THE FRAUD PERPETRATED IN THE FIELD OF GENETICS

Clifton A. Emahiser's
Non-Universal Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830

From William Bradford Shockley's book on the subject of *Eugenics And Race,* written by Roger Pearson, document 16, "Anthropological Taboos About Determinations of Racial Mixes", p. 223, we read in part:

"Most anthropologists are intellectually irresponsible about the problems of race and intelligence. A world-wide tragedy may grow because national leaders will be misled by trusting erroneous anthropological views. Of all the scientific disciplines, anthropology is most responsible for science about the biological basis for humanity's social structures – including the effects of racial differences. But many anthropologists assert that the concept of race is a 'myth' and urge taboos against related research."

In my essay William Bradford Shockley *(1910-89) on* "Eugenics & Race" #1, I wrote on him in part:

"His work has been rewarded with many honours. He received the Medal for Merit in 1946, for his work with the War Department; the Morris Leibmann Memorial Prize of the Institute of Radio Engineers in 1952; the following year, the Oliver E. Buckley Solid State Physics Prize of the American Physical Society, and a year later the Cyrus B. Comstock Award of the National Academy of Sciences. The crowning honour – the Nobel Prize for Physics – was bestowed on him in 1956, jointly with his two former colleagues at the Bell Telephone Laboratories, John Bardeen and Walter H. Brattain. In 1963 he was selected as recipient of the Holley Medal of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

"Dr. Shockley has been a member of the Scientific Advisory Panel of the U.S. Army since 1951 and he has served on the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board since 1958. In 1962 he was appointed to the President's Scientific Advisory Committee. He has received honorary science doctorates from the University of Pennsylvania, Rutgers University and Gustavus Adolphus Colleges (Minn.).

"In addition to numerous articles in scientific and technical journals, Shockley has written *Electrons and Holes in Semiconductors* (1950) and has edited *Imperfections of Nearly Perfect Crystals* (1952). He has taken out more than 50 U.S. patents for his inventions."

So when Shockley points out: "But many anthropologists assert that the concept of race is a 'myth' and urge taboos against related research", we can be certain he is aware of a good portion of the subterfuge that is transpiring.

I will be quoting from a 426 page book (plus index) entitled *Race and Modern Science; A Collection of Essays by Biologists, Anthropologists, Sociologists and Psychologists,* © 1967, (hereinafter RAMS).

What we have in the scientific field of genetics are two opposing views: (1) those who lean toward evolution that supposedly will be effected by environment, mental/physical stress, and a process they call mutation. (2) those who hold the view that one must seek racial purity, and choose a mate of like-kind, and by doing so the quality of the male sperm and the female oocyte will be preserved without any degeneration whatsoever throughout all future generations. One can either choose to breed-up to maintain ones' racial purity, or breed-down by miscegenation (*i.e.,* crossbreed) to contaminate one's racial purity down-line forever, without remedy.

Before we get to deep in this subject, we should learn the difference between genes and chromosomes, so I will quote from the 1980 *Collier's Encyclopedia,* vol. 4, p. 180 under the heading "Modern Biological Concepts" in part:

"Cell Doctrine. One of the broadest and most fundamental biological generalizations is the cell doctrine. This includes the concepts that all living things, both animal and plant, are composed of cells and cell products; that new cells are formed by the division of preexisting cells; that there are basic similarities in the chemical constituents and metabolic activities of all cells; and that the activity of an organism as a whole is the sum of the activities and interactions of its independent units.

"Genetic Mechanisms ... The gene theory states that the characteristics of each generation are transmitted to the next by the units of inheritance known as genes. The genes are composed of deoxyribonucleic acid, or DNA. The large complex molecules of DNA are made up of four kinds of subunits, called nucleotides, which are arranged in a double helix. The information in each gene resides in the particular order of these subunits. Since each gene is composed of 10,000 or so nucleotides arranged in some specific sequence, there is a very large number of possible combinations of nucleotides and therefore a large number of different sequences representing different bits of genetic information.

"One of the more recent important biological generalizations is the 'one gene-one enzyme-one metabolic reaction' hypothesis stated by the American geneticists George Beadle and Edward Tatum in 1941. According to this hypothesis each biochemical reaction in the development and maintenance of a particular organism is controlled by a particular enzyme and the enzyme, in turn, is controlled by a single gene. The information in each gene is transmitted from one generation to the next by a code, called the genetic code, which involves the linear sequence of the four nucleotide units making up the gene. In each cell generation the gene undergoes replication, so that when the cell divides each of the two daughter cells gets an exact copy of the code. Also in each cell generation one or more transcriptions of the code may be made by which the genic information is used to regulate the assembly of a specific enzyme or protein.

"In 1953 the American biologist James Watson and the British biochemist Francis Crick formulated a theory regarding the structure of the DNA molecule that accounts for the known properties of the gene, its ability to replicate itself, its ability to

transmit information, and its ability to undergo mutation. On the basis of this theory predictions can be made regarding gene action in the control of protein synthesis, and these have been verified experimentally ...."

It is my opinion that any such "mutation" occurs while our bodies are aging, rather than mutating all the sperm and oocytes in our gene banks. It is rather absurd to believe that a mutation in one gene in one of our chromosomes could genetically alter every single one of the 850,000 oocytes in a female's two ovaries, or every single sperm cell of the millions of sperm cells that are stored in a man's testicles! The proponents of such a theory totally neglect to explain in detail the physical, natural phenomenon and/or process on how such a thing could happen!

However, mutations do occur as most our body cells replicate 12 to 14 thousands of times, if we live to seventy or eighty years old. If mutations didn't occur, we wouldn't grow old. Also, as we continue to age, connective tissue starts to replace important functioning tissue like muscle tissue. That is why, as we gradually become older, our muscles become weaker and weaker. But it is harebrained to believe these naturally occurring mutations could in anyway alter the male sperm and the female ovarian gene banks. Cancer usually results from a series of mutations within a single cell. Often, a faulty, damaged, or missing p53 gene is to blame. The p53 gene makes a protein that stops mutated cells from dividing. Without this protein, cells divide unchecked and become tumors. Nevertheless, this missing p53 gene would not alter the male sperm germ cells or the female ovarian oocytes. The real enemy of male sperm germ cells or female ovarian oocytes are the direct contact with X-rays, radiation, chemicals and viruses. The parent's lack of the p53 gene is not a direct contact with the male sperm cell or the female oocyte!

To give an example of how the book RAMS leans toward evolution, I will cite a paragraph under the chapter heading, *Race and Anthropology*, by Bertil Lundman on pp. 4-5, and I don't necessarily agree with his other remarks:

"The above discussion *[on traits]* applies to the classification of the living races of man. As we go further back into time we must realize that the genetic structure of human populations may, or rather must, undergo gradual change. For even races did, after all, 'originate' somewhere, sometime. A particularly striking example of such an evolutionary trend is the genetically-determined broadening and shortening of the cranium, which has appeared in many population groups of the 'White,' 'Yellow,' and 'Red' races during the last few millennia. However, this trend has scarcely at all been very evident among the 'Black' race."

To give another example of how the book RAMS leans toward evolution, I will cite a paragraph under the chapter heading, "The Last Paleolithic Expansion", by C.D. Darlington on p. 230, and I don't necessarily agree with his other remarks:

"... Another evolutionary property revealed by the paleolithic expansion concerns the B blood group. This blood group is determined by the least frequent of the three balanced alleles or elements of the multiple ABO gene system. It has been lost in the gorilla. But in common with the chimpanzee most human populations still possess it. The B group however has been lost in the most rapidly moving of the expanding peoples, those which have spread furthest, into South America, south Australia, and

east Polynesia (Mourant, 1959). Possibly this loss has been assisted by the concurrent loss of diseases such as smallpox and bubonic plague which the B group may help to resist (Vogel, 1961). In any case, we see that the genetic and medical sources of evidence, themselves independent, are independently attested by the archaeological dating of the paleolithic expansion." [Note: One's ABO blood type is said to be controlled by a single gene which is therefore called the ABO gene.]

To give a fourth example of how the book RAMS leans toward evolution, I will cite a segment under the subheading, "Population Control, by C.D. Darlington on p. 246, and I don't necessarily agree with all of the material he presents:

"... The building in of genetic controls to the breeding mechanism is an example of the close mutual adaptation of all the materials and processes of heredity, variation and reproduction, extended in time and in space, which is characteristic of the evolution of genetic systems (Darlington, 1958). The mutations and recombinations of genes in the cell and the instincts of individuals in mating are all related to the adaptation of one system in evolution. And in this system the regulation of territory, of social behavior, and of sexual fertility are all necessary parts.

"What happens in man? The situation was made clear by Carr-Saunders (1922) in man some time before it was understood in animals. Under paleolithic conditions the principles of restriction found in animals still applied. An instinctive feeling for territory is still indeed characteristic of civilized peoples. But amongst all paleolithic peoples control of propagation has been universally practiced. Before sexual life begins initiation is required. Afterwards infanticide is the best known method of limitation. It is always selective, usually against the female, when it has the further effect of promoting homosexuality or polyandry. Abortion is perhaps equally important. Human sacrifice, whether of widows or captives, was also formerly a widespread means of population control.

"The agricultural revolution led to a change, indeed a reversal, in the selective situation which had operated throughout time. Settled farming made it possible to provide for increases, not rapid but still unprecedented increases, of the farming population. Most of the world was open to their colonization. Two great evolutionary changes were therefore favored during the long quiescent period of the neolithic and we know that they occurred. First, as Darwin (1871) suggested, there was an increase in the natural fertility. Secondly, there was a shedding of the instinctive paleolithic restrictions on multiplication and on unlimited exploitation of the habitat. Slowly the brakes were taken off and the great population explosion began.

"The shedding of the instinctive restrictions on multiplication was no doubt itself due to decay of the selective pressures supporting them. Later, however, the change in attitude found religious expression and guidance. Great religions, we must not forget, have always been propagated by breeding. Their lasting success has been proportional to the care and discernment with which they organized the survival and sexual reproduction of the faithful ...."

There are problems, though, with today's nuclear and mitochondrial DNA testing. We read the following in part at the website:

http://www.utexas.edu/courses/bio301d/Topics/DNA/text.html

"Errors: When DNA typing was a new technology, its introduction to the courts in the U.S. was hotly contested by some scientists. One objection was that the DNA typing process itself was not meeting ideal data criteria. Initially, there were NO rules for DNA labs, and there were no certification procedures. Databases for evaluating RMPs (random match probability) were inadequate. Many of the former problems have been resolved with database expansion and with technologies that removes the subjectivity in assigning DNA type to a sample, but problems still remain, at least for some labs. In summer of 2003, the Houston Crime Lab made the news by having such sloppy DNA procedures that even the local authorities recommended withdrawal of its certification. Dr. Larry Mueller's web page at U.C. Irvine (to 'Forensic DNA Resources' at the bottom of the left menu) lists some of the lab errors that he has encountered in his experiences as an expert witness for the defense. Another, more recent and comprehensive site is http://www.scientific.org. Since most or all of these errors favored the prosecutions' cases until they were discovered, there is no incentive for the government to maintain a public record of them.

"The types of errors and problems most commonly encountered fall into a few types (A and D are apparently the most prevalent):

"(A) **sample mixup.** This is probably the most common source of false matches – the people in the lab mixed up the samples. Sample mixup is understandable simply because the technologies involve use of standardized tubes and other plastic ware, and unless one is absolutely rigorous, it is very easy to accidentally grab the wrong tube, or load the wrong well with a sample. Ultimately, every sample is handled by a person before it gets processed, and this step of human handling is the vulnerable one.

(B) **Sample contamination.** Some cases of sample contamination are similar to sample mixup. In other cases, sample contamination occurs because an officer touches the material with his/her hands, or the contamination may occur when the sample is deposited (e.g., if a blood stain gets bacteria in it).

(C) **DNA degradation.** DNA degrades if it is not kept cold or dry. Thus, by the time the police arrive at a crime scene, the DNA in some of the samples may already be bad. Improper storage of samples also contributes to degradation. Degradation may lead to inaccurate DNA typing, though more so for the STR (short tandem repeat) method than for the mitochondrial method.

(D) **Bad data analysis.** The calculation of RMP (random match probability) may be straightforward in many cases, and some software automatically calculates it for each STR (short tandem repeat). However, unusual cases require a deep understanding of probabilities (and statistics), which is often lacking.

"Ideal data: what's missing? Lab error rates are typically regarded as being around 2%, although the labs do what they can to conceal errors (as well as avoid them). If the RMP (random match probability) is as low as 1 in a million, a lab error rate of 2% dominates the considerations of the significance of a match, so labs need to be striving for vastly lower error rates than they have had in the past. As outsiders, it is difficult to know what all the causes of these errors are, but we can get an idea from past exposures of these errors. A big unknown is the extent to which a lab actually

follows its own protocols. The written protocol is only a model of what is done, and if the technicians deviate from the written protocol, it is difficult to uncover that after the fact:

"(1) Absence of external, blind proficiency tests (inadequate standards). The only way a lab can begin to correct its mistakes is to know how often and why they occur. Blind proficiency tests are the surest way to know the lab's error rate. Few labs submit to external, blind proficiency tests, though all labs now submit to some form of proficiency testing. (A blind test means that the lab does not realize they are being tested on the sample; a blind test is good because it means that the technicians are being no more careful in testing that sample than in testing any other sample.)

(2) Sample identification is known when processing occurs (bad protocol: absence of blind) ... By knowing which samples belong to which people (or crimes), it is far easier to unintentionally produce a false match (perhaps by sample mixup or contamination).

(3) Samples from the same crime are often processed together, in the same lab (bad protocol). This greatly increases the chance of sample mixup going undetected.

(4) Inadequate replication (bad protocol). With the use of PCR (polymerase chain reaction), a single sample can be processed many times (which was not true of past methods). Ideally, samples should be split and sent to different labs for testing, which would greatly reduce sample mixups going undetected. Cost is probably the biggest impediment to this kind of replication.

(5) Bad protocols for data analysis. People analyzing DNA data have not usually been trained adequately for assessing the true RMP (random match probability). It is thus common for the RMP (random match probability) to be miscalculated (and the error may go in favor of or against the defendant) ...."

Now what we must ask is this: with all of these things that can go wrong with DNA left behind at crime scenes relatively recently, how can "scientists" dig up DNA thousands of years old and tell us whose ancestors are whose?

Heredity And Environment: Major Findings From Twin Studies Of Ability, Personality and Interests, by Robert C. Nichols proposes weeding out bad genetics by selective breeding, pp. 42-43 in part:

"Perhaps the most reasonable proposal for a beginning in the control of human evolution is the method of germinal choice that was proposed by the late Nobel Prize-winning biologist, Hermann J. Muller (1965). In this method sperm is collected from selected outstanding men and is kept safely stored at very low temperatures. After time permits an objective evaluation of the life of the donor, his sperm is made available to women who desire to conceive a child with it. Muller reasoned that this opportunity for genetic choice would be immediately adopted by those women now relying on more haphazard methods of artificial insemination. Then, as its success was demonstrated, many couples would opt for the chance to raise an exceptional child. Muller suggested that, in addition to the absence of genetic disease, the traits to be used in selecting donors be intelligence and cooperativeness on the ground that these traits have been most responsible for successful human evolution in the past.

"Rapid progress in biological technology has already extended the potentialities of the method of germinal choice beyond those discussed by Muller. It is now

technically feasible to collect ova as well as sperm from selected donors and to implant the fertilized ova in the uterus of the recipient woman (Glass, 1972). With this form of 'prenatal adoption' genetic selection would be much more effective ...."

This is all well and good, but Almighty Yahweh has a better plan at Obadiah 16, when all of those with impure genetics will be exterminated, and "... shall be as though they had not been." Only the racially pure will survive!