

Partial Draft 1

Polling and Politics

Polling

Nationwide polling shows that only 9% of the populace accepted evolution in 1982 and only 15% accept it now in 2012. In other words, the pro-evolution professors at BYU are in a minority and are teaching a minority position on the topic of evolution. At least 48% of college professors self-identify as liberals, and accepting evolution seems to be a requirement to be a member of the liberal/humanist religion, so in that sense, pro-evolution professors might consider themselves to be almost part of the majority in academia. However, if 85% of the United States population, from which BYU draws his students, does not accept atheistic organic evolution, it should be no surprise to find at least that high a percentage of LDS parents who disagree with it, and are appalled at the license granted BYU evolutionists to teach it as though it were pure and correct science, unchallenged by anyone in the religion department or from elsewhere inside or outside the University.

Politics

Author Gary North does a nice job of describing the strategy and politics of those who promote evolution. Evolution is certainly a humanistic political power doctrine, and many of its promoters would claim that now that man has arrived on the scene, with intellectual planning powers which are new to the biosphere, the historical biological evolution which they describe has now ended. Man should now have all possible powers, including powers over other men. The idea that "If there is no God, then all things are permitted" fits in here. Perhaps they mean to say that since man has fought his way up from the level of pond scum to having great intellectual powers, and this happened without the intervention of any God, then man owes allegiance and obedience to no one and no thing or idea, and can thus do as he pleases.

Evolution: independence and dependence

As just mentioned, supposedly, man, as a product of evolution, is now independent, especially of any connections with God. However, there is a little problem with the godless Marxist ideas which typically come along with the atheistic evolution ideas: If there are lower classes of humans who naturally should be ruled by higher classes of humans, and it is convenient to have those lower classes of people dependent on the higher classes of people so that they will be obedient and support the political ambitions of the upper-class (even with enforced equality, some are always "more equal" than others), then it is not really true that all men should be independent according to the philosophies of the evolutionists. In other words, the dependence of the masses on the upper classes for ideological guidance and direction is part of the constellation of ideas that come along with Marxism and Darwinist evolution. Thus some men can be considered "responsible," and many can be considered irresponsible.

Religious compromise not accepted by evolutionists

It should be noted that those with a religious turn of mind who try to accept a form of Deism as a way of compromising with the atheist dogmas of evolution, instead of finding their accommodation to be acceptable to the evolutionists, will find that they are scorned for their halfway acceptance of the full atheist interpretation.

The Dover, Pennsylvania, school board case

The atheists consider the Dover, Pennsylvania, school board case to be a great win, but as a legal case I consider it to be an embarrassment to the courts and to the legal profession in general. The arguments put forward by the ACLU attorneys would have been shredded on review by any serious court. That legitimate criticism would have included the irritating mis-citing, mis-quoting, and misinterpreting of Supreme Court cases on the topic. It is lucky for the atheist plaintiffs that they did not have the case appealed where a review court could undo their supposed great victory.

The plaintiff's attorneys made much of the fact that the Intelligent Design (ID) people did not participate in the case. The atheist ACLU lawyers cunningly and deceptively imply that the ID people had nothing to say, and that they knew they were going to lose all the real arguments, and were afraid, so they stayed away, etc. I assume the real truth is that on advice of counsel, the ID people stayed away, not because they didn't have something important to say, or that it wasn't correct, but because of the procedural setting of the case. By the time the case was tried, it was probably clear that there would never be an appeal and a review by a higher court, and that the ignoramus who was the federal district court judge was probably going to accept even the wildest claims and speculations of the ACLU plaintiffs. So, in other words, they stayed out of the case so that no one could say that they were bound by the results of that abysmally-handled case. They could be free to present their materials and arguments in another setting where a solid legal opinion and results could be possible, including appellate review in case the future district judge was again a lazy, uninformed, and ambitious activist judge who imagined that he was going to settle this issue once and for all, for all the world, in his humble courtroom.

This is another interesting situation where the ACLU and evolutionist bullies want to use the ignorance and inexperience of the public as a weapon against them. Most people do not have the understanding of legal processes to realize that this Dover, Pennsylvania, case was going to be worse than a waste of time and money for many of the people who were interested in getting government-enforced atheism out of the public schools. This constant use of deception and bullying by the Left, as opposed to relying on sincere and thorough scientific argument, ought to be a good indicator that their cause is not just and that they lack the information which they claim to have. This is all part of the Big Bluff, which is also the Big Lie.

The trial transcript and resulting decision are full of all sorts of nonsense, but perhaps the two biggest items are 1) the bureaucratic argument for evolution, and 2) the obscene twisting of the First Amendment so that the Establishment Clause could supposedly be used to completely destroy the Free Speech clause. The legal argument goes something like this: By taking 1 minute out of the entire school year to read a few sentences of skepticism concerning evolution, which could conceivably undermine the absolute pagan religious sanctity of evolutionary dogmas, the school was guilty of infringing upon the Establishment Clause by importing that tiny fragment of supposedly religious sentiment of open-mindedness. Reading those one or two sentences was so evil, according to this interpretation of the Constitution, that all teachers everywhere must be gagged, and their First Amendment rights to free speech and academic freedom must be stopped with the equivalent of duct tape and an iron mask. This rending and destruction of the First Amendment by the atheist plaintiffs is so egregious and so foolish, that single act of legal overreaching alone should be reason enough to reject all of their other specious arguments.

The absurd bureaucratic argument for evolution goes something like this: In today's scientific world, the only way someone's work can be considered to be part of "science" is if it is published in a certain limited set of academic journals after passing through peer review. So if believers in organic evolution have a complete lock on these particular journals, then nothing can be published which transgresses their accepted dogmas. This is another one of those tautologies which are so much loved by the evolutionists. No one can do science unless it agrees with the prevailing opinion on evolution, and that is enforced by those pro-evolutionist forces having nearly complete control of the relevant journals.

There are several things wrong with the argument. It claims that if someone publishes a book which is made available to the public through some means other than going through these approved journals,

nothing in that book can be considered science. Of course, many of the most renowned scientists in the history of the world have published their own books which were well received and were considered high quality science. Galileo and Isaac Newton are two of the many well-known examples. Even Charles Darwin, worshiped by the evolutionists, published his findings and philosophies in his own private book, unreviewed by his peers until after publication.

This bureaucratic argument was invented and presented to discredit Michael Behe, who is a respected microbiologist, and who was involved in creating the Intelligent Design movement. At the time, I think his only published book was *Darwin's Black Box*. Since then, he has published a book entitled *The Edge of Evolution* which takes another giant scientific leap in demonstrating the accuracy of the Intelligent Design movement.

Michael Behe had also published numerous articles in those scientific-world-controlling journals so worshiped by the ACLU attorneys, but that was given little notice. Perhaps the implied argument was that by publishing a book privately, that would undo and negate all prior journal articles.

Of course, this bureaucratic argument is complete nonsense. One might guess that a very large portion of scientific material which is available and used in the world never went through any journal publication process. I assume that very little of the world-changing work done by the giant pharmaceutical companies is ever sent through the journal publication process. The goal in pharmaceutical companies is often to acquire patents on their findings. Publishing a patent is quite a different process from publishing a scientific journal article, and the results are likely to be far more valuable, certainly at least commercially. And publishing in a journal could later make it impossible to acquire a patent or to retain and defend trade secrets.

The History of Church leaders' opinions on the evolution issue

The names of Church leaders I have briefly researched so far on the evolution issue are as follows: Talmage, Widstoe, Roberts, Packer, Smith, and McKay. I believe it is fair to say that none of them were willing to go anywhere near challenging the basic Genesis story concerning the origin of man. Some, such as Talmage, Widstoe, and Roberts, were puzzled by various geological findings, but that did not lead them to even begin to accept the atheistic theories of evolution.

We have extensive and powerful public statements from Joseph Fielding Smith and Boyd K. Packer rejecting every version of the men-from-monkey kinds of atheist speculations. We have slightly less public and extensive statements from Talmage and Widstoe, but their statements are no less clear and intense. According to the McKay book, President McKay was willing to accept some version of evolution. However, apparently he was unwilling to make any significant public Church statements on the topic, as evidenced by his resistance to publishing the Roberts book which contained chapters on evolution. Also, apparently, Roberts was unwilling to accept any atheistic interpretations of the Earth's history, and proposed a creative "two creations" solution to the historical and scientific puzzle in an attempt to separate the major issues into different time categories. But apparently even that equivocal discussion of the evolution topic was considered too speculative and controversial for direct Church publication.

There were probably at least 20 other Church leaders in the 20th century who were essentially silent on this point. But if that is true, do we begin with that silence and use it to impute assent to the atheistic interpretations of the Earth's history? I think not. That is a terribly weak and implausible argument. More likely, they decided that enough had already been said on the topic, and they left the topic alone.

In summary, we have a very poor historical basis for saying that the Church is truly neutral on the question of teaching atheistic organic evolution. Not all the Church leaders have spoken on this point, but all those who have, have been against it. If the Church has stopped short of forbidding the teaching of atheistic organic evolution at BYU, that is hardly the same thing as saying that it is approved by the brethren, or even considered a harmless topic .

The BYU defense for teaching evolution

Introduction

The two collections offered by the pro-evolution factions at BYU, an online packet and a published book, are so incomplete as to be deceptive, and apparently intentionally so. What we have here is another example of the bureaucratic argument which was used in the Dover case. By carefully and artificially defining and parsing and framing their presentation, the amount of information which gets through their filter is minimized, and it is hoped that that minimal amount of information, without further explanation from other sources, can be twisted to allow the evolutionists to sneak through a small break in the otherwise fairly strong fortress of historical church leader argument against accepting atheistic evolution.

Most busy students will not have the time to perform their own independent research on all the public materials presented by Church leaders on the topic of evolution over that last 150 years, so if they are presented with a very minimal set of materials which can be twisted to reach a certain conclusion, they are going to be inclined to accept that presentation as a fair account of all that has gone before. Of course, the impression they are given is a complete lie, and the perpetrators of that lie ought to be worse off in the public acceptance of their argument than they were before publishing their active deception.

Evolutionists typically base their arguments on some kind of fraud and deception, and so there is no reason not to expect it in this case, even though a religious organization is involved (or perhaps especially because there is a religious organization involved).

The bureaucratic or "publishing" argument

In the Dover, PA, case, it was argued that nothing can be considered "science" unless it is published by one of the evolutionist-controlled scientific journals. Obviously, that is not going to happen, or may do so only rarely, because, by definition, the reigning science journal administrators are never going to publish anything which counteracts their strongly held dogmas on the topic of evolution, regardless of the indications and consequences of the actual science involved. (In fact, there are some evolution-compromising materials which have gotten through that fine-grained sieve, but those materials were either not mentioned or were condemned or ridiculed for some specious reason as part of the pro-evolution ACLU argument.)

Similarly, in the BYU situation, even though there is a fairly rich history of Church leaders speaking and writing clearly and unequivocally against the atheist evolution position, the BYU evolutionists have simply ignored and hidden that material (because it was not "properly published"), and try to leave the impression that very little has been said on the topic by Church leaders, and that what little has been said by Church leaders is very restrained and equivocal. This extensive selecting and editing and parsing amounts to a lie, and the authors of these materials ought to be ashamed and be shamed.

It seems like some kind of academic crime has been committed here. Everyone knows that plagiarism is a bad academic practice, whether done by students or teachers, but actively hiding and suppressing powerful contrary materials means that the results are not fair and balanced in the slightest way, and are so partisan as to be embarrassing when presented as though it were a fair evaluation of the current state of Church belief and policy. If these people have to torture the truth to that extent to make their arguments seem plausible, when the truth comes out more fully they ought to feel a backlash and a punishment for their incomplete and therefore deceptive writings.

Examining the actual materials

Even the materials they do quote in the packet are not much help to their main case. For example:

It is held by some that Adam was not the first man upon this earth, and that the original human being was a development from lower orders of the animal creation. These, however, are the theories of men. The word of the Lord declares that Adam was "the first man of all men" (Moses 1: 34), and we are therefore in duty bound to regard him as the primal parent of our race. ...

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, basing its belief on divine revelation, ancient and modern, proclaims man to be the direct and lineal offspring of Deity.

These, and similar formulations, appear over and over again in the packet.

It seems clear that the brethren are not willing to accept that man came from monkey. This single statement means that there is no chance whatsoever that the brethren would accept the Deist interpretation used by so many BYU professors to argue that God merely set up some invisible metaphysical rules (and then disappeared forever), and that all of biological creation happened "randomly" (but also somehow in accordance with those secret metaphysical rules).

Obviously, man did not come through that evolutionary process, and if you take man out of the evolutionary biological equation, what does that leave behind? If man did not come through evolutionary processes, why would you think that any other creature on the Earth came through evolutionary processes? Is God only able to do biological miracles in the case of man and not in the case of any other creature? He can only work on the most complex and most valuable, and not the less complex and less valuable? That would be rather silly reasoning. Of course, the whole point of evolutionist argument is to disconnect man from God and leave him without any commandments to follow. (Why would they really care whether ants or bugs were created or evolved?) If man is not included within the range of evolution, then their whole argument is meaningless and pointless.

The *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* quotation in the BYU packet contains this quibble added by its author: "The scriptures tell why man was created, but they do not tell how...." Having seen how emphatic the brethren were in their various statements that man is a child of God and came directly from God, it is hard to see how someone can legitimately ask the question of "how." Just how many kinds of "how" are there left to consider as still open possibilities? The brethren have specifically rejected evolution as a means of creating a body for man. Does anyone seriously think that in the end, when all things are made known, God is then going to retract all his statements about creating man and creating other organic life, and admit that he sat on the sidelines for at least 4 billion years and did nothing as a nearly infinite number of random trial and error events took place in the biological world? Is he really going to admit that he's actually a Deist God, and not the theistic God that we imagined was so close to us throughout human history? This "how" question is nothing more than an obstinate refusal by the scientists to read the words before them, as spoken and written by the prophets. They want so much to have their atheistic creation myths still allowed as plausible, and still retain their chance for glory by finding the metaphysical rules of evolutionary creation hidden behind randomness, that they are willingly blind to plain meanings. It seems that the scriptures typically contain no diagrams, only words, and certainly no detailed instructional videos on how things happened. But even if there were diagrams and videos, is not likely that the prophets' words would be made more clear.

To repeat, the words quoted in the packet, on their own, and especially in their historical context, are quite enough to torpedo the claims of the evolutionists to have Church support. I assume the very reason for the announcement was to settle this issue, at least the most important parts of it, not to encourage it to continue to fester and confuse. Surely this announcement was not made to give license to evolutionists, especially since they had just removed teachers of evolution from BYU Academy.[?timing?]

The solution offered by B. H. Roberts is certainly a clever one, the idea of two sequential creations, but to a very large extent no such compromise is needed. It is becoming clearer every day that the evolutionists' assertion that existing species give rise to new species which are fundamentally different, through some process of "descent with modification," is simply impossible based on the actual workings at the microbiological level. Still, there is a factual difficulty which has not been explained, and that is the large number of fossils of extinct creatures. To fit within the gospel narrative, these creatures would all have to die and become extinct after the fall of Adam. That seems like a perfectly plausible answer in most cases, but there may still be some of the most unusual cases which are unsatisfactorily explained. Perhaps a version of B. H. Roberts' dual-creation solution will still be necessary, but for a different reason than was assumed historically.

Perhaps, something like the fact that man lived 1000 years at the beginning just after the Fall, the original creations were allowed to live and propagate for 1000 years to fill their niche before death came into their world. That way, God would only have to create one pair of Buffalo creatures and they could spawn the millions that it would take to cover the Great Plains, for example.

Without the evolutionist requirement for continual mass extinctions of inferior subspecies in order for the "descent with modification" process to work, there is no particular need for death before the Fall, and if death was delayed after the Fall, as in man, everything could work out properly.

The entire need for "death before the fall" is based on the evolutionist speculation that the death of the weakest and the survival of the strongest was what caused speciation to occur in the first place. We can now say with some certainty that it did not happen that way, so the requirements for death, early and often, also goes away.

Do we assume that there was no procreation among any of the creatures during the pre-Fall times, just as there was no procreation of man? That may be an unnecessary restriction. It was man's innocence and lack of knowledge which was the crucial element in the requirement for and timing of the Fall, and that specific requirement could not apply to plants and animals. Perhaps there is no requirement that plants and animals had no seed before the Fall. In the story of the Garden of Eden, there were such fruits as apples, which presumably would contain seeds, which could lead to the growth of other apples. (How does a person "tend a Garden" without any reference to starting new plants?) Or flowers and grasses might have seeds which made possible the propagation of their species even in a paradisiacal state, perhaps that being a special and essential part of a paradisiacal state. After all, what good is a fruit tree or vine which does not produce fruit? And why would not that fruit also contain seeds which could produce other fruit? In other words, there is more than one way that things could have happened so that things worked out to be as they are, without any death until the Fall, and perhaps no natural death for up to 1000 years thereafter. All that is required is that plants and animals were created by God as described in Genesis.