

Draft 1

The gospel according to the LDS evolutionists

I have been hoping that someone in the LDS community of evolutionists, whether professional scientists or not, would be willing to set out in plain English their complete version of the Gospel after all necessary adjustments have been made to fit with their strongly held views about science and evolution. Alas, that is unlikely to happen, although apparently a few people have made a few comments about some limited aspects of the effect on the Gospel of their overriding commitment to evolutionary science.

I believe the lack of a complete and coherent reworking of the Gospel according to their lights is a great detriment to understanding their positions on many points, so that Church members may better understand their arguments.

Perhaps this is one of those situations where if you want something done right, you have to do it yourself. In that frame of reference I plan to offer my version of the effects on the Gospel of their commitments to evolution. Whether they would respond, after the fact, with their adjustments to my version of their modified Gospel, we will have to wait and see.

The major sticking point – the source of Adam's body

It seems possible that the whole matter can be reduced to the question of whether Adam received his body as the culmination of eons of evolutionary conflict and mutation, perhaps receiving some miraculous intervention at the last step, or whether he received his body as any other human has ever received it, through being born to a woman. Here are three options mentioned by others:

"There are at least three different theories proposed by LDS evolutionists about the source of Adam's body:

1. B.H. Roberts, one of the Seventy, suggested that there were actually two creations, one which happened first which would essentially meet the atheistic evolutionist people's requirements of nearly endless mutation and death, with all of that phase being ended by a cataclysm, and then a second round of creation which happened essentially as the Book of Genesis describes.
2. James E. Talmage, an apostle, theorized that introducing a spirit into some creature, which roughly approximated a human being, would allow that spirit to completely and immediately revamp the body to make it suitable for use by a man such as Adam.
3. William Bradshaw, a BYU professor, theorized that there were actually two simultaneous situations occurring during the overall (extended) creation period. Most of the Earth was operating under the evolutionist rules, especially those concerning mutation and death, while a small part of the Earth operated under Garden of Eden rules where there was no death. But I don't believe he made it clear exactly which process was responsible for Adam's body, although that is the central question of the matter.

Presumably he would opt for some way to take "Adam" out of the bloody world and upgrade him through dropping in a spirit which would fix up all the leftover problems. Was Christ really so much more important and worthy and privileged than Adam, so that Adam got a warmed over monkey body, which was repaired and upgraded as needed, and Christ got a body with a godly heritage on both sides? In his list of possible sources for Adam's body, he leaves out the option for Adam to be born of woman, but he does not assert that Adam was a direct descendent of amoebas. Even though he is vague and ambiguous on this critical point, it appears that he would like to find some way to make Adam the product of amoebas, but is not willing to say that. Surely he is aware of the critical question of the source of Adam's body, but he prefers to dance around the subject rather than deal with it directly.

I need to reemphasize here that, in spite of their various flights of theorizing, in the end, neither James E. Talmage nor B.H. Roberts was willing to say that Adam was the descendent of amoebas, rather than

being a direct descendent of God himself."

Whatever else they may say, it appears the LDS evolutionists believe that they must avoid at all costs the idea that Adam was born as a son to God, just as Christ was born a son to God. If that were to be admitted, their entire professional façade would be destroyed, since that professional façade requires that man must be the product of amoebas, and cannot be a literal descendent of God. It does not help to say that all creatures *except man* arose from amoebas, since "man is the measure of all things," at least in the physical/scientific world of evolutionary biology. Man must have come through the long, dreary, and bloody process of rising up from pond scum, or their entire evolution speculation collapses, at least within the gospel framework. (It is interesting to note that the most commonly and forcefully stated element of LDS Church leaders' statements concerning evolution is that Adam was a literal descendent of God. One might guess that they sensed that this was the heart of the matter, and wanted to make their interpretation as clear and succinct as possible.)

The LDS evolutionists are on pretty shaky ground trying to maintain that absolute assertion about the "pond scum" source of Adam's body in the face of at least 30 out of 30 of the leading brethren in the last century disagreeing with them. They might choose to reject the authority of these men, perhaps by simply saying that these men were not scientists, and so they could not be speaking about things of which they know firsthand. That quibble alone could get them in trouble, since these men, as prophets, claim to speak for God, at least on important occasions.

But perhaps there are some other more scientific arguments which they might have to pay attention to. We might notice that the birth of Christ, using the DNA of God the father and the DNA of Mary a human, worked perfectly well and produced an extremely successful offspring. Normally, the people familiar with biology and reproduction would be likely to say that one definition of a species is whether two individuals of the species being examined can successfully produce offspring even though there might be slight differences in their individual characteristics. Does it seem like very much of a stretch to say that God and Mary were of the same species if they can so easily have a very successful offspring together? But of course that is the teaching of the scriptures and of all the prophets -- that man and God are of the same species -- so no one should be surprised in the least that this unique joinder of God and man to produce "God with us," Jesus Christ, should be successful. This event, the birth of Christ the Redeemer, was expected from before the beginning of time, so someone had to be absolutely certain that the process would work correctly in the much awaited event.

If the body of Jesus Christ was so easy to produce through the joinder of a God and a human, are the LDS evolutionists prepared to argue that the joinder of God and his heavenly resurrected wife could not similarly produce a proper physical body for the benefit of Adam? Surely they're not going to say that there is no marriage in heaven, or that women do not retain their femaleness in heaven. The temples are surrounded and enveloped with an overwhelming set of doctrines and traditions to say that "families are forever," and that offspring of some sort will continue hereafter for those who are worthy and who desire to carry on the great work of the gods.

The LDS evolutionists put themselves in the unenviable position of dictating what powers and choices God has in conducting this great work of "bringing to pass the immortality and eternal life of man." Are they truly going to try to maintain that God could not have produced Adam's body as a child born of woman, just as Christ was born of woman? How could they possibly know and assert such a critical statement within the boundaries of the gospel plan? Do they have some Scriptures to defend their viewpoint? Are they going to use their feeble science and related speculations to tell the creator of the universe exactly what he can and cannot do within the plan he created? This sounds like a very risky business, symbolically going toe to toe with their Creator on a critical point in his well rehearsed plan.

I assume they will do everything in their powers to tiptoe around this critical issue and hope to never have to be challenged on it directly or have to defend it directly. When the smoke clears, all that is left is their insistence that much of their profession would become meaningless if they were ever to admit that one crucial point.

To say it another way, God had plenty of time to plan for the birth of his son, and can anyone imagine that he would do it in anything less than the perfect way (even apparently including a supernova explosion planned to coincide with his birth)? After all, his son was a God himself, and ought to have a body which was 100% of the lineage of the gods. Both sides of the liaison that brought him a mortal body should logically be of the lineage of the gods. Can you really imagine that Mary was the descendent of some mongrel, potentially hideous subhuman creature which clawed its way up from some pond scum or amoeba to become the handmaiden of God? Would you really get exactly the same result if you had this random and unpredictable accumulation of features and traits which became just barely able to mate with a God? This seems absurd when put this way. With the emphasis on families and genealogy, and with the obvious ease with which God could supply a consort which herself was 100% of the lineage of the gods, that he would fail to do so? Even after a few billion years of development, why would anyone think that a randomly put together creature would really be of the same species and lineage as God himself? This is just too silly to contemplate, all for the single purpose of justifying a few LDS evolutionists in their desire to stay on good terms with the atheist biologists of the world and amuse themselves with beliefs in atheist fairytales about biological progression from miraculous chemical beginnings. It seems to me that simply stating the case clearly is enough to make it just too absurd to accept in any way at all.

Other methods considered

I suppose it is theoretically possible that God is continually taking subhuman and definitely sub-godlike bodies and miraculously upgrading them to be equal to the physical lineage of the gods, as in the potential cases of Adam and Eve and perhaps Mary. But why would he choose to do it that way when he always has the obvious and simple option to just create the real thing in the first place, bodies with 100% lineage of the gods? If he chose to do such strange and unnecessary things all the time – upgrading non-divine bodies to divine status – might he have given us a clue about that? Certainly the LDS evolutionists are at a great disadvantage in pressing their interpretation with no known evidence of any kind, and in the face of the simple, obvious, straightforward way God has described these processes, without a hint of the unnatural and ungodly and demeaning gyrations needed to pacify the professional preferences and needs of LDS evolutionists.

We might consider what happened when Christ directed the Devils to leave a possessed man, and those devils invaded the herd of swine and caused it to jump into the sea? Did those swine suddenly change to human form, in accordance with the devils which were within them? We are told that these devils desire to claim the bodies of humans, since their spiritual bodies are of the same type as ours. However, as far as I know, although these evil spirits have taken over people's minds and bodies to some extent, I know of no case where they actually got complete and permanent control. I presume in the end that the rightful owner of that body will end up with it, at least in the resurrection.

If it really was an option for a spirit to take any particular blob of material such as a swine and turn it completely into human form, we would have seen this happen on a grand scale and billions of animals would all have become like "Mr. Ed," the talking horse, or a horse which morphed into the shape of a man to fit the needs of the errant spirit within. For some reason, I think it highly unlikely that, in the eternal scheme of things, any random spirit is going to be given the power to take a blob of biological material and form it after itself. That seems like one of those things which would be forbidden simply to prevent such bizarre and unjust things from happening. If all things were indeed created spiritually before they were created naturally, one might expect that spirits can only inhabit bodies which had the identical DNA and other matching parameters.

I am assuming that in the science of theology, as in any other logical set of assertions and consequences, there are general principles which apply in more than one place. If spirits have the power which some of the LDS evolutionists suppose, to invade a blob of biological material and reorganize it at the molecular level, we would see this happen somewhere else as well. I know of no other place where this is said to have happened, so I am very skeptical that it would happen in this one bizarre and very convenient place for the evolution professionals.

Expanding the scope of the "Adam Question" to include the power and intent of God

The LDS evolutionists' cobbled-together and convoluted story of the history of God and the universe has more inconsistencies and epicycles than Ptolemy's version of the universe which argued that the earth was the center of the universe. There is a schizophrenic and unreliable god who cannot be counted on for any kind of consistent attention to man and his needs, past, present, or future.

Classical deism

Classical deism assumes that there is a God of some sort, who created the universe, but then he disappeared forever. Deists don't seem to offer a reason about why God did this great work and then disappeared forever. Perhaps they are really just atheists simply trying to adapt for the fact that there is a universe and we are in it. The atheists of today would say that there was a Big Bang which created the universe suddenly. The nice thing about that is that no God is required for any purposes. In other words, we have come up with a creation myth which totally eliminates God, where the deists essentially eliminated him, but left in that one function, just to explain how we all got here.

The convenient thing about classical deism is that the deists have also explained why they don't need to pay any attention to any scriptures. They have declared there is no God who would have had any contact with people, so there could not have been any prophets and therefore no scriptures. There's really no basis for this, any more than there is a basis for the evolutionist's belief in spontaneous generation of life, but it is something they have chosen to assert just to justify their philosophy of ignoring the scriptures. One has to assume that deism was created for the very purpose of supplying a reason to ignore the scriptures, just as evolution was invented as a reason to accept atheism as a complete explanation of the universe and its history.

In other words, a deist is really an atheist who hadn't thought of the Big Bang yet and so had to leave this far distant function to a god which otherwise had no purpose. They were just filling in the one missing blank about how we got here.

The LDS evolutionists seem strongly drawn to this deist interpretation of God and the universe, and they use the same explanations that deists/atheists like to use. However, being members of the LDS Church gives them quite a large number of extra hurdles to explain that the other semi-atheist deists of the world don't need to attend to.

We start out with the uniquely LDS Scripture that says "this is my work and my glory to bring to pass the exaltation and eternal life of man." That little bit of Scripture makes it a great deal harder for someone to say that God awoke from his slumber billions of years ago, created a universe, which may or may not have included an earth at that time, and then went back to sleep forever.

The God of the LDS is a very powerful and immediate God who has intervened at every step of man's existence, according to the Scriptures. He has answered prayers, and performed many miracles. He has parted the waters, he has stopped the sun, he has calmed the waves, he has healed the sick, and he has raised the dead. He has supported his prophets with the power of his arm as in the case of Enoch using the forces of nature to crush his attacking enemies, etc., etc. So how then does the LDS deist get us from this version of God who awakens long enough to create the universe and then disappears forever, to the LDS god who is ever with us, manifesting his power at every turn?

One aspect of the deist view is that they have declared that there is no other source for life on Earth than the random behavior of chemistry and physics. Of course they also would say that God does not have a physical body, but is merely some kind of mysterious force about which we can know very little. They would also say that there was no such thing as a preexistence as we speak of which recognizes the existence of all of the individuals who were to inhabit the earth who were advanced from their eternal individuality to a spirit status and taught various things about which they voted in a grand council in heaven. When you bring up those kinds of things, it sounds like maybe God was indeed quite busy from the very beginning in his association with this earth.

Perhaps the LDS evolutionists do not really believe in God having a body and there being a preexistence filled with billions of spirit children of God. By claiming to believe in those two uniquely LDS points of theology, they greatly inconvenience themselves in their defense of evolution. Perhaps they would be more comfortable being Protestants than LDS members.

If God had no body himself, and therefore had no particular preference about what man should look like, and had no intention of having children such as Adam and Christ directly born to him and placed on the earth, then any reasonably functional physical form would do for these creatures which were intelligent enough to understand the directives of God (and be his created playthings, according to some religions).

But if we are serious about saying that we are of the race of the gods and that we are descendents of God, that plays havoc with the total randomness of the behavior of chemistry and physics which the evolutionists cling to so irrationally. If God has already created everyone spiritually in complete detail before they come to earth and he himself has a physical body and expects to have at least one son born of that lineage – Christ who is a God himself – then one might seriously wonder why he would let biology go wild and then accept the arbitrary result in the end? And, as noted above, if Adam and Christ were descendents of God in every possible meaning of that term, then there is not much left for evolution to attend to. It makes the whole thing a joke. It assumes that God is, again, quite inconsistent and unpredictable. He will go to great ends to get the exact result he wants in the question of human and godly bodies, but he cares nothing about the rest of the biosphere that surrounds and supports humanity? That seems rather silly.

If it seems good to have dogs and horses and cows and sheep and goats to aid man, what if, by accident, they all turned out to be flesh eating lizards who spent their every waking moment hunting down man rather than assisting him? It is completely inconsistent to inject a theory of complete determinism where God let biology run its course, supposedly, but in the end he had extremely precise results that must reach down to the molecule level. That makes the whole process a farce. It certainly would tell us that any appearance of randomness is a complete fraud. And yet to say that God invented a super-DNA or meta-DNA which was metaphysical, in the sense that we can never see it or measure it, is just as strange. Why don't we just say that God created these creatures, rather than inventing these tortuous detours which seem to maintain this freedom of biology, while actually crushing it into meaninglessness.

Obviously, the classical deist would never imagine that there was a life before this. But the LDS view of the preexistence gives God something important to do for a few billion years, while still staying closely engaged with his "work and glory." And if he were so engaged in his "work and glory," and had created all creatures, including man and every other biological entity down to the atomic level, why would he bother with this horribly wasteful trial and error process awaiting the outcome of total randomness, when he would not accept anything but absolute precision and perfection in the end result? This is just silliness. Can we imagine that God spends much of his time pulling useless jokes on people? It is inconceivable that an atheist evolutionist would ever grant God even a tiny portion of the power inherent in this possible LDS evolutionist view

Stretching even further – the King Follett discourse

Joseph Smith, in the King Follett discourse, had this to say: "God himself, the Father of us all, dwelt on an earth the same as Jesus Christ himself did, and I will show it from the Bible." This statement has many implications for the LDS evolutionists. For the sake of their profession, they would much rather believe that all of the life in the history of the universe happened on this earth in the last 4 billion years according to their favorite oxymoron "guided randomness" formula. If the God of this Earth is a descendent of a long series of other gods who created similar earths for their children to have similar experiences, presumably supplying the same biological support systems on those earths as on ours, namely sheep, goats, dogs, cows, horses, fish, etc., then the favorite assertion of the LDS evolutionists, that the first and only life on the universe happened on our Earth, through a fresh set of random outcomes, is nothing but a self-centered wish. Again, why should one of a long series of Gods suddenly decide to start over fresh and do things differently than had been done on millions of other earths, and let random chemicals have a chance at determining the nature of this next earth? How many trillions of times might he need to let this

process run its course until, by pure chance, some of it turned out to meet his exact and demanding specifications?

This is the long way of saying that the grand scheme of things as outlined by Joseph Smith in the King Follett discourse would naturally be rejected by the LDS evolutionists, simply because it adds another layer of theological difficulty and implausibility to their preferences as to how our Earth came into its current condition. They would probably find themselves wanting to return to the deist version of religion wherein a single God of mysterious attributes appears out of the cosmos long enough to create a universe, and then disappears for all time. There are certainly no multiple gods in that conception of our universe, where there is indeed a multiplicity of gods in the Joseph Smith conception. They want their evolution experience to be grand and unique for all time, rather than be reduced to nothing more than a possible small sideshow in a vast universe of past, present, and future worlds directed by many gods. The most likely outcome in this vast collection of gods and worlds is that there never was a creation of the biosphere through the evolutionary processes they strongly cling to, or if there was such an event, it happened an infinitely long time ago, certainly more than 4 billion billion years ago, rather than the mere 4 billion years of their suggested timeframe.

Postulating a mentally healthy God who cares about his earthly family

Joseph Smith struggled to get us to understand the true nature of God. Apparently that is a very difficult thing to do, because people seem to have a strong tendency to limit God's powers and influence, to downgrade him from a person to some kind of mysterious force, and to push him as far away as possible. They might even suggest that God is not a rational and predictable being. Apparently people invent these strange ideas for many different reasons, including personal reasons to lessen the weight of his pronouncements against sin, and for professional reasons to make their own professions seem more important and valuable.

Here is a comment I posted to a Facebook discussion on evolution:

"It is true that the Book of Genesis is not completely thorough, since it doesn't deal with every issue an atheist-leaning person might bring up. But the problems for an LDS person who accepts evolution are even worse. For example, we have this idea that God is the God of many worlds, not just this one. So if this same process has been done at least 1000 times before, exactly why is it that our God suddenly lost the knack of doing things quickly? Even though he created innumerable worlds before, for some reason, the LDS scientists insist that when he got to our world, he suddenly developed a very severe case of obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD), so that instead of going off and building other worlds and universes, and doing other great works, he decided to take off for 4 billion years and monitor every formation of every organic molecule and protein in the biosphere. So those trillions of trillions of mutational transformations concerning billions of creatures, all at the sub-cellular level, going on for billions of years was what transfixed this great being.

Some would say that you can shortcut the OCD process a little bit by postulating a metaphysical super-DNA structure which would control all the actual formations of DNA which in turn control all the formations of actual organic molecules and proteins. The great difficulty here is that, as scientists, they cannot recognize anything which is metaphysical, because that smacks of God. So instead, they have created this concept of an enormous collection of hidden knowledge, matched with force, which then oversees the laborious "creation" process through mutation, etc. But, of course, what they have done is simply redefine God, because that is what God does. Again, scientists cannot possibly see anything behind the random activity which is apparent, so they are stuck in this twilight world of imagining a metaphysical force which affects physics, but cannot possibly be described or tested. Here is where we start to match fairytale for fairytale, because we have no other options."

I think the LDS evolutionists have a lot of explaining to do to reconcile their rigid support for certain theological points with other important and conflicting theological points.

A range of possible gospel interpretations by LDS evolutionists

Perhaps having discussed some of the largest issues, we can now begin to suggest a more complete framework of Gospel belief for the LDS evolutionists

It is unlikely that the LDS evolutionists will detail their exact take on the Gospel, simply because putting their (possible) heresies in writing would probably instantly get them in big trouble. However, it is useful for the rest of us to have a way to categorize what these people really think. Since we can expect them to be secretive as far as keeping their thoughts to themselves on Gospel issues, because they are potentially in the middle of a maelstrom of difficulties if they make their views clear, I'm going to offer a series of alternative interpretations of the Gospel that they might secretly or openly believe in, and let the readers here choose for themselves which ones the LDS evolutionists are likely to feel the greatest affinity with.

One might expect the full LDS gospel to be the preferred religion. However, these people have made it clear that they are willing to dismantle whole sections of it in order to maintain their liaison with the committed atheists.

There are several fairly standard approaches to theology, which at least are internally consistent and coherent. There are probably several other versions which might be very idiosyncratic in the sense that these LDS evolutionists might each have their own version of the Gospel that they are willing to accept, and these various versions are likely to contain either more or less coherence and consistency.

A range of options:

1. Pure atheism -- Atheists assert that there is no God, there never was any God, and there are no evidences of his existence which can be accepted, such as scriptures, prophets, miracles, etc.

The concept of organic evolution was created by atheists for atheists, and so one might expect that the LDS evolutionists would feel most at home with the atheists, since that provides zero conflicts with their preferred way of viewing the biological world which envelops them in their profession

2. Pure deism -- There was a god which set up the universe and the physics on which it is based. It is optional whether God created this Earth specifically, or whether it was just one of the many happenstance consequences of setting up the universe. The physics which he set up were such that the principles of evolution could operate, and life could come into being and reach its full complexity and variation within the principles of those physics.

In this Deist conception of God, God is reduced to being about one billionth as powerful as the LDS God is portrayed in the Scriptures. Obviously, if God disappeared long ago, never to be seen again, then he cannot see to it that we are resurrected and given the power to live in a heaven which he has constructed and supports. He has neither the power nor the inclination to take care of these important outstanding scriptural promises. We might conclude that whimsy, not constancy, is his trademark behavior

We might conclude that even if God wished to carry out the scriptural promises, he does not have the power to do so, at least not within a reasonable timeframe. If it took him billions of years to create the universe, perhaps all of his actions take billions of years to complete, meaning we cannot expect answers to prayer in our lifetimes.

One great difficulty here is that those who accept a version of this deist interpretation, such as the LDS evolutionists, try to say that God set up a set of rules by which evolution could proceed, knowing that it would finally arrive at man and the animals and creatures we see today. Some state it is their goal to find out these rules. The great difficulty here is that these are not physical rules which can be measured by scientific techniques, if they exist at all. They are only metaphysical rules, operating outside the sphere of

the physics we can detect. In other words, they have defined the continuing involvement of God, but without calling it God. So God came, set up the universe, and left, but left himself behind in the form of meta-DNA rules to direct the evolution of life on this planet. This is incoherent, although some people might accept it, simply because they are incapable of or unwilling to work through the logic of the situation. If God had complete and absolute control of the outcome of the process, whether it was done in one step through direct creation or in two steps which included some random evolutionary activity, it seems that we arrive at the same result.

Deism seems to be the preferred way for weak religionists to surrender and reconcile their beliefs with the evolutionists, and many of the LDS evolutionists have shown a distinct tendency to accept this pattern, at least in large measure. Some of them have said quite a bit about how their view of God fits in with the greatly diminished power and presence which the Deists allow God.

3. Pure deism plus Christ and the apostles.

Logically, deism implies that there are no communications from God to late-arriving man, meaning there are no prophets, there are no scriptures, prayer has no meaning, there is no power of God on earth to do miracles, etc., etc.

If one decides that God chose to take billions of years to do something which he could have done in an eyeblink, having already done the entire job in its blueprint/spiritual form, then, logically, someone has to come up with the reasoning of God about why he would make such a strange choice. Did he choose to act through evolution as a way of trying to trick us into thinking he is far less powerful than he really is? Does that help or hurt us in our faith in him to resurrect us and provide a heaven hereafter? I think it puts the whole plan of salvation into question if we are not sure he actually has the power to carry out his promises.

Merely to postulate that he could make that choice to use evolution if he wanted to does not rise to the status of a doctrine or teaching. There is probably an infinite number of things that he could have done, but didn't do, or at least he hasn't told us about them. The question is not what could God choose to do, but what did he do, and can do and will do, and what does he teach that others should do? For us to understand the mind of God, we have to have some details and some examples. Merely saying that he could have done it that way if he wanted to doesn't help us in the least.

Perhaps we can say that the LDS evolutionists believe in prophets, but they may not believe in all that they say, especially concerning the source of Adam's body. The Church appears to have no strong pronouncements on the age of the earth, but they have many very strong pronouncements on the origin of Adam.

So-called "higher criticism of the Bible" would likely go along with this viewpoint. A large portion of the Bible would then be considered merely allegorical rather than literal. Literal miracles and visitations of heavenly beings are among those things which would be the first to go. This would have the LDS evolutionists accepting many of the biblical interpretations of the world rather than accepting the King James and Joseph Smith versions of the Bible as largely literally correct, especially concerning creation issues.

This could involve their asserting that Jesus was only a man, and not divine. Certainly they would have trouble accepting that he had unlimited miraculous powers to heal the sick, raise the dead, and command the elements. That would be totally inconsistent with their naturalistic evolution viewpoint wherein God (and God With Us) either had no miraculous powers or chose not to use them.

They would have to recognize that they cannot consistently give God those kinds of overwhelming powers while on earth and still keep their atheist creation myths intact. Their claims seem foolish if God has that great power, uses it sometimes, but not others, for the benefit of man, and those other times where powers are not exercised are the ones required to be that way by the evolutionist professors.

4..... Work out your own theology belief gradient here.

5..... Work out your own theology belief gradient here.

9. The full LDS Gospel -- it embraces a very powerful God who desires to stay in close contact with his children on earth. He has the power to create or repair/heal anything. He has power over the elements, etc. He has a fully fleshed out moral system and that includes rewards and punishments in the hereafter in a kingdom in a heaven constructed and maintained by himself where his children can go and continue a productive existence.

This God must indeed have vast power if he is to be able to follow through on his promises. If he implies that he could do certain things we need desperately, but he might randomly decide to do other things which are of no help to us at all, what kind of faith would that engender? Maybe he will just wake up some morning and decide he has vastly overpromised, and just decide to default on his promises, just because he can. What recourse would we have?

The LDS God continually offers to believers evidence of his existence and power and concern for his children. This immediate and powerful God who makes extensive plans and promises and carries them out is in great contrast to the God of the deists who came and disappeared before we knew anything of him and has no continuing interest in his creations.

A different religious scale -- paganism

What follows is a post I made to a discussion on evolution:

On the question of evolution, I suppose it all comes down to a choice. I prefer the situation where we have a highly developed set of principles and morality (religion) which can lead to, and has led to, a high state of righteousness among the people of America which has meant liberty and prosperity for a very long time, something which is unique in the history of the world.

It seems absurd to me to contemplate the alternative which is to assert that man has no place in a broad and eternal moral universe which embodies justice and mercy, but is simply a malleable lump of accidental flesh that can be molded at will by the desires of wicked men to control and enslave others. I have invented the term "warlord religion" to describe the insane systems of beliefs which have been instilled into the overwhelming bulk of the world's peoples to convince them that they are meaningless and should accept slavery at the hands of their "enlightened" masters who can "save" them -- China, India, Japan, Middle East, etc. Some of these religions hold beliefs in a nearly endless reincarnation cycle where man supposedly spends eons as various insects and other lower forms of life, perhaps never reaching any higher form.

As I see it, evolution is simply another "warlord religion" (invented by a self-styled elite, hoping to become an uncontested ruling elite) which is intended to weaken and demean the natural freedom and nobility of the world's peoples. The perpetrators of this latest version of a warlord religion have certainly been successful in their goal, perhaps beyond their wildest expectations. The shackles on people's minds worldwide is astonishing. At this point, almost any idiocy that can be invented will be accepted by people who now dutifully see themselves as nothing but helpless, powerless victims, awaiting a worldly messiah to save them IN their sins. It is both pitiful and revolting.

Why not take religious values as the place to start, and put science on the defensive to come up with something as thoroughly thought out and thoroughly proven in practice? When atheists start telling me that I should learn my morality from groundhogs and apes, I don't have much patience with them.

Teaching evolution damages freedom and promotes slavery

I personally believe that freedom is the first principle of the gospel, because nothing else makes any sense without it. Obedience may be important, but the need and ability and freedom to choose whether to

be obedient or not comes before the actual obedience. As the Scriptures tell us, "The truth shall make you free." I take that very literally in the case of the teaching of the devil's atheist creation myths called evolution. As with all other "warlord religions," I believe the main intent of teaching evolution is to belittle man and try to convince him that he is nothing more than a worm. The science behind evolution is very speculative indeed, and is used merely as a convenient cover for the underlying atheist philosophy. Causing men to doubt the rightness of God's commands immediately weakens their dedication to always do the right things and weakens the justness and cohesiveness of our society. That lowering of standards of righteousness allows power-hungry men to dominate and pillage other men who accept their ideology through ignorance. As we have seen in United States, as the level of morality in the nation declines, all the other good things in the country decline along with it.

I am upset with the LDS evolutionists because their profession requires that they teach that men are nothing but worms with bigger brains, regardless of whatever words they might utter on Sunday. This damages the LDS religion by bringing into question whether man is of divine origin and whether he can achieve divine status by living divine rules taught by LDS Scriptures. It naturally tends to confuse and coarsen the people who accept any of its tenets. And, as intended, it also tends toward their progressive loss of political freedom because they may begin to doubt the value of that freedom for themselves and others, and trade their freedom and birthright for a mess of secular pottage. All of these are bad outcomes, and they are being furthered by the LDS evolutionists teaching at BYU, regardless of any good intentions these men may have about not causing these exact results. It is simply inconceivable that one can mix equal parts of atheism and theism on the campus of a religious university and not cause problems at several levels.

The "ways of knowing" relativistic refuge

When evolutionists are challenged with the absurdity of their claims, they often choose to retreat to a psychological defensive position. They try to claim that there are various "ways of knowing" the world and the universe that need not be even slightly consistent. They patronizingly pat the ignorant and childish layman on the head and say that it is okay for such a person to live in an imaginary world where religious truths and other myths and abstractions exist, while they, with their more mature and superior minds, are actually able to apprehend reality correctly without any of the mental crutches of religious myths. This "dual reality," which only they, the superior scientists, can comprehend, is really just a way of saying that the rest of us are too stupid to know the real secrets of the universe. This amounts to a redefinition of the concept of human reason, meaning there is really no such thing as a way for all people to sense and understand the various elements of reality in the same way and come to any kind of agreement. Strangely enough, this kind of relativistic definition of human thought actually denies the possibility of there being such an endeavor as science, since no two people could ever come to agreement on the nature and meaning of any physical experiments performed. It also reveals their disdain for those they wish to confuse and rule over as philosopher kings in their totalitarian fantasies. I would prefer to say that *they* are the ones with the mental disease, not the masses they scorn.