

CHAPTER VII

A B C's on Origins & 1st Amendment!

Where did we come from?" "How did we get here?" "What does it all mean?" "Where are we headed and is it really important?" Most of us seek and search to satisfy this curiosity as we contemplate and consider these profound questions.

Busy schedules of working people generally will not permit listening to lengthy lectures or making a lifetime study and detailed reading of the thousands of books and tens of thousands of pages on the complex subject of origins. Many do not have, nor will they take, the time to read anything over about a dozen pages on any given subject unless it is required reading. Even where time is available, because of sharply differing and contrasting interpretations and viewpoints held by experts in every area of educational explorations in origins research, the reader at times will be confused and ill at ease.

"Gorilla Tactics" of educational intimidation, or "bowling over or brow beating" those who may disagree into submission, e.g., statements such as "only the ignorant or uninformed longer question these interpretations," may often cause the objective reader to throw up their hands or silently acquiesce and give up the quest for a grasp and real understanding of this highly controversial and complicated subject. None, particularly students, desire to publicly appear unscientific, uninformed or thought ignorant, and so many will accept without question the ideas, interpretations and indoctrinations of the one particular view implanted in curriculums and handed down as gospel to all by the elite educational establishment textbook writers and publishers.

It occurred to the author that many readers and researchers, whether students, teachers, civic and church leaders, or others, would welcome a thumbnail sketch, or concise, courteous critique and outline of the ABC's as to claims, counterclaims and contentions that are considered by most. Gaining and grasping the articulable arguments and particular proposals and positions will assist the players and participants to better understand what some refer to as the "origins game".

Hopefully, as one becomes more knowledgeable and comfortable in discussing and debating the differing distinctions and viewpoints, this confidence will stimulate and encourage additional research within the great macro international debate on this age-old question.

Charles Darwin emphasized two views: "the theory of evolution" and "the theory of creation." George Wald stated that one can "believe in spontaneous generation; the only alternative, to believe in a single, primary act of supernatural creation. There is no third position." Robert Jastrow confirms the validity of alternative positions: "Either life was created on the earth by the will of a being outside the grasp of scientific understanding, or it evolved on our planet spontaneously through chemical reactions occurring in non-living matter lying on the surface of the planet." Biology Professor at San Francisco State University Dean H. Kenyon praises the dual consideration, cross-examination and critiquing of alternative, competing claims and counterclaims on origins. He urges students to make careful study of the "solid competing positions."

Charles Darwin has said that in his wildest daydream he only wanted to show "there were two viable views." Atlanta attorney W.R. Bird emphasizes the value of presenting the existing viable views, stating that a "fair result" in considering origins may be reached by "fully stating and balancing" the facts, arguments and all the evidence in each scientific field of endeavor or discipline. Sherwood L. Washburn refers to origins as a game and regularly begins his lectures by stating "this is my prejudice." Most debaters on origins acknowledge that the two views are mutually exclusive. About the same data and evidence are considered by both sides but each have differing interpretations. Whatever evidence is generally accepted as unfavorable as to one position is generally accepted as favorable to the other, and vice-versa. One's view depends upon one's viewpoint or point of view.

A.

(1) ABRUPT APPEARANCE.

An alleged abrupt appearance, achievement, activation and arrival of the universe, earth, all life, including human beings, plants and animals, fully functioning in complex forms, but discontinuously toward any higher macro evolutionary progression or lower major devolutionary regression. (In other words, a model, explanatory belief system or philosophical theory that all aspects of the universe and life, originally, suddenly and simultaneously, all abruptly appeared, but discontinuously in complex forms. Humans, plants and animals arrived and abruptly appeared fully functioning, substantially as in present day forms. While acknowledging that humans and apes appeared and arrived abruptly, there are no ape-human or human-ape intermediates or connecting links in the past or present.) The "abrupt appearance" model does not affirmatively address any activity prior to the abrupt appearance, such as suggesting an "architectural achiever," "first cause" or "creator."

Adherents of "abrupt appearance" affirmatively challenge the evolution claims of a naturalistic origin of the universe and earth and subsequent chance chemical evolution of life from nonlife. The gaseous planetesimal proposals of naturalistic big bang begets, and beginnings from accidental chance explosions suggested by evolutionists would result in disorder, disarray and destruction, rather than cause an orderly creation of the universe and earth. The transition from lifeless matter lying on the surface of the planet to living matter through chance chemical chain reactions is incomprehensible, improbable, impossible, as well as indubitably and incontrovertibly unscientific. The laws of cause and effect, conservation, entropy, bio-genesis, similarity stasis, and experiments made in laboratories, unequivocally demonstrate that the big bang and spontaneously generation claims are unrealistic, unreasonable, unscientific and untrue.

Additional arguments advancing the abrupt appearance model in the study of comparative anatomy, embryology, classification of plants and animals, morphology, bio-chemistry

and physiology may be made. Similarities and differences are viewed within these disciplines as to humans and animals. Evolution claims that the characteristics of similarities and resemblances of humans and animals (man and monkey) imply kinship, suggesting one may have evolved from the other, or that both may have shared a common ancestor. Non-evolutionists counter the similarity explanation by stating solidarity of stasis standards of similarity, which suggests no genetic or other relationship between the two. It is further contended that the distinctions, differences and dissimilarities are more pronounced, numerous, noteworthy and newsworthy than similarities and resemblances observed.

Within the disciplines of breeding experiments, vestigial organs, geographical distribution and mutations, the debate centers on the amount of "change" observed. Advocates of abrupt appearance argue that the change seen is always horizontal or "limited change," while evolutionists contend that if given enough time the small change noted will grow into vertical, large complete change, such as reptile to bird or monkey-like ancestor to man. The latter proposes particles to people and molecules to man, while the former contends that flies, moths, horses, reptiles, birds, apes and humans come in different varieties within limited change but remain substantially the same; there never in the past or present being any half rat, cat or bat, or, half mongoose-monkey-man. "A rose is a rose is a rose!" The non-evolution model contends that natural selection is a conservative process that selects from pre-existing characteristics and does not and cannot produce any new genetics not previously blueprinted; that mutations are harmful and lethal and produce problems and disadvantages rather than benefits.

A few of the many other arguments that may be advanced are emphasizing the gaps within the study of Paleontology and the fossil record that are more pronounced than any suggested links (between reptiles and birds and monkey and man); the study of statistical and mathematical probability supports the abrupt appearance model and suggests the improbability and impossibility of "molecules to monkey to man" model and methodology; Isomers and radiohalos studies discredits macro-evolution while pointing towards an abrupt

appearance occurrence; within Geology and Paleontology, the probabilities of a rapid global catastrophic calcium cementing of strata formations in the past appear more realistic than the traditional uniformitarian speculation as to a gradual global sedimentary formation; when considering "young earth" time clocks, "medium-age earth" time clocks, and "old earth time clocks," with all the many assumptions that must be made in the utilization of any of the clocks in seeking to calculate the age of the earth, the preponderance of evidence points persuasively to a rapid abrupt appearance rather than a slow evolution.

A few of the many time clocks such as (a) measurements of the earth's magnetic field, (b) the thin layer of dust accumulation on the moon's surface, and (c) measuring of the shrinkage of the sun's diameter all point towards a "young earth."

(2) ARCHITECTURALLY ACCOMPLISHED ABRUPT APPEARANCE.

This model is almost identical to the "abrupt appearance" explanation of origins previously discussed above, but provides an alternative activation, adding an allwise (omniscient) all powerful (omnipotent) autonomous author and architectural artist accomplisher and achiever. (In other words, this model contends that the universe, earth and life could not have generated itself, and, on the basis of observable scientific laws now operating, is incapable of such a task. It is postulated that the universe and all living things must have been created as the result of intelligent, purposeful design by a supernatural power external to the universe. Sometimes this explanation is referred to as special creation, creation science or scientific-creationism, but is here denominated as an abrupt appearance architecturally accomplished).

This proposal suggests intelligent, purposeful design of the universe and life. The leaders and founders of our country recognized and adopted this concept in the Declaration of Independence, i.e., humans are "created equal" with "creator endowed" rights. Our courts take judicial notice of what everyone knows. It is common knowledge that a watch has a watchmaker, an automobile a manufacturer, a building an architect, and a creation likewise presupposes a creator. All

arguments previously made as supporting "abrupt appearance" are also appropriately applicable and are added and adopted in this alternative advanced "architecturally accomplished abrupt appearance" model. As to the "similarities" arguments previously discussed, where humans and animals both have a "common creator" one would expect both to have some "common characteristics" for "common purposes," i.e., men and monkey have the common characteristics of "eyes" for the common purpose of both having sight, but that does not imply any kinship.

The complexity and integration exhibited by humans, plants and animals and all organisms reflect basic design with modifications for particular applications. All of this data collectively supports design and plan over chance and accident; the gaps we see today between different genetic groups, as well as the gaps existing in the fossil record, overwhelmingly support this model and discredits the notion of a spontaneous origin and formation of the solar system, earth and life, and the hypothesis of a gradual transformation of species to a higher group of life (molecules to monkey to mankind). If classroom curriculums can include and accommodate "big bang" creation from accident, luck and chance, why not include and accommodate the antithesis "big bang" creation from plan, purpose and design? The latter is no less scientific than the former.

Abrupt appearance advocates and articulators deny that any macro evolution has ever occurred except in the mind of man. Further exception is taken to any proposals or claims of macro devolution, although it is acknowledged there is more evidence to build a case for devolution of humans to apes than the reverse evolution of apes to humans. Macro Devolution and Macro Evolution, whether alleged as a gradual and slow event, or, as speculated has happened rapidly in fits and starts, has really never occurred. Micro Devolution and Micro Evolution, or genetic variation (trivial and easily observed changes in shapes, colors, sizes but with an absence of any change of increasing complexity) does occur, but is acknowledged by all and is irrelevant to the origins debate. For confirmation of the many contentions and scientific arguments of Abrupt Appearance (1) and (2) see W.R. Bird's **"The Origin of Species**

Revisited”, “The Theories of Evolution and of Abrupt Appearance”, Volumes I and II; John N. Moore’s **“How To Teach Origins”** (Without ACLU Interference); Henry Morris’s **“Scientific Creationism”** (Public School Edition); Bliss and Parkers **“Origin of Life”** (Evolution.Creation); Marshall Hall’s **“The Earth Is Not Moving”**; and Evan Shute’s **“Flaws in the theory of Evolution”**; Moore and Slusher’s **BIOLOGY A Search For Order In Complexity**; Gish’s **DINOSAURS Those Terrible Lizards**, and Rhea County Historical Society’s **WORLD’S MOST FAMOUS TRIAL - TENNESSEE EVOLUTION CASE.**

(3) RELIGIOUS CREATION, RELIGIOUS DEVOLUTION AND RELIGIOUS EVOLUTION.

Biblical Creationism (Noah, the Ark and a worldwide flood), Biblical Evolutionism (“I am a brother to dragons and a companion to owls”), Biblical Devolutionism (“The Descent of Man” sin, entropy downward decline declarations and speculations), religious humanism (Humanist Manifesto’s I & II), American Atheistic Church, Islam, Hinduism, Christianity, Judaism, and all other ideas and notions of religious origins should be reserved for debate, discussion and deliberation in curriculums of comparative religions, wherever the subject is presented in tax-funded schools and colleges.

B.

(1) GRADUAL MACRO EVOLUTION.

An alleged naturalistic, chance and accidental big bang blast beginning, occurring billions of years ago which resulted in the origin of the universe and earth; life evolved millions of years ago spontaneously through chemical reactions of nonliving matter lying upon the surface of the planet. (In other words, a model, explanatory belief system or philosophical theory that a gradual, naturalistic building up and commencement and continuum of constant chance chemical changing caused the creation of the universe and earth. Life by chance evolved from non-life through natural selection and beneficial random

mutations. Simple life and species developed into higher and more complex species upon the passage of time, with apes and humans sharing a common ancestor. The macro evolutionary development and sequence as well as the earth's Geology is explained by uniformitarianism. Old earth time clocks such as "uranium-lead" radiometric dating is used suggesting a multibillion year inception of the earth and life).

College classroom curriculums concentrate on confirmation of a consensus chemical and carbon chance commencement of life from non-life: "Life had its origin in these oceans. Today the nature of life no longer seems as impenetrable as it once did, and the transaction from lifeless matter to living matter, though still hardly an open book, nevertheless seems more to be an inevitable sequel to the physical and chemical conditions that prevailed on the earth some billions of years ago than a supernatural event. Chemical reactions occur most readily in liquids, and furthermore water is the best solvent. Hence the early oceans must have been fertile media for chemical processes of all sorts, with ample energy available in sunlight and lightning discharges." **"Fundamentals of Physical Science"**, 6th ed., p-571, Krauskopf and Beiser, McGraw Hill Book Company.

Through non-intelligent intellectualless innovation and integration, and, in an atmosphere containing methane and ammonia, nucleotides and other chemicals may have gelled together into globs called coacervates and microspheres. Stanley Miller mixed and heated chemicals collecting amino acids in a cold trap part of his apparatus. Sidney Fox hypothesized that heat from a volcano might cause proteins to form with rain washing the proteins into pools before the sun could destroy them. A.I. Oparin proposed that coacervate globules possibly might randomly absorb the right molecules to become a living cell, although he acknowledged that unstable coacervates might also absorb harmful molecules. All of these tests collectively demonstrate scientifically how the universe and earth may have originated over a long period of time by natural processes and how all living things could have begun from a single source. Some refer to these explanations as "Molecules to Man" models or "Particles to People" proposal.

Advocates of the macro-evolution model insist that incontrovertible evidence exists that the gradual large evolution of molecules to man has without doubt occurred and that the only remaining debate is how it actually happened. The linch pin of this model always proposes a prediction of "Ape-Human Intermediates" or, in other words that Humans share a common ancestor with monkeys, apes and baboons. Darwin's two best sellers, "**Origin of Species**" and "**Descent of Man**;" Washburn and Moore's "**Ape Into Man, a study of human evolution**"; Desmond Morris' "**The Naked Ape**", and, "**The Human Zoo**"; Eldredge's "**The Monkey Business**"; Carl Sagan's "**The Dragons of Eden**"; non-evolutionist Harold Hill's "**From Goo To You by way of the Zoo**"; Irvine's **Apes, Angels, and Victorians**; and Stone's "**The Origin**", generally provide confirmation of these contentions.

Many scientists who are evolutionists disagree as to how macro-evolution may have occurred but most all unequivocally agree that men and women have lowly animal origins. Paleontology Professor George Gaylord Simpson has stated "man's ancestors were apes or monkeys. It is pusillanimous if not dishonest for an informed investigator to say otherwise." Nobel Prize-winning geneticist H.J. Miller has emphasized that to fail to make this admission is "mere wishful thinking on the part of those who resent too vivid a visualization of their lowly origin." Anthropologist William L. Straus, Jr., believes "man has evolved from a true anthropoid ape..."; University of Oxford's famous evolutionist, Wilfred Le Gros Clark, concurs that men and women are products of anthropoid apes, "a statement which no longer admits doubts". Paleontologist Roy Chapman equates human ancestry with "forest apes." Other evolutionists who believe literally in animal ancestry fundamentalist terminology have expressed themselves without equivocation. Anthropologist Ashley Montagu (Eastern Hemisphere monkey stock); Professor Julian Huxley (tree life as a monkey gave him grasping hands able to manipulate objects, and a binocular vision).

Anthropologist Ralph Linton (our remote ancestors were monkeys); Elliot Smith (The question of speech was, in fact, an essential part of the process of transforming an ape into a human being); Anthropologist Carlton Coon (Some of the descendants

of monkeys that had learned to walk upright went back to the forest, where they became the ancestors of apes. Only those upright ones that stayed out in the open grew to be men). The Readers Digest Association in a pictorial article published in 1974 entitled "The Last Two Million Years" confirm the model, explanations, and philosophical theories and beliefs of many, where "Evolution's long path from 'missing link' to modern man," is demonstrated with artistic drawings. A monkey-like animal labeled as a common ancestor of men and women and apes is pictured walking on all fours. A subsequent series of artistic drawings of candidates or characters denominated "Ramapithicus," "Australopithicus," "1470 Man," "Erectopithicus," "Homo sapiens," "Neanderthal Man," and "Modern Man Homo sapien sapiens" follow, demonstrating how apes may have evolved progressively upward toward, and into, manhood and mankind.

Those who teach macro evolution emphasize "similarities" which may be observed, when comparing animals and humans, as suggesting and implying kinship. This is done within disciplines such as embryology, comparative anatomy, bio-chemistry, physiology, and classifications of plants and animals. Complete change from animals to humans is stressed instead of limited changes of stasis which is deemphasized. Fossils such as "Archaeopteryx" is presented as evidence of transitional links representing half reptile and half bird, which demonstrates how reptiles may have evolved into birds. Many believe cow-like mammals went into the water and later ascended into whales; that monkeys later developed upward becoming man. The macro evolutionary theory is still evolving. A great international debate exists within the evolutionary camp mostly unknown to the general public, i.e., "synthetic theory" v. "Nondarwinian Evolution" v. "Rapid Macro Evolution," the latter sometimes called punctuated equilibria. The different notions of how macro evolution occurred are mostly all contradictory, but the two things agreed to by most all evolutionists are that animals did evolve into humans, and that non-evolution theories such as "humans only coming from other humans" (abrupt appearance models) must be excluded from all curriculums and textbooks in tax supported public schools and colleges.

(2) RAPID MACRO EVOLUTION or PUNCTUATED EQUILIBRIA.

This model of evolution is identical to Gradual Macro Evolution to the extent that apes evolved into human, but is the antithesis in one feature, that is, it is argued that the accomplishment of apes into humans was done rapidly, in fits and starts, rather than in a gradual process. The evolutionary scientists supporting this model do so because they agree with abrupt appearance scientists that no transitional fossils between man and monkey exist; therefore, if macro evolution really happened, it must have been accomplished rapidly. This version of macro evolution appears to be supported by a growing and vocal number of evolutionary scientists. This model of evolution also calls into question uniformitarianism in Geology and Paleontology and the reliability of "old earth time clocks" thought valid by those subscribing to the idea of a gradual macro evolution occurrence. Whether macro evolution is presented as occurring "quick or slow," both notions appear to have textbook credibility in classroom curriculums, while Abrupt Appearance ideas are consistently censored and conspicuous by their absence.

(3) GRADUAL MACRO DEVOLUTION or RAPID MACRO DEVOLUTION.

These models of Macro Devolution are the reverse versions of the two models of Macro Evolution previously outlined. It is conceded that only a small number of scientists hold to these explanations. While none have observed macro devolution, it must be acknowledged that the law of entropy would appear to support the notion of humans devolving, declining, descending downward, dehydrating, degenerating into decadence, disorder, deterioration and disarray into apes, monkeys and baboons. Arguments may be made to support macro devolution that are very similar to those supporting macro evolution except they must be made in reverse.

C.

ORIGINS and the 1st AMENDMENT!

(1) THE LEMON TEST.

The establishment clause contained in the 1st Amendment of the U.S. Constitution prohibits certain legislative activity of federal, state and local governmental bodies. This includes action and adoption by school boards and boards of regents in the setting of classroom curriculums and approval of textbooks to be used. These prohibitions, restrictions and limitations under this clause are placed on the state and school board activity and does not place any imposition, limitation or penalty against "religion." "Congress shall make no law respecting establishment of religion" has been interpreted to include enacting of laws, rules, regulations or any action taken not only by Congress, but any other federal, state, or local government, including boards of education. The restriction and prohibition is against state activity. No limitations are placed on "religion," or religious activity, under the establishment clause.

The original understanding of the establishment clause seemed to make it clear that the federal government could not legislate favoring or establishing any one particular theistic religion or church as the official national religion, or showing any preferential treatment to any one church. The notion prevailed that the congress or the national government would be neutral, but not hostile, among differing religions. (At the time of the adoption of the 1st amendment many states had by law established a particular theistic religion.) This clause has been unfortunately, sometimes labeled and popularly known as the "separation of state and religion," or, a wall of separation between government and religion. This idea is nowhere mentioned in the First Amendment but was first injected, based on comments made by Thomas Jefferson in a letter written to members of a baptist church, in the case of *Everson v. Board of Educ.*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

The court, nevertheless, made clear they were dealing with a mythical and metaphorical "wall of separation" by approving in this same case the accommodation of religion by commingling of state and religious funds in educational matters through the providing of bus transportation for children

attending religious schools. Justice Jackson, in this case, chided his colleagues for talking about building a wall, and then knocking it down, all at the same time. He suggested it reminded him of the precedent of *Julia* who, according to Byron's reports, "whispering I will ne're consent, ...consented." Whether there is any wall, real or imagined, the court has since, in the words of Humpty Dumpty, ambiguously articulated, "it means whatever I say it means," in particular cases.

Most of the time, the U.S. Supreme Court will generally use what is known as the "Lemon Test" (see, *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971), in determining whether classroom curriculums in biology and other subjects which include origins explanations taught in public schools and colleges, and which are set by local, state or federal governmental school boards, breach or violate the establishment clause of the 1st Amendment. The adoption, approval or action by the state entity in the selection of an "origins" curriculum or use of textbooks which include explanations of origins from a scientific perspective must pass all of the three following tests: (1) The action taken and approved by the governmental body must have a secular purpose; (this must be a legitimate secular purpose not dominated by a religious goal.) (2) The primary purpose of the action taken must not advance or inhibit [some include "endorse"] religion; and, (3) The government, by its action, may not become excessively entangled in religion. If the action taken fails to pass muster in any of the three areas, there results a breach, invalidating the action taken.

Indubitably, there appears to be no problem of including in all textbooks and curriculums of biology and other disciplines, wherever origins are explained and discussed, the Abrupt Appearance Model, the gradual and rapid Macro Evolution Models, and the gradual and rapid Macro Devolution Models. Likewise, the Architecturally Accomplished Abrupt Appearance Model (AAAAM) should be also included and have a prominent place in the scientific discussions relating to origins in all textbooks that are used in public schools and colleges. The big bang theory of Evolution and Devolution is a model which includes an effect without a first cause, violating the law of cause and effect. The AAAAM Model provides a model

including an effect with a first cause which is consistent with the law of cause and effect.

All of the mentioned Models involve more philosophy than science, but all may be articulated in scientific terms and should be fairly included in curriculums. Each requires a degree of faith as no witnesses are alive today who actually observed what occurred in the distant past. In the public schools and colleges, funded by taxpayers, representing the forum and marketplace for the exchange of ideas, the freedom of speech of all students and faculty demand and require inclusion rather than exclusion of legitimate and reasonable opposing ideas and thoughts as to the profound question of origins. More information is better than less information. Discussing the several models of origins in scientific terms has the secular purpose of providing more and better information; it does not advance, inhibit or endorse religion, nor does it excessively involve the government in religion.

(2) OTHER 1st AMENDMENT TESTS.

(a) Historical Test, and, (b) Accommodation of Religion Trend or Treatment. Under the former test much of the history of our nation has clearly recognized or presupposed a "Creator." "Creator Endowed Rights" and "In God We Trust" and other ideas of a theistic nation surely would demand that the model of origins (AAAAM) be allowed in the schoolroom door. The time of academic discrimination in origins curriculums and textbooks must come to an end. The establishment by the state of any single scientific notion or idea is prohibited by the establishment, free exercise and free speech clauses of the First Amendment. Under the latter test or trend, the state and government must be neutral when considering religion, but must also seek to accommodate rather than be hostile to religion. Minus a creator models of origins are no less religious and no more scientific than plus a creator models of origins. The state cannot favor a no-creator model over a pro-creator model, nor can it give preference to non-theistic and atheistic ideas and notions over theistic ideas and notions. If in doubt a tie goes to the runner. The "runner" in America is "Creator" endowed, and accommodation to theism should be favored because of our

nation's history, but, if not favored, surely the state must not be hostile to models embracing theism while providing comfort and aid to models embracing non-theism and atheism.

(3) SUMMARY-LAW & SCIENCE.

Students attending public educational institutions possess a constitutional "right to receive information and ideas." *Board of Educ. of Island Trees Union Free Sch. Dist. v. Pico*, 457 U.S. 853 (1982). "Theories, besides evolution, for the origin of humankind" and of plants and animals, may be presented by teachers in public schools. See *Edwards v. Aguillard*, 482 U.S. 593, where it was said: "Teaching a variety of scientific theories about the origin of humankind to school children might be validly done with the clear secular intent of enhancing the effectiveness of science instruction."

The Supreme Court of the United States has thus made it crystal clear that teachers have a right to teach and students have a right to hear about non-evolution abrupt appearance theories. They have a right to know there are more scientific arguments that humans only have human ancestry than there are that humans have any alleged animal ancestry. The job and task is currently made more difficult because biology textbooks that teachers are permitted to use concentrate on the notion that apes and monkeys are man's ancestor while ignoring the idea that humans, based on genetics, biology, and science, only have human ancestry. If only the animal ancestry theory is going to be presented then the weaknesses and flaws of evolution must be presented along with the supposed alleged strengths of evolution.

Some are emphatic, that "the state must establish humanism as its official 'religion'." See "SHARPENING THE PRONGS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE: APPLYING STRICTER SCRUTINY TO MAJORITY RELIGIONS," by Scott Titshaw, *GEORGIA LAW REVIEW*, Volume 23, Summer 1989, Number 4, p-1085, p-1124. Religious Humanism always embraces evolution notions on origins in its Manifesto's I and II. Any attempt to establish Humanism as America's state "religion" would be patently unconstitutional. Religious Humanism and

religious evolution must be presented and taught, along with other religions, in comparative religion curriculums and classrooms.

Today there are thousands of scientists who are nonevolutionists and who believe the preponderance of evidence points to abrupt appearance or creation science models or theories. Likewise, many evolution scientists acknowledge the many weaknesses of evolution. The big problem is providing this information to students within the respective textbooks wherever origins are discussed. Dr. Edward Blick has said: "Evolution is a scientific fairytale just as the 'flat earth theory' was in the 12th century." He states it requires a faith that is incomprehensible. Dr. Thomas G. Barnes believes evolution is "a barrier to scientific progress." Dr. T.N. Tahmisian has said "Scientists that go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life are great con men, and the story they are telling may be the greatest hoax ever. In explaining evolution we do not have one iota of fact." He suggested it was "a tangled mishmash of guessing games and figure juggling." Davis B. Kitts acknowledges "Evolution requires intermediate forms between species and paleontology does not provide them." Evolutionist G.G. Simpson has characterized the absence of Precambrian fossils as "the major mystery of the history of life."

Harvard-trained attorney Norman Macbeth wrote a book entitled DARWIN RETRIED: an appeal to reason. On the front cover of his excellent book it is observed "How modern science not only fails to confirm Darwinian theory but finds new mystery in the course of evolution." This imaginary changing mechanism of evolving adaptation of slow or rapid macro-evolution provides the unlimited seeking and searching of how evolution may have occurred is what Macbeth calls the career evolutionist's endless quest. Private and public funding sustains thousands of careers and lifetime studies to resolve and satisfy the curiosity of evolutionists as to the origin of life on, not only the earth, but throughout the universe. Karl Popper has added "This is of course the reason why Darwinism has almost been universally accepted. Its theory of adaptation was the first nontheistic one that was convincing; and theism was worse than an open admission of failure, for it created the impression that an ultimate explanation had been reached." If the ultimate

explanation had or has been reached, it follows, the source of money for many or most of "career evolutionist's endless quest," could in truth be cut off. The bottom line in the origins battle of censorship seems to be the love of money.

It has been said the love of money is the root of all evil. Attorney William Jennings Bryan referred to evolution as "eviltion." The parents and taxpayers provide the money for research in science and for textbooks used in the public and private schools. What is needed and demanded in all public educational institutions is a fair, courteous and truthful presentation as to what has been proven in science. Models and theories as to origins, is something that has not been proven in science, and should be outlined and discussed truthfully, objectively and courteously as previously above set forth.

Gorilla Tactics and educational intimidation should be a thing of the past. Patients, prior to surgery are entitled to know the risks involved and the alternatives to having surgery so as to enable them to make an informed intelligent decision affecting their life. Clients, facing possible litigation are entitled to know all the facts as to the risks involved as well as alternatives to litigation, so as to be in a position to make an informed intelligent decision affecting their pocketbook and property rights. Origins is the most profound question of all. Many believe it affects the destiny of all of us. How much more important is it for students, parents, teachers and all others, to know the truth, all the facts, alternatives notions and theories, all the arguments, so that an intelligent and informed decision may be made. Only when all information is made available can one made this informed decision.

The bad news is that the Elite Educational Establishment of Textbook Writers and Publishers, current classroom control and censorship, of presenting only pro Macro-Evolution, without also including the con and weaknesses about Evolution, still presently preponderates. The balancing of Evolution with the strengths of Non-Evolution is still consistently ignored, although it is an idea whose time has come. All Science Textbooks used in tax supported schools and colleges must be revised to include the pro and con, strengths and weaknesses, affirmative and negative, scientific evidences

for any theory of the origin of humans or other living things, included in a course of study in a classroom curriculum.

The good news is, that there are thousands of individuals, scientists, professors, students, civic leaders, and many others, who believe in academic freedom and scientific integrity, that are today actively working with many state and local boards of education, and, with many state legislatures, in seeking to improve education and all the science standards. Many believe that all states will soon adopt the notion, idea and standard, that whenever any theory of the origin of humans or other living things is included in a course of study offered in a classroom curriculum, both scientific evidence supporting or consistent with the theory and scientific evidence problematic for, inconsistent with, or not supporting the theory shall be included.

The presentation of a broad range of scientific evidence regarding theories of the origin of humans and other living things will surely provide the secular purpose to strengthen all the analytical skills of students and teachers as well as enhance the effectiveness of good and objective science instruction. One's view and interpretation will then depend upon one's viewpoint of all of the evidence, or, as to one's point of view, of reason, logic, good sense and what one conceives to be the truth!