

found that researchers like Dohnanyi merely took their estimates from satellite detectors of dust falling to the Earth and divided them by 2 to obtain estimates for the moon influx. This factor of 2 reflects the difference in gravity between the Earth's surface and the moon's surface, only. Therefore, since those researchers obviously considered the relative surface areas of the Earth and moon as not relevant, we also concluded that it must not be a significant factor.

As for whose rhetoric is 'scathing', we certainly did not accuse our fellow Christians of lacking moral integrity. We were baffled by their calculations and found some of their claims could not be substantiated nor their arguments sustained from careful reading of the papers they cited. On the other hand, Drs Menninga, Van Till and Young admit they **did** accuse creationists of 'failure to live up to the codes of thoroughness and integrity' and 'intolerable violation of the standards of professional integrity', that is, lack of moral rectitude.

Dr Andrew Snelling,
Brisbane, Queensland,
AUSTRALIA.

Drs Menninga, Van Till and Young have, understandably, felt the need to respond to a creationist response/critique of their moon dust comments in their book Science Held Hostage. On the other hand, Dr Davis Young has declined in writing my invitation to defend in this journal his case study on the geology of the Colorado Plateau/Grand Canyon in the book Portraits of Creation: Biblical and Scientific Perspectives of the World's Formation by Van Till, H. J., Snow, R. E., Stek, J. H. and Young, D. A. (William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1990, pp. 62-81) in response to Dr Steve Austin's book Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe (Institute for Creation Research, San Diego, California, 1994). Dr Young suggested we contact other Christian geologists!

— Editor.

EARLY HISTORY OF MAN

Dear Editor,

Further to Bill Cooper and his series on the early history of man, in my opinion this work represents a milestone in our history of creation.

It is important we recognise in this information that, at last is again being released a history with its valid links with valid characters in our history books and the history given us in Genesis. Already I have power in my own study to refute Calvert Watkins in his **Indo-European Origin of English** and in part his quoted Sir William Jones, Orientalist, together with the purported 'chart' of 'Proto-Indo-European' language distribution: all of this contained in the **1970 Heritage Illustrated Dictionary**, my principle authoritative dictionary.

Those eruditions prove the lie evolution teachings has forced upon us. The writers and chart preparers might not have known the facts, for they had already been served up with the well-prepared statements of the evolutionists in their desire to exclude Scripture and God, the Creator.

You see, the evolution camp 'has the wood on us' for in their understanding we have no more ground for a created universe than they, that all things just created themselves. With the world in general they have not the spirit that comes of God, because when they had the opportunity they preferred not to know God and therefore pride was substituted, and due to that their foolish hearts darkened their minds (Romans 1:21).

Now, with the origin of the nations revealed to us once again, thanks to Bill Cooper we have not only the Bible but we can meet evolution on its ground. We have not only the Spirit but the sort of bread evolution wants but cannot find. Even evolution, its 'saner' members cannot believe things just made themselves. They seek everywhere for what they cannot find — some sort of viable hypothesis that mechanically can explain origins without having to bring God whom they abhor into the frame.

If they admit God they have to go on to what God has said of Jesus' responsibility in saving man, for He created man — and prophecy too — the end of God's ploy for man.

This is taking the long way round to what I want to suggest. On page 11 of part 2, Baron Waldstein states he saw in London's Lambeth Palace in 1600 '*a splendid genealogy of all the kings of England from the beginning of the world*', and later at Richmond Palace '*on parchment a genealogy of the kings of England which goes back to Adam*.' Cooper throughout traces genealogies back to Noah; no problem. Flood the evolutionary world with pamphlets to show how our present day people trace back to merge in with characters in Genesis, 'The table of nations'. The profound reality is there in the secular world. Get it to them. We have facts against their foolishnesses Paul confirmed in Romans.

Robert de Louth,
Bowral, New South Wales,
AUSTRALIA.

DISEASES ON THE ARK

Dear Editor,

Concerning my article on diseases surviving through the Flood,¹ it has since come to my attention that a prominent anti-creationist in this country has appeared on national television, indicating that the creationists have an impossible conundrum explaining how kuru survived the Flood.

Kuru is a rare brain generative disease which, he alleged, is spread only through the eating of infected human brain tissue. Hence the mocking suggestion that Noah's family included cannibals.

However, in *New Scientist*, May 28, 1994, we read, '*Kuru was transmitted through handling and possibly eating tissue from infected corpses during funeral rites in Papua New Guinea*' (emphasis added).²

Kuru is one of the so-called 'prion

diseases' in which the infective agent, though yet to be established with certainty, appears to contain no nucleic material (DNA/RNA) but apparently only protein.

There is actually mounting evidence that such agents may in fact be, in each case, merely an abnormal form of an existing brain protein with the capacity to interact with its normal counterpart so as to transform that normal form into its 'twisted self'. Such an 'infective agent' would not multiply by normal biosynthetic mechanisms, but would spread by slow progressive biochemical corruption of supplies of existing brain proteins.

If so, then the source of this abnormal protein is likely to be mutation, as suggested by the inherited forms of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease. In a fallen world, there is of course no difficulty explaining the origin of such an 'infective protein' in the case of kuru as a result of a *de novo* mutation in one individual. The abnormal protein can then go on to contaminate other subjects one after the other by direct post-mortem contact or ingestion.

Carl Wieland,
Brisbane, Queensland,
AUSTRALIA.

REFERENCES

1. Wieland, C., 1994. Diseases on the Ark. **CEN Tech. J.**, 8(1):
2. Ferry, G., 1994. Of mice, men and cattle. **New Scientist**, 142(1927):36.

DINOSAURS AND DRAGONS

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for fresh issues of **Creation** magazine and **CEN Tech. J.** It was especially interesting for me to read a paper by Mr Nierman on dragons¹ and find his version of the problem very close to my one. By the way, have you realized that his St

George used skill very much like our Daniel's — 'by thrusting balls of pitch and straw down the beasts' throat'?

I would be very thankful to you if you could send to Mr Nierman my best Christian regards and a couple of notes, which he may find both interesting and useful

(1) St George. We find St George first mentioned in church chronicles as a komit (advisor and military chief) of emperor Dioklitian. He was born in Kappadokia and executed together with the emperor's wife (she was a Christian also) on April 23, AD 303 at Nikomidia (today called Ismide — I hope my English spelling is correct). The tale about St George fighting with a dragon is more traditional than chronicle, but contains a lot of interesting details. The dragon lived in a lake in the Lebanese mountains not far from Beirut, which then belonged to Phoenicia. Its inhabitants worshipped the dragon and made human sacrifices (it is not clear whether the dragon was carnivorous, or priests were killing victims themselves). Like it usually happened in legends, St George arrived just on the day when the noble sacrifice (king's daughter) was chosen. He went to the lake, met the dragon, pinned it to the ground with a spear and trampled it with his horse's feet (maybe the dragon was not very big). Then he bound it (the reptile was enduring enough), dragged it into the town, and cut off its head in the presence of hundreds of witnesses.

(2) Zmey Gorynych (that is, Serpent Son-of-the mount) is a very popular monster of Russian folklore. Until the end of the 9th century Slavonic written language did not exist at all. Nevertheless we have a very long painting tradition, which, I believe, goes from pre-writing times. It shows Zmey Gorynych as a sauropod-like creature with a stegosaurian ridge of spines. Nevertheless Zmey Gorynych has three heads usually, while the word for 'three' may not have been a defi-

nite number, but just meant 'few'.

Sergei Golovin,
Christian Scientific Center 'Parthenit',
Simferopol, Crimea,
UKRAINE.

REFERENCE

1. Nierman, D. L., 1994. Dinosaurs and dragons. **CEN Tech. J.**, 8(1):85–104.

Dear Editor,

I have just received the **CEN Tech. J.** and I like the expanded format and increased amount of material. Keep up the good work!

D. L. Nierman's article¹ and Dr Taylor's article² both raise intriguing questions regarding the post-Flood survival of dinosaurs. I am inclined to agree with the position that certain passages in modern Bible translations should indeed be rendered in reference to dinosaurs.

For instance, the NIV renders Job 30:29 thus: '*I have become a brother of jackals, a companion of owls.*'³ According to **Strong's Concordance** the word translated 'jackal', *tanniyin*, is 'a marine or land monster, that is, sea-serpent or jackal: — dragon, sea-monster, serpent, whale.' Owls are hardly associated with whales, and presumably not with sea-monsters. This leaves the 'land monsters' — dragons/serpents and jackals. Significantly, the King James Version does not use the word jackal, preferring instead to render the passage 'brother to dragons'.

I believe the next passage of Scripture provides two critical clues. Job 30:30 reads (NIV): '*My skin grows black and peels; my body burns with fever.*' Both sections of this verse make better sense if *tanniyin* refers to a reptilian monster rather than a dog-like jackal. The reference to black and peeling skin, for example, suggests an analogy to molting reptiles.

As for a body burning with fever, jackals are warm-blooded — that is, capable of regulating their own body temperature — and adapted to warm