

20120904Review of Converging Paths To TruthV14-extract

Partial Draft 1

Review of *Converging Paths To Truth*

Kent W. Huff

I will begin with some specific reactions to some of the book's articles, and then continue on to comment on the broader setting in which BYU students and professors are operating.

Article 1 - Terry B. Ball, "Faith and the Scientific Method"

On the second page of his article, Professor Ball does his part to add to the typical "apples and oranges," "bait and switch" logical category fallacies which (I assume intentionally) riddle the comments of those who support organic evolution. It is this constantly twisted logic which I will mostly focus on in this first part of the review:

A Georgia judge, arguing against the teaching of evolution in school, offered an overzealous polemic that illustrates the point well. Making absurd accusations about the effect of Darwin's theories on society, the judge claimed that the "monkey mythology of Darwin is the cause of permissiveness, promiscuity, pills, prophylactics, perversions, pregnancies, abortions, pornotherapy, pollution, poisoning and proliferation of crimes of all types." Such pejorative and irrational rhetoric only serves to fan the flames of hostility between science and religion while deepening the dilemma for men and women devoted to both disciplines. (p. 2)

Advocates of organic evolution are constantly switching back and forth between the incontestable and exhaustively proven truths of the world of physics and chemistry on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the highly contestable worlds of atheistic speculation on how life came to be without God. The rhetorical goal is always to hide the incredibly weak scientific arguments for organic evolution by covering them up with the strong arguments for such things as the law of gravity. Showing students how to quickly cut through this pervasive logical fallacy ought to be one of the prime purposes of at least one body of knowledge made available on campus.

If we put the quoted paragraph in more carefully delineated form, we might rewrite it to say that "When people reject religion and accept atheism, which typically includes rejecting the 10 Commandments and all other moral imperatives from the Bible, then they adopt various perversions." In fact, the normal reason for adopting atheism is to attempt to remove any moral constraints for the very purpose of indulging in perversions. "If there is no God, then all things are permitted."

The "monkey mythology of Darwin" is simply another way to identify the atheist inroads and distortions of real science. The typical organic evolution argument begins with the implied statement that "There is

no God, therefore..." If that implied assumption were always made explicit, communication would be more accurate.

This intellectual dishonesty and rhetorical trickery that goes along with most advocacy of organic evolution does a great disservice to real science. If scientists accept the flimsy and inconsistent speculations of organic evolution as on a par with the law of gravity, then they cannot be thinking clearly, and people would be right to distrust them.

Another way to describe this rhetorical trick is to notice that proponents of organic evolution argue that if something can be shoehorned into a category which can be called "science," then by that simple mental act of adding it to this very large and highly diverse category of "science," that new item must then be just as true as any other bit of "science." Stated more clearly in that way, almost everyone can recognize that as faulty logic. For example, we might say that studying the phenomenon known as "cold fusion" falls within the realm of science. By the logic used by evolutionists, at that point "cold fusion" becomes just as well proven and harnessed as any of the elements of hot fusion. All our experience with and certainty concerning nuclear power plants, strategic defensive weapons, medical applications of radioactive isotopes, etc., must now all be applied to this speculative new addition to the world of "science." That, of course, is all completely absurd, but that is what evolutionists are trying to make us think.

Prof. Ball on page 3 of his article lays on more of the same kind of "reasoning:"

Others, while maintaining faith in the restored gospel, have made significant contributions to their scientific fields, like the physicist Philo T. Farnsworth, whose research led to the development of the television; the chemist Henry Eyring, who developed the absolute rate of chemical reactions theory; and the physicist Harvey Fletcher, who pioneered the development of stereophonic sound reproduction. (p. 3)

Notice that none of the scientific fields mentioned – physics and chemistry – have anything to do with biology, and say nothing about organic evolution and its nearly overwhelming atheistic components. All of those fields could be studied to whatever depth one would like, and the issue of organic evolution would never come up. Nonetheless, these vast and well trampled fields of science are, by implication, used to bolster the flimsy atheistic speculations of organic evolution.

We might notice that courses on biology at the university level only represent about 5% of all the courses taught. And the majority of those biology courses that are taught have nothing explicit to do with the topic of organic evolution. So here we have the overwrought evolutionary biologists trying to claim that their 1% of the world's university curriculum ought to control all the other fields of science. This is just ridiculous, and amounts to nothing more than arrogance and hubris. How much time do you expect that computer engineers, or nuclear scientists, or mathematicians, or civil engineers, or chemical engineers, or physicists or any of 100 other areas of studies and professions spend bothering their heads about issues of organic evolution? These evolutionary biologists who claim to speak for all of science have definitely gone too far. They do not get to be the arbiters of what is and is not science, as they try to piggyback their pet speculations on the backs of all the rest of the world of science. Perhaps if all these other scientists were not cowed by the politicized dogmas of atheism, they would insist on a little more humility from the biologists who claim they can replace God (but never show us how).

Another factor which should be considered is that the true gospel teaches freedom, including freedom of choice, with those choices given extra power and meaning because they extend beyond this life. The

atheism which misuses the "science" argument as a club to cow others into submission also just happens to be the "natural man" personified, meaning that doctrines of maximum governmental power are also conveniently amplified by the dogmas of organic evolution. So what we see today is a strange admixture of politics, atheistic religion, and science, in the form of organic evolution, all uniting to crush Christianity and increase the slavery of man. If death is the end of us all, and no responsibilities or rewards extend beyond the grave, then with Korihor the atheists/evolutionists say

Alma 30:17 And many more such things did he say unto them, telling them that there could be no atonement made for the sins of men, but every man fared in this life according to the management of the creature; therefore every man prospered according to his genius, and that every man conquered according to his strength; and whatsoever a man did was no crime.

If we are serious about talking about real science, then we would carefully separate out all these extraneous political and philosophical factors and focus on the pure results of observation and experimentation. That allows real science to be part of the gospel, without also importing vast tracts from the lands of atheism.

Also from page 3 of Prof. Ball's article:

How tragic it would be if a BYU student who had the potential to become a James E. Talmage or a Henry Eyring never reached that potential because some teacher, purposefully or unwittingly, convinced that student that one must abandon faith in God in order to be a credible scientist, or conversely, that one with a testimony of the restored gospel cannot accept the tenets of science. It is imperative that as a community of learners at BYU we work to avoid such a tragedy. Every student here needs to understand, as Elder Widtsoe taught, that "the Church supports and welcomes the growth of science. ... The religion of the Latter-day Saints is not hostile to any truth, nor to scientific search for truth." (p. 3)

On its surface it seems like a reasonable plea to try to avoid that "either-or" choice. However, there are at least two things seriously wrong with this statement. First, a sensible student should realize that he really only has that option of both science and religion at BYU, and even then the option is muddled. Many of their science professors will pretend to offer that dual option, because they must, even though their professional interests require them to be in the uncomfortable position of being fully aligned with both the outside atheists and the inside theists. Any student who does not realize that, as things stand, he really does have to eventually make the choice, even at BYU, will suffer sometime for his naïveté.

Second, Prof. Ball presents another variation on the same distorted "either-or" logic. Prof. Ball still essentially assumes and asserts that when you choose to study and accept science as well as religion, you have to accept as equally true everything that every scientist has ever said in the history of the world, including those atheistic scientists who reject God and devise their own creation myths through the random operation of chemistry and physics. The logically-required third option of a pure science stripped of all its atheistic and political trappings never seems to even occur to him.

It is only because the atheists have such a powerful and undeserved grip on the general topic of science in our society today that this "either-or" question (which should be a 3-way question) even need arise. Engineers and scientists can do their study and laboratory work perfectly competently without bothering their heads about theories of the origin of life. It is only the "priests of Pharaoh" who have gained such powers in our society today that are able to enforce this "twofer:" in today's world of academia and government science grants, one must first enter the cult of atheistic evolution before one can be allowed to continue in their chosen field of science, however little it may have to do with organic

evolution and the origin of life. This is a result of man's corrupt bureaucracy, not the true nature of science.

However much Prof. Ball decries this need to make the choice between religion and science, for example, that is the overwhelming reality in today's world. I recall a Church leader in Europe making the comment that young Church members had to choose between 1) going to college, and 2) staying active in the Church. In the consistently secular/atheist universities of Europe, apparently it is not permitted for someone to be involved in science and also give any outward evidence of being involved in religion, and it is not much different in the US.

BYU is rather unique in this way, it appears. One is allowed and expected to operate in the both the world of science and the world of religion, even though that would be severely punished socially elsewhere. The irony is that the BYU version is otherwise not unique. Rather than try to find and follow a uniquely pure separation of science from "politics and religion" that would meet the most stringent requirements of gospel teachings, most of the pro-evolution people at BYU seem to prefer to have one foot solidly in each of these two warring camps. That might allow them individually to be on good terms with important people in the outside secular science community, and thus possibly offer them a route to research grants and professional advancement, but it really does nothing to offer a purely rational gospel solution to any actual conflicts between science and religion. They should not be surprised in the least that their speech and behavior is highly confusing to BYU students.

Is BYU simply not the place to devise a unique solution to today's overwhelming control by atheists of the public debate concerning "science?" I can imagine a person's supporting such a unique solution becoming a potential liability for any BYU scientists involved, but, at the same time, where in the world is this going to get resolved, if not at BYU? Do we leave this strictly to the evangelical Christians? In the meantime, potentially tens of thousands of BYU students are left bewildered and vulnerable to dark social forces.

Article 2 -- Rodney I. Brown, "In Your Mind and In Your Heart"

The author offers an interesting definition of the scientific method:

When Albert Einstein's new ideas challenged those of Newton, and proved them wrong in some respects, a new view of how science works was emerging. Karl Popper became the spokesperson for critical rationalism. The main idea behind critical rationalism is that theories about how things are can be proven false or not proven false, but can never be proven true. This realization has propelled the great surge of scientific progress in the past one hundred years.

The method used by science to find truth is appropriately called the scientific method. It is based on observations and follows Popper's premise that a thing cannot be proven to be true, but can be proven to be not true. Here is how it works:

1. A theory that seems to explain all that has been observed is developed.
2. An experiment is designed to test the theory; i.e., to try to prove the theory wrong.
3. The experiment is conducted.
4. If the experiment is unable to prove the theory wrong, more experiments are designed and conducted, always trying to disprove the theory.

5. If an experiment succeeds in disproving the theory, a new theory is developed and the process begins again.

This method exposes much that is not true by slowly eliminating theories and thus causing them to be refined. It brings us incrementally closer to the truth, but never quite to it. Some theories are quickly discredited; others survive for much longer. A hierarchy of theories develops, with those that have withstood challenges for the longest time as the foundation of the pile and the newer, less tested ones exposed on the surface. All are theories that have not been proven wrong rather than facts that have been proven true. (pp 25-6)

In examining the rhetoric of the evolutionists, we find that these people, who are more politicians than scientists, have managed to turn the scientific method upside down. They want their "facts" to be treated as absolutely true, in direct conflict with the normal rules of science. In the world of organic evolution, for example concerning the atheistic speculations on the origin of life, the protagonists insist that those speculations must be accepted unless the questioner can prove them wrong.

The evolutionists defending their speculations claim they have no responsibility to perform any tests themselves. Obviously, performing any tests always has the possibility of proving a theory wrong, so that is to be avoided at all costs by the good politician. This nonscientific behavior alone takes the "science" related to organic evolution and puts it into the realm of philosophy and theology.

As the ultimate transgression against these rules describing the scientific method, today's proponents of organic evolution are constantly insisting that people accept their interpretation of the origin of life as "fact," not a mere theory, and certainly not the mere speculation which it is.

Atheism today has all the features and trappings of a religion, but its adherents endlessly claim that it is not a religion, even though at least in a few legal cases it has been held to be such. The obvious reason for this prevarication is because of their great desire to have atheism established as a state religion and supported by the full wealth of the government against Christianity, even though our Constitution denies that there can be an established state religion. Obviously this is nothing more than political and legal maneuvering, not to be taken seriously in the philosophical and logical realm.

The author offers another interesting definition:

Spontaneous generation. The theory of spontaneous generation said that living things appear spontaneously. This explained everything from mice appearing in a pile of dirty rags thrown in a corner to maggots on meat. It was a theory that was believed by almost everyone, including Aristotle, for hundreds of years. Then in the nineteenth century, Louis Pasteur designed and ran a simple experiment that easily proved it wrong. The current theory, which has held its own since Pasteur, is referred to as "all life from the living." Mice come from other mice, bacteria from bacteria, and so on. (p.28)

This definition is interesting in this context because Charles Darwin explicitly rejected the work of Louis Pasteur. Darwin was certain that even though microorganisms were killed by heat, all the constituent elements were still there and could spontaneously spring to life again. His book *Origin of Species* assumes that billions of creatures come into existence each day, so the question of where life came from was of no concern. The only question remaining was how a mouse might become a giraffe. Modern-day evolutionists would appear foolish if they were to publicly adhere to Darwin's theory of spontaneous generation, but they have no replacement in their system of speculative thought about

where life might have begun, so they are forced to accept spontaneous generation, but merely move it back a few billion years into the unknown and unknowable past.

The author includes a wise caution:

It is at least as easy to extrapolate revealed truth beyond what is known as it is to do the same with scientific data. (p. 33)

Evolutionists have certainly failed this test. In this review I am mostly concerned about the extreme excesses which the secular world has generated in the speculative world of organic evolution. One might even describe most of the field of organic evolution as extreme extrapolations from the smallest facts or assumptions. In most cases, it can only be considered serious "science" in the fevered minds of its fanatical adherents.

Article 4 -- Steven E. Jones, "A Brief Survey of Sir Isaac Newton's Views On Religion"

The author includes a definition of the rules for the scientific method:

We have important issues today that are of general concern for society. For example, is global warming real? Is it man-caused or the result of natural fluctuations in temperature? We can get the answer by repeated, careful experiments, observations, and measurements rather than by dogmatic or political statements.

A true scientist requires analysis based on experiments and observational evidence--it is not a matter of popular opinion or what some authority figure states. Questions important to society can be addressed by the scientific method, using experiments, then published in refereed journals. This system of review by knowledgeable peers was worked out during Newton's lifetime by the British Royal Academy of Sciences. It is generally considered a major step in a nascent field of science when results are finally published in established peer-reviewed venues and journals. The scientific method has served us well for about 350 years. (p. 63)

I include this excerpt to set the stage for noting that the public culture concerning teachings of evolution very explicitly contravene all the rules which the author has just set forth. Just like the "global warming" movement, the organic evolution movement is basically a political movement which misuses and abuses science as a mere ploy, a pawn to reach its goals. "Dogmatic or political statements" is the essence of the public presentation of organic evolution. The real experimental science is very thin and scattered, if it exists at all.

"It is not a matter of popular opinion or what some authority figure states," but evolution proponents are endlessly using public opinion and bureaucratic tests to decide what is and is not "science." It is of some value to have peer-reviewed publications to maintain consistency and integrity in a well-defined scientific paradigm (which now is heavily controlled by the thinking of organic evolution). However, just as Newton and Galileo and Darwin himself published their ground-breaking scientific work without the benefit of peer-review, that very peer review can cripple the "evolution" of science itself. In the famous Dover School Board case in Pennsylvania, the pro-evolution ACLU lawyers argued vehemently that nothing that has not passed through the journals of the ruling pro-evolution scientific clique could ever be considered "science." Their target was a very high quality book written and published by a critic of

organic evolution, Michael Behe, an academic researcher in microbiology. Their attempts to give themselves absolute bureaucratic power over all definitions of science reach well into the realms of the absurd, including claiming that the establishment clause of the First Amendment must absolutely override any free speech, academic freedom, or freedom of religion issues. Their straining of the First Amendment in the cause of their secular religion can only be described as grotesque.

Article 8 -- Michael F. Whiting, "Evolution and the Gospel: Seeking Grandeur in this View of Life"

Among the articles, Professor Whiting's is bold in his unrestrained support for the speculations on organic evolution, and he raises many interesting issues. I will directly and briefly address some of his assertions, and leave others for more detailed treatment later.

1. He begins with a quote from Darwin concerning "grandeur in this view of life" and uses this phrase in his article title. So what does he mean by "this view of life?" One might indeed be inspired to see the many forms of life on Earth, and thus feel a sense of grandeur. However, the important question is where this life came from. Was it the work of God, with a grand and eternal plan for man, or was it the random and arbitrary work of chemicals interacting? Of course, the grandeur Darwin speaks of comes from the thoughts of Darwin himself as he comes up with his grand speculation about how life spontaneously sprang from the inert elements and went on to create the many complex forms of life found on Earth, including man, who can then, in turn, survey and appreciate this long chain of development. In other words, Darwin is excited about the thoughts and creations of his own mind, and that is where he finds the grandeur. He has found a way to seemingly explain life without the need for God, and considers that a marvelous achievement. Professor Whiting seems to glory with Darwin in this creation of the mind, not with any particular set of observable artifacts of whatever the creation process may have been.

For reasons which I hope to explain as I go along, I consider this a kind of idolatry, where man worships not so much the products of his hands wrought in stone and wood, but the products of his mind. Man has conceptually pushed God out of the whole equation of life, so that man, in his arrogance, can claim it all for himself. I believe Darwin and Professor Whiting are in agreement that God did have a small role to play perhaps 4 billion years ago, but has not been heard from since. This is the classic Deist way to reconcile God with evolution. God is granted only one billionth of a power that most Christians would grant him, but at least he is not completely painted out of the picture.

Having postulated that God defined a meta-DNA billions of years ago, a set of rules which has governed all the steps of evolution ever since, without God's intervention even once, Professor Whiting now assigns himself the task of discovering and describing that undergirding and overarching set of rules which has guided evolution from the beginning. But he appears to have set himself an impossible task. Scientists can only study that which makes its presence known in the physical world. As far as I know, no one has ever found evidence in the physical world for this meta-DNA for which he seeks. In other words, this meta-DNA set of rules must operate above and behind normal physics, meaning that it is in the metaphysical realm. By definition, that means that science is not even able to detect its existence, let alone study its features.

It may be great fun to postulate the existence of an infinite number of universes, as some have done to try to explain how our particularly unique and human-friendly universe came to be, but finding actual

evidence of such an infinite number of parallel universes is quite a different matter. So far it has stayed in the realm of science fiction. In a similar way, it may be entertaining to try to imagine some of the millions of rules which would have to be in such a meta-DNA construct, but it seems extremely unlikely to go much further. As far as I'm aware, the only evidence scientists have to actually study are the random mutations to DNA structures, which can in turn make small changes to organisms. Finding a way to get past that Iron Curtain of randomness to see the imagined plethora of rules which reside there -- that which makes the random non-random, and in some predictable way -- is likely to remain in the realms of artists and storytellers rather than scientists. I would personally be surprised to find a single rule which Professor Whiting has found that dwells in this meta-DNA world he imagines. Has he published professional work on his experimental findings in this area? I suspect not. Discovering interesting things about existing biological structures may be generally useful, but how often might one expect to discover a rule that demonstrates how creation by evolution was directed step-by-step by some meta-DNA rules?

2. Prof. Whiting could never be charged with "damning with faint praise" his beloved evolution:

PATTERN AND PROCESS

Many critics of evolution portray evolutionary theory as a series of made-up stories that require just as much faith to believe in as any religion requires. They point out that evolution is only a theory, which they equate with a guess or speculation, not recognizing that all science is built on theory and that the so-called laws of science are not qualitatively different from theories—they are simply theories that have stood up to many challenges and (as of yet) have not been refuted. A good theory must be descriptive, predictive, and refutable; that is, it must describe current observations and predict observations that have yet to be made, and it must be possible to collect a set of observations that would disprove it. Evolution passes the muster on all accounts. In fact, evolutionary theory is widely considered to be one of the most successful scientific theories ever proposed because of its ability to explain the biological observations of Darwin's day and its continued ability to elegantly explain a plethora of biological observations that Darwin could not even fathom, including the genomic-based research of today. (p.153)

Scientists embrace evolution because it is the central underlying concept in all of biology, and It provides us with an extensive set of tools to address real-world problems such as devising strategies to rescue threatened species and protecting humans against infectious agents. There are few scientific theories that have so successfully summarized such an abundance of observations with such an economy of descriptive processes. This is why evolutionary theory is unabashedly not just good science but great science. (p.154)

His two comments "Evolution passes the muster on all accounts" and "This is why evolutionary theory is unabashedly not just good science but great science" show his unlimited enthusiasm for the topic. The difficulty is that what he says simply is not true. Evolution is, and always has been, a fraud. The fact that it is widely accepted by so many people does make it an important fraud, but a fraud nonetheless.

Obviously it is not possible for me to insert a few sentences here which would quickly prove that this entire conspiracy of speculation for political purposes is the fraud that it is, but I can start to whittle away at the problem. It has much to do with the highly political and politicized "global warming" and Malthusian end-of-the-world pronouncements by other so-called scientists. Several lengthy scholarly works would be needed to smash it to smithereens, and that may be beyond my time resources to construct, but I intend to get started now. Elsewhere I have published my article entitled "Five Barriers to Belief in Evolution." It lays out the truly gargantuan barriers to belief in evolution, which are all blithely ignored by Prof. Whiting and other contributors to this book (and carefully hidden from the students at BYU). It would be useful to continue on down one or two levels of magnitude in the

importance of the topics treated, but that will be difficult. We have libraries full of pro-evolution materials, and refuting them one by one is certainly beyond the abilities of any one man.

3. To continue on the theme of "Pattern and Process," Prof. Whiting says "In many cases, we can infer the process by a careful observation of the pattern." However, in most situations of interest to biology, theoretically, there are an infinite number of processes that could produce a particular complex pattern. Yes, if there is something simple and obvious going on like a river meandering through a valley, cutting a bank here and depositing dirt there, the possibilities are sufficiently constrained that one can observe the patterns and guess at the process. But items of interest are always far more complicated than that.

In the case that the professor cites, of his daughter playing with chocolate pudding and teddy bear crackers, one already knows the process before one sees the pattern, so there's no need to speculate at all.

But the professor has put his finger on an important issue. If the evolutionists cannot present plausible and complete processes which can lead to the biological outcomes we see, then all they can do is wave their arms and speak in magical terms. The famous discussion about the flagellum of a bacterium being derived from the poison pump used by another bacterium is an interesting example. Although mountains of paper and ink have been used up on this topic, to my knowledge no one has come up with a plausible scenario. The evolutionists simply endlessly assert that nothing is impossible for the overwhelming basic forces of evolution, and let it go at that.

On that point, one might note that none of the proteins used in the poison pump are found in the infrastructure for the flagellum, even though there are some interesting similarities in that this is an appliance which goes through the wall of the cell and requires some kind of motive force to be useful. In the biology world, organisms don't just go around and find parts to sew onto themselves, Frankenstein like, and then have those parts automatically incorporated into their DNA so that when they divide the next time these extra parts go with the new organism. If one adds a complex attachment like a flagellum, there needs to be an even more complex set of support mechanisms which grow the attachment on each new bacterium and provide all the structural maintenance and power maintenance functions to keep this thing going.

I suppose some science fiction writer could imagine that an aggressive little bacterium dared to challenge the bacterium with the poison pump, and with his own light saber cut off the parts he needed and glued them onto himself. But that is not how things work. If the poison pump bacterium were dead, it might be a little easier to work with, but then the proteins might have degenerated. If the poison pump bacterium was alive, then the Jedi attacker might be one of its victims. The only option left is for a highly intelligent bacterium to study the target creatures extensively, analyze the physics and chemistry of the situation, analyze the proteins required, invent those new proteins, come up with a system to manufacture and install those proteins as needed, and then update its own DNA software so that this process could go on indefinitely. These are the processes that Prof. Whiting must account for, and the accounts I've read, are simply laughable. They are nothing more than appeals to magic. The requirement for such things as these genius bacteria are found throughout the "logic" of evolution. They reject any kind of Christianity-related intelligent designer, but then spend enormous amounts of effort dreaming up their own intelligent designs and designers.

4. Is the hierarchy of organisms a ladder or an escalator?

Naturally, the evolutionists are insisting that it is all an escalator, with the "common descent" principle meaning that one unbelievably improbable but complete spontaneous generation of life, including DNA, happened at some point in the distant past, and everything has flowed from that. They have great theories and great speculations but only the smallest crumbs of evidence. One of the great dirty little secrets of evolution is that the "bones" people, the paleontologists, simply do not have the evidence that everyone claims they have. If you ask a paleontologist where these wonderful fossils are that people talk of, he has never seen them. It must be in someone else's location where they found these bones that show the necessary transition stages, etc. This is part of this amazing hoax that has so many people either fooled or cowed into going along with this worldwide fraud.

5. Prof. Whiting praises Charles Darwin as having "provided profound insights into the nature of nature." But one should recognize that in Darwin's *Origin of Species* there is not a word about where life came from originally. He fully accepted the spontaneous generation theory whereby billions of creatures come into existence spontaneously every day, including insects, rats, etc. Charles Darwin rejected the findings of another scientist Louis Pasteur, whose findings concerning pasteurization, for example, have been endlessly proven correct. So although Charles Darwin was operating in the world of science, part of the time, he was not willing to accept any science which contradicted the philosophical construction he created and loved so much. Pasteur noted that microscopic organisms which were killed by heat in such food sources as wine stayed dead. The nutrient fluid did not have any new living microorganisms unless they were introduced by some contamination process. This direct challenge to Darwin's theory of spontaneous generation was something that he could not accept. One would have to wonder how objective a scientist he was if he missed this very basic bit of solid science.

As Darwin himself noted, his book was simply "one long argument" to support his philosophical conclusion concerning the origins of various species. One might imagine that he would focus mostly on the evidence he had collected, and then at the end give his findings. There is another way to write a book which is to start out with one's philosophy, and then add in whatever references to the real world might prove helpful to your argument. This latter method is a better description of what Darwin produced.

6. Prof. Whiting praises the supposed summarizing power of Darwin's theory:

For the first time, someone was able to successfully draw a connection between the jaws of a stag beetle, the ornate feathers of the peacock, the blooming patterns of plums, and the behavior of honeybees, and to tie all of these observations to literally thousands more. Moreover, Darwin recognized the hierarchy of similarity among all species. A housefly looks like a fruit fly (they both have one set of wings for flight), and both flies share similarities with a beetle (they all have six legs), but these insects do not look much like a rhinoceros, and as a group, they look even less like dandelions. Darwin recognized that all species can in fact be tied together into a pattern that unfolds into a great tree of life, and he explained these and other patterns with a coherent set of processes—natural selection, descent with modification, and sexual selection—all of which form the basis for modern evolutionary research. (p.157)

Actually, it does not take a great genius to realize that wings are useful for flight, whether you are a fly or a bird, and that legs are useful for walking whether you are a beetle or a rhinoceros. One does not have to draw a giant hierarchy diagram to justify the use of these standard biological features. One of the important mathematical principles of statistics is that correlation does not equal causation. In the world of numbers and influences, if all you have is the numbers, there is often no way to know which thing caused the other, or if neither caused the other and unknown outside forces are the cause. It is really rather silly to say that every creature with four legs must have arisen from a creature with four

legs. If one wants to walk stably on the Earth, one cannot be more stable than having four legs. Water creatures, especially amphibians, might reasonably have four limbs, whether they also walk on the land or not. I believe whales have been shown to have so-called vestigial limbs, which are not really vestigial since they're used for procreation functions. The human coccyx was once thought to be merely a vestigial tail, but I believe now it has been shown to be well integrated into the bone and muscle structure of the body and has some reproductive functions as well.

If one believes fanatically that everything on the planet came from a single original cell, then perhaps it does make sense to try to draw these relationship diagrams. But that usually is an artificial and contrived process.

7. Prof. Whiting asks "Where did all the grandeur go?" as he notes the widespread resistance to evolutionary concepts. He again brings up the category fallacy of comparing speculations on evolution with the endlessly proven laws of thermodynamics and the periodic table of elements. If one piece of science is true, does that prove that all other pieces of "science" are equally true? Of course not. It is insulting to keep making that claim.

8. Prof. Whiting bemoans the fact that "we encounter efforts to teach 'intelligent design' as a scientific alternative to evolution." That is a clear misstatement of fact. No one claims that Intelligent Design is a replacement for evolution. Intelligent Design is rather a logical challenge to the claims of evolution in the sense that it challenges the magical "unstoppable force" preached by the evolutionists concerning the power of evolutionary forces. Intelligent Design locates situations in nature which seem far outside the bounds of what the forces of random chance could accomplish. The evolutionists see this as very inconvenient, since it challenges their many unproven speculations and their great lack of clarity on the hidden processes which Prof. Whiting insists exist, but leaves them undescribed.

In most cases, Intelligent Design is the real science and evolutionary speculations are the pseudoscience. Intelligent Design is well-positioned in the long history of science where part of the function of scientists is to challenge existing speculations, hypotheses, and theories. Every scientific paradigm seems to involve the same forces and structures. There is a deeply embedded orthodoxy which controls most of the money and positions in science. The "old bulls" find it useful to maintain their personal power as long as possible, regardless of the facts, while the younger set, with new theories, waits for the older generation to die out before they can have their new theories recognized and have the general research paradigm modified.

Here we have a situation where the "older generation" is locked into the speculations on evolution, and they are not willing to take any challenges or criticism, or to do any significant serious experimental research themselves. They have gotten away for decades with simply claiming that on the general authority of "science," evolution must be true. Here comes Intelligent Design with some well-crafted and serious challenges to the assumptions of historical evolution, and all the evolutionists feel they need to do is to attack the messenger. They see no need to offer any serious answers to the serious questions that the ID people bring forward.

The book by Michael J. Behe, *The Edge of Evolution: The Search For The Limits of Darwinism*, is a great step forward by the critics of today's entrenched evolutionists, and those evolutionists should be producing their own answers to the same questions. This is exploring the philosophical conflict between the unstoppable force and the immovable object, the oft-claimed omnipotent powers of evolution versus any limiting forces in biological reality. Instead, the entrenched evolutionists simply attack Prof.

Behe and ignore his conclusions. He has done some really fine work, and the shame is that the entrenched evolutionists simply try to sweep it all under the rug. They may be good politicians in making that choice, but they are terrible scientists, and do not deserve our respect.

9. Prof. Whiting mentions the debate within the LDS church about evolution. He recalls that

When I was an undergraduate student at BYU in the 1980s, I vividly recall receiving one set of General Authority statements on evolution that were assembled by biology professors and another very different set from professors in Religious Education. These compilations generally did not reflect the full spectrum of statements that had been given on the matter but instead supported only the particular positions held by the professors who assembled them.

It is true that reference to religious authority will not get us very far, especially since the Scriptures are not terribly specific on most important points, but that is certainly not the only way to challenge the evolution speculation. Pure science is the best answer to pseudoscience. The speculations on evolution have enormous numbers of weaknesses which can easily be exploited. There's no reason to bring in the religionists. However, it would be useful to carefully point out the extreme consequences of trying to mix atheistic evolution with a serious belief in religion. People seem to find it easy to deceive themselves about the consequences of trying to have these issues both ways.

10. On his last page Prof. Whiting says

What I would caution against is forcing a Joshua ultimatum here with "Choose you this day whom ye will serve" (Joshua 24:15), as if these are fundamentally and diametrically opposed views of creation with no degree of overlap and no possibility of reconciliation. In my experience, students who continue to think of this as a dichotomy will either have their faith so shaken when they learn the evidence for evolution that they drift away from the Church, or they will simply shut their eyes and their minds to what I consider to be a glorious way to view creation.

I believe this is exactly the wrong advice. This really amounts to saying you must accept both atheism and theism all at once, and we will not give you any help in distinguishing between the two. Someone on the faculty at BYU ought to be able to separate out the small amount of real provable science that goes along with the organic evolution package, from the atheistic speculation and propaganda which makes up the largest portion of that philosophical package. This separation of real science from propaganda would be a great service to BYU students. I recognize that the professors who walk this middle path based on solid science between the two warring camps will not be well received by the fanatical evolutionists, and if he is a scientist, that could hurt his career. But someone needs to do this job and clear up the counterproductive taboos on campus which now prevent any constructive discussion, any "teaching of the controversy." The fact that 50 or 100 years ago there were some general authorities who believed in evolution, as they understood it then, is not a good reason to allow the arrogance of the teachings of men to be unchallenged on the BYU campus

More General Comments On Evolution and Evolutionists

Brandon Flowers and evolutionist Richard Dawkins

On August 9, 2012, Brandon Flowers, lead singer for the rock band "The Killers" was on a Swedish talkshow. He was there to promote his band, but in the middle of their discussion the interviewer turned the topic to religion, asked Brandon about his Mormon faith, unusual for a rock singer, and then brought in Richard Dawkins who immediately asserted that the Book of Mormon was an obvious fake and that Joseph Smith had been convicted of being a fraud. Richard Dawkins was introduced by the interviewer in this way: "Many claim that he's God's greatest opponent on earth, a biology professor who brought atheism to the people of the world. Please welcome Richard Dawkins."

Brandon was able to briefly assert his belief in the Book and mentioned that many people had examined the Book quite thoroughly. Although he did not have a body of historical facts at hand to counter the charges of Dawkins, the implication of what he did say was that no one had found anything bad enough to dissuade the millions of LDS believers. The *Desert News* published an article on this encounter on September 17, 2012.

This was obviously an intentional ambush by the talkshow moderator. Who would have expected Brandon Flowers, who was there to perform with his band, to be fully briefed at that point on defending his faith against "God's greatest opponent on earth?" After Brandon got to make a few brief points, the moderator excused him to go join his band for an impending performance on the show. Based on the way the rest of the talkshow went, one might guess that the moderator's original intent was to give each of his two visiting "rock stars" approximately equal time. Richard Dawkins got his speaking time to hammer religion, and Brandon Flowers got his time a little later to perform his music. One might also guess that in Norway, music and atheism are both fairly popular topics. It would generally be counterproductive from the talkshow's viewpoint to have these two very different "rock stars" get involved in a long and contentious debate.

The question to be considered here is how well prepared are young LDS professionals to defend their religion on the one hand, and, on the other hand, to attack the many obvious weaknesses of the evolutionists, especially when those evolutionists try to play the bully in a public setting such as this talkshow situation. In my opinion, it is about time that LDS members had access to some debate notes to allow them to go on offense when attacked in this way by militant atheists. Rather than be totally unprepared and calmly take a verbal beating from their opponents, as Brandon endured, perhaps they could call up the set of notes on their personal Internet device and turn the tables to some extent.

One long argument

Just as Darwin saw his book *Origin of Species* as just one long argument for what I will call his "life without God" speculation concerning an atheist creation mythology, his philosophical descendents have continued to add to his "one long argument" over the 150+ years since the publication. The problem is that their well-rehearsed arguments are riddled with rhetorical tricks and deceptions designed to catch the unwary, hardly the behavior one would expect of serious truth-loving scientists.

This vigorous continued effort is not science in any experimental sense of the word. For the most part, it

is nothing but politics in which the self-styled elite attempt to control the thinking of the masses, with the goal of replacing the traditional Christian morality with a "better" atheist alternative. Just as with the priests of Pharaoh, the elite are counting on the general ignorance of the masses concerning serious science to allow the priestly class to use the awe of the masses for magic or "science" to control their thinking. As one science fiction writer has noted, a sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic, at least to the ignorant masses. It was true in Pharaoh's time and it is still true now.

Rather than work to raise the real ability of the masses to understand science on its own terms, as one might expect idealistic scientists to want to do, today's ruling band of "political" scientists or evolutionists are still happy to operate in the mode of the priests of Pharaoh as they use "science" to hoodwink and control the populace for their own selfish purposes in seeking public acclaim and power. Their ideology sees governmental power as good in and of itself, but having a massive central government also conveniently allows them to acquire large amounts of tax money to fund their religion and their science.

As evolution teaches, if we are nothing but aggregated pond scum, how could our freedom and eternal self worth be of any importance? The ideas of the *origin* of life and the *meaning* of life are closely connected, especially in the case of the influences of freedom versus slavery in our lives. The world has had a very long history of what I call "warlord religions" whose purpose is to subdue the masses by convincing them that they are meaningless. If they are meaningless, then of course their freedom doesn't matter and the warlords can hold absolute power over them. This certainly is true of the religion of the priests of Pharaoh. It is true of Marxism. It's true of Islam. It is true of most of the eastern religions. It is not true of classical Christianity which has in most eras tried to bring about freedom and respect for the individual.

Let's say it the other way around – that without Christianity there would not be freedom on the Earth today. All of the other philosophies lead to the centralization of power and the diminishment of the individual. Atheism, and its creation myth speculations, called chemical evolution, also fits that same category for all the basic reasons. It is just another warlord religion whose goal it is to subdue the freedom of the masses in favor of the centralized would-be God-Kings. Just as science and technology was used, often in the form of "magic" to support the regimes of the pharaohs through the work of their priests, the anti-freedom forces are trying to use their supposed special knowledge of science and technology to overawe and control the masses.

We should note that Christianity has had its bad times, 1) when, in a twisted form, it was used as the official religion of Rome to support a dictatorial regime, 2) when it was used later in some parts of Europe to bend the political life of nations to the political will of the Roman Catholic Church, and 3) and when, even in the Protestant nations of Europe which had broken away from the Roman Catholic Church, religious concepts of predestination and of God's creation of men as his playthings, totally dependent for their existence on him, were used in similar ways to try to convince the populace that they were of little more worth than pond scum, and thus make them more governable. It is the same argument as the evolutionists today, merely couched in a different religious language of a different time. With the "divine right of kings," Marxism, Fascism, and militant Islam having been shown to be the destructive frauds they are, evolution is our warlord religion today, which is especially noticeable when the evolutionists spend so much time on theology. "Their thoughts betray them" as Darth Vader might say in some of today's mythology.

One of the important truths which Joseph Smith declared, but which only some of Mormondom is

willing to accept, because it goes contrary to fundamentalist Protestantism and atheistic evolution, is that men are eternal beings, co-eternal with God, and therefore of infinite and eternal worth. Any philosophy which declares otherwise can rightfully take its place among the "warlord religions" of the Earth's history.