

NOTE:

Please do not read this article until after you have read either the article "Why the Confusion" or the medium-size book: Patterns of Intelligence.

Without a clear understanding of the fraud in science, and their use of tricky definitions, and a clear understanding of the difference between microevolution and macroevolution, this article will make no sense to the reader.

The average person thinks they have a clear understanding of the evidence for the theory of evolution, but in fact the average person has absolutely no clue how absurd the theory of evolution is and how massive the frauds are in the scientific community.

UNDERSTANDING THE CONTEXT OF THE 1909 AND 1910 STATEMENTS OF THE FIRST PRESIDENCY

In 1909, the First Presidency of the LDS church issued a statement which did not mention or challenge the theory of evolution. However, the document described official church doctrines in such a way that it was obvious that church doctrines were inconsistent with the claims of the theory of evolution, specifically with regards to the creation of Adam and Eve. Here is a section of the quote from 1909:

"Man, by searching, cannot find out God. Never, unaided, will he discover the truth about the beginning of human life. The Lord must reveal Himself or remain unrevealed; and the same is true of the facts relating to the origin of Adam's race -- God alone can reveal them. Some of these facts, however, are already known, and what has been made known it is our duty to receive and retain.

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**. God Himself is an exalted man, perfected, enthroned, and supreme. By His almighty power He organized the earth and all that it contains, from spirit and element, which exist coeternally with Himself. **He formed** every plant that grows and every animal that breathes, each after its own kind, spiritually **and temporally** -- "that which is spiritual being in the likeness of that which is temporal, and **that which is temporal** in the likeness of that which is spiritual."

He made the tadpole and the ape, the lion and the elephant, but He did not make them in His own image, nor endow them with godlike reason and intelligence. Nevertheless, the whole animal creation will be perfected and perpetuated in the Hereafter, each class in its "distinct order or sphere," and will enjoy "eternal felicity." That fact has been made plain in this dispensation (see D&C 77:3).

Man is the child of God, formed in the divine image and endowed with divine attributes, and even as the infant son of an earthly father and mother is capable in due time of becoming a man, so the undeveloped offspring of celestial parentage is capable, by experience through ages and aeons, of evolving [i.e. eternal progression] into a God."

"The Origin of Man"

Joseph F. Smith, President (plus the rest of the First Presidency),
November, 1909

This statement does not mention the theory of evolution or Darwin. It is a completely positive statement of church doctrines which is just as accurate today as it was then.

However, it does challenge the theory of evolution by clearly stating that human spirits are the children of God ("**proclaims man to be the direct and lineal offspring of Deity**") and that all species were created spiritually and temporally by God.

Of course, it is our spirits that are literally the children of God, and our physical bodies are the children of our parents and we are descended from Adam and Eve.

Note that our spirit body may have a great deal of influence over the design, creation and appearance of our physical body. This is evident from the above quote: "... that which is temporal in the likeness of that which is spiritual."

There is little doubt that many people interpreted the document as an attack on the theory of evolution, even though it did not mention Darwin or his theories.

The "scientific evidence" for evolution in 1909 (e.g. the beaks of Darwin's finches) were totally from microevolution, but the concepts of microevolution and macroevolution did not exist until after 1953, long after 1909. Thus, from the perspective of a scientist, **in 1909**, the theory of evolution had massive amounts of evidence to support it. And this is an important concept to remember.

Darwin claimed that species "evolved" slowly over many, many years. There was clearly physical evidence of his claims based on his scientific travels and research.

Enough fossils and the forms of living animals existed in 1909 to provide significant support for the claims of the theory of evolution.

What was missing in 1909 was an understanding of DNA and the concepts of microevolution and macroevolution. The discovery of DNA in 1953 completely changed (or should I say: should have changed) the evolution debate.

Darwin used his evidence to claim that the human race was not created by God, but evolved from more primitive species, even though he did not specifically claim human evolution in his first book.

Darwin did not think that people were ready for the concept of human evolution when he wrote his first book. Later, he wrote a second book, The Descent of Man, which mentioned human evolution and which was also published long before 1909.

Thus, by 1909 it was well established in society, and believed by many people, that the account of Adam and Eve in the Bible was symbolic (at best) or fraudulent (at worst) and that humans evolved from apes and had not been created by the hand of God.

It is important to understand that this was the position of science the church members in 1909 had to deal with. [There was no scientific proof that evolution \(i.e. macroevolution\) was false because DNA had not yet been discovered!!](#)

The church members had a testimony of their prophets, but they were likely also exposed to seemingly valid scientific evidence of evolution (i.e. valid in 1909 because DNA had not yet been discovered) because of Darwin's claims and the evidence both in fossils and in nature.

Thus, church members had valid evidence from both sides of the fence, so to speak.

DNA had not been discovered by 1909, thus the concepts of microevolution versus macroevolution were not understood, so [there was no reason to criticize the scientists in 1909 or even 1950 for believing in the theory of evolution](#). The claims of evolutionists were perfectly correct in their logic and conclusions insofar as the physical evidence that existed; combined with their total lack of understanding DNA.

Thus, some church members were likely torn between two worlds, the world of science and the world of religion, both of which seemed to be true.

Note that in the above quote, in 1909, the First Presidency comes out and clearly discounts the theory of evolution as an option to explain Adam and Eve, but the quote does this without a frontal attack on, or criticism of, the theory of evolution.

What were the church members to do?

Perhaps to prevent a schism in the church, where the evolutionists had valid evidence (because DNA has not yet been discovered), which schism could possibly divide the church, in 1910 the First Presidency came out with another statement:

"Whether the mortal bodies of man **evolved** in natural processes to present perfection, **through the direction and power of God**; whether the first parents of our generations, Adam and Eve, were **transplanted** from another sphere, with immortal tabernacles, which became corrupted through sin and the partaking of natural foods, in the process of time; whether they were **born** into mortality, as other mortals have been, are questions not fully answered in the revealed word of God."

President Smith provided **three options** for the origin of man. None of them were Darwinian evolution in the sense of accidents being the cause of human beings (Darwin rejected the existence of Adam and Eve). Rather, the presidency said that evolution, which was one of the options, if it were true, was **directed by God**.

The quote also clearly professes the existence of Adam and Eve as real people and as our ancestors. The theory of evolution denied that Adam and Eve were created by God and in a sense this is a denial that they ever existed.

Remember, DNA had not been discovered in 1909 or 1910 or even 1950, so there was no scientific proof that evolution was false.

The above quote totally rejects the theory of evolution, as explained by Darwin, because it does not include any option that humans descended from apes **by a series of accidents and natural processes!!**

The quote gave no credibility to any Darwinian accidents in nature.

The First Presidency statement did not totally reject that humans descended from apes, only that if they did, God was responsible for it happening. This is why I said that "accidents" were not an option.

When the quote talks about "natural processes" it also states that these natural processes, if they occurred, occurred **"through the direction and power of God."**

Thus, a member of the church could now think of "evolution" as being a valid scientific theory (because there was valid scientific evidence from microevolution,

but no one knew the difference between microevolution and macroevolution), but that if that is what happened, it was directed by God, not accidents of nature.

Thus, the accidental "evolution" of Darwin was discounted without a frontal attack on his character or his theory.

It was not until after 1953 that scientists could clearly delineate between "microevolution" (which is true science) and "macroevolution" (which is false science). Actually, even in 1953 scientists were far from being able to differentiate between "microevolution" and "macroevolution."

Thus, in 1910 (and until today) examples from "microevolution" were being touted as a "proof" of evolution!! In fact, the beaks of Darwin's finches, as one of many examples, which preceded 1910 by many years, seemed to be a "proof" of evolution because DNA was many years from being discovered.

Thus, there were probably many members of the church who believed in the theory of evolution. These members were not to be criticized because the establishment scientists had not committed fraud (well, in some cases they did, but even if they hadn't it would not have made a significant difference) in coming to their conclusions.

The response of the First Presidency prevented any type of schism in the church by giving those members, who believed the scientific claims of the day, a chance to believe in the theory of evolution, but only to reject the [mechanism](#) by which evolution happened.

Some might think that the church "gave in" to the theory of evolution.

I disagree. I think the church was in a paradoxical situation and had to be very delicate in dealing with the situation.

Heavenly Father certainly knew that Darwinian evolution was scientific nonsense, because He was the Creator. But the scientific evidence in 1909 for evolution was perfectly valid and believable and was not significantly founded on fraud.

The church clearly did not want to lose any member of the church to the theory of evolution because the evidence of the day was scientifically valid, given what scientists knew at the time. Nor did the church want the members to think that Darwin was right in the sense that the creation of human beings was the result of accidents in nature.

Remember, there was clear and valid scientific evidence for the theory of evolution in 1909 without any dishonesty on the part of the scientific establishment!!!

Thus, in 1909, the church was not in a justifiable position to criticize the scientific establishment because the scientists were making claims which were perfectly [honest](#) based on the evidence they had access to!!

You don't criticize a person for doing the best they can, you only criticize them when they are dishonest and dishonesty at that time was relative rare.

Thus, there was no reason to make the scientific establishment look dishonest or ignorant, because they were not dishonest or ignorant at the time!! They simply lacked full and proper information about DNA.

The best way out of the predicament was for the church to admit that the scientists had a valid point and were not dishonest (based on the technology of the day), by accepting that Adam and Eve may have "evolved" from apes, but yet if this were the case, the First Presidency said that God controlled the evolution.

Of course, the First Presidency knew that Adam and Eve did not evolve from apes, even under the control of God, but they acknowledged this possibility probably [in respect to the fact](#) that the scientific community of the day was not pervasively dishonest.

The reply of the church was perfectly honorable because the church had no reason to criticize the scientists of the day because the scientists did have valid, believable evidence for evolution.

Their statement may have lessened the criticism of the scientific community relative to the church's position on evolution.

If there was any criticism in the quote it was that the prophets probably knew that the "evolution" part of the quote was not the correct option (there were 3 options) and that it was only there to be respectful to the scientific community of the time because they were doing the best they could given what they knew.

The scriptures are not devoid of pragmatic responses by prophets to prevent chaos in the church!!

An example is [Jacob introducing his wife as his sister](#). It was not a lie, it was the truth. But normally he would have introduced his wife as his wife.

Pragmatism is not dishonesty. In fact it can be a statement of the truth [or a respect for opposing opinions](#).

God could have directed evolution, at the DNA level, if He had wanted to. That is a fact and the statement acknowledges this fact. But God chose to create all species by design as far as we know from the scriptures and the above quote.

The response of the First Presidency also gave those members of the church who associated with the scientists a way out of potential scientific criticism of the member's beliefs.

Who could deny that God could not control evolution!! That is a perfectly true statement and everyone knew that, even the atheists!!

Also, for members of the church who believed in evolution, it gave them a chance to maintain their dignity and the statement kept them from being ostracized by other members of the church because in fact the evidence for evolution was perfectly reasonable, given the discoveries at that time.

Keep in mind that the scientific establishment had plenty of evidence for the theory of evolution which was perfectly logical and legitimate!!

Thus, there was no reason for the First Presidency to ridicule the scientific establishment or to criticize those who believed in evolution or to say things that would challenge the theory of evolution; because there were plenty of valid scientific facts that honestly supported their theories.

In short, without the knowledge of DNA, the church could not scientifically argue with the scientists, even though the prophet likely knew the truth.

As always, it was an inspired response, albeit a pragmatic response, to a paradoxical situation where a frontal criticism of the theory of evolution would not have been justified and could have been a totally unnecessary disaster for both parties involved in the debate!!

But it was a true statement to say that God could have directed evolution from apes to humans. It is still a true statement long after the discovery of DNA!!

What About the Church and Evolution In the Post-DNA World?

Today, the scientific establishment knows a lot about DNA.

From a mathematical perspective there is no mathematical excuse for any scientist to claim that "evolution" was true or even statistically possible (see the [Patterns of Intelligence](#) book).

Today, evolutionists use examples from microevolution to claim that evolution is true. **This is an inexcusable and intentional lie and fraud!!!**

It must be understood that today the scientific community's support of the theory of evolution is an intentional and well-calculated master deception!!

The scientific community today does not have any integrity, not even a hint of integrity. They are full of lies and deceptions.

Today, there is overwhelming evidence that the theory of evolution is scientific nonsense and mathematically absurd.

Today, the church would have massive reasons to be critical of the scientific establishment for their fraudulent use of deceptive definitions and their ubiquitous avoidance of honest discussions of DNA.

Scientists now know that microevolution (e.g. Darwin's finches) could never in a billion years create a single new multi-cell species and that using examples from "microevolution" to "prove" the theory of evolution are nothing but a blatant and overt fraud!!

While macroevolution can explain the theory of evolution, the probability that macroevolution can explain the theory of evolution (in the creation of Adam and Eve) are far, far, far more absurd than claiming that the computer programs used to launch a space shuttle were written by monkeys which randomly pushed the keys of a computer.

The probability of the theory of evolution being explained by macroevolution are totally absurd and lack any modicum of a level of thought or analysis.

As I say in the Patterns of Intelligence book, in the history of this planet no more than 2 or 3 single-celled species could have been created by macroevolution. Certainly, no complex species, such as an insect or monkey, could have been created by macroevolution. It is mathematically insane to think otherwise.

In other words, the scientific establishment today lacks any modicum of integrity and it is easy to disprove the theory of evolution and to expose the frauds of the scientific establishment.

The scientific establishment itself should admit that macroevolution is clearly scientifically impossible as an explanation for human DNA. But that will never happen due to a massive, massive lack of integrity as is evidenced by their continued use of examples from **microevolution** to claim that **macroevolution** (i.e. true "evolution") is a fact. In fact, neither theory can explain the existence of human DNA, but for very different reasons.

Sorry, but there is absolutely no excuse in the world that "scientists" don't know the difference between microevolution and macroevolution. Scientists are not as dumb as monkeys; though they act as if they are. They primarily lack the integrity to admit defeat.

So what should the LDS church do today about the theory of evolution?

The problem the church faces is the absolute control of the [scientific establishment](#) and the total control of the [mass media](#) by those who support the theory of evolution fraud.

In some cases the powers that be support the theory of evolution due to their atheism and in other cases they push the theory of evolution for personal profit.

If the church were to come out openly against the theory of evolution; then the media, combined with the scientific establishment, would have a field-day criticizing the church as living in the dark ages of science.

The general public is totally brainwashed by the sophisticated tactics of the media and it could greatly hinder the mission of the church to openly attack the theory of evolution.

There is no way the church could get enough truth to the general public to form a response to the propaganda of the media, which totally controls virtually everything the general public hears and believes.

"No one understood better than Stalin that the true object of propaganda is [neither to convince nor even to persuade](#), but to produce a [uniform pattern of public utterance](#) in which the first trace of unorthodox thought immediately reveals itself as a jarring dissonance."

Alan Bullock, Hitler and Stalin: Parallel Lives

The media today are masters of creating a "[uniform pattern of public utterance](#)." The general public today is totally brainwashed by whatever the media says. The word "zombie" clearly comes to mind when thinking about the general population and the media.

Thus, due to the power and lack of integrity of the scientific establishment, and the total lack of integrity of the media, which together totally control the minds of the people with false scientific claims; it clearly would be in the best interests of the church to [avoid](#) an official direct attack against the theory of evolution (i.e. an official attack against the scientific establishment).

Nor would the church ever say that the scientific establishment was totally corrupt, the church is far too diplomatic to do that, even though it is largely true!! It is not totally true because there are many honest scientists in the scientific establishment, some who have been deceived and some who know the truth.

But perhaps the real reason the church has not come out more aggressively against the theory of evolution, even though its doctrines are a mirror image of LDS doctrine (see the [Patterns of Intelligence](#) book), is that the scientific establishment has so intentionally obfuscated scientific terminology, and twisted

the minds of their students, and proven that they are willing to invent data, that the church would look like dolts in the minds of many people who have been indoctrinated by the scientific establishment's clever deceptions.

Thus, the LDS church is in a paradoxical situation if it were to make any type of claim critical of the theory of evolution, even though the "theory" of evolution is clearly mathematical nonsense and more important is doctrinally false.

Any evolutionist reading this would be jumping up and down for joy that the LDS church has been defeated by the scientific establishment's lack of integrity and their roadblocks to prevent the church from attacking the theory of evolution.

However, don't jump too high and don't underestimate the Lord!!

What the church has done, from its inception (which was done in 1830, long [before](#) the theory of evolution was generally known to the public!!) is claim that Adam and Eve were created by the hand of God. Actually, this claim was in the Old Testament and was clearly reaffirmed by modern scriptures (e.g. 2 Nephi 2:15-20 in the Book of Mormon, which was published 29 years [before](#) the [Origin of Species](#), as one example).

The above quote by the First Presidency simply says we don't know HOW God created Adam and Eve. There is no option other than God; we have just not been told HOW He did it.

This is essentially a slap in the face of the theory of evolution (because the theory of evolution is excluded as an option to explain where humans came from) and it does not depend on statistics because macroevolution is far beyond having any rational statistical chance of creating a single new complex species, much less many thousands of them (see the [Patterns of Intelligence](#) book) which would be necessary to explain how the "first living cell" "evolved" into human DNA.

The mathematical truth is that macroevolution could never have created Adam or Eve from the "first living cell"!!! It would have taken many tens of thousands of new, highly sophisticated genes, created solely by macroevolution, to create Adam and Eve from a "first living cell."

This is an inane claim because scientists have never seen a single, new functional gene be created by macroevolution even in single-celled bacteria.

This is precisely why the scientific establishment has to use two crutches to get people to believe in the theory of evolution: first, deception in science and second, the brainwashing power of the media.

So to claim that many millions of mathematically impossible coincidences could have happened before the time of Adam and Eve would be an open door to their absolute ignorance!!

While the media would protect the evolutionists, don't underestimate the money and brains (of God) behind the LDS church.

Scientists would be insane to claim that there was enough scientific evidence to prove that Adam and Eve were not created by God due to the statistically inane absurdity of macroevolution!!!

Note also that the church's claim about Adam and Eve is "past tense," meaning it makes claims for events that have already happened. Unlike claiming that evolution is false, which would include future events, the claim about Adam and Eve is a perfectly safe claim which absolutely cannot be challenged scientifically!!!

To make a claim about the future (i.e. to claim that macroevolution could never create a new gene) would expose the church to the design and creation of **fraudulent scientific "studies"** to "prove them wrong." The scientific establishment has proven many times its willingness to commit outright scientific fraud to get their students to idolize them and ridicule religion.

In fact, the scientific community commits outright scientific fraud every time it claims that evolution is a proven fact of science. Fraud is more common than rain falling on the scientific community.

By the church making a claim about historical events, instead of future events; the scientific establishment would have to claim that many millions of examples of macroevolution have occurred in the past, instead of just one in the present (only one fraud would be needed to disprove a future claim against macroevolution by the church).

There is no way in the English language to describe how inane the claim is that macroevolution created all species on this planet. That is precisely why the scientific establishment uses outright fraud to support the theory of evolution.

By using their power in the classrooms and the media, and with the use of massive deceptions and fraudulent data, and massive amounts of money, scientists have managed to convince many people that evolution actually happened!!

In other words, to challenge the current, official claims of the church, scientists would have to show evidence that macroevolution could have created thousands of consecutive species, and millions of new genes and algorithms, from the "first living cell" (FLC) to Adam and Eve, purely by macroevolution!!

This would be a laughable claim except for their control of the media and their control over what students hear in the classrooms.

Plus the evolutionists would have to prove macroevolution created millions of other genes for species not on our ancestry of species to the FLC. Such a claim would not only be unscientific, it would be statistically insane beyond comprehension!!!

Remember, there is not one shred of scientific evidence that macroevolution has ever happened on this planet a single time or that it is even remotely within the realm of possibility that it has ever happened a single time, much less millions of times which would have been required for Adam and Eve to have descended from a "first living cell."

While scientists claim that Adam and Eve did descend from the "first living cell" all of their false "evidence" comes from massive deceptions where the evidence comes from microevolution, not macroevolution!!

Were the scientific establishment to attack the church's claim that Adam and Eve were created by the Hand of God, in court, they would have to have plenty of evidence to prove that macroevolution can easily create new species. They cannot do that.

While such a claim might go over well in a classroom of attentive students, in a court of law it would be crushed by anyone who understood the difference between microevolution and macroevolution and who knew how the scientific establishment operated.

And the church has the resources to hire plenty of bright and inspired people to defend the church, especially in a situation so ludicrous as the scientific establishment's inane claim that Adam and Eve were created by macroevolution from the "first living cell."

And even if the evolutionists could find a corrupt judge, as they have done in the past, the church has the financial resources, and the political clout, to appeal the decision to a higher court of law.

Scientists have NEVER proven macroevolution has happened a single time in this Universe and they would never make such an absurd claim if anyone remembered the "Axiom of Random Mutations", which many scientists obviously don't comprehend (see the Patterns of Intelligence book).

In a sense, the church really doesn't have to say anything about the theory of evolution because its claim that Adam and Eve were created by God is clearly

church doctrine and any honest scientist would have to admit it is also a scientifically accurate historical claim!!

Whether God created the species as in creation, or He created their DNA in turn, as in God-driven evolution, we do not know. The First Presidency simply said that God created all species.

But the Adam and Eve account is not the only official church statement on the theory of evolution.

Alma 30, which is the account of Korihor teaching the theory of evolution, makes the church's position about the theory of evolution very clear. In this chapter it is stated that satan personally appeared to Korihor and taught Korihor the theory of evolution!!

Plus, to add insult to injury to the scientific community, the Book of Mormon (in the account of Adam and Eve and the account of Korihor) was public information 29 years before the theory of evolution was known by the general public. Thus, [no one can claim](#) that the account of Korihor was a reactive attempt by the church to challenge Darwin's major book!!

But there is another reason the church does not actually confront the theory of evolution publicly, namely the potential ramifications to some members of the church.

If the church were to attack the theory of evolution openly (instead of burying its doctrines in the Book of Mormon and other scriptures), graduates of BYU, for example, might not be able to find jobs in certain fields and/or they may not be able to get into certain graduate schools, etc. Plus, the media would have a field-day any time they wanted to mock the church.

Few members of the church comprehend the power of the media and schools to convince people to believe things which cannot possibly be true. The concept of the "whited sepulcher" is just as true today as it was in the time of the Savior.

But the church does have allies, friends and good relations with many other churches which also claim that the Bible is literally true. These allies might not be so quick to come forward and join with the church if the church made an open attack on the theory of evolution.

Remember, the general public still has no clue what the difference between microevolution and macroevolution is, and scientists constantly bombard the general public with examples from microevolution which pose as "proof" of macroevolution.

So from an official doctrinal standpoint, the church's avoidance of a frontal attack on the theory of evolution is a wise policy, yet the church fully achieves their goal of claiming that the theory of evolution is scientific nonsense because it is far beyond scientific nonsense to claim that Adam and Eve descended from the "first living cell" via macroevolution, even using today's technologies.

Thus, the LDS church and the pro-evolution scientific establishment currently live in peaceful coexistence, with neither openly attacking the other.

The LDS church cannot attack the scientific community, mainly because the general public is brainwashed by the media; and the scientific community cannot attack the church because they have zero scientific evidence that the theory of evolution could have happened.

What the church will do in the future about this issue is obviously not something I can predict. However, the church has already clearly spoken and doesn't need to say anything more about the issue unless it chooses to do so.

What I can predict, with absolute perfect certainty, is that the Savior of the world will continue to run this church with a perfect knowledge of what He is doing.

All of the necessary church doctrines about evolution actually were public information long before Darwin's major book came out in 1859, so effectively the church took a position on evolution before Darwin "discovered" natural selection or published his major book on the subject. Yes, I am well aware that Darwin's grandfather was an evolutionist, but it was Charles Darwin who made the theory of evolution a public issue!!

The Lord, and He alone, will decide when and how to deal with the many paradoxical situations the church constantly finds itself in. That is precisely why the church is led by prophets, not philosophers, and it is exactly why the church continues to prosper and will continue to prosper.

In fact, President Joseph F. Smith made this comment:

"We should have gained sufficient experience by this time to realize that no man, no individual, no clique, and no secret organization can combine with force and power sufficient to overturn the purposes of the Almighty; *or to change the course of His work.*" (italics added)
Joseph F. Smith (2000-2001 Priesthood/R.S. Manual - page 114)

Clearly, the supposed "discovery" of evolution by Darwin did not change the course of the Lord's work. Nor will it ever change the course of the Lord's work.