

DIE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IST FUNNY

WILLIAM J. TINKLE*

An educated German planned to visit America. He said, "I have studied English so mooch, fen der Americans talk to me I can say, "Ich fershtay; but I must say it in English, I understand."

When the German got off the train at his destination the conductor called, "All aboard." "Pardon me," he asked of another passenger, "fot does dot mean?" "Oh, it means that it is time for the people waiting here to get on the train."

Starting from the train, a fellow-passenger said, "Walk on the board."

"Und does board now mean sometings else?"

"It means if you step on this plank you keep out of the mud."

"Danke. Fer can ve find one restaurant?"

"A block farther along is a good place. By the way, is board very expensive in your country?"

"Another board? Fot you mean?"

"Oh, I mean, not like the other boards, this is what one eats."

"Board—get on train; board—one plank of holz, ach, wood; board—what you eat. Die English language ist funny! Ich fershtay nicht. Ach, I do not understand." The companion tried to explain, but the German was bored.

This incident sets me to thinking about academic degrees. When Manchester College conferred the Bachelor of Arts degree there was some logic in it, for I was not married; but not an artist either.

The Master of Arts was inappropriate, for by that time I had learned enough to know I was not a master of anything. It is a person who knows just a little who gets a swell head.

When the Ohio State University called me a Doctor of Philosophy they were far off the beam; for I majored in zoology, not philosophy, and if I should doctor anybody he would be sure to die.

To cap the climax, last Sunday Indiana Christian University dubbed me Doctor of Laws. What in the world do I know about law? I will admit that when I think of my daughter, son, and three grandsons I appreciate the degree Pa. Furthermore, in summer, I wear BVD. Die English language ist funny.

Now for the serious side of this piece. A few weeks ago a letter of contempt by William Hines appeared in many newspapers, alleging that the Creation Research Society is but a group of 300 obscure scientists. We maintain, however, that we have our share of academic degrees, and also our share of biographies in *American Men of Science* and even in *World Who's Who in Sci-*

ence. The latter volume lists all the noted scientists who ever lived. Come on, you evolutionists, if you want to match cards with us we are ready!

Now, the following letter is the forceful and accurate answer of our president to this unfounded charge:

(Copy of a letter sent in reply to the newspaper article)

November 20, 1970

Mr. William Hines

Universal Science News, Inc.

516 Travis Street

Houston, Texas 77002

Dear Mr. Hines:

A friend has sent me a copy of your recent column on the Creation Research Society. In this column, you inadvertently made a number of incorrect or misleading statements about the Society which reflect unfavorably on your column. As President of the Creation Research Society, I hope you will, in fairness, publish these corrections in an early future column.

The erroneous statements are as follows:

(1) The Creation Research Society is not based in California, but in Michigan. Neither was the John Birch Society fostered in California, but in New England. (I am not a member of the latter and know little about it, but that much is common knowledge.)

(2) The Creation Research Society is strictly a research and publication society, holding no meetings and engaging in no lobbying or political activity whatever. We publish a quarterly journal of research articles on scientific creationism, all written by qualified scientists with the standard academic and scientific credentials. We have also recently published a high school biology textbook, written by a committee of qualified biologists and other specialists. A copy of the publisher's advertising is enclosed for your information as well as a brochure on the Creation Research Society.

(3) The Creation Research Society as such had nothing to do with the California textbook decision, nor with similar efforts by citizens' textbook groups in other states. Individual members of C. R. S. of course are free to participate in such activities if they wish, but they do so as individuals and not as representatives of the Society. In the California action, most of the concerned parents and others who were instrumental in obtaining the favorable decision were not C. R. S. scientists.

*William J. Tinkle, Ph.D., is a retired geneticist, and lives in Eaton, Indiana.

(4) The C. R. S. "sustaining members" do not "bankroll" any activities of the Society. Both the voting members (men with a graduate degree in a natural science) and non-voting members pay only the annual dues of \$7.00, which covers merely the subscription cost to the journal. There is also a research fund and a textbook fund, both of which are small and are financed by gifts designated by interested individuals for either research activity or textbook preparation. There is no fund for lobbying or any other activities, because we engage in no such activities.

(5) The scientists in our Society are no more "obscure" than those in any other scientific society. All have graduate degrees in science from recognized universities, many are teaching on university faculties (I myself served on the faculties at Rice, Minnesota, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and others; at V.P.I., I was Head of a large engineering department for 12 years), many have extensive lists of significant publications, etc. Our total scientific membership of around 350 compares favorably with that in many other scientific societies.

(6) It is not true that only a "few-hundred bemused laymen" are concerned about the teaching of evolution in the public schools. There are millions of fundamentalist Christians in scores of Christian denominations in this country who believe in the divine origin and accuracy of the Bible, including the Genesis account of creation, and they deeply resent the takeover of our public school system by the evolutionist "establishment."

(7) The theory of evolution is neither more "scientific" nor less "religious" than the theory of creation. Both deal with the subject of origins and of non-reproducible events of the past. Neither creation nor evolution (in the sense of transformation from one basic kind into another) can be observed as taking place today, and therefore neither is "scientific" in the sense of studying observable and reproducible events. The basic processes of the present, in fact, are processes of

conservation and decay (in accord with the two universal laws of thermodynamics) rather than of origin and development, as the evolutionary hypothesis supposes. Evolution is based on faith, rather than scientific proof, and therefore is simply a religious philosophy. The fact that more scientists are evolutionists than are creationists is basically a matter of religious preference. It is significant that scientific creationists are always answered only by ridicule, as in your column, and never by considered scientific argument. The facts of science overwhelmingly point to creation, rather than evolution, but evolutionists refuse even to discuss the matter on its scientific merits, preferring instead to confuse the issue by referring emotionally to Galileo, the Scopes trial, and similar irrelevancies.

(8) The fundamental Christians in California and other states who are concerned about this matter are not trying to ban evolution from the schools or from textbooks, but are only asking that scientific creationism be included as an alternate theory. No mention need be made of the Genesis record of creation at all—only the legitimate scientific evidence that supports creationism, as well as the legitimate scientific evidence contradicting evolutionism (of which there is an abundance). It is unconstitutional, discriminatory, unscientific, and contrary to academic freedom to do otherwise.

If you are interested in further documentation of the above points, I would be happy to send you some of the wealth of material that is now available. I should also mention that the Creation Science Research Center, with which I am now connected, was organized only three months ago and has no connection with the Creation Research Society.

Thank you very much for reading this letter and for any clarification of this matter which you may be willing to print in your column.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY M. MORRIS