that there had been an affair with a dog. Or if the malformed did not suggest some animal, then it was thought that either some witch in the neighborhood had cast a spell over the prospective mother, or that she herself was possessed of an evil spirit.

Through the centuries, as folk have become acquainted with numerous strange and wild accounts of assumed man-beast crosses, it is not surprising that eventually even some intelligent folk have almost unconsciously followed along in that direction in their own thoughts. The man-beast-cross fallacy has been more or less inherited from the past, and resultingly, confusion at even high levels on this point is not uncommon today. It is appropriate that we examine this problem and discover as many pertinent facts as space allows. For convenience we will divide the subject under these headings: (1) In the Scriptures, (2) In nature, (3) Significance of virility, and (4) Uniformity in nature.

#### (1) In the Scriptures

The account of creation in Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 makes very clear that by the close of creation week the landscape was verdent with plants in all their basic types from lowly carpeting forms to the lofty trees; from the mighty oak to the lichens on its bark, and to the delicate herbaceous forms blossoming prettily at its base.

All kinds of animals swam in the waters, burrowed in the ground, crept, walked, and moved lightly over the land, climbed the trees, and in variable sizes from the insect mote in the sunshine to the giant *Teratornis*, flew through the air. According to the record each of these organisms was created after its kind with a form and structure which, when compared with all

other living things, constituted a discrete, clearly delimited unit in nature.

Reasoning deductively, we ask, "Would an omniscient Creator bring into being all this wonderful plethora of basic types, types manifesting distinctly different morphologies (appearances) and at the same time, make them so similar physiologically (chemically) that they could cross helter-skelter and in a few generations erase the beautiful, clear-cut discontinuity of diversity?"

### Verses in Genesis

The answer to this question is found in Genesis 1:11, 12. But in the KJV of the Hebrew Holy Bible, these two verses are sufficiently ambiguous to permit doubt to be cast upon any reference being made here to the reproductive behavior of plants. In this version it might be concluded that only reference to differences in appearance is made, that is, the reference is purely taxonomic.

However, in more recent translations this ambiguity vanishes as we read, Genesis 1:12 RSV: "The earth brought forth vegetation, *plants yielding seed according to their own kinds*, and trees bearing fruit in which is their seed, each according to its own kind."<sup>9</sup> (Emphasis added); and NEB: "So it was; the earth yielded fresh growth, *plants bearing seed according to their kind and trees bearing fruit each with seed according to its kind.*"<sup>10</sup> (Emphasis added)

Kenneth N. Taylor expresses the thought of Genesis 1:11, 12, which is set forth not only in these two translations, but also in the large majority of Bible commentaries when he paraphrases these verses as follows: "And He said, 'Let the earth burst forth with every sort of grass and seed-bearing plant, and fruit trees with seeds inside the fruit, *so that these seeds will produce the kinds of plants and fruits they came from*.' And so it was, and God was pleased."<sup>11</sup> (Emphasis added)

In the original Hebrew it will be recognized that Taylor is grammatically correct in his three groups of plants; and he does state the majority opinion of Bible commentators that reproduction is involved, and, among plants, results in offspring which belong to the same kind as their parents. It seems reasonable to assume if such were the case with the plants, so was it true also with the animals. Empirical evidence from the modern scientific laboratory supports such behavior among animals.

To express it mildly, in the light of Genesis 1:12, it is difficult to understand how one basic type could cross with another basic type (as man with a beast) if the law of creation dictated that their reproductive performance was to be such as to bring forth only additional individuals of the same kind as their parents. In the face of

this clear record we dare not say, "Oh yes, generally that was true, but there may have been an occasional exception." Laboratory findings today demonstrate that, *without exception*, basic types are so different in their cellular chemistry as to make a departure from the law of each after its kind physically impossible. Again we get glimpses of the handiwork of an omniscient Creator.

The assertion in Genesis 6:12 RSV, "And God saw the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth," was once taken to suggest that possibly a crossing of man and beast is here suggested. However, question is cast upon such speculation when we read Genesis 6:12 NEB: "In his sight the world had become corrupted, for all men had lived corrupt lives on earth." This translation suggests to us that the expression "all flesh" does not necessarily include animals.

It would appear that the only verse in which these versions unitedly and indirectly suggest that in their behavior animals had gone astray from the original intention, is Genesis 6:7. We read in RSV: "And the Lord said, I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the ground, man and beast and creeping things and birds of the air, for I am sorry I have made them." KJV and NEB agree with RSV in their translations in this verse.

At the close of creation week it is recorded in Genesis 1:31 RSV, "And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good." So most obviously something had occurred among men and animals during the succeeding sixteen centuries which caused God to declare, at the time of Noah's flood, that He was sorry that He had made them.

Remembering the law of creation which prevented crossing of basic kinds, we could speculate that possibly at the close of creation week variants within created types were distributed over the earth in different ecological habitats, depending on their adaptation to specific temperatures and moisture conditions, so that in the over-all view they presented a beautiful mosaic pattern of geographic distribution. Under stable conditions of environmental factors, these populations would remain isolated in their respective original areas.

However, with the entrance of sin, accompanying temperature and moisture changes would cause these variants within a kind to wander from original habitats, meet other members of their kind, and hybridize to such an extent as completely to confuse and erase the original beautiful pattern of distribution. It seems wise to conclude that whatever had occurred among living things to cause them in the sight of God,

by the time of Noah to deserve annihilation, it probably was not fusion of types.

It is helpful here to bear in mind that among the fossils there is often great variation within kinds, yet at the same time, a prevailing clear-cut discontinuity between kinds. In other words, evidence for the general crossing of basic kinds is absent. Those few forms which suggest an amalgamation of types could well have been created in their respective patterns. At the same time, the confusion of variants *within* basic types could have resulted from an intratypal amalgamation among originally created variants. Thus it is that the fossil evidence serves to substantiate our speculation regarding an original mosaic pattern of ecological variants within created types.

### Verses in Leviticus

It has been averred that Leviticus 20:15, 16 RSV, "If a man lies with a beast, he shall be put to death; and you shall kill the beast. If a woman approaches any beast and lies with it, you shall kill the woman and the beast," is proof that in the 13th century B.C. it was possible for man-beast hybrids to result from such intercourse, and the death of the female partner was imposed to prevent the birth of such a creature. However, if that were the case, how shall we understand verse 13 RSV, "If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall be put to death, their blood is upon them"?

Certainly male-with-male cohabitation could produce no offspring, and yet the partners in this act were to be killed as dead as in the case of a man with a beast. Taylor's paraphrase of Leviticus 18:22-24 may be helpful here: "Homosexuality is absolutely forbidden, for it is an enormous sin. A man shall have no sexual intercourse with any female animal, thus defiling himself; and a woman must never give herself to a male animal, to mate with it; this is a terrible perversion. Do not defile yourselves in any of these ways. . . ."<sup>11</sup>

We would suggest that in none of these situations is the penalty meted because of possibility of offspring. Rather, those involved have given indication of a greatly debased and immoral state of being and under the Mosaic Law were therefore deserving of death.

Perhaps at this point I should make it very clear that there is a vast difference biologically between *crossing* with a beast and having sexual *intercourse* with a beast. It is common knowledge with a great many folk, and to the shame of the whole race of man, that depraved humans have had, and are having, intercourse with just about every animal on earth with whom such an act is mechanically possible. We are *not* referring alone to this sexual act in our discussion.

Instead, the specific point of our study is, has it ever been possible for man to *cross* with a beast, and by the word "cross" we mean produce man-beast hybrid offspring. The historical fact that certain eastern religions included sexual intercourse with animals is invalid as far as proof for a man-beast cross is concerned. Albeit, the greater the occurrence of these unfruitful human cohabitations with beasts the more conclusive is the inductive evidence against the possibility of a man-beast cross.

Leviticus 19:19 and Deuteronomy 22:9 have been thought by some to suggest that different created kinds could cross. The reading of the pertinent portions of these verses is as follows: Leviticus 19:19 RSV: "You shall not let your cattle breed with a diverse kind: you shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed; nor shall there come upon you a garment of cloth made of two kinds of stuff;" and Deuteronomy 22:9 RSV: "You shall not sow your vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest the whole yield be forfeited to the sanctuary."

In the first place, we must bear in mind that the word "kind" in the Bible does not always refer to the major created kind. For instance, in Leviticus 11:22 RSV the term is applied separately to clusters of individuals as minor as "the locust" and the "bald locust." If the reader feels that these verses in the preceding paragraph suggest the ability of two created major kinds to cross, he should consult the numerous standard Bible commentaries.

Not one of these authorities believes that more than crossing within original kinds is concerned. To illustrate, Adam Clark says that the prohibition against the breeding of cattle with a diverse kind "implies that the horse and the she-ass were not to be permitted to couple" (both are breeds of a single basic type, the horse kind (in the Scriptures the word "cattle" includes in part, cows, horses, goats, sheep, and camels).

These verses are puzzling to commentators. For instance they know that the prohibition notwithstanding, mules were bred in the time of David and Ahab (2 Samuel 18:1; 1 Kings 1:33; 18:5). Commentators suggest that the intent of these verses is probably to teach the lesson of purity. The Israelites were to respect the laws of nature, and there was something unnatural and even irreverent in the crossing of different breeds of stock, and in mingling two kinds of seed in a field and linen and wool in the same garment. The basic truth taught through these regulations may have been that purity in domestic life lies at the root of national prosperity.

### (2) In Nature

In earlier portions of this discussion we have already called attention to a number of demon-

strable natural facts which bear upon the problem of the crossability of the basic types of plants and animals. Today natural investigation has proceeded to the point where it is *known* that it is *impossible* to cross the basic kinds, kinds illustrated by men, horses, cows, dogs, cats, oaks, maples, roses, and gladioli. Thus it is that we *know* that, at least since the days of modern science, man has crossed with *no* mammal, in accordance with Colin's statement quoted earlier.

Since the time that such records have been kept, we know that man cannot even cross with apes. Some years ago, while discussing this problem of man-beast cross with the noted geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky then of Columbia University, he wrote in a personal letter under date of May 31, 1945, that Russian biologists had just completed a more or less all-out attempt to cross man with apes through artificial insemination, but had been entirely unsuccessful. Hybrids did not even begin to develop.

Understandably we find vigorous resistance to the concept of man being an animal. However, in the biological realm all living organisms are classed as either plants or animals. With which category will you identify yourself as a member? I join those who believe it unfitting to call man an animal because of the fact that he was created in the image of God, has the power of conceptual reasoning, and is possessed of a soul to save. Such striking differences from animals should place him in a separate and most unique category.

However, we recognize a great deal of similarity between man and animals, chiefly physiological, but in a broad way there are also many morphological characteristics which are common to both. This is not surprising when we remember Genesis and the fact that both man and beast were made from the same chemical elements, and were given the same basic foodstuffs (See Genesis 2:7, 19; 1:29, 30).

The term "foodstuffs" includes any substances which have food value in the bodies of organisms. Generally speaking, for *all* organisms there are six categories of foods: carbohydrates, fats (lipids), proteins, water, inorganic salts (minerals), and vitamins. Man and beast, as it were, sit down together at the same table.

#### Importance of DNA

Utilizing the food eaten, men and animals synthesize within their bodies many complex substances. For our purpose here, let us select the synthesized macromolecules called nucleic acids, of which there are two classes, deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) and ribonucleic acid (RNA). These complex substances are composed of a five-carbon sugar (either deoxyribose or ribose), phosphorous, and several different

nitrogen-containing organic molecules known as purines and pyrimidines.

Taking the word of molecular biologists, it may be almost a startling experience for a person to learn for the first time that DNA constitutes the genetic material of *all* organisms (except where RNA serves instead in certain viruses). And to add to that knowledge that only two purines (always adenine and guanine), and only two pyrimidines (always thymine and cytosine), constitute the key material of this most important hereditary substance, whether in man, elephant, or jellyfish.

To illustrate, in the matter of their hereditary mechanism, the only difference between a man and a mouse is in the longitudinal sequences of these same four nucleotides (always joined adenine to thymine and guanine to cytosine), in the DNA molecule (the gene) in the chromosomes within the nucleus of each cell.

The DNA's in the fused nuclei of the fertilized egg serve as a coded set of building instructions which direct the production of the chemical substances which in turn accomplish the multiplication and differentiation of cells in the embryo in such a way as to build a man or a mouse from the same basic foodstuffs. In man the DNA's are the same in every cell of his body, and the same is true in the mouse, but the DNA's of man are not the same as those of the mouse.

The difference appears to lie in the infinite arrangement of the pairs of nucleotides in longitudinal series in the DNA molecules of the organism. It has been estimated that the number of possible sequences is larger than the number of subatomic particles in the universe. We believe we begin to see the plan the Creator followed as He filled our earth with numberless wonderfully challenging forms of life. (For additional information here see more detailed expositions, for instance, Loewy and Siekevitz.<sup>12</sup>).

The simplicity with complexity in the plan is the amazing part, and we are led to conclude that indeed "chance" alone could never have wrought so perfect a system for the production of life from like in so great a complexity of chemical substances. The handiwork of a Supreme Being, Who to the scientist is an Honest Workman, stands clearly revealed. As sincere truth-seekers in a natural world, we endeavor to think His thoughts after Him.

#### Compatibility Tests Interpreted

That the bodies of man and hairy animals are physiologically quite similar, and yet different, has recently been demonstrated still more fully in the laboratory in experiments which have achieved DNA hybridization. Some interesting tissue cultures have been carried on in which soma (body) cells of various animals are brought

together in a single culture. Some hybridization of DNA has taken place.

One of the most interesting cases of such hybridization occurred when human embryonic lung fibroblasts were grown in the same culture with a strain of mouse fibroblasts. In this association, in some cases, human and mouse chromosomes appeared in the same cell. Albeit from 75 to 95 percent of the human complement or set of chromosomes did not appear in the hybrid cells, and continued growth of the hybrid line resulted in slow elimination of *all* human chromosomes. (For further detail see Weiss and Green<sup>13</sup> and Rabovsky.<sup>14</sup>)

Such cellular behavior shows considerable chemical compatibility between the protoplasm of man and that of the mouse, and still the compatibility is not close enough to permit the two protoplasms to unit in the development of healthy hybrid lung tissue. To the creationist, such behavior in tissue cultures helps corroborate empirically the statements of Genesis which portray man and animals originating from the same materials, the dust of the earth, and sustaining themselves with the same basic foodstuffs, at the command of one Creator.

Does the fact that the arrangement of the *same* four nucleotides constitutes the hereditary mechanism of all plants and animals make it more possible or less possible that man has ever crossed with a beast? Molecular biologists assure us that the DNA's of each basic type of animal are different from those of all other animals. This means that chemical incompatibility exists between the sex cells of all these discrete types and results in failure of fertilization of the egg in all cases except among members of the same type. Man and beast might engage in sexual intercourse but they cannot hybridize.

Does tissue culture data, which demonstrates that a few of the chromosomes of a man can coexist for a few weeks in the same cell with mouse chromosomes, suggest that man has ever crossed with a beast? No!

Up to the present, these data show that man and mouse DNA's are so incompatible as to result in the eventual casting out of the human DNA's.

The formation of a man-beast hybrid would require much more than the tissue-culture results can promise. The infinitely more delicate and finely balanced chemical set-up which must exist between the chromosomes of the male and those of the female in fertilization is a far cry from the short period of coexistence which has occurred *in vitro*. In the cultures only a few chromosomes of man could abide even briefly with those of the mouse.

In fertilization *all* the chromosomes of the male (containing all the male DNA's) must

cooperate compatibly with *all* the female chromosomes (containing all the female DNA's), not only for a short period but throughout the life of the hybrid. To add to the difficulty of hybrid formation, are the common differences in chromosome numbers. Man has 46 chromosomes in each cell while, for example, members of the *Pongidae* family (the man-apes) have more or less than 46. To illustrate, the chimpanzee has 48 and the gibbon 44. All results from tissue cultures constitute negative evidence for the formation of a man-beast hybrid.

Both among living things and among fossils, variation is one of the most universal characteristics. However, as we begin to study variation, we soon discover another universal fact. This is the discontinuity of diversity among plants and animals. Organisms, living or fossil, in their multitudinous varieties cannot be arranged in such a way that there is a continuous unbroken series from simplest in structure to those which are more complex, nor can one variant be traced through a continuous series to a markedly different variant.

Instead, we observe that variation is discontinuous, so that rather than a graded series of individuals we find separate clusters of similar forms, a fact which makes possible, with the greatest ease, to distinguish corn and wheat, violets and windflowers, horses and cows, men and chimpanzees. If either hybridization of kinds or "evolution" of kinds had occurred in nature, this discontinuity would not exist. The difference in form and structure among basic types of organisms, the discontinuity, reproductively constitute bridgeless abysses.

### (3) Significance of Virility

Virility as applied to our problem refers to power of procreation and, in males, concerns itself only with numbers of germ cells and length of period of fertility of the male. In other words, it has nothing to do with the crossing of a man with a beast. As far as actual fertilization goes, crossing has to do with the exact matching of the DNA's, and if the DNA's of the partners do not match, twenty million sperms could do no more than one.

Abraham was a virile man in that he fathered six sons after he was well past an age of one hundred years (Genesis 25:1, 2). However, even his great virility would have accomplished nothing in the matter of crossing with an ape. Human DNA-component plus chimpanzee DNA-component = 0.000 hybrids.

### (4) Uniformity in Nature

As far as I know, objections of creationists to the idea of uniformity arise only when assumptions of uniformists run counter to the clear as-

sertions of special revelation. There is certainly nothing unscientific or unbiblical in the assumption in biology that the life principles, the natural laws on our earth, have continued in a uniform manner since creation week. In fact, it would seem a reasonable view to hold that harmony between Genesis and present-day nature depends upon the *uniformity* of life principles since creation week.

Actually, to assume that life principles which were implemented at creation have *not* prevailed down through the centuries gives encouragement to such inharmonious ideas as spontaneous generation and organic evolution. The cosmos in which we live would quickly become a chaos if these natural laws were capricious. Charles Darwin wandered off into a land of make-believe after he concluded there were no law-bound forces in nature.

Suppose I said to you, "After the flood it is possible that Noah, for very joy in getting out of the ark, leaped right over the 45-foot-high ridgepole of his ponderous structure." Suppose you replied, "But it would have been impossible for a man to jump that high!" Then, suppose I shrugged my shoulders and said, "Oh, I know it isn't possible today, but it just might have been possible then!" Would you think I was a careful and accurate supposer?

Suppose I said to you, "I know it is impossible today for man to cross with any animal, but I still believe that it just might have been possible a long time ago." Then, suppose you reminded me that all basic types of animals have different DNA's, in fact that is why they do not all look alike, and for that very reason crossing of kinds would always have been impossible; in fact the nearer to creation, possibly the more clearly different would have been the DNA's of the basic types. Then, suppose I shrugged my shoulders again and replied, "Oh, yes, but I still believe it just might have happened!" And then you said to me, "But Dr. M. . . .!"—well, you complete the statement.

In conclusion, I will state that it is my opinion that the creationist may (in fact is quite required to) conclude, from a study of both revealed truth and natural truth, that Genesis kinds have never crossed. No man needs to believe that he or any of his fellow men have within their bodies any of the genetic material of animals. Paul declared that God had "made of *one* blood all . . . men

for to dwell on all the face of the earth," (Acts 17:26). This leaves no percentage of ape-men.

The first ancestors of every race of men, no matter how he or she may differ in appearance from Father Adam and Mother Eve, were formed from the dust of the earth (Genesis 2:7), in the image of God (Genesis 1:26, 27), the son (or daughter) of God (Luke 3:38). By virtue of this divine origin, every man and woman may, through acceptance of Christ's gracious gift of His righteousness, be members of the household of God (Ephesians 2:19), and as such, the portals of everlasting bliss stand invitingly open before them (Revelation 22:17)!

### References

- <sup>1</sup>*Consumers' Guide*. War Food Administration, Washington, D. C. Nov. 1943, Vol. 9, no. 12, page 16.
- <sup>2</sup>*Time*, Letters to the Editor, May 20, 1946.
- <sup>3</sup>*The Denver Post* Sunday, Dec. 28, 1947.
- <sup>4</sup>*Live Stock Journal*, London, Jan. 16, 1931, page 72.
- <sup>5</sup>*Science and Scripture*. 1972. "Tampering with Life" by editor Louis Trapasso, Vol. 2, no. 1, Jan.-Feb., 1972, pages 17, 18, 32, 33.
- <sup>6</sup>Morton, Samuel George, M.D. 1846. "Hybridity in Animals and Plants" read before the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Nov. 4 and 11, 1846. Reprinted (New Haven) 1847, from the *American Journal of Science and Arts*, Vol. 3, Second Series, page 7.
- <sup>7</sup>Smith, Uriah. 1868. *The Visions of Mrs. E. G. White, A Manifestation of Spiritual Gifts According to the Scriptures*. Steam Press of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Mich., pages 102-04.
- <sup>8</sup>Colin, Edward C. 1946. *Elements of Genetics*, Second Edition Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company, pages 222-23.
- <sup>9</sup>*The Holy Bible*. Revised Standard Version. 1953. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons.
- <sup>10</sup>*The New English Bible*. 1970. The delegates of the Oxford University Press and Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, England.
- <sup>11</sup>Taylor, Kenneth N. 1972. *The Living Bible*. A paraphrase. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishers.
- <sup>12</sup>Loewy, Ariel G., and Philip Siekevitz. 1963. *Cell Structure and Function*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- <sup>13</sup>Weiss, Mary C., and Howard Green. 1967. Human-mouse hybrid cell lines containing partial complements of human chromosomes and functioning human genes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA)*, Vol. 58, Sept. 1967, no. 3, pages 1104-11.
- <sup>14</sup>Rabovsky, Daniel. 1971. Molecular biology: gene insertion into mammalian cells, *Science*, Vol. 174, 26 Nov. 1971, pages 933-34.