

A DISTURBING TREND

JACK WOOD SEARS

Department of Biology, Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas

A trend, gaining general acceptance in contemporary practice, even in the ranks of scientists, might be entitled "The Call to Prophecy." Scientists and self-appointed spokesmen for science from among non-scientists are boldly predicting the future. One recent example is an article in *Life*, "The New Man, What Will He Be Like?"¹

Traditionally scientists have been disturbed by the tendency of reporters to "put words in their mouths" and to sensationalize the news of scientific endeavors. But now it seems that respected scientists have turned from their fields of competence and have taken up the "mantle of Elijah."

Of course it has always been the prerogative of men to try to look into the future. Some scientists have always been blessed by ability to see more meaning and greater possibilities in the "facts" and concepts of science than their fellows, but until recently these insights have been expressed in careful terms. It was left to men like Jules Verne to present the "wild predictions" in pseudo-scientific novels.

Scientists Predict Without Caution

Now, however, scientist seems to vie with scientist to "out predict" each other. This would be only amusing and no one would be disturbed, if at the same time, these men did not use their prestige as scientists to give substance to their dreams so that the lay public is impressed and takes the predictions as "scientific truth."

The *Life* article referred to does contain an occasional phrase of caution. In dealing with the dream that scientists may in the future be able to culture whole organs and complete human beings so that, "A living creature would be printed in hundreds, in thousands of copies, all of them real twins,"² the author does point out, "It is, of course, a very long way from carrots to people, and Steward cautions that animal and human cells may behave differently."³ The general impression is that it is just a matter of time. We know enough now, just give us time to overcome technical difficulties.

Certainly no one can say what is possible in the future. When I first started the study of science, only those "wild visionaries" among us even dreamed of the advancement to be made in our scientific understanding. It is hard to comprehend the progress toward "subduing the earth" that has been made in the last two or three decades.

Further, I would strongly oppose any attempt to limit the thoughts and dreams of scientists or others. The visionaries in each generation have

blessed humanity. It is not the dreams that disturb, but the tendency to throw caution to the wind and wildly predict in terms that say to the uninformed that "these things are sure to be," and then go on to attempt to undermine our spiritual, religious, and ethical foundations by implying that "these things that are sure to be" will make all this other obsolete. Scientists who do this are not acting as scientists. They are leaving their sphere of competence to flounder in areas of obvious incompetence.

Materialism Emphasized

Another area of concern is the materialism on which the whole article is based. This is indicated all through the article in such statements as follows:

"As man's knowledge takes on new dimensions, hardly any human concept or value will remain sacrosanct. Health and disease, youth and age, male and female, good and evil—all these will take on transformed meaning. Life and death will have to be redefined. Family relationships will be quite different. Even individual identity may be hard to ascertain."⁴

"Could the concept of the soul become barren of meaning, and would some other theological concept have to be substituted for it?"⁵

"The growing movement is called Scientific Humanism . . ."⁶

"Many biologists are hopeful that the revelations of biology itself will give us new and profound insights into the true nature of man, allowing us to draw up laws and ethical systems that are consistent with that nature,"⁷

The discussion concerning DNA and heredity and learning is predicated on the assumption that man is simply an animal, and upon an equally erroneous assumption that man can direct his own way and "play God,"⁸ Dr. Jack Kevorkian's proposal that we use condemned criminals for human experimentation "under anesthesia—never again to awaken"⁹ is presented with only the remark that Dr. Page disagrees in this matter on the basis of "grave moral misgivings."¹⁰ All of this ignores the spiritual realm and accepts as true the rank materialism of men like Julian Huxley.

Truth Not Material Alone

It is a fact that science can deal only with material things. As scientists, acting as scientists, we cannot experiment with the spiritual. We must, as scientists, act as if there were no other realm but the material. This does not mean, however, that we do not recognize that there are other

realms of reality and truth. To do so would be foolish.

A baseball player must abide by the rules of the game of baseball while playing baseball, but he certainly does not deny that there is another game called football when he does so. Scientists can work only with "matter in motion." Concepts of spirit, soul, right or wrong, good or bad, ethical conduct or esthetic values are not and can never be in the area of science. Yet the article ignores this fact and many of the scientists quoted have also failed to recognize it or, like Huxley, they have espoused the faith of militant materialism.

Of course it is scientifically impossible to prove the existence or non-existence of the non-material realm; just as, it is scientifically impossible to prove that George Washington was the first president of the United States. The first is in the spiritual realm and the latter in the historical. Materialism, a philosophy much older than this

scientific age, has failed to satisfy the human mind and to explain the basic facts of existence. The end of materialism is complete chaos. There is no knowledge, no right or wrong, no "ought," no purpose in all the universe.

My chief regret is that the article and others like it lends support to materialism and to the concept that man can and will "play God" and direct his own destiny. One is reminded, with a shudder, of the arrogance of the builders of the tower of Babel in the Biblical account. If ever man has become arrogant, it is now.

References

- 1 *Life*: Vol. 59, No. 14, Oct. 1, 1965, pp. 94-111.
- 2 *Ibid.*, pp. 98-99.
- 3 *Ibid.*, p. 98.
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 98.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 107.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 111.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 111.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 108.
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 111.

A NOTE ON CANOPIES

DR. H. L. ARMSTRONG

Queens University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

There is some evidence that, before the Flood, the earth had a canopy of water in some form. This canopy, known as the "greenhouse effect," brought about the uniform, warm climate, for which there is so much geological evidence. This matter is discussed in *The Genesis Flood*, by Whitcomb and Morris. At the time of the Flood the canopy fell, and at least contributed to the waters.

A paper by C. Sagan and J. B. Pollack, presented at the meeting of the American Astronomical Society at the University of California, Berkeley, in December, 1965, and abstracted in *The Astronomical Journal*, Vol. 71, April, 1966, p. 178, discusses conditions on Venus. These researchers have shown that clouds of ice crystals, of mean radius about 7.5 microns, would be very effective in causing the greenhouse effect, and hence the high temperatures which are be-

lieved to exist on Venus. They might also cause the strong reflection and consequent brightness, and other effects which are observed.

Interest in this lies in the possibility which this immediately suggests, that some or all of the water in the canopy may well have been in the form of such crystals of ice.

It is interesting to note that D. W. Patton, in the *Creation Research Society Annual* for 1966, p. 63, has suggested that particles of ice, falling to the earth, may have had to do with the Flood and the ice age. So these two suggestions may well fit together.

Also, I have recently seen a review of the book *Marvels of the Earth's Canopies*, by C. T. Schwarze, published by Good News Publishers, Westchester, Ill., but have not yet seen the book itself. Here again it is suggested that the canopy was composed of ice.

ERRATA

Corrections for previously published issues are stated below. The editors regret any inconvenience.

In 1966 *Annual*:

(a) On page 16, birth date for Nicholaus Steno was 1638 instead of 1631. On page 17, publication date of the John Ray "Discourses" was 1692 instead of 1629.

(b) On page 79, reference 1 should read: *Biological Science for High School* by William A. Gregory and Edward H. Goldman. New York: Ginn and Company, 1965. Also, delete material

in parentheses in second line of the article on page 73.

In July, 1966, *Quarterly*:

(a) On page 14, add this line: "taken place in the past!" to the second paragraph in the left column. Also, on page 15, delete: "also limestones of various colors," from the top line in the right column.

(b) On page 23, in third paragraph of left column, insert: "confused but exciting. It doesn't matter that our present-day accepted theories are but temporary" after the fifth line of that paragraph.