

sis and phylogenesis proceed from lower order to higher order. Application of the First Law to such systems shows that the entropy change must include a random and a non-random contribution. The random contribution explains the general demise of the system through aging. The non-random contribution explains growth and development. The non-random contribution, or the $-\Delta S_0$ term in Equation 10, is necessary to account for the increasing order of living systems.

Equation 12: *non-living matter* \rightarrow *living matter* is therefore not correct. It has a missing term. This missing term is the $-W_0$ contribution to Equation 10. It is the required intelligence (coding, design, direction, etc.) that the scientist (or creator) provides to the process. Intellectual activity is the highest form of energy. By this people do things. They build. They make. They CREATE. Intelligence is seen in the DNA coding, in the assembly of a watch, in the design of a pump to get water to go uphill, and in any higher order energy requirement to finance the processes of life. Equation 12 therefore needs to be modified. The equation is then¹⁷

$$\text{matter} + \text{intelligence} \rightarrow \text{life} \quad (19)$$

This equation fits the universe in which we live. The key component in the transformation of non-living matter into living matter is intelligence. This intelligence must come from a source outside of "matter" itself. It must

reside in the scientist, the designer or, in the case of life, in the Creator.

References

- ¹By natural causes will be understood here those which can be studied by the methods of natural sciences. As for what constitutes natural sciences, there is fairly general agreement on that question.
- ²Creation, Evolution and Public Instruction, pp. 2-3. The Position Paper of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Curriculum Division, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
- ³*Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.
- ⁴Stull, Daniel L., 1971. The thermodynamic transformation of organic chemistry. *American Scientist* 59(6):734-743.
- ⁵*Ibid.*, p. 736.
- ⁶Calvin, Melvin, 1975. Chemical evolution. *American Scientist* 63(2):169-177.
- ⁷Brillouin, L., 1949. Life, thermodynamics, and cybernetics. *American Scientist* 37(4):554-568.
- ⁸Calvin, *op. cit.*, p. 171.
- ⁹Stull, *op. cit.*, p. 736.
- ¹⁰Brillouin, *op. cit.*, p. 465.
- ¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 554-555.
- ¹²*Ibid.*, p. 563.
- ¹³Quinn, Loyd Y., 1975. Evidence for the existence of an intelligible genetic code. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 11(4):188-198.
- ¹⁴Prigogine, Ilya, Gregoire Nicolis, and Agnes Babloyants, 1972. Thermodynamics of evolution. *Physics Today* 25(11):23-28.
- ¹⁵Wald, George, 1955. The origin of life (in) *The Physics and Chemistry of Life*. Simon and Schuster, New York. P. 12.
- ¹⁶Boulding, K. E., 1976. The importance of improbable events. *Technology Review*. (February) P. 5.
- ¹⁷Wilder, Smith, A. E., 1970. The creation of life. Harold Shaw Pub. p. 26.

TRUE CREATIONISTS

WILLIAM J. TINKLE*

Received 8 September 1977, revised from 11 August 1977

The doctrine of social Darwinism is not popular nowadays. But it and Darwinism in nature should stand or fall together; those who reject the former and hold the latter are being inconsistent.

Indeed, even nowadays an occasional voice is heard in support of social Darwinism. Here, one such recent attempt serves to initiate a critical investigation of Darwinism generally.

Darwinism is still with us in the life sciences, I am sorry to say. As for the doctrine of social Darwinism, about which so much used to be heard, I had hoped that it had passed into a richly deserved oblivion. Evidently it has not, at least not entirely so; for a recent article¹ has expounded a doctrine which hardly differs from the social Darwinism of the last century, when it was in its heyday.

Charles Darwin believed in the inheritance of acquired characters; and to show how it worked he professed a belief called pangenesis. Heredity was supposed to be accomplished by gemmules which are brought from all parts of the body in the blood. Francis Dalton disproved the groundless belief by injecting blood from black rabbits into white rabbits with no change in the color of the offspring. Social Darwinism, too, like the

claims of Darwin himself, is lacking in scientific foundation.

The author of the article cited (he does not sign his name) claims that sociobiology is a new science. Really it is but slightly younger than the original Darwinism, which is 120 years old. It advocates individual selfishness, claiming that progress comes by self-effort, overcoming other individuals, working to rise by their fall. Even a little deceit is helpful; but too much may cause repulsion, it is claimed. The yardstick by which progress is measured is selfish gain. Thus this doctrine recognizes, indeed glorifies, one's lower impulses and condones yielding to them, just as Darwin said that struggle is the natural means by which the weak are eliminated, the strong become stronger and thus the average is raised. It may be true that natural selection eliminates crippled and diseased animals; but no genetic mechanism has been discovered by means of which fit animals become fitter at each reproduction. Darwin visualized what would now be called the genes chang-

*William J. Tinkle, Ph.D., worked at and taught genetics for many years. He is now retired, and lives at Timbercrest Home, North Manchester, Indiana 46962.

ing slightly in all directions at each reproduction, but this was only an idea; such results never have been observed. Snyder and David, in a much-used textbook say, "Most genes are exceedingly stable . . . The natural mutation rate is very low. Many species have remained much the same for long geologic ages."²

It was his justification of selfishness that sold all of the copies of Darwin's *Origin of Species* on the first day they were offered. English middle classes were gaining money and status by oppressing their employees, but they felt a bit conscience-stricken. When Darwin wrote that this oppression was found in plants and animals and indeed that this is the method of improvement they felt justified in advancing themselves by putting others down. They were glad to read Darwin's book and they made him a hero. But conversely, anything said against sociobiology can be said against Darwinism as it is supposed to apply to plants and animals.

People as Robots

The author of the paper cited above denies freedom of the will, claiming that we are robots controlled by our genes. The present author recognizes the intricate work of the genes, having specialized in genetics; but does not overlook a number of other factors which influence our actions. We should choose among the influences rather than yielding to the one which for the moment seems strongest, blaming the decision upon our genes. The author cited says that some scientists say we do not need to listen to the genes. This is true; we should be trained to make a choice among the calls.

Many critics of sociobiology say that it is racist, and indeed this it was from the beginning. Darwin wrote, "The so-called Caucasian races have beaten the Turks hollow in the struggle for existence. Looking to the world at no very distant date, what an endless number of the lower races will have been eliminated by the higher races throughout the world." Thomas H. Huxley, Darwin's chief ally, said, "No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average negro is the equal, still less the superior, of the white man."³

Genes as Codes

Instead of Darwin's guess that the genes are put together anew at each reproduction, geneticists are now agreed that they are in the nature of a code and have a construction resembling a word. The message of this code is determined by the *order* of its parts. To illustrate, using a word n-o-t carries a far different meaning from t-o-n, showing that the *order* of the letters is the determiner of its message. Even if life had been on the earth a million years (which we do not believe), the correct order of the parts of genes would never have been established by chance. Intelligence was needed and evidently employed by the Creator.

The author cited deserves credit for admitting that there are exceptions to selfish action. There are examples of a bird increasing its own danger by giving a cry that announces this danger to the flock. There are many examples of persons risking their own lives to save others from fire. This author even says, "Another common objection; human sociobiology is long on theory,

short on proof." The modification should start by dropping the unproved assumptions of its author, Charles Darwin. It is only because he is held as a hero that his reputation has endured.

Theistic Evolutionists

The main thrust of the Creation Research Society to the careless agnostic, if only he would listen, is that we should recognize God as the maker and ruler of the universe, especially the world and man. But only a few of that class read the *Quarterly*. Most of our readers are church members already; but some are void of, or shaky on, correct beliefs about God as Creator and Ruler, inclined to compromise and make peace with "science"; inclined to say "I don't care how God made the world, just so you say that He did it". They do not recognize that evolution, while approved by many scientists, is not proved science at all but a presupposition formulated while sitting in an armchair. People who have such an idea may be among our readers. Let us try to give the message of our *Quarterly* to such folk.

The thinkers who first formulated the stance of evolution, some of them calling themselves Christians, expressed a belief in chance and trial and error which, to say the least, does not remind us of God. Some of the leaders at present *emphasize* the lack of purpose and planning, contending that there is no planning, only result. Those who call themselves Christians, but deny God's efficacy in order to agree with "science", and thus to be popular, are not helping the cause of truth nor honoring Him who created them.

Which Model?

The fact is that both creation and evolution are not science but more a philosophy. In our opinion the model of creation is more nearly proved because it agrees with the observed facts of nature much better than the model of evolution. No human observed the beginning of the world, consequently we cannot say that either model is proved by direct observation; but the creation model agrees with present observed facts and with valued records. Moreover, belief in it builds persons of strong minds and hearts.

The models are useful in the same way the diagrams are useful which an instructor draws on the blackboard while teaching. They present graphically the nature of the world, leaving the details for later study. The creation model presents the universe as the product of a plan, formed by a wise and powerful God; created promptly* and preserved ever since against a tendency of loss and decay.

The evolution model calls for a long period of time, uncertain beginnings of matter, very small changes by chance among particles which somehow became alive. Some of them remained much the same while others slowly became larger and highly organized. This process is claimed to be going on today in the same manner and at the same rate. A philosophy of life is important; but these philosophies conflict. So each person must choose between them, rather than trying to believe both or find solid ground midway between.

Some Christians have had severe mental conflict until they seemed to reach a position midway between the two models. Actually they did not agree with either camp; but from that time onward they read the claims of evolutionists and agreed with them. But they forgot that they were doing violence to the greatest Book that ever was written. They said; "Christianity says that God created the world and science tells me how He did it."

Creationism Cast Off

These persons paid no heed to scientists such as Gregor Mendel, Louis Agassiz and Henri Fabre, who never accepted the theory of evolution. If they had read the articles by modern scientists in the pages of this *Quarterly* it would have made a difference. Gregor Mendel's paper on heredity in peas which had cost him seven years of work and observation was kept in obscurity 35 years while Darwin held the stage of interest; but Mendel is now recognized as the father of genetics. Louis Agassiz did more for the teaching of biology in the world than any other person, in that he introduced both field work and laboratory periods. Henri Fabre was recognized by Charles Darwin as "the inimitable observer."

"But these men lived too long ago to know much" some may say. They lived at the same time as Darwin and Abe Lincoln. No one says they were the product of a primitive age.

Theistic evolution which is the common attempt at compromise, is not founded upon a careful study of either the Bible or biology. No theistic evolutionist believes in the whole Bible, and I do not refer alone to the first eleven chapters of Genesis. In Matthew 19:4 our Master tells us that God made man in the *beginning*, not through the ages, and that He made them well formed, male and female. There is much more in the New Testament on creation.

Consider Youth

Many young persons have given up their Christian belief because of evolution, and many others have become only nominal church members with a humanist attitude. This attitude holds down the power of God and substitutes dependence on the weak ability of man. Too many church leaders consider creation only a minor doctrine. To join the popular crowd they are going against many hard-working scientists and even the Bible as well. Yes, I mean it; this is not a misprint. Church leaders are going against scientists who are creationists and we hope this awkward and regrettable situation will soon end. What will the rising generation do, prompted by these church leaders' conception of the world? You may live to be 90 years old and those who now are children will be running the world. Will they run it to suit you? Much depends upon what we are teaching them now about the nature of the world.

True Science

As already stated, both models of the world are philosophies and both must rely upon faith to an extent, yet we will not close this paper without reminding you

of some facts which have been observed. There is not room to explain them here, but all have been explained on the pages of the *Quarterly*. (a) The world is not old enough for our plants and animals to develop by evolution. Earth's magnetism is decreasing at a rate which would have depleted the supply long ago if the world were billions of years old.⁵ (b) Mutations are the material for natural selection to work on; but these changes are a loss of something, not a means to make improvements.⁶ (c) Changes made by selecting for size, speed, etc. give results for only a time and then reach a definite limit.⁷ (d) Fossils do not prove evolution because their alleged relative ages are based on evolution. Why do some people believe fossils do show these ages? Because they believe in evolution.⁸ (e) The second law of thermodynamics shows that the world is slowly but surely running down.⁹ All of these points are supported by observed facts, which have been reported and discussed in the *Quarterly*.

References

- ¹1977. Why you do what you do. *Time*, 1 August. Pp. 54 *et seq.*
- ²Snyder, L. H., and P. R. David, 1957. Principles of heredity. Heath P. 349.
- ³Morris, H., (Ed.) 1974. Scientific Creationism. Creation-Life Publishers. San Diego. P. 179.
- ⁴Moses, writing under inspiration, in Genesis 2:1.
- ⁵Barnes, Thomas G., 1975. Earth's magnetic energy provides confirmation of its young age. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 12(1):11-13.
- ⁶Haines, Roger W., 1976. Macroevolution questioned. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 13(3):162-171.
- ⁷Siegler, Hilbert R., 1976. Fleeming Jenkin's critique of Darwin's Origin of Species. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 13(2):111-114.
- ⁸Morrell, R. W., 1976. Evolutionary contradictions and geological facts. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 13(1):56-58.
- ⁹Penny, David, 1972. The implications of the two laws of thermodynamics in the origin and destiny of the universe. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 8(4):261-269.

NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING

Notice Regarding Research Reports

An open meeting of the C.R.S. Board will be held at 6:00 p.m., Friday, April 20, 1979 at the Concordia College, Ann Arbor, Michigan. At this session general announcements and progress reports will be given.

C.R.S. does not hold conventions and this meeting is not to be understood as a "Creation Seminar" in the usual sense of that term. However, various individuals and groups carrying out research under the auspices of C.R.S. will give progress reports on such activity. C.R.S. members wishing to present short reports of their own creation research projects should write to Dr. Emmett Williams, Jr., 403 Library Drive, Greenville, South Carolina (20609) submitting a one-page abstract of the data and conclusions to be shared. Abstracts of papers accepted will be circulated at this meeting. Dr. Williams will coordinate this session and will include as many papers as the allotted time will permit. Those wishing to attend are cordially invited.

On Saturday morning, April 21, 1979, the Board of C.R.S. goes into closed sessions.