Thus the superiority of the Creationist approach could be demonstrated.

References

[1]Rupke, N.A. 1970. Prolegomena to a study of cataclysmal sedimentation. in W.E. Lammerts, ed. Why Not Creation? Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Nutley, N.J., pp. 141-147.

[2]Cox, D.E. 1975. The formation of cross stratification: a new explanation. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 12(3):166-173.

[3]Conant, L.C., R.F. Black, and J. W. Hosterman, 1976. Sediment-filled pots in upland gravels of Maryland and Virginia, *Journal of Research U.S. Geological Survey* 4(3):353-358.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 354.

[5]Mather, K.F., R.P. Goldthwait, and L.R. Thiesmeyer, 1942. Pleistocene geology of western Cape Cod, Massachusetts: *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America*. 53(8):1127-1174.

[6]Dionne, J-C., and C. Laverdière, 1972, Structure cylindrique verticale dans un dépôt meuble Quaternaire, au nord de Montreal, Quebec. *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*, 9(5):528-543.

[7]Cox. D.E., 1975. *Op. Cit.*

[8]Cox, D.E., 1975, On the interpretation of potholes, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 12(1)25-31.

[9]Brögger, W.C. and Reusch. H.H. 1874. Giant's kettles at Christiania. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society*, 30, 750-771.

[10]*Ibid.*, p. 760.

[11]Weston, T.C., 1899. Reminiscences among the Rocks, Warwick Bros and Rutter, Toronto. p. 278.

[12]Baker, M.B., 1916. The geology of Kingston and vicinity, *Ontario Bureau of Mines Annual Report*, vol 25, pt. 3. pp. 19-20.

[13]Hawley, J.E. and Hart, R.C., 1934. Cylindrical structures in sandstone. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America* 45(6):1017-1034.

[14]Gabelman, J.W. 1955. Cylindrical structures in Permian (?) siltstone, Eagle County, Colorado. *Journal of Geology*, 63(3):214-227.

[15]Schlee, J.S., 1963. Sandstone pipes of the Laguna area, New Mexico. *Journal of Sedimentary Petrology*, 33(1):112-123.

[16]*Ibid.*, p. 115.

[17]Dietrich, R.V., 1953. Conical and Cylindrical structures in the Potsdam sandstone, Redwood, New York. *New York State Museum Circular* 34, pp. 8-9.

[18]Simpson, G.G., 1935. Cylindrical structures in sandstone, (discussion). *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America*, vol 46, pp. 2011-2014.

[19]Cox, D.E. 1976. Cave formation by rock disintegration. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 13(3):155-161.

GENETICS FAVORS CREATION

WILLIAM J. TINKLE*

Received 5 July 1977

While Charles Darwin and the naturalists were speculating about vague tendencies in heredity, Gregor Mendel was learning from his own research the scientific laws which govern the passing of genes from parent to offspring. This paper points out how these laws do not agree with the speculations of the evolutionists.

In the last few years much has been written against evolution, as there should be; but relatively little from the standpoint of genetics. There is a definiteness, an objectivity about this science which stands out clearly against the cloudiness and suppositions of paleontology and anthropology. Scientists say they accept the findings of genetics, giving lip service to that science, then go on accepting an armchair speculation which they want to believe about the nature and formation of living things. It was the facts of genetics that made necessary a reconciliation about fifty years ago in order to bring peace in the family of science; but this "peace" is only a patch-work affair.

The Beginning of Genetics

Genetics describes the changes which actually have occurred in living things and shows that they are small, or recurrent and not increasing, or of a disadvantage to the plant or animal. They do not tend toward greater size or better organization as the generations succeed one other.

The father of genetics, it is agreed, was Gregor Mendel, who lived at the same time as Charles Darwin. However people for a long time listened to the latter instead of to Mendel, who was primarily a teacher and later administrator. After seven year's work on the genetics of peas, he read his report to the Natural History Society of Brunn, his home town, in 1865. Modern scientists agree that his report gave definite results in an orderly manner, but the minutes of the meeting report that there were no comments.[1] The minutes also report that a member of the Society mentioned a book written by a certain Englishman named Darwin six years before, and that is what they talked about. And that is what all Europe talked about for 35 years while Mendel's paper lay on a shelf. Now that paper has become the foundation of genetics.

Different Kinds of Change Distinguished

Charles Darwin lumped all changes together, whereas we now recognize four definite kinds: acquired characters, latent genes, groups of diverse genes, and mutations. Acquired characters arise from the environment, from use or disuse, and are not inherited by the next generation if the causative environment has ceased; evolutionists and creationists agree on this point. J. B. Lamarck was the great protagonist of acquired characters; but Darwin also believed they were inherited.

Mendel pointed out that a gene may be recessive and, in the presence of a dominant gene, it becomes latent, not causing the formation of its trait. In a later generation it may occur, not accompanied by its dominant partner, and so produce its characteristic trait. It is clear that such genetics works toward recurrence rather than evolution.

In some plants and animals genes occur in groups rather than pairs and are accountable for different sizes

*William J. Tinkle, PhD., lives at Timbercrest Home, North Manchester, Indiana 46962.

animals, different production of eggs or milk, etcetera. Experiment and experience have established limits in such changes by selection.

Evidence for Limitations on Variability

Results of selection were tested by Charles Zeleny working with a compound eye in Drosophila. The normal eye is made up of 850 facets, while the mutant type may have as few as 65. In a white bar race, Zeleny selected a line having the highest number of facets and also a line having the least number. Selection caused a rapid increase in mean facet number during the first five generations, but after the fifth generation the effectiveness of selection ceased, although flies with the most facets were selected for 25 more generations.[2] Similar limits of effective selection have been found in sugar beets and corn, showing that while there may be selection in the types of gene the gene itself rarely changes.

In any case the change brought about by selection tends to reach a limit, as was shown by sugar beets in France. These have been developed from ordinary table beets starting with roots having 6 percent of sugar. By planting seed from the best i.e. richest in sugar, each year, after about 100 years, 17 percent of sugar was attained. This, of course, was a good result; but the same process of selection, continued for 40 years more, gave no higher percentage of sugar.[3] This is the situation found time and again in nature with genes, which do not increase in effectiveness. If they change, it is because they become abnormal, i.e. a mutation takes place. Genetics gives no ground for believing in the bit changes in the direction of improvement demanded by evolution.

Charles Darwin, with no observation of such behavior but his neighbors' rule of thumb selection, guessed wrongly that genes change slightly in each reproduction, in every possible direction, and without limit.

Mutations Rarely, if Ever, Cause Improvement

The last type of change in living things, mutation, seldom occurs, but is hereditary. It involves a change in a gene or a chromosome and is hereditary like other genes. Some may cause changes which make plants or animals more useful to man, but very few if any bring a real improvement; an advanced plant or animal. People write glibly about harmful and beneficial mutants, but do not mention the beneficial ones. When a new mutation is discovered, a few tests are made to see if it is recessive or dominant and so on, but not to see if it has greater vigor than the parent type.

The present author raised several generations of tomatoes which came up with three cotyledons instead of two. Weighing all the fruits produced by the two types, I found that an average normal plant produced 119.3 ounces of fruit, while an average mutant plant produced 92.0 ounces. The normal plants also did better in lack of light, in cool temperature and in light frost. Mutants, even plants that appear improved at first sight, seem to lack vigor.[4]

Belief in Evolution Comes from Predilection, not Evidence

Scientists have looked in vain for changed plants or animals which can live better in natural surroundings because of the change; many live worse, if at all. Evolution is what some men wish to happen, not what happens.

Evolution I say, is not science, it is an arbitrary world-view which some scientists a hundred years ago wanted to believe, but which some discriminating scientists of the present reject. The conclusion of this paper is that genetics does not give evidence for the improvements which the theory of evolution needs. As Professor Caullery of the Chair of Evolution, University of Paris, said at Harvard University already in 1916, "It comes to pass that some biologists of the highest authority in the study of Mendelian principles of heredity are led to the expression of ideas which would almost take us back to creationism."[5]

Time and again scholars have pointed out that Darwin's ideas of fundamental principles were influenced more by what he wanted to believe than by what he observed.[6] Such criticisms have commonly been rejected by the majority, who seem to be influenced more by their preferences, even as Darwin was. In truth, however, genetics accounts well for all the changes which are actually observed; and it permits, nay encourages, a belief that the world of life was planned and created by a Higher Power.

References

[1]Iltis, Hugo, 1932. Life of Mendel. Allen, London. p. 178. (Reproduced by Hafner in 1966.)
[2]Zeleny, C., 1922. The effect of selection on eye facet number. *Genetics* 7(January):1-115.
[3]Jones, D.F., 1924. Genetics in plant and animal improvement. Wiley. p. 414.
[4]Tinkle, William J., 1975. Further research on reduced viability of mutant plants. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 12(1):52.
[5]*Smithsonian Institution Report*, 1916.
[6]Siegler, Hilbert R., 1976. Fleeming Jenkin's critique of Darwin's Origin of Species. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 13:(2):111-114.