

Responding to The Personal Point of View of William Bradshaw

Introduction

Even though I disagree with him thoroughly on almost every point, William Bradshaw should be commended for making clear his views about evolution. I believe in many cases LDS evolutionists are not anxious to make their views clearly known. As he notes in the introduction, it is often not a pleasant experience to try to be very specific on these matters.

He makes the basic statement that "I don't believe that evolution is incompatible with the doctrines of the Church nor is it an enemy to faith." I believe the term "evolution" has an extremely narrow, almost infinitesimal legitimate application to Church doctrine, and that in its normal atheistic form, it is indeed an enemy to faith. The leading brethren in the Church are certainly unanimous on at least one point – that Adam is a lineal offspring of God, and has no connection to any process of evolution. I believe that from his writings, Prof. Bradshaw would not be willing to exempt Adam from the random chemical processes so dear to evolutionists. That single exemption for Adam would mostly obliterate the rest of the meaning and purpose for evolutionist arguments.

For simplicity, I have only included Prof. Bradshaw's short answers to the questions. He offers much longer answers in most cases, and those should be examined in a separate document which include his full list of questions and full answers..

My responses to his answers may seem quite repetitive, but that is simply because the same issues appear over and over viewed from different angles in his following catechism.

1. Q: What is the scientific status of evolution? How should I regard the idea? Is it legitimate to discount evolution as "Just a theory"?

A: Evolution stands on very secure ground. The hard data supporting it are numerous and varied. It is no less a satisfying and compelling explanation for the diversity of living things than is the notion of gravity for explaining the behavior of falling objects.

My response: He gives the standard Big Lie, Big Bluff answer that avid, committed evolutionists always seem to give. This is an "Emperor's New Clothes" situation. The whole purpose of my collection of commentary is to show that there is absolutely nothing to this claim. After more than 150 years of trying, there is zero scientific data showing how the first spontaneous generation occurred to begin life, or how any such beginning was the basis for all plant and animal life. There is zero experimental data and explanation of how the astronomical complexity of DNA came into being. There are almost zero serious attempts by scientists to explain how the complex molecular systems of life actually arrange themselves into the structures which evolutionists claim happens spontaneously. All of these critical points for demonstrating the basics of their theory are based on nothing but speculation. It is atheistic speculation in that the unwritten first phrase is always "There is no God to create such things, therefore X must have happened in some magical and currently unexplainable way, which we will call 'random.'"

Their constant attempts to compare the totally speculative processes of evolution to the absolutely known and documented laws of science such as gravity, electricity, fluid pressures, etc., are meant to do nothing but bully and confuse the unschooled reader. This is pure deception. There is absolutely no logical connection between the truth of gravity and the truth of evolution. The mere fact that the two ideas are held in one brain does not make one prove the other. Only real data can do that. If a scientist can think of phlogiston, evolution, gravity, and phrenology all at the same time, does the gravity piece make all of the other three (obsolete or speculative) items fully accurate and fully documented? That is beyond absurd,

but that is what evolutionists ask everyone else to believe all the time. This sort of argument is an insult to everyone else, but they endlessly persist, nonetheless.

2. Q: At present there is considerable debate and difference of opinion among evolutionary biologists. Doesn't this mean uncertainty about the truthfulness of evolution, and provide a reason why I should reject the idea?

A: No.

My response: Prof. Bradshaw tells us "There is agreement on the fact of evolution." What he does not say is that there is zero proof that life began spontaneously, and that single miraculous incident is supposed to have spawned all other forms of life on the Earth. The only reason there is such widespread agreement on this so-called "fact" is that atheistic philosophy requires it. If creation by God is rejected, then one must still explain the presence of life on the Earth by creating atheist creation myths to support atheistic philosophy, so atheists/scientists have no alternative but to present their alternative as a "fact." There is no science here, only rhetorical bullying.

3. Q: Who is a creationist? Is it correct to identify Latter-day Saints as creationists?

A: Though this may seem to be a straight-forward question, the work "creationist" - like so many used in conversations about evolution needs careful definition. As generally used in the context of the controversy over teaching creationism in the public schools, Latter-day Saints are not creationists.

My response: Prof. Bradshaw is correct in distinguishing the LDS Church from some of the extremely literal positions taken by some Protestants on the question of creation. However, by necessity, because of our scriptures and the words of the prophets, we are still 99.999% creationists and only 0.001% evolutionists. We must allow for microevolution, or variation within species, especially since we can see it with our own eyes, and the scriptural notion of "kind" acknowledges its existence as part of a larger set of rules.

Here he is playing some of the usual word games played by the politically motivated evolutionists. He, along with other politically aggressive evolutionists, defines an extremely narrow definition of the term "creationist," and then says that the LDS Church does not fit within that precise definition of "creationist," even though it is only a whisker away, an insignificant distance away, from what most non-fanatical people would understand is intended by the term "creationist."

Michael Behe, in his study of malaria and HIV and other such organisms, has shown that the "Edge of Evolution" stops at "kind." Of course, the evolutionists will no more accept this experimental scientific proof than Darwin accepted biogenesis, the "life comes only from life" principle demonstrated by Pasteur. But whether or not the evolutionists accept it, it is true nonetheless.

Although it is not true at the moment, historically the Church leaders, especially Brigham Young, wanted the children of the Church to not attend any secular institutions where atheistic evolution was taught. As far as I can tell, there has been no change in doctrine whatsoever, but perhaps politics has required a change -- assimilation, accommodation, etc. -- although I personally think it has gone much too far. (See the "Utah State Board of Education Position Statement on Teaching Evolution" which aggressively promotes atheistic evolution with a very superior and patronizing attitude toward religion (as merely a scorned alternate "way of knowing"), plus the matching statement by the Utah Science Teachers Association. These two statements are displayed as trophies on the website of the fanatically pro-evolution National Center for Science Education. See <http://ncse.com/media/voices/utah-state-board-education> and <http://ncse.com/media/voices/utah-science-teachers-association>)

In his "Personal Point of View" segment, Prof. Bradshaw raises the question of whether BYU needs to teach evolution to retain its accreditation. He does not deny that that could well be the case, although his concern was whether the teachers of evolution at BYU were seen to be sincere in their beliefs in that aspect of science or whether they were simply somewhat cynically going through the motions to meet some accreditation standards.

I personally consider it a shortcoming of the Church that we do not support the efforts of other Christian religions to defend the public school science curriculum from the hostile takeover by the militant atheist evolutionists.

4. Q: Is "creationism" a science? Is "evolution" a religion?

A: "Creationism" is not science. "Creation Science" is a contemporary religious/political movement masquerading as science in order to gain public acceptance. Evolution is the central, unifying theory of biology, not a religious principle.

My response: Regardless of his self-serving assertions to the contrary, at its core this is a theological debate between two religions or philosophies – atheism and Christianity. Or, using Prof. Bradshaw's word choices, they are competing dogmas. Both require large amounts of faith, since no exhaustive proof is available to either side (although the principle of revelation can completely end the debate for some Christians, where no such certain knowledge can be available to atheists/evolutionists, even if they happen to be visited by evil spirits as with Korihor (Alma 30:53) or Moses in Moses 1:12.) Based on the sheer volume of raw evidence available, the Christian view is actually better documented than the atheist view.

There is in fact a substantial body of scientific information collected by creationist scientists which directly challenges the claims of the atheistic evolutionists. His choosing to mock and scorn that serious science, which includes Intelligent Design, does not in any way refute its many specific challenges and assertions.

5. Q: Is evolution an atheistic concept? (Does evolution assume the absence of a divine being acting as creator?)

A: Unfortunately, it is commonly assumed that evolutionary theory operates on the premise of the absence of a Creator. This is not true. Students of evolution do attempt to accumulate data to answer questions such as how old is the earth, when did species of plants and animals appear (and disappear) and are the organisms (including man) genealogically related to one another. Evolution, however, is not inherently atheistic. There is no data generated by chemistry, biology, the earth sciences (geology, paleontology) or other related academic disciplines which validate the conclusion that God does not exist, or that exclude God from the process that generated living creatures. Theological questions are outside of the realm in which science is able to make a direct contribution. Some evolutionary scientists are atheists, but many others in many religious faiths maintain a strong belief in God.

My response: What he says is simply not true. It is nothing but double talk -- he is playing more word games here. The overwhelming bulk of evolutionists would say that there definitely is no God, at least none that has any observable effect whatsoever, meaning they operate as total atheists as to any science speculation, and that is the reason they need the wild and totally unscientific speculations concerning abiogenesis or spontaneous generation.

Randomness is all there is that is observable or accepted, leaving no operational place for God in the creative process. It is only a few uncertain religionists who leave a role for God in place of the Big Bang, but otherwise allow him no place in the cosmos.

It is a meaningless gesture to say, as he does here, that there might in fact be a God, but science

operates totally as though there was no God, leaving no place in Earth's history for any of his creative acts or other involvement with man and other creations.

If I were to continue his short answer I would make the last sentence read: "Some evolutionary scientists are atheists, but many others in many religious faiths maintain a strong belief in God, but they still have no belief in a God with any duties or powers relating to the biology of this Earth."

He hints at the possibility of divine intervention, but would never find the slightest place for it in evolutionary theory. We need to assume that here the "hand of God" means nothing more than his role in a deist universe where he merely started the whole process and then disappeared forever.

His whole answer is a confusing version of the "other ways of knowing" attack on reason and rationality itself.

6. Q: If evolution is true (a correct principle) does that mean that life originated "by chance"?

A: Let's rephrase the question. "Could life have originated without the hand of God?" I believe the answer is no. "Could God have employed a mechanism for creation which depended on the random behavior of molecules and other probabilistic biochemical and biological events with confidence that the outcome would be as he desired (envisioned) - was it predictable?" I believe the answer is yes. It would not have been necessary for God to intervene at each stage of the creative process in order to insure the eventual appearance of living organisms on the earth.

My response: This is a lovely attempt at "squaring the circle" and making everyone happy, but it makes no sense at all. It is only a few odd people who are willing to accept the idea that God may have set up some kind of meta-DNA rules that directed evolution to asymptotically approach the structure of the beings God created spiritually, although there is no possibility that any of that could ever be demonstrated scientifically. This is another "scientific" postulate that is inherently unprovable and thus pure philosophy.

God did not "envision" it, in the most general of terms. He created the exact creatures and men, spiritually, down to the molecule level. Again, why would God waste such incomprehensibly vast gyrations of mutation and death, when he could simply speak and it would be done exactly. But these people are really denying the power and intent of God to make man, his children, in his image, and supply them with a suitable environment for living.

This imagined process of mutation and death would necessarily involve the biological churning of a large portion of the Earth's mass, creating many cubic miles of biological refuse in the process. He might in fact choose at some point to turn over such vast amounts of biological material, but there is no need to have it be random or unpredictable in the least.

None of his talk about rules can ever touch the source of the astronomically detailed and complex DNA system, although some aspects of DNA have become understood to some extent.

There is nothing even slightly or remotely "inevitable" about how the 10 million known species came into being. All these important assumptions are nothing but speculation, since nothing of the sort has been directly shown. Hydrogen and oxygen may form water, and adding in carbon may lead to methane, but there is nothing but the most tenuous speculation that can get you from something like methane to DNA and to the millions of highly specialized and interrelated organic molecules. This only happens in the dreams of evolutionists, which also sometimes involves a magical "emergent" property of matter that can be postulated but never proven.

7. Q: Based on LDS theology, is it reasonable that the Savior would have employed evolution as a mechanism for effecting the creation?

A: Given my understanding of the divine strategy employed to elevate the spirit offspring of God to a celestial state, I believe that creation by the Savior of the physical diversity of life through evolutionary processes is a much more satisfactory explanation (more compatible with the means God uses to achieve his ends) than creation by fiat.

My response: I believe it is a silly assertion that the Savior would have used evolution as "a mechanism for effecting the creation." There is nothing in the record of his life on earth that would confirm that, and much which would dispute it. Was he able to heal the sick, raise the dead, and command the elements because they were all subservient to him because those are powers that gods have, or did it only happen because he prayed to the individual (possibly godlike) particles and was able to convince them to join in (on an ad hoc basis) a cooperative effort which he preferred?

It is true that God respects the agency of other intelligent beings, but do we really want to assign godlike levels of intelligence and agency to every particle in the universe, and also assume that they would all automatically know what actions would make them most happy and put them in harmony with themselves and with God? It might turn the power of God into a joke (and bring into question whether he could really save us and resurrect us and prepare a heaven for us hereafter), if he had to repeatedly present all of his ethical preferences to a committee of all the physical particles in the universe and hope that they could reach a necessary level of consensus one more time.

I believe Prof. Bradshaw goes too far when he proposes in his extended answer the idea of pantheism in which every atom and molecule of the universe is endowed with intelligence and intent so that if it decides a horse is needed, it can join with its friends and create a horse. This level of chaos sounds strangely like the "Selfish Genes" idea of Richard Dawkins wherein materials consisting of a few chemical bonds in DNA somewhere acquire a godlike intelligence which can overwhelm and direct what would otherwise appear to be the independent rational behavior of humans. What we could arrive at here is a power struggle between God and the elements of the universe. Does the Earth stay in its orbit around the sun simply because it's atoms and molecules decide that is the best thing for it to do, and it enjoys it for the moment, or because it was ordered to do so by God? I believe Prof. Bradshaw has gone way too far in assigning independent rational behavior to every particle in the universe.

Some of the evolutionists are enamored of "emergent properties" which they imagine are concealed in otherwise completely inanimate particles. It is these speculative magical pantheistic powers of particles which they use to explain the mystery of "mind" as it is found in humans, and in a supposed urge by these particles to form themselves into one or another of the possibly 10 million species of creatures which now exist on the Earth. How different sets of these particles choose to become ants or horses or trees or cows and find their destiny in constituting such consistent biological entities is not explained. With this level of independence and creativity and self actualization among the Earth's particles, one might expect to find an infinite number of strange concoctions of biological creatures, perhaps with bamboo shoots growing where a rhinoceros's horn might be, assuming that particles with differing agendas happen to be joined together by chance and failed to reach a common consensus. Has anyone found the wavelength on which these communications and negotiations among micro-gods might be carried out? Shouldn't we find features of lions and ostriches somehow intertwined because of a failure of negotiations among particles? Some of the strangest kinds of atheistic fairytales come out of these kinds of speculations.

8. Q: Is evolution a concept which demeans and degrades mankind?

A: Though some people may feel this way, such a conclusion is certainly not necessary. For many, the notion of man's physical kinship with the organisms of the world is an ennobling and uplifting concept that gives meaning to our stewardship of the earth.

My response: Which would any normal person rather be, a direct son of God or the presumably genderless "son" of a genderless, mindless, and amorphous amoeba? Perhaps we ought not to be so

proud as to put ourselves above the amoebas, but nonetheless we have a built-in tendency to feel that bit of "prejudice." But this kind of super-tolerance and possibly Politically Correct kind of thinking is probably part of Satan's plan to remove all standards of truth and righteousness, and replace them with something far less elevated. How can it be a bad thing to be proud of being a son of God, and to use that assurance of our innate divinity to help us actually rise to that level of morality and righteous action? Do you really want to say that it is just as commendable to be a good "all you can be" amoeba as it is to be a good "all you can be" God? That doesn't seem too hard to answer.

As mentioned in my answer to question 7 above, do we want to feel "at one" with the bugs and worms and microbes of the Earth, treating them as our equals and our "brothers," or do we want to prepare ourselves to properly rule over them, as Adam was directed to do in the book of Genesis?

9. Q: How does the Garden of Eden fit in? Where did Adam come from? (What are the possible models to explain the creation of man?)

A: The scriptural accounts of the creation of man are beautiful, inspiring, and provide indispensable doctrinal insights about the purpose of life and our relationship with God. It is not appropriate, however, to interpret them as a scientific description of the creative process. Several of the concepts are stated figuratively, and are important for the spiritual truths they convey symbolically. The truth is, we don't know the details of how Adam was introduced into mortality. In spite of our ignorance, the religious principles and the scientific evidence are not mutually exclusive and can be reconciled. Accepting Adam doesn't require rejecting evolution or vice versa.

My response: One of the options for the source of Adam's body is carefully eliminated from the list of possibilities in Prof. Bradshaw's exposition. The most likely and non-mysterious source for the body of a creature destined to become a God would be to be born of another God – born of a woman or goddess as every other God and human has been born. Unfortunately, accepting that extremely obvious and oft-repeated solution to the "mystery" of Adam's body creates an enormous difficulty for the LDS evolutionist. If the most complex of all of God's creations, man, came about through the eternal creative process called birth, why couldn't all other lesser creations come forth in a similar way to the formation of seeds or the birth of lesser creatures to immortal versions of themselves?

Speculating on the nature of evolution thus becomes the process of adding almost incomprehensible levels of confusion and anarchy on top of a most straightforward and simple process. Just as concepts of evolution fly in the teeth of the second law of thermodynamics (the tendency for physical systems to reach the lowest possible level of activity and complexity), those concepts also completely slaughter the beloved scientific rule of simplicity, sometimes called Occam's razor, wherein the simplest explanation is assumed to also be the most likely one.

Prof. Bradshaw's final appeal to ignorance as justification for trying to firmly bond together atheism and theism is not very convincing. The question is really whether we accept religion and its related morality and ethics as the rock-solid beginning reference point, and try to eventually make the science match the religious interpretation, or do we start with the feeble findings of science and put religion on the defense every time someone finds a new bone? I believe he has made the wrong choice here. It should be possible for a scientist to accept religion first and put science on the defensive as far as rearranging religious concepts, but that is essentially impossible to do when you also must merge your discourse with militant atheists who cannot accept the tension and the suspense.

10. Q: Does acceptance of evolution lead to a loss of faith, religious skepticism, an inclination to sin, or the adoption of immoral behavior?

A: The answer is no. Though it is common for sinners and skeptics to find reasons to explain or excuse their behavior, it is incorrect to view evolution as a pathway leading to immorality. There are thousands of

faithful, active Latter-day Saints who accept evolution as a true principle.

My response: One of Darwin's goals was to relieve God of the responsibility for creating some disturbing biological species and behaviors. In other words, he wanted to get God as far away from men and Earth and its biosphere as possible. That is the typical reasoning which draws people into a strong emotional bond with concepts of evolution and its related assumptions, or even militant assertions, of atheism. I believe a survey would show that most people who avidly accept evolution, first accept atheism and then seek out evolution to fill the void left by their denial of God and any of his creations or influences.

"If there is no God, then all things are permitted." That is the reasoning of a famous Russian character in a famous Russian novel. As noted above, a very large number of people adopt atheism for the very purpose of supposedly freeing themselves from the moral imperatives of the writings of the prophets, with evolution supplying the atheistic creation myths they need to fill out their worldview.

The "thousands of faithful, active Latter-day Saints who accept evolution as a true principle" are believing in a lie. They are trying to fully connect atheism and theism, and that is as difficult as trying to reconcile good and evil. It is a mathematical certainty that they will fail, and they will suffer for it in some way.

Again, trying to merge atheism and theism, good and evil, into a harmonious mixture is a fool's errand, and those try to do it will almost certainly make some bad choices because of their many accepted ambiguities and relativities.

Prof. Bradshaw does propose an interesting test: Can one get the witness of the Holy Ghost that the principle of evolution is true and that God used it in creating the biosphere of the Earth, including bodies for men? Do the two personal expressions by students quoted in his answer give the impression that they can bear witness through the power of the Holy Ghost that evolution is the principal of creation adopted by God? I really don't think so.

The student who rejected the "zap" method of creation in favor of what he considers the more interesting "mutation and death" scenario has already basically rejected the often-announced assertions in the Scriptures of the vast power and unalterable intent of God. He has made the choice to mentally downgrade the power of God by perhaps a factor of 1 billion times by his assertion, perhaps without fully consciously realizing what he has done. Did he get the confirmation of the Holy Ghost on that point? I doubt it. What other powers and teachings of God might he find that are inconvenient in his new professional activities? He can be sure that he will not be fully accepted into the worldwide atheist priesthood of evolutionists until he has gotten rid of all but the most insignificant vapors of a belief in God.

For me, the important test would be to know how many students leave BYU for graduate studies, especially graduate studies in the physical sciences, and retain their commitment to the Church and their activity in it, once they are out of the environment of BYU where their faith is externally supported regardless of their internal mental meanderings. Although I don't have anything more than a small amount of anecdotal data to go on, I suspect that a very large number of graduate students are unable to maintain this lovely balance between religion and science, which Prof. Bradshaw proposes, when they go on to graduate studies in places which are militantly atheist, as are nearly all centers for higher learning these days. In one case, it appears that LDS students who may have attended LDS seminary, and then go on to centers of higher learning such as Yale, quickly drop out of Church activity in that hostile environment. Those who did their undergraduate work at BYU and go on to graduate work elsewhere may be a little more resilient, but that is not clear. A Church leader in Europe mentioned that European LDS students basically have the choice of staying in the Church or going to university. It appears that even fairly well-prepared students rarely stand up under the pressures of militant atheism. Perhaps the lesson is that if they are prepared to compromise in any way their religious convictions in the face of "scientific" challenges from militant atheists, they will almost always lose. The ambiguity of accepting atheism on the same level as theism apparently is not a stable situation.

11. Q: Is there an official position of the Church with respect to evolution?

A: No. There is considerable evidence that the Church has not taken an official position on the subject of evolution; statements by LDS authorities and members past and present reflect a wide diversity of viewpoints.

My response: His answer is deceptive and almost completely wrong here.

I would say the real answer is "Yes, there is, and it does not accept evolution" (whatever academic freedoms professors at BYU may be granted to say otherwise).

As I have pointed out in great detail in other articles, regardless of the assertions and publications of LDS evolutionists, the Church has indeed issued official statements in the past denying the most crucial aspects of evolution which relate to the source of Adam's body. Resolving that one extremely important point does not necessarily resolve all others, but it certainly creates an immense barrier to the casual acceptance of the rest of the atheistic speculations concerning evolution. Strangely enough, in trying to demonstrate the lack of an official Church position, the LDS evolutionists choose to use the 1909 and 1925 public statements of the Church against the principles of evolution on the anniversary of Darwin's birth and the publication of his most famous book, and during the time of the Scopes monkey trial. How those conscious denials by the Church of the validity of evolution can be twisted into statements of neutrality is quite a challenge to accomplish by rhetoric, or "spin," as we might say today.

If one finds that 30 out of 30 Church leaders, "prophets, seers, and revelators," over the past hundred years have all been in absolute agreement that man did not arrive on this earth through evolutionary processes, that makes the "diversity" claim extremely weak. It is true that Church members of lesser status have indeed had a diversity of opinions, but we don't typically use them as any kind of reference point.

It appears in Prof. Bradshaw's answer that he has found three more people who are willing to quibble slightly about our level of certainty about how Adam and Eve arrived on this earth. Now perhaps we can say that the score is 30 to 3 for the proposition that God has made his plans and actions clear to us on the exact source for Adam's body. Which side seems like the safer choice?

Prof. Bradshaw has President McKay stating that Joseph Fielding's Smith's book, *Man His Origin and Destiny*, was not an official publication of the Church, and that the book consisted only of Elder Smith's personal opinions.

To be more thorough, we must notice that Elder Smith, upon becoming the president of the Church himself, reaffirmed his belief in the ideas stated in his book. If it is only presidents of the Church we should listen to, then we should take more notice of President Joseph Fielding Smith.

Prof. Bradshaw also finds a very imprecise statement by Pres. Joseph F. Smith, but fails to mention that this is the same president who affirmed more precisely than anyone else that Adam was born of woman just as Christ was born of woman.

Perhaps we can at least say that we're not getting a very well balanced view of questions about evolution from this highly partisan exposition by Prof. Bradshaw. If he quotes only one side of what one important Church leader has said, and fails to acknowledge the other side of the comments by the same person, how much should we accept his view as dispositive?

Incidentally, if all the prophets go around saying that all the words of the other prophets are only their personal opinion, what kind of muddle does that leave us in? It appears we have just found a way to nullify all modern revelation. Is that really what we are trying to do here? I think we have just found the point at which public relations meets revelation, and it appears that the most recent prophets have tried to hide this issue from the world to the extent they can. That is a separate and interesting question of

Church politics and administration, but I don't think it really tells us anything about how the gospel itself can be adapted to the atheistic principles of evolution.

12. Q: How should I respond to the widely divergent views about evolution held by persons I respect, especially teachers and leaders in the Church?

A: Any important idea of consequence deserves thoughtful consideration. Our difficulty lies in giving a fair hearing to ideas we seem to disagree with. We ought to conduct such an investigation with open minds, and in a spirit of humility and kindness for those whose opinions are different from our own. Latter-day Saints can properly expect unity on fundamental doctrines. On issues for which revelation is incomplete, a diversity of opinion is natural and valuable.

My response: The real question is whether revelation really is incomplete on the topic of the creation. He says it is incomplete, while others say it is not. How do you resolve that, except with more revelation, and why would anyone believe that new revelation if they would not believe the preceding revelation?

Prof. Bradshaw asks whether our views should yield to those of most Church authorities (an interesting implied admission as to what most of those views contain). Actually, there is no need to yield to anyone's views. Remember, there is an absolute philosophical need for atheists to have an explanation for the obvious fact that there is life on Earth without referencing God, but there is no evidence to support their spontaneous generation assumptions about the source of life, or their assumptions about mutation, death, and survival. We do not need to engage in "angels on the head of a pin" kind of inquiries or set up competing religious authorities. The "scientists" simply have no answer to the most basic question, and we can verify that fact ourselves.

In contrast to Prof. Bradshaw's ideas about always keeping an open mind, if a question can be resolved, it usually ought to be. What is there to be gained by continually leaving one's mind open and wondering about important issues which can be quickly resolved?

This is something like an issue which Joseph Smith spoke of in his King Follett discourse. He was continually being persecuted for saying that God was an exalted man, or at least had a body like a man, rather than being just a vague, strange, and mysterious force. Unfortunately, it sounds like Prof. Bradshaw, who wants to leave wide-open the question of the process of creation because he prefers the "strange and mysterious force" explanation, would be among those actively resisting more precision on theological topics such as creation and evolution.

A Personal Point of View

My response: I object Prof. Bradshaw using in his "A Personal Point of View" another of the many false comparisons which evolutionists are always pressing in their arguments. Here he tries to compare on an equivalent basis the thoroughly studied and highly controlled immediate use of radioactive materials in medical diagnostic procedures, with the far more open-ended and conjectural use of assumptions about original density and deterioration rates of radioactive materials over millions of years. The first is subject to very tight monitoring and validation, while the second is open to a nearly infinite number of unknown and unmeasurable parameters. Perhaps we can say that, by treating these extremely different situations as equivalent, the evolutionists show how thin and speculative their so-called "data" actually is on evolutionary topics.

Naturally, on the question of dinosaurs, he leaves out one of the equally plausible options, which is that dinosaurs preceded man by only a short time or in fact were contemporaneous with man. That is a far less speculative option than dinosaurs from outer space or from Satan's conspirings.

What do I have to do to harmonize the two theories?

A: See chart.

My response: In the first four segments of his chart "What Do I Have To Do to Harmonize the Two Theories?" Prof. Bradshaw always accepts the religious conclusion when he seems to have no scientific data, but always accepts the evolutionary theory conclusion if there is any purported data from science. The one exception is item 5 where he tries to have it both ways. Although he ostensibly leaves the question open, he seems to be saying that Adam did indeed have a different kind of spirit than earlier man-like creatures, but that he probably descended from the prehuman creatures in the "mutation and death" portion of the Earth.

On item 3, Prof. Bradshaw finds the evidence compelling that there is a genealogical relationship through time for the plants and animals of earth, including Adam. In my opinion, the evidence is so thin and so confused and speculative that only a strong predisposition to accept that viewpoint could overcome the weakness of the miniscule evidence available. For example, just the simple assertion that atheistic evolutionists make that all life came from a single miraculous random source of life, which somehow split itself into photosynthesizing plants and the creatures who eat them, thus becoming the single hereditary parent of all life, is just too much for me to swallow. The mathematical possibilities of that happening by random chance are so infinitesimal as to be ridiculous, and any god-substitutes which the atheistic evolutionists may propose to get around that mathematical difficulty are just as ridiculous.

On item 5, Prof. Bradshaw, in the face of zero general authorities willing to go against the "Adam as a direct son of God" pronouncement, still seems to be insisting that the option of "Adam as a mature amoeba" must be held open in the interest of science (and atheism), regardless of fantastic odds against such being the case in fact. Apparently, as long as the option is held open, grants and other outside encouragements are available for evolutionary scientists.