

## **PART ONE: 1881-1911**

*Part One is divided into two sections: A and B.*

*Section A includes selected journal entries (from my personal files) of James E. Talmage, concerning the subject of evolution. These selected entries begin with a February 7, 1881 entry and end with an entry on October 3, 1928. At the end of each entry, the volume and page number of the journal from which the entry was taken is noted in parentheses.*

*Section B covers in some detail the 1911 evolution controversy at the BYU.*

### **Section A - Early Talmage journal entries (1881-1928)**

*James E. Talmage was born, 1862, in Hungerford, England. He was baptized a member of the Mormon Church in 1873, the same year he received the Aaronic Priesthood and was ordained a Deacon. Four years later, in 1877, he was ordained a Teacher, and three years later, in 1880, he received the Melchisedic Priesthood and was ordained an Elder. In 1884, he was ordained a High Priest. He was ordained an Apostle and sustained as a member of The Quorum of the Twelve in 1911.*

*He married Mary May Booth in 1888. They had eight children. Talmage received a number of degrees including a doctorate in Geology. He was the author of Articles of Faith (1899) and Jesus the Christ (1915).*

*He passed away in Salt Lake City, Utah in 1933.*

**Feb. 7, 1881:** *Went to Salt Lake City to attend a series of two lectures to be delivered by Prof. R.A. Proctor. Attended his first lecture the same evening; \_\_\_\_\_(?); "Birth and Growth of Worlds." Have formed a decided opinion regarding Proctor's views, though that opinion of mine is certainly immature, and therefore I will refrain from expressing it, for I may change it. I will say, however, that though Prof. Proctor's theory is logical and fascinating, I am able clearly to see how he lacks that firmness, which one who has just claim by his Priesthood on the spirit of God will possess. Proctor says that the theory of the winding up scene being at hand, is without foundation: that it is the "cracked-brain project of the nineteenth century," as every century has been characterized by some such alarm. Prof. Proctor with us, all will find out. (James E. Talmage Journal, 1:45-46)*

**Feb. 8, 1881:** *Attended the second lecture of Professor Proctor in the evening. His theory is indeed beautiful but I modify his views to suit my own convictions. (James E. Talmage Journal, 1:46)*

**Dec. 12, 1881:** *I want to do (?) among the young—probably lecture amongst the Improvement Associations, and encourage the study of nature. I have thought to give a first lecture on the subject of harmony between Geology and the Bible—a*

*subject upon which so many of our people have mistaken ideas. We sent off at once for a set of views costing thirty (30) dollars for this lecture. (James E. Talmage Journal, 1:112)*

**March 16, 1884:** *In course of my studies I have naturally been brought face to face with the alleged atheistic tendency of scientific thought and conflict usually said to exist between Science and Religion. Now, I have felt in a dilemma—and begin now to fancy (?) a way out. I have been unable to see the point of conflict myself--my belief in a loving God perfectly accords with my reverence for science, and I can see no reason why the evolution of animal bodies cannot be true—and indeed the facts of observation make it difficult to deny—and still the soul of man is of divine origin. The dilemma which has troubled me is this—being unable to perceive the great difficulty of which Scientists, and Theologians, and Scientific theologians refer--I have feared that my investigation of the subject was highly superficial, for when such great as most of the writers upon the subject are--find a puzzle, “would be high egotism for me to say I find no puzzle. And the fancied exit which I see has appeared from my reading some of John Stuart Mill’s writings and I feel—that if I had none other idea of a Deity that those men have, viz. that of an unknown being whose acts as Mill says “contrary to the highest human morality” –I too would hail atheism with delight. I could never believe in such a God as theirs, not though one should rise from the grave to declare Him to me. And just as certainly do I perceive that there can be no antagonism between the true science as revealed and made easy by the Priesthood, and the God whose attributes and passions of love and mercy are also declared by that same Priesthood. (James E. Talmage Journal, 2:23-24)*

**May 4, 1884:** *Have just returned tonight from service at the Westminster Presbyterian Church. The minister spoke against belief in Darwinism and like most ministers whose remarks I have heard or read upon this subject—showed his ignorance. He spoke much as an ordinary person would—“Darwin,” O yes—says we come from monkeys”—then condemns. I certainly think ‘tis the ministers themselves who have bred the disgust with which most scientific people regard them—because they will dabble with matters from which their ignorance should keep them at a safe distance. The speaker tonight brought out many noble principles, but in spite of his eminence as a preacher—self contradiction and inconsistency were apparent.*

*Really, I do not wonder that any scientific man refuses to belong to a church where he is told nothing but “Only believe & you’ll be saved”—“The blood of the Lamb is all powerful”—“take up the cross of Christ” etc. The preachers always talk in metaphors—you can’t bring them down to fact; and anything which will not bear scrutiny when stripped of fine language is to the scientific mind nonsense. Again, Darwin wrote for those who can understand him; some of whom will agree with & others oppose him; but he did not write for ministers who never read beyond other’s opinions of the man, anymore than Plato or (?) wrote for babes and sucklings. (James E. Talmage Journal, 2:38-39)*

**June 8, 1885:** *Went to Salt Lake City by evening train to attend the lecture by Monseignor Capel on Science and Religion. I am glad to have heard the gentleman—but his arguments were in no respect stronger than I have heard brought out by students. I believe I could name three or four of my own students*

*who could argue stronger than did he. He took a decidedly Catholic stance. (James E. Talmage Journal, 2:82)*

**June 27, 1888:** *In the evening according to previous appointment, I went to Springville to lecture there under the auspices of the Improvement Association, on the subject of "Nature and Nature's God." I have been requested by the Springville people, since before the time of the accident to my eye, that I should speak in that place on "Evolution," as a partial offset to the tendency of certain atheistical doctrine \_\_\_\_\_? There through the teachings of a certain Dr. York. The subject was treated tonight according to my poor ability under the title first above named. I trust it did some good. (James E. Talmage Journal, 3:78-79)*

**Jan. 21, 1890:** *According to previous appointment, I tonight delivered a lecture on "The Theory of Evolution" at the University of Deseret under the auspices of the Delta Phi Society. The subject and the nature of the audience caused me to depart from my usual course in lectures,--I wrote and read the address; mainly that there may be no uncertainty to my expressions. While speaking extemporaneously, a person is liable by a slip to say the opposite of what he means. It is easy to omit a "not" or a "no" and cause a misunderstanding. (James E. Talmage Journal, 3:218-219)*

**March 8, 1890:** *According to an appointment of long standing, I this day went to Provo and there delivered a lecture on the "Theory of Evolution" before the County Teacher's Convention. The convention, after listening to the lecture, asked permission to publish it. Because of the importance of the subject and the case with which misunderstandings arise as to a speaker's intentions, I read the lecture from notes. (James E. Talmage Journal, 3:228)*

**Sept. 27, 1909:** *Special committee meeting at the President's office, to consider a proposed article by the First Presidency on "The Origin of Man." (James E. Talmage Journal, 12:91)*

**Sept. 30, 1909:** *Committee meeting for further consideration of the article on "The Origin of Man." Meeting was held at my office. (James E. Talmage Journal 12:92)*

**March 12, 1922:** *While we were in Pittsburgh, President McCune informed me of an invitation extended by the "Free Thought Forum" of this city to address the body at 4:30 today. A meeting was held in the room we had occupied during the earlier part of the day. According to report there were over 300 present. I spoke on the "Origin and Destiny of Man," giving attention to the distinction between the body only and the man, and dealing with the subjects of ante-mortal existence, life beyond the grave, and the resurrection. I was listened to with every outward mark of close attention during the 50 minutes allotted to me. Then, according to the order, discussion was invited. The scene that followed is memorable and saddening. Sometimes several people were on their feet at once asking recognition of the chairman. None of them discussed the subject I had treated; but as I had quoted from the Bible, each directed his remarks to a denunciation of Holy Scriptures and some of them were blatant in proclaiming their atheism. There were three or four women who took part in the discussion, and these were even more extreme than the men. Such an exhibition of godlessness I have seldom seen; and the effect was not lost upon our*

*missionaries and other members of the church who remained throughout the session. (James E. Talmage Journal, 25:11)*

**June 22, 1922:** *The American Association for the Advancement of Science, specifically the Pacific division, opened its annual session at the University of Utah today at 9a.m. Elders John A. Widtsoe and Richard R. Lyman and I are fellows of the Association, and of course it is expected that we do our share of the work incident to the carrying out of the program. At the luncheon hour Dr. John A. Widtsoe gave an excellent address on "Research Problems of the Great Basin." In the afternoon I attended the meeting of the section known as the The Western Society of Naturalists. The general topic for discussion was "Heredity and Evolution." Dr. David Starr Jordan spoke by way of reply to a recent statement by the President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, who said that we know little about the origin of species. Dr. Jordan holds that we know much about it.*

*I was profoundly impressed in listening to the several papers bearing upon this subject, that the evolutionists are much disturbed. Their chief aim at the present time seems to be to counteract the general impression that evolutionists do not agree among themselves; nevertheless, that they do not agree is a well-attested fact. (James E. Talmage Journal, 25:30)*

**May 19, 1923:** *At 6p.m. I attended a social in the open air at the home of President and Sister (?) Bentley, and I gave an informal talk in answer to questions relating to the subject of evolution. (James E. Talmage Journal, 25:123)*

**April 20, 1925:** *(While Mission President of the European Mission): This marks the beginning of a three days conference of the Royal Microscopical Society. I had received special and urgent invitation to be present: and in accordance with the expressed wishes of the First Presidency—that I attend as many of the scientific meetings as I can, I had accepted the invitation. (James E. Talmage Journal, 26:12)*

**Oct. 3, 1928:** *I attended a meeting of the Council of the Twelve, beginning at 9:00 o'clock, and then the regular weekly meeting of the First Presidency and the Twelve beginning at 10:00 o'clock. The members of the First Council of the Seventy sat with us for special inquiry into the probable effect of a recent address delivered in the Tabernacle by Elder B. H. Roberts. (James E. Talmage Journal, 28:49)*

***Inner Dialogue: James Talmage's Choice of Science as a Career, 1876-84******Dennis Rowley (from Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought)***

*James E. Talmage's interest in science was first awakened by his grandfather, James Edward Talmage, an herbal doctor in the village of Ramsbury, Wiltshire, England.<sup>1</sup> Young James lived with his grandfather from age three to five while attending infant school and visited him often in later years, sometimes just to walk in the woods and visit, sometimes for weeks and months while attending school in Ramsbury.<sup>2</sup> Occasionally he traveled with the older man.<sup>3</sup> In 1874, shortly after graduating from the National School in Hungerford, Talmage and his grandfather toured Wiltshire and Berkshire. As they tramped the woods and streams looking for herbs, the elder James taught young James his first simple botany lessons, awakening a love for nature that never died.<sup>4</sup> Talmage gathered, identified, and labeled a collection of botanical and mineralogical specimens which he took with him to Utah two years after his grandfather's death in 1874.<sup>5</sup>*

*Talmage's English schooling appears to have contributed little to directly stimulate his interest in science or to add to his grandfather's teachings. He was taught religion, geography, English history, reading, writing, arithmetic, and singing. History and geography stressed the greatness of English accomplishments and were designed to instill pride in the empire and its heroes. Geography students were required to know the minerals and principal coal fields of England, but that was as close to science as any part of the basic [p.44] curriculum came. The daily regimen at all levels above infant school was prescribed and strict. Memorization and recitation were emphasized. Examination questions asked for description or simple recall rather than analysis or independent thinking.<sup>6</sup> It is possible, though unlikely, that James also took courses in algebra, geometry, natural philosophy, natural sciences, political economy, English literature, French, Latin, or German.<sup>7</sup>*

*This education taught him the indispensable skills of hard work, a sense of order, and self-discipline. He became precise in the use of language and developed a retentive memory. Some of these traits were reinforced at home where he helped his parents manage the Bell Inn. Hungerford was a prosperous resort and market town on the main east-west thoroughfare between London and Bristol, about an hour away from London by train. In its shops, lecture hall, and library, and from the passage of travelers in and out of the Bell and other inns, there was much activity to develop the powers of observation and the curiosity necessary to a successful scientist. Thus, when young James left England, although he had not yet consciously chosen to devote his life to science, the seeds for a future decision had been planted.*

*The chief nurturer of these seeds was Brigham Young Academy's principal, Karl G. Maeser. When Talmage arrived in Utah in 1876 at the age of fourteen, he was attending the academy within a few weeks. During the next eight years, he finished the complete course of the academy, taking virtually every grammar, academic, normal, and scientific class offered and receiving every certificate and diploma awarded. Between August 1876 and June 1879, he took about forty ten-week classes from Maeser ranging from arithmetic, rhetoric, and composition to natural philosophy, chemistry, and geology.<sup>8</sup>*

*Maeser's first love was the art of teaching. His greatest expertise was in the classics. But, he also had an adequate knowledge of the sciences and with the proper textbook he taught all of them at an elementary level.<sup>9</sup> In each class*

*Maeser did Iris best to carry out Brigham Young's admonition to teach nothing without the spirit of God. Thus he told his students in the "Theory of Teaching" that they must "introduce the subject [of religion]...wherever the opportunity offers;...For instance, in the geography of South America the [p.45] wide-awake teacher could instruct in regard to the history and travels of the Nephites and Lamanites. In the geography of the eastern states, the site of the burial of the plates etc."<sup>10</sup>*

*In that spirit, Maeser taught Talmage about science and made science more attractive because he reinforced the spiritual mind-set Talmage had acquired in England.<sup>11</sup> Talmage's 1876 geography notes capture Maeser's typical mix of Mormon teachings and science and his tendency to oversimplify when teaching without a text (as he was in this instance):*

### THE CREATION

*We have two sources by which we gain a knowledge of the creation viz. 1st Revelations in Scripture and 2nd by Geological discoveries. The 1st source viz Revelations in Scripture will be found in Genesis (See Bible). We find there that God showed Moses six visions—I. He saw only mists huricanes & fearful commotion. II. Saw that the huricanes had ceased & also the waters had separated from the clouds, and rocks peeping out from the Oceans. III. He saw the rocks had been washed, powdered and decomposed which formed soil, which was green with small plants, & the waters had cooled off & had in them some small animals, IV. appeared as trees on the land with great animals in the water & the air. V. He saw all kinds of monsters on land in water & in the air. VI. appeared to him in its perfect state with man in Garden of Eden. We cannot say how long a time elapsed between these great changes, but must have been millions of years. The Bible says God created the world in six days, but this does not mean the time which we call days now, viz 24 hours it means simply 6 great periods. We also read of two creations spiritual & temporal. Whenever any Geological discoveries are made they verify the statements of the Bible though we must not take the Bible as a History it was never meant for it.<sup>12</sup>*

*To students planning to be teachers, Maeser stated that the aims of natural science were: "1. To become acquainted with Nature. 2. To learn to utilize the elements of nature for the use and benefit of self and others. 3. To demonstrate the wisdom and goodness of the Creator."<sup>13</sup> Following his own advice, Maeser depended heavily upon "Steele's Series in the Natural Sciences"<sup>14</sup> in his lectures and examinations. Each volume reprinted a verse of scripture or a poetic [p.46] verse about the Creator on the title page, and there were abundant references to the "work of the Creator" throughout the text.*

*Maeser also encouraged interest in science outside the class room. The earliest circulars of the academy spelled out plans for a museum and a laboratory. The museum (or cabinet) was established in October 1876, the result of student/citizen donations and faculty-led field trips to gather specimens.<sup>15</sup> In his term report of June 1877 Maeser reported on growth in the museum's botanical and mineral specimens, lamenting their lack of organization and the lack of a chemical laboratory and astronomical apparatus.<sup>16</sup> On 21 August 1878 Maeser appointed Talmage the first curator of the museum and the laboratory, the latter only a few pieces of equipment without a place to use them until Oct. 1880. The*

*appointment probably reflected Talmage's interest, enthusiasm, as well as the donation of his personal collection.*

*During those first three years, Talmage learned a great deal of elementary science and developed increasing enthusiasm for it. By June 1879 he had taken courses in natural philosophy (physics), chemistry, physiology, astronomy, geology, and electricity. His examination answers in the sciences were longer (including detailed drawings) and more exact than in other subjects. Test responses in other courses tended to be merely adequate or very brief.<sup>17</sup> An algebra examination contains this response to two problems: "Absent when information covered."<sup>18</sup>*

*After he received his normal diploma in June 1879, Talmage began to teach full-time at the academy. His intellectual pace quickened and the pressures and influences in his life multiplied until he felt propelled toward a decision about his future in science. He taught his first science course, elementary physiology, in the spring of 1880. At that point Maeser had sufficient confidence in his student to recommend to a bishop and his wife that seventeen-year-old Talmage operate on their son, who had a bullet lodged in his thigh as a result of a hunting accident. Talmage and Maeser were boarding with the boy's parents at the time on a tour of schools in southern Idaho, far from a doctor. Maeser's confidence was not misplaced. Talmage removed the bullet, the boy recovered nicely, and Talmage's self-confidence and interest in things scientific grew correspondingly.<sup>19</sup>*

*[p.47] When Maeser informed Talmage that he would be teaching chemistry along with two other science courses in the fall of 1880, Talmage took a three-week intensive course in qualitative analysis from Professor Thomas Hadley of Ogden. Hadley, an assayer, was an old friend of the Talmages who had studied chemistry in England. He taught Talmage fundamental chemical analysis procedures and formulae. Neither Maeser nor George Coray, who had taught Talmage elementary chemistry during 1879-80, had sufficient background to supply this information. Maeser supported Talmage's request to draw an advance on academy funds to complete the course.<sup>20</sup>*

*In the next two years, Talmage taught virtually every science course offered at the academy. He also continued to teach penmanship, reading, grammar, Latin, and drawing—a total of eight classes during the first term in 1880 and ten during the second. In addition he was still taking classes as well. Apparently Maeser was not totally sympathetic with Talmage's desire to continue taking science classes while teaching full time. Although he arranged Talmage's teaching schedule so his free periods coincided with the times the science classes were offered,<sup>21</sup> he did not reduce his teaching load or increase his salary despite Talmage's regular complaints that he was worth more money.<sup>22</sup>*

*But to his credit, especially in light of financial difficulties experienced by the academy in its early years, Maeser supported Talmage's growing demands for chemicals and scientific apparatus. Talmage records happily in his journal on 15 December 1881 that Maeser agreed to replace a new microscope because its magnification was not powerful enough for their needs. On 21-22 January 1882 after a successful public experiment by some of his students, Talmage promptly requested another \$150 worth of supplies while, as he put it in his journal, there was an "excess of good feeling" from Maeser and the board.*

*Without any lessening of the love and respect they felt for each other, the role shift from student to colleague caused inevitable differences to surface. For example, to Maeser education meant drawing out and cultivating "that contained in the mind, more than crowding new subjects continually into the mind."<sup>23</sup> In contrast Talmage tried to learn everything he could about every subject he [p.48] could with an emphasis on science. By early 1882 he proposed taking his insatiable appetite to the infidel and anti-Mormon east coast—specifically to Lehigh College in South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland. Maeser could not approve. His aversion to eastern education was profound.<sup>24</sup> His concern for the spiritual safety of a beloved student must have been intensified by the academy's financial problems and his concern over the added cost of Talmage's present and proposed activities.*

*However, Talmage found encouragement and financial support from other friends—probably George Coray and Joseph M. Tanner, who encouraged him strongly after he was in the east and presumably earlier. Tanner, who wrote him regularly after he went east, was Talmage's immediate supervisor at the academy and was a man with an open and inquiring mind and a devotion to learning. Coray, the first person to teach and examine Talmage in the results of specific experiments, shared his interest in experimental science. Both Tanner and Coray would follow Talmage east, Coray to Cornell in 1883 and Tanner to Harvard in 1891.<sup>25</sup> Their combined financial support amounted to over half the cost of Talmage's year of study at Johns Hopkins University.<sup>26</sup>*

*J. L. Townsend, a Payson, Utah, pharmacist and taxidermist who also composed music and poetry, gave Talmage a one-day course in taxidermy in April 1881. Richard A. Proctor, a famous English astronomer, gave public lectures in Salt Lake City, 7-8 February 1881, from which Talmage learned of the controversial theory of the birth, growth, decay, and death of worlds. On both occasions he described the teacher's personality in his journal. He disliked Townsend's conceited nature (because it reminded him of his own conceit) and observed "that, though Prof. Proctor's theory is logical and fascinating, I am able clearly to see how he lacks that firmness, which one who has just claim by his Priesthood on the spirit of God will possess. Proctor says that the theory of the winding up scene being at hand is without foundation; that it is the 'Cracked-brain project of the nineteenth century'; as every century has been characterized by some such alarm. Prof. Proctor with us all will find out."*

*Talmage had felt insecure and inadequate when he began teaching science, though his classroom poise, dignity, and [p.49] self-assurance masked such feelings. He completely reworked his class notes, rereading the texts, taking additional notes, and working at least partially through their bibliographies.<sup>27</sup> In the process he first read British natural philosopher John Tyndall on sound and light and the Manual of Geology of American geologist James Dwight Dana.<sup>28</sup> He rewrote his notes every night in preparation for the next day's lectures, getting by on four to five hours of sleep a night. Later he would confess that he had no inherent love for teaching,<sup>29</sup> a condition his feelings of inadequacy no doubt exacerbated.*

*His efforts in the classroom seemed unappreciated. In late 1881 after a full year of teaching science he lamented that the students seemed "to care for science but little" and that to many the very word was a "revolting name."<sup>30</sup> Not only did he feel wounded because of his love for the subject, but his continued teaching*

*depended on student enrollment. Science courses were listed as optional and were not always well attended. If any of his courses were dropped, he would have been assigned to teach courses in other areas thus losing in addition, preparation time in the sciences. Also, he needed the the practical experience to obtain an advanced certificate, necessary for his admission to Lehigh University. He turned increasingly to classroom experimentation since his first year had taught him that "only experiments hold [the students'] attention."<sup>31</sup> Although he loved experimentation and his Pestalozzian training from Maeser emphasized object-teaching, he seemed to resent the students' unwillingness to perform the mental labor of understanding a scientific principle without experimentation.*

*Although a laboratory had been established in October 1880, the equipment was inadequate. His brief sessions with Hadley and Coray in chemistry had left him on his own for any other subject. Presumably, his usual (and the safest) procedure was to unpack any newly acquired apparatus, set it up, and try the experiment himself prior to attempting to demonstrate it in the classroom. However, in a journal entry on 22 August 1881 he characterized himself as "impetuous, rushing and energetic," which may have resulted in some of his more colorful classroom experiments. On one occasion he and his assistant Daniel Harrington prepared to demonstrate the functioning of the lungs of a small animal to a physiology class. Harrington recorded, "Of course, before these things could be [p.50] shown, the cat must be killed. Talmage held the gunny sack securely, as he thought, while I had the axe in the air. At this moment a small hole in the sack tore open and the cat broke out and ran wildly off into the lot." The cat was recaptured, the necessary organ removed, and Talmage demonstrated the expandibility of the lungs by inflating them with a small tube.<sup>32</sup>*

*A more spectacular experiment which went awry had potentially more serious consequences:*

*I was lecturing upon the "Composition of Water" and demonstrating the various properties of Oxygen and Hydrogen. While exploding a mixture of the gases in a cylinder, the latter burst with such a concussion as to extinguish all lamps in the room excepting those held in the chandeliers.*

*My feelings were difficult to describe as I realized the probable extent of the consequences. A scare ensued among the audience, but soon abated. One young lady was struck on the left side of the forehead by a flying fragment of glass; when she discovered traces of blood she fainted very nicely and I changed at once my occupation from that of a public lecturer to an attendant physician. She recovered, however, when 'twas found that the large amount of blood filling the bowl from which I was bathing her head came from my own hand. Two pieces of glass had struck the index finger of my right hand, one fragment burying itself in the knuckle joint. Another young lady had been struck on the left shoulder, the fragment piercing the clothes and inflicting a severe gash. Beside these, four or five were robbed of traces of skin, and all were severely scared.*

*After the circumstance I went back and completed the lecture, which act, I believe, did much to lessen the fear of the audience.... Fatal results may have followed.... I chide myself for one thing: that I did not insist on all keeping the back seats.<sup>33</sup>*

*Still other experiments robbed him of time and money, while adding to his frustrations. Between April 1 and 11, 1882, while studying electricity, he tried eight times on as many days to partially duplicate Franklin's experiment "to test the results of the electricity of the atmosphere." He procured or built and subsequently lost or ruined a total of six kites and one balloon before giving up.*

*<sup>34</sup>*

*Six months after his first classroom explosion, when he had [p.51] learned to take a few precautions, he described the following experiment in his journal.*

*June 6, 1882. Experienced another accident in the course of experimenting. A small wooden powder mortar, to be fired by the passage of electricity called an "Electric Bomb," had recently been procured by the Academy; and as I was demonstrating before the Physics class in the small Laboratory the bomb burst with terrific force, demolishing the Leyden Jars placed alongside to accomplish the experiment, and shattering the whole instrument into splinters. Luckily I had opened the window & placed the whole on a board shelf on the outside. The force of course was directed right and left, and no one was hurt.*

*Such dramatic and unpredictable lectures, not unnaturally, increased attendance. One week after the oxygen explosion on 14 December, he noted in his journal: "The room became so crowded as hardly to afford standing room, and the rostrum upon which I had placed my apparatus was literally besieged. Such a crowded room interfered with my machine to a certain extent. This is my usual luck, my experiments are generally highly satisfactory when I perform them alone."*

*His expanding reputation as an expert—fueled by dozens of invitations to lecture from bishops and youth groups in Utah Valley and beyond—also brought mixed feelings. He liked the attention and publicity but also knew that few Utahns knew enough science to recognize an expert. Even more unsettling than the flattery were occasional questions about his competence to teach some of the science courses. To stem such criticism, he had passed examinations for an advanced normal certificate in the natural sciences in 1881. The certificate attested to his theoretical knowledge and practical ability to teach. On 13 November 1881 he recorded his intention of spending three hours every evening in his tiny laboratory. He was nineteen years old.<sup>35</sup>*

*The encouragement of key individuals, the expectations of students and public, occasional criticism, his desire to know, and the diminishing opportunities to learn more at the academy made up a complex mixture pressuring him toward further academic study. But the decision to leave Utah did not come easily. Beginning in the fall [p.52] of 1880 his journal entries became increasingly introspective and occasionally, confused. The alluring but unshaped future was a consistent theme.*

*Sept. 1, 1880. I really do not approve of the plan of saying beforehand what one intends doing,...*

*Nov. 6, 1880. I do not like the vocation of teaching, that is, as a District School teacher.... Here in the Academy I am teaching all higher, scientific or philological branches; in order to do which I am necessitated to work up on the subjects myself, thereby opening up to me a field of research which is almost as beneficial as regularly attending school.... I can see plainly that I will not be enabled to save the least means for a start in life. In fact cannot see my way clear for my future course.*

*June 17, 1881.... if I would give way to selfish feelings I would today almost register a vow that I would not serve in the B. Y. Academy again unless I were well paid.... Then again I think and realize that the training I am receiving in teaching these higher branches benefits me as much, if not more than regular attendance at school would.*

*Nov. 13, 1881. I began to consider how my labors may be laid to greatest advantage during the coming winter months.... opportunities for study and research will not last long. I may be sent on a mission before winter or my occupation may be varied as to admit of but little time for private study.*

*Dec. 12, 1881. I want to do good among the young—probably lecture amongst the Improvement Associations, and encourage the study of nature. I have to give a first lecture on the subject of harmony between Geology and the Bible—a subject upon which so many of our people have mistaken ideas.<sup>36</sup>*

*On 23 January 1882 he took a firmer but still tentative stand: "I have for myself harbored a vague idea of making an effort to raise sufficient means to pass a year in a prominent science school or college.... I may be counseled however to remain among my own people and as I hold myself as on neutral ground willing to following counsel implicitly in this important step, I can only refer to such as a vague idea." On 8 and 14 March his future at the academy was cast in the conditional: "If I remain in charge of the Scientific Department," and "if I retain my position in the academy another [p.53] year..." Finally on 31 March, he wrote: "My desire to attend some leading institution for a time to train myself in scientific pursuits has been growing with me. A conversation with Bro. Maeser on the subject resulted in his heartily seconding my desires, and saying that he expected the project to be given me as a mission."<sup>37</sup>*

*Maeser's enthusiasm was probably sincere (although short-lived), despite his animosity toward eastern education. His suggestion that Talmage be called on a mission was customary for the time. He had been quite insistent that Talmage accompany him on his tour of northern Utah and southern Idaho schools in the summer of 1880 and again in 1881 through southern Utah, despite Talmage's reluctance. He would have much preferred to remain in Provo and conduct experiments and study, but Maeser had extended the invitation in the form of a mission.<sup>38</sup> However, he made the best of both trips, taking notes, collecting specimens, making new friends with whom to exchange specimens, and cultivating his speaking ability. Maeser probably intended Talmage to see the relative comfort of his position at BYA. Indeed, Talmage came away convinced he did not want to teach in the district schools and haunted by the education needs of "his people." However, he saw increasingly the mastery of higher science as his way of meeting those needs.*

*A key event in convincing Maeser that Talmage's faith could withstand an eastern education occurred on 8 March 1882, when Talmage used a newly acquired optical lantern and stereopticon slides to deliver an illustrated lecture to the Polysophical Society on "The History of the Earth." According to his script-like notes for the lecture (partially in shorthand), nineteen-year-old Talmage spoke warmly of the correctness and utility of the principle of uniformitarianism and proclaimed that studying the history of the earth as written in the rocks "cannot but lead us nearer the platform of God." Using time periods of undetermined length in place of days as Maeser had taught him, he matched the biblical account of the Creation with the geological time scale, traced the history of the earth from its origins according to the nebular theory of Laplace up*

*through the long pre-human period to the destructive glacial period which God had sent to bring "great and pleasing variety" to an earth that had known "comparative perfection" prior to that time. Then came mankind, "a new creation," being among other things the first among God's [p.54] creatures who "reached toward the knowledge of himself and of his God." In ringing tones Talmage declared the reality of evolution which even "a glance at the past" will show and according to which "the simple forms have ever preceded the more complex." However, he noted that "the missing link between the form of man and that of the highest animal forms has never as yet been found." He closed by a reiteration of his central theme that science and religion were but separate paths of truth to the same God and that they were not in conflict: "This earth is but a great record, each continent but a page, each community but a paragraph, and each human being's body but a sentence."<sup>39</sup>*

*Maeser and members of the academy board were so pleased that they asked Talmage to repeat the lecture on 15 March, which he did before a large and enthusiastic crowd. The views Talmage expressed were certainly not uncommon among the educated and the leaders of Mormon society at that time.<sup>40</sup> Although Maeser would make a strong public statement against evolution in 1893, on that spring evening in 1882 he seems to have been at least partially convinced by the vision, eloquence, and stereopticon lantern of young James Talmage. It was only two weeks later that Talmage had his conversation with Maeser about further study.*

*While Talmage awaited the arrival of the first school catalogs to see if he had admission deficiencies, he cautiously wrote that he was training an assistant and a teacher to take his place, if he left. He later resolved, "Shall begin at once," when he learned he had deficiencies in algebra and German.<sup>41</sup> He firmly turned down two job offers, one on 20 April as principal of the St. George schools with a provision of special attention to the scientific branches, and another on 25 April when the Gunnison Sugar Committee tried to hire him for its chemical plant during the approaching sugar season.*

*On 15 May Talmage had an interview with LDS Church President John Taylor: "Visited Prest. Taylor at his residence; explained to him my desires. He kept me in a long consultation, asking many questions as to the purposes of my desired trip, and closed by giving his decided advice that I proceed to some leading institution there to pursue a course of study in the Sciences. Returned to Provo in afternoon and reported at once my intended withdrawal to the Principal." This meeting was significant in determining the future [p.55] course of Talmage's life and career. Even though he was seeking confirmation for his tentative decision rather than open advice on the best course of action, President Taylor's disapproval would have been a nearly insurmountable obstacle, given Talmage's devotion to the church.*

*As spring wore into summer, Maeser's encouragement seemed to wane. On 16 June Talmage recorded in his journal: "My intended withdrawal as reported to the Faculty and Board, was kept very quiet, no public notice of the same in any report being made. The Principal informed me that such were his instructions, but declined to give me his reasons." On 23 June Talmage recorded that "the Principal still informs me that I am expected back at the Academy when I conclude my studies in the East." And finally, on behalf of the board and the faculty, Maeser wrote a testimonial of Talmage's service and gave it to Talmage on 25 August just prior to his departure. In it he stated that they had yielded*

*"only reluctantly" to Talmage's request for release and that they hoped he would return to them "in due time still more qualified to assist...in the advancement of the educational interests of...[their] Mountain Home."<sup>42</sup>*

*Talmage spent a hectic summer of experimentation and study in preparation for school, taking time out only to help his father hay and to dig up another human skeleton from a nearby canyon to add to one he already had transferred from the lake shore to the laboratory.<sup>43</sup> He spent his time studying so he would reap the greatest possible return for the time he spent in the east. Apparently he already had enough money, for he recorded in his journal on 4 September 1882 that he arrived at Lehigh with \$420 from his savings after paying for the trip, a remarkable feat considering that his teaching salary for the previous three years had been \$1200 out of which he had to live and buy chemicals, apparatus, and books. He also paid his father \$40 per term beginning in 1880 to help pay back money advanced for school expenses.*

*Talmage rejected urgings that he attend medical school and felt relief when his stake president counseled him to stick with science. "Such meets my wishes," he recorded, and added:*

*I have many times contemplated my probable destiny and mission in life without obtaining a satisfactory conclusion; but I have for [p.56] some time past felt an intense desire to become familiar with the walks of Science for the Sciences have to be redeemed from their present position of infidelity & skepticism. The idea has been a favorite one for my meditations of late, and has formed the theme of my public speaking. I conclude that this great mission has to be performed by the Priesthood of God, and to lay a single stone in such a work is perhaps my mission in life.<sup>44</sup>*

*Talmage arrived at Lehigh College in South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, on 4 September 1882, and like a man possessed, threw himself into his courses.<sup>45</sup> At both Lehigh and Johns Hopkins University where he enrolled the following year, he took classes from leading men in their fields, copied the notes of professors and students for classes he could not take, and reviewed, studied, and audited classes so he could challenge lower-level courses by examination. He also spent long hours in the library reading Herbert Spencer and Charles Darwin, among others, and even longer hours in laboratories exhilarated at performing virtually every experiment and analysis he had read about. In addition he used every available opportunity to visit sites of scientific, cultural, and economic interest, collecting abundant specimens and on occasion conducting an experiment or two. Though he concentrated on chemistry, physiology and biology were also priorities. He took courses in geology, physics, mineralogy, metallurgy, astronomy, and botany, as well.*

*In chemistry his interests ranged widely, benefiting from the industrial and agricultural emphasis at Lehigh and the organic and medical emphasis at Johns Hopkins. At Lehigh he took courses in agricultural and manufacturing chemistry, assaying, toxicology, and medical chemistry. At Johns Hopkins he took chemical physics, analytical chemistry, medical chemistry, the chemistry of the compounds of carbon, organic chemistry, and quantitative analysis. Students had to keep current with *Chemical News* and *The American Chemist*. The latter was co-edited by William H. Chandler of Lehigh, a man from whom Talmage heard a few lectures. At Johns Hopkins Talmage records an invitation on 9 October 1883 to the regular meetings of the *Chemistry Journal*, a group organized to keep the faculty and upper level students aware of current research*

*and writing. Both institutions were also interested in applied science and [p.57] in the university's relationship with the industrial community. This concern led to some contract work and employment opportunities, both temporary and permanent, for students and graduates, some of which were offered to Talmage.*

*Laboratory work was his first and permanent love. After George Coray arrived in the east, he wrote to Talmage suggesting that they return to Utah after their schooling, pay off their debts, and "proceed to establish and build up a laboratory." Talmage replied that he could "make no promises for the future, though my heart's desire is to see a laboratory in Utah."<sup>46</sup>*

*At Lehigh Talmage gave a lecture entitled "Chemistry and Life" based in part on his own laboratory research. In it he made the point that the term "organic chemistry" was a misnomer because any substance ceased to live when experimentation began. He reminded his audience that sometimes life must be sacrificed for the interests of science. Included in the lecture was a report on the amazing resistance of some animals, especially cats, to certain poisons that are deadly to man. Earlier in his Toxical Analysis notebook he had entered the following:*

*Full-grown male cat*

*Administered 0.3 grams white Arsenic (As<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) April 10/83 at 7:30 p.m.*

*Second dose of 0.3 grm. at 9 p.m.*

*Third dose, next morning at 10.*

*Killed by force at 12:30.*

*Subsequently he removed every organ for weighing, measuring, dissecting, and analyzing, recording the information in twelve pages of notes.<sup>47</sup>*

*During the summer of 1883, when he was preparing for John Hopkins by reading biology in the Lehigh library (including Herbert Spencer's First Principles) and gathering specimens, he went*

*...fishing for frogs; caught a very large specimen and was anxious to preserve it for its skeleton entire. Did not know how to kill it there on the ground without torture, unless by cutting off [its] head which would have spoiled the bones. So at a sudden gash I cut out its heart, liver, etc. The friend with me picked up the heart which [p.58] was beating strongly; but as soon as I released the "heartless" frog it turned off its back and took vigorous jumps for the water. Its leaps were 3-4 feet as measured. It saw us and tried to avoid us whenever we approached it; seemed entirely unharmed and continued its strong demonstrations for 1-1/2 minutes; having taken no less than 15 leaps in all directions; when I picked it up to prevent its getting into water; then it died suddenly.<sup>48</sup>*

*Such incidents reveal the depth of Talmage's commitment to laboratory work and his general fascination with science. For every student who has performed dissections in a biology course, an animal or amphibian had to die. Since Talmage was a student in a time and place when fully supplied laboratories were a luxury, he early developed the habit of supplying his own specimens. Perhaps the most telling example of the depth of his scientific curiosity and his commitment to experimentation occurred in the spring of 1884 while he was studying narcotics at Johns Hopkins. He recorded the following entries in his journal:*

*March 17. I have been engaged some time in the study of the effects of Narcotics upon the system, i.e. studying the same theoretically only. Today I found a gentleman who works in the same Laboratory as I, and who has for 2 years been addicted to the habit of eating Haschich or extract of Cannabis Indica. He was very willing to give me any data from his own experience; and gave me such.*

*March 18...Three of us in the University have entered upon the study of the Narcotics in use.*

*March 21. The result of our work in research upon Narcotics has been tolerably satisfactory. We utilize my friend referred to above, with his Haschich eating experience—and find four or five others whom he knows have also an experience upon the subject. But the effects experienced by the different ones are so widely different that we can scarcely draw a conclusion. The opium habit is well explained by books, and the bad after effects of the same are sufficiently appalling to keep down experimentation upon the subject. But, the ill effects are reported very low in the Haschich or Hemp administration; and we have concluded to try effect of small dose upon ourselves.*

*Of course, such a course is the proper one for the study of the effects of the drug, though I very much disliked the idea of doing [p.59] such a thing, for as yet I have never known what it is to be narcotized either by tobacco, alcohol, or any drug ....*

*March 22. This being Saturday, was the day I selected to study practically the effects of Haschisch. This evening, after work and all was over, I took at 3 doses each an hour after the preceeding, 5 grains solid extract Cannabis Indica. At this writing—midnight—5 hours since last dose, I have experienced no effect whatever. The effect is said to be widely different in different people.*

*March 23. Sunday. Spent quietly. Have had no result to be noted of my physiological experiment yesterday ....*

*April 5...Took in all 15 grains. No effects.*

*April 6. Sunday...Continued my experiment by taking 20 grains Cannabis Indica and the effect was felt in a not very agreeable way.*

*Talmage would lecture to the Brigham Young Academy faculty in September 1884 on "The Effects of the Narcotic Hashish on the Human System," but the Faculty Minute Book does not record whether he mentioned the source of his information.*

*With an eye to the future, Talmage shipped specimens home by the crateful. His journal records an incredible variety, including examples of: "the processes in the manufacture of tin cans," "the process of oil refining," fossilized shark teeth, tobacco leaves, phosphates, lead, asbestos, zinc, iron, steel, chocolate, cork, fertilizer, rubber, ferns, minerals, vinegar, fossil shells and bones, pottery, paraffin, soap, candles, illuminating oil, iron ore, and even the complete skeleton of a monkey from the zoo in Druid Hill Park.*

*He also obtained an articulated human forearm, finger, some other bones, and a large piece of skin from the university dissecting rooms with the aid of a student and the janitor. Although he disapproved of the callousness of the medical students and even the janitor, who apparently sold bones to the students regularly, he was even more surprised on 14 January 1884 when he was scraping the finger bones and preparing the skin for preservation. "A young*

*gentleman of the University came to my room.... He is a classical scholar and I believe intends to study to become a Minister. Oh! the utter horror he expressed at what he saw me engaged in, was something intense. In fact, he could not rest in the room—was terrified.... He is 29 years of age and a fine scholar. What will not use and habit cause one to be?"*

*[p.60] Perhaps most significant in its impact on Talmage was his opportunity to participate in original research at Johns Hopkins under the direction of Ira Remsen and Harmon N. Morse, both on the cutting edge of research in their fields. From 1872 on Remsen wrote numerous books and papers covering a wide field of chemistry and was founding editor of the American Chemical Journal, 1879-1913.*

*Harmon Northrop Morse, professor of inorganic chemistry, published ten papers in the American Chemical Journal between 1880 and 1892 based on investigations in his laboratory, some of which were conducted when Talmage was working there. In addition Morse invented equipment for reading gas volumes over water, determining the equivalents of metals, grading and calibrating liquid measuring apparatus, an electric furnace, and electric laboratory heating devices. Between Remsen and Morse many original discoveries came out of the Johns Hopkins labs, including white phosphorous, saccharin, and a phenomenon that became known in the chemical world as Remsen's Law. Shortly before Talmage left Baltimore to return to Utah he dejectedly described the work he had been doing with them: "May 9 [1884]...For nearly 3 months I have been engaged on a piece of original work in Chemistry —'on the oxidation of Cymene Sulphamide in alkaline solution'. The labor has not been easy—great difficulty having been met in purifying the substances fit for analysis. Another line of investigation will have to be pursued: and the Professors told me today it would be impossible to do anything in less than another 3 months, and as the college closes in a month the subject would be better given up. I shall be unable to continue the labor at home for lack of material."*

*Despite Talmage's absorption in his studies and research, an odd theme of self-justification runs through his journals, a determination to prove that his choice was correct and that Mormons could study in the east without losing their faith. Because his religious commitments meant that he was never totally free to follow his "selfish" interests in science, he frequently pondered how far he could go without being disloyal to his faith.<sup>49</sup>*

*Had Talmage been more free to choose, he may have remained in the east until he finished a degree. From a practical standpoint, he was out of money by the spring of 1884, but he could easily have earned more in the east working as a chemist and, in fact, [p.61] refused several job offers, one from the College of Western Maryland as a professor of chemistry which included an all-expense-paid year in residence as a student, to earn the necessary degree. At first he was tempted, even though chemistry was "but a minor study there anyway." Ultimately he declined, confiding in his journal that he did not value a degree so highly that he was willing to pay such a price in time. But, he did value a degree and had been willing to accept one from Western Maryland if they would confer it on the basis of June examinations.<sup>50</sup>*

*Another offer had come in the late summer of 1883, when Talmage was deciding whether to go to Johns Hopkins or stay at Lehigh. As money began to arrive for the next year of study from J. M. Tanner, George Coray, and members*

*of the academy board, his mind turned strongly to home and his obligations there. Had Coray joined him at Lehigh, Talmage would almost surely have completed his degree there. When Coray went to Cornell instead and Maeser responded to Talmage's appeal for advice by telling him to make up his own mind after prayerful consideration, he made his final decision for Johns Hopkins, but he felt "sadly alone" in the decision.<sup>51</sup> While he waited for classes to begin in Baltimore, he wrote three essays for Utah audiences, apparently to be used later and perhaps partly out of homesickness. In "Good for Nothing," he described how to the chemist there is no such thing as "dirt." It includes a moving passage about Adam being a great philosopher even though he lacked a college degree.*

<sup>52</sup>

*Talmage immersed himself as thoroughly in his studies at Johns Hopkins as he had at Lehigh. Then on 30 January 1884 he received word that Brigham Young Academy had burned to the ground. He was ready to begin his last term of schooling, but he was willing to leave for home immediately if called. Despite his prompt response, there were hints of ambiguity. A few weeks earlier he had written George Coray that "I...hope to come East again, when the cloud of debt will have passed off me." One month after hearing about the fire, he mentions "if" in connection with teaching again.<sup>53</sup>*

*Apparently, however, Talmage never seriously considered staying longer. The Utah question—meaning the Mormon question of plural marriage—was a current issue. Talmage responded to dozens of inquiries about the Utah question, including at least two [p.62] letters prompted by public lectures, each time defending his people and religion. He was offended in Baltimore by crime, drunkenness, poverty, and the practices of other churches. All of the above plus the constant influence of letters from home telling of sick family members, giving him advice, sending news of the academy, and requesting assistance in procuring scientific apparatus, made it nearly inevitable that he return home on schedule.*

*He could return home with the assurance that he had tested his choice in the big leagues of American science and that Mormons had nothing to fear from science. With rare exceptions, his professors had been warm, encouraging, and focused on the specific detailed facts of their science. He mentions Darwin only twice in the two years, on both occasions complaining about recent lectures on the subject by ignorant clergymen who misrepresented Darwin in particular and science in general.<sup>54</sup> He returned as he had been instructed, "like a bee to the hive,"<sup>55</sup> but he re-entered with the firm intention of returning to the blossoms and nectar of science at his earliest opportunity. [p.67]*

#### Notes:

1. See *The Contributor* 16 (Feb. 1895): 229, based on an interview with James E. Talmage. He also said that his father followed the herbal profession "afterward." According to his son, Talmage frequently told his children stories of the elder James's influence. John R. Talmage, *The Talmage Story* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1972), 1-2, hereafter cited as *Talmage Story*.

2. Most biographical accounts refer only to his attending infant school in Ramsbury. His "Notes on English History," however, carry the clear label, "Ramsbury, Wilts, 1872," and corroborate his journal statement that he attended the National School in Hungerford only intermittently between the ages of five

and twelve. *Talmage Papers*, box 9, folder 1, Archives and Manuscripts, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; hereafter cited as *Papers*.

3. *The Contributor* 16 (Feb. 1895): 229.

4. See James E. Talmage *Journal*, Vol. 2, 4 Apr. and 12 Dec. 1881, in *Papers* and hereafter cited as *Journal* and the preface to *First Book of Nature* (Salt Lake City: Geo. Q. Cannon & Sons Co., 1888).

5. Later as the first curator of the museum collections of the Brigham Young Academy, he added his personal collection to the holdings. Ernest L. Wilkinson, ed., *Brigham Young University. The First One Hundred Years* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1975), 1:169, hereafter cited as *BYU Centennial History*.

6. See *Examination Paper for Standard VI*, *Papers*, box 9, folder 1.

7. The decision to add any subject beyond religion, the three R's, singing and sewing for the girls was made by each local school.

8. For the number of classes Maeser taught, see *Brigham Young University Archives*, hereafter cited as *UA*, *Register of Studies*, which is not extant for the period of 1877-79, the *Circulars*, and the notes and examinations of Talmage in *Papers*, boxes 9 and 10.

9. *BYU Centennial History* 1:159; Douglas F. Tobler, "Karl G. Maeser's German Background, 1828-56; The Making of Zion's Teacher," *BYU Studies* 17 (Winter 1977): 155-75. Maeser taught his students that the teacher of primary and intermediate grades must have a thorough understanding of all the natural sciences even though "formally, in a common school these can claim no place." See *Papers*, box 9, folder 4, "Theory of Teaching," 93.

10. *Papers*, box 9, folder 4, "Theory of Teaching," 41.

11. *Talmage Story*, Ch. 1.

12. *Papers*, box 10, folder 6, *Geography Notes*. Allowances must be made, of course, for any distortion of Maeser's teachings as they passed through Talmage's mind; however, all of Talmage's BYA notes are a valuable source for the content of what Maeser actually taught in the early years in contrast to what he said ought to be taught in his 1898 *School and Fireside*.

13. *Papers*, box 9, folder 4, "Theory of Teaching," 132.

14. J. Dorman Steele, *Fourteen Weeks in Physics* (New York: A. S. Barnes & Company, 1878). Other titles in the series were physiology, zoology, chemistry, astronomy, and geology. Steele was an educator who achieved great success as a popularizer of science.

15. *UA* 186, Folder M50, Vol. 1, 19.

16. *UA*, *Register of Studies*, June 1877.

17. For example, compare the essay entitled, "What arguments have we that Joseph Smith was sent of God?" in *Papers*, box 9, folder 2, with "The Cotton Gin" and "The Microscope" in *Papers*, box 9, folder 3.

18. *Papers*, box 9, folder 7.

19. *Journal*, 28 July 1880.

20. *Journal*, Aug. 1880; *Ogden Daily Junction*, 23-24 Aug. 1880; *Maeser to John Taylor*, 23 July 1880, UA. *Maeser correspondence*, box 1, folder 2; U.S. Census for 1900, Utah, Salt Lake, 3rd Precinct, Roll #1241684, 12 June, District 273, Sheet 12, page A; and *Papers: Scientific Analysis* in box 10, folder 2, *Chemistry Tables* in box 9, folder 8, and "Scrap" in box 10, folder 6.
21. UA, *Register of Studies*, 1880-81.
22. *Journal*, regular entries 1879-82, see e.g., 6 Nov. 1880, 17 June 1881, 25 Aug. 1881.
23. *Papers*, box 9, folder 4, "Theory of Teaching," 7.
24. *BYU Centennial History* 1:215, 224.
25. UA, *biographical files* for both men.
26. *Journal*, 27 June 1884. Other supporters were Thomas Hadley and Joseph L. Barfoot, long-time curator of the Deseret Museum whom Talmage had met at the museum in February 1881. Thereafter they exchanged specimens and Barfoot helped Talmage with specimens at the BYA Museum. Talmage credited Hadley and Barfoot with awakening his interest in nature. See *The Contributor* 16 (Feb. 1895): 231.
27. *Papers*, box 10, folder 3. See also *Journal*, 1 Sept. and 6 Nov. 1880; 17 June 1881.
28. *Papers*, box 9, folder 5, and box 10, folder 3. It is not known which edition of Dana's manual Talmage used. If it was the 1874 edition, in which Dana began to give qualified support to evolution in much the same way Talmage subsequently did, then the likelihood of Dana having been an influence in helping to formulate the details of Talmage's stand is increased. See Bert James Loewenberg, "The Reaction of American Scientists to Darwinism," *American Historical Review* 38 (1932-33): 698-701.
29. *The Contributor* 16 (Feb. 1895): 230.
30. *Journal*, 14 Nov., 14 Dec. 1881.
31. *Journal*, 14 Nov. 1881.
32. UA 317, *Papers*, box 9, folder 5.
33. *Journal*, 7 Dec. 1881.
34. *Journal*, 1 Apr. 1882.
35. *Journal*, 13 Nov. 1881.
36. *Journal*, dates given.
37. *Journal*, dates given.
38. *Journal*, 17 and 28 June and 22 Aug. 1881.
39. See original notes, partially in Pitman shorthand, in *Papers*, box 10, folder 5. I am indebted to LaJean Purcell for the transcription of these notes.
40. Davis Bitton, "Anti-Intellectualism in Mormon History," *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 1 (Autumn 1966): 111-33, and John A. Widtsoe, *Joseph Smith as Scientist* (Salt Lake City: YMMIA General Board, 1908).
41. *Journal*, April-May, 1882.
42. *Journal*, 25 Aug. 1882. Compare Maeser's advice to Talmage to remain at Johns Hopkins if he could (*Journal*, 13 Feb. 1884) after the academy fire.

*Perhaps Maeser was less concerned about Talmage losing his faith after having corresponded with him for almost two years.*

43. *Journal, 3 July and 7 Aug. 1882, 26 Oct. 1881.*

44. *Journal, 17 June 1882. Talmage's father is seldom mentioned in the journals, but he was among those who argued for medical school and urged him to spend the summer studying.*

45. *Information on Talmage's courses is drawn from journal entries and class notes. In general see Papers, box 10, folder 5, through box 13, folder 7, and box 1, folders 1-2.*

46. *Journal, 24 Dec. 1883.*

47. *Journal, 26 Apr. 1883; and Papers, box 10, folder 5, box 11, folder 6, "Analyses," 3-15. Again I am indebted to LaJean Purcell for transcribing the Pitman shorthand. See also earlier references to toxicology in Journal, 3 and 10 Apr. 1883.*

48. *Papers, box 13, folder 1; Journal, 1 Aug. 1883.*

49. *Journal, see e.g., 9 Sept. 1883.*

50. *Journal, 23 June and 8 July 1883; 28 Mar. 1884. He also considered the possibility of approaching a North Carolina institution that could award a degree by academic record and examination; 2 May 1884.*

51. *Journal, 17 Aug. 1883. See also 9 Sept. 1883.*

52. *Papers, box 12, folder 9.*

53. *Journal, 24 Dec. 1883, 29 Feb. 1884.*

54. *Journal, 4 May and 16 Mar. 1884.*

55. *Journal, 9 Sept. 1882; 9 Sept. 1883.*

## **Section B**

### **1911 Evolution Controversy at Brigham Young University by Gary James Bergera**

***(from actually, I don't remember where? dialogue or signature Books. Probably Signature Books, in their online library. But, I can't say for sure.)***

*This essay was originally published in The Search For Harmony, ed. Gene A. Sessions and Craig Oberg, Signature Books, 1993. Reprinted with permission. For Horace Hall Cummings's perspective, see this excerpt from his autobiography.*

*The Search For Harmony is currently out-of-print in book form, but is available on Signature Books' comprehensive New Mormon Studies CD-ROM.*

*Four years after assuming the presidency of Brigham Young University in 1903 George H. Brimhall embarked on an ambitious plan "to include in [his] faculty...the best scholars of the church."<sup>1</sup> LDS leaders had only recently*

*upgraded their Provo, Utah, academy to university status, and the fifty-five-year-old Utah Valley educator was anxious to improve his school's largely home-spun faculty. Brimhall's initial coup was hiring in 1907 BYU's first Ph.D., Joseph Peterson, to oversee the psychology department. Brimhall also succeeded that year in recruiting Peterson's younger brother, Henry, who held a master's degree from Harvard, to supervise the school's College of Education.<sup>2</sup>*

*The following year, Brimhall convinced twenty-eight-year-old Ralph V. Chamberlin, chair of the University of Utah's biology department and dean of its medical school, to join the growing faculty. Upon his arrival Chamberlin was made head of the biology department, and in 1909 his brother, William Henry, was also hired. Trained in modern and ancient languages and theology, William taught classes in psychology, philosophy, and languages. In addition to their regular assignments, the Petersons and William Chamberlin, three of the most highly credentialed Utah academics of their day, were appointed to the part-time theology faculty.<sup>3</sup>*

*Academically superior to their colleagues, the Petersons and Chamberlins brought to BYU a contagious enthusiasm for the latest intellectual pursuits, and were, along with Brimhall and other members of the faculty, determined to counter persistent criticism that the rural Mormon school was "lacking in genuine scholarship: from its "farm teachers."<sup>4</sup> In repeated attempts to upgrade the school's lackluster curriculum, subjects ranging from communism to eugenics were added and soon hotly debated both in and out of class.<sup>5</sup> "I recall one occasion in which there had been a good informal talk in a little group," Henry Peterson later wrote. Although less intellectually-oriented than his teachers, Brimhall himself reportedly "spoke up and said, 'I too am an evolutionist.' That viewpoint [was] unavoidable."<sup>6</sup>*

*At services in 1909 commemorating the centennial of Charles Darwin's birth and semicentennial of his Origin of the Species, Ralph Chamberlin publicly pronounced the British biologist one of the greatest scientific minds of the era. BYU's student newspaper, the White and Blue, echoed: "Undoubtedly among the great men of the nineteenth century the foremost place should be given to the eminent scientist Charles Darwin." For Chamberlin, Darwin's theories of evolution explained both the origin of life and belief in God, while biblical scholarship unveiled "the progressive unfolding of the Divine." He subsequently published two lengthy articles in the White and Blue illustrating the aims of scriptural criticism. The Petersons and Chamberlins soon became well known for their support of organic evolution and scriptural exegesis. "How I enjoyed them!" remembered BYU alumna Annie Clark Tanner. "I had been a teacher of the Bible in several of the organizations of the church and now for the first time in my life I was learning some truths which made reasonable explanations of Bible difficulties."<sup>7</sup>*

*Seven months after the Darwin centennial, and perhaps in response to questions raised during the Darwin celebration, the First Presidency of the LDS church, consisting of life-long Mormon official Joseph F. Smith and counselors John R. Winder and Anthon H. Lund, asked Apostle Orson F. Whitney to draft an official statement on the "origin of the physical man." A special committee of apostles corrected Whitney's text, which was then read to the First Presidency and Quorum of Twelve Apostles, was "sanctioned by them" as "the official*

*position of the church," and appeared in the November 1909 issue of the official Improvement Era. As published, the statement defended a spiritual and physical creation, the creation of man in the image of God, and Adam as the "primal parent of the race," without addressing the age of the earth, or, most importantly, the mutability of species. Still, the statement's anti-evolutionary sentiment was unmistakable, and many church members no doubt interpreted it as a refutation of Darwinism.<sup>8</sup>*

*Sketchy reports of the Chamberlins' and Petersons' "progressive" teachings had reached church headquarters and were referred to superintendent of church schools Horace Hall Cummings. Largely self-educated, Cummings had concluded from his own unsuccessful attempt to study in the East during the 1880s with church support that "previous faithfulness and good character [are] no assurance against" the loss of one's faith. Cummings's career in church education had been foretold by the widow of a church apostle who had blessed him in tongues that he "should visit the stakes of Zion, establishing and setting in order educational institutions in them." Like his mentor and career church educator, Karl G. Maeser, Cummings had remained within the ranks of the church school system, convinced that its value lay in spiritual and moral rather than intellectual development. Skeptical of secular teachings, he had instructed Brimhall in 1908: "The use of any text book on the New or Old Testament written by a non-member of our church [is] expressly forbidden, and the use of the outlines prepared for that purpose enjoined." Cummings viewed with alarm the growing popularity of evolution and scriptural criticism, which in his mind portended a move away from the religious simplicity he felt duty-bound to uphold.<sup>9</sup>*

*Reportedly responding to complaints from as far away as Mexico, Cummings visited BYU in late November 1910 to evaluate the situation. He subsequently reported to the LDS board of education that a number of teachers were "applying the evolutionary theory and other philosophical hypotheses to principles of the gospel and to the teachings of the church in such a way as to disturb, if not destroy the faith of the pupils." The board, allegedly "thunderstruck" at the report, instructed Cummings to "make a thorough investigation of conditions there and bring them a written report of [his] findings." Cummings returned to Provo within the week and toured the school for nine days, "visiting classes, talking with teachers and students, and in the evenings visit[ing] some of the parents to see what they thought of the situation." Fearing a general condemnation of his faculty from church officials, Brimhall wrote a cautiously worded explanation to Joseph F. Smith a few days after Cummings's arrival. "While I believe [the Petersons and Chamberlins] are from their point of view perfectly right," he wrote, "still I think they are a little over-zealous in their desires to bring people to their point of view. As they look at it their teachings are in perfect harmony with the principles of the gospel, but there are certainly many who cannot perceive that harmony, and, therefore, it seems to me that a little [patience] will be in keeping with greater wisdom on their part."<sup>10</sup>*

*When news of Cummings's visit spread across campus, "the friendly, respectful spirit heretofore always shown me changed to one of opposition and fault-finding," he noted. Faculty and students alike "said I wanted to destroy the 'academic liberty' of some of their best teachers, and would kill the school." These defenders argued that "theological work had never been so interesting*

*and well patronized. The 'new thought' was making a new school of the B.Y.U." Indeed, one Provo native observed that the teachings of the Petersons and the Chamberlins "seemed to meet a strong need in many students, as well as [in] some of the other faculty members." Their theology classes especially "were among the most popular on the campus and their status as well trained and highly competent men in their specialties attracted large followings." Thus among many upperclass-men Cummings became a "blue-nose killjoy whose office was to detect and ferret out inrectitude [sic], waywardness and sin [and who] ... was merely [tolerated], except by college graduates seeking teaching positions in church schools." Students began striking back with "semi-ribald yarns" regarding Cummings's "ultra piety and purity." Hoping to avoid "needless antagonisms," Cummings evidently hedged when he appeared before the faculty in early December and was asked what he would relay to the board. He reported evasively that "he was glad to learn through conversation with the [university] presidency that matters [had] been misrepresented."<sup>11</sup>*

*However, the report Cummings submitted six weeks later on 21 January 1911 did not mention misrepresentation. Cummings wrote that "when some of the most radical changes in theological views were first introduced" two years earlier, "it caused great disturbance in the minds of both pupils and the old style teachers." While most agreed that "interest in theological work had never been more universal or more intense in the school," and none expressed doubt "in the living oracles . . . and the ordinances of the gospel," still, Cummings reported, "there is a pronounced difference of opinion among both students and teachers upon many important points of doctrine and belief." Without mentioning names, he accused "four or five of the teachers" of championing organic evolution and biblical criticism. The theory of evolution, he alleged, was "treated as a demonstrated law and their applications of it to gospel truths [had given] rise to many curious and conflicting explanations of scripture." He described "the struggle [of] both teacher and student . . . when the new thought was being presented to them. ... It was like the sorrow of the little child when first told there is no Santa Claus." "Conditions in Provo are unfavorable for ... a solution [to this] difficulty," Cummings concluded. The number of teachers defending the new teachings "is sufficient to form a coterie having similar views, and the opposition they receive from others keeps them drawn together and determined to defend their views. . . . [They] have been warned by the presidency of the school and by myself, and even pleaded with, for the sake of the school, not to press their views with so much vigor. Even if they were right, conditions are not suitable; but their zeal overcomes all counsel and they seem even more determined, if not defiant, in pushing their beliefs upon the students. They seem to feel they have a mission to protect the young from the errors of their parents."<sup>12</sup>*

*One week later Cummings appeared before the faculty to summarize his report. Afterwards Brimhall, increasingly nervous, warned that "criticism of leaders should be kept in the background" and urged teachers to be loyal to "the heroes of Mormondom." "A general discussion" followed "in which a goodly number of teachers participated." Amos Merrill, an instructor of education, called for a resolution "invit[ing] the authorities of the church to appoint a committee to investigate the points of doctrine upon which [they had been] criticised." Brimhall, however, tabled the resolution, saying that it would be considered later at a "meeting called by the president for that purpose." Frustrated at the apparent lack of administrative support, Ralph Chamberlin alluded to*

*Cummings's report in an article appearing four days later in the White and Blue. "When we see men so unhappily bound with prejudice and tradition," he wrote, "that they are blind to the beauties and light of the grandest conception that science has yet won for man, we sorrow . . . Ultimate cause and meaning," he concluded, "remain untouched and as impenetrable as before. Evolution leaves the theistic argument from causality in its essence untouched."*<sup>13</sup>

*Although members of the General Church Board of Education had received copies of Cummings's report nearly two weeks earlier, they did not discuss its contents until 3 February. In his presentation Cummings named the offending teachers as Henry and Joseph Peterson and Ralph Chamberlin, "who, from an educational standpoint," he conceded, were "perhaps the strongest men in the institution, and they have a potent influence with the students, thus making their theological teachings the more dangerous." In the brewing confrontation, Brimhall aligned himself with Cummings, telling board members that "the only thing he could see to do was to get rid of these teachers." He reported that he had "patiently labored with them in the hope that they would change their attitude, . . . but it seemed that they were more determined than ever to teach theology according to their own ideas and theories, instead of according to the revealed truth." Based on Cummings's and Brimhall's testimony, the board concluded that "immediate steps should be taken [to investigate further] the three teachers named, and [to proceed with] their removal if necessary." They also ruled that "other teachers who may entertain the same ideas should be talked to very plainly and given to understand that the teaching of such theories could not be tolerated in the church schools." A special committee was appointed to meet with Chamberlin and the Petersons. Chaired by Francis M. Lyman, president of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, the committee included Heber J. Grant, Hyrum M. Smith, Charles W. Penrose, George F. Richards, Anthony W. Ivins, as well as Brimhall and Cummings. Ivins, though suspicious of evolution himself, soon resigned. "I will not . . . judge those men," he reportedly protested. "We are not qualified."<sup>14</sup>*

*One week later to the day the three professors were summoned to Salt Lake City. "We suddenly were brought out into a room," wrote Chamberlin, "with six of the top dignitaries of the church there to try us. We were, as they say, flabbergasted." Chamberlin was charged with "teaching evolution," which he did not deny. The three men asked for a copy of the charges against them but were refused. They were, however, aware of the substance of Cummings's report and the broad issues under discussion. All "frankly acknowledged" belief in biblical criticism and "absolute certainty as to the truth of evolution." More seriously, they evidently balked at recognizing the authority of the university president or Board of Trustees to rule on questions of science. The committee remained in session nearly five hours. "Many questions [were] asked" and answered, Apostle Charles Penrose recorded, "some directly, others evasively." But, Elder Heber Grant added, the three men "manifested a very good spirit." The committee met again the following morning and, according to Penrose, "all agreed that the ideas and belief expressed by the professors under fire ought not to be taught in church schools but that the men were sincere and good." They then resolved to "report accordingly and to recommend that their service be dispensed with unless they conform[ed] to the decisions and instructions of the Board of Education." Grant's account, however, is less generously phrased: "We were of a unanimous opinion that it would be unsafe for them to continue teaching at the*

*Brigham Young University." In their report, submitted later that day, the committee recommended that "the services of those three teachers in the B.Y. University be dispensed with unless they change their teachings to conform to the decision and instructions of the Board." The following week BYU board members adopted a nearly identical resolution, while William Chamberlin, whose teachings had not come under board review, published a four-page defense of evolution as an "Aid to Faith in God and Belief in the Resurrection" in the *White and Blue*.<sup>15</sup>*

*Again Brimhall pleaded with the professors to conform to the board's decisions. Ralph Chamberlin responded defensively, "If you can bring me one student whose faith I have injured in Mormonism, I will bring you five that you, through your narrowness, have driven out of the church. ... I never gave a public lecture on evolution until I had consulted you as to whether it would be all right. You urged me to do it. Now, why have you changed suddenly?" Brimhall could only feebly joke, "Well, I'll tell you, Brother Chamberlin, I know which side my bread's buttered on."<sup>16</sup>*

*BYU trustees were to communicate their charges to the three men on 21 February. Unfortunately, the professors first learned of the board's position when they read an editorial attacking higher criticism in the evening's *Deseret News*. Peterson publicly denied that he had taught anything contrary to the gospel and added that, in view of the accusations, he doubted there was much he or the others could do. On 24 February, the board finally issued its ultimatum to Peterson that he modify his teachings or be dismissed. Board members stressed that "from their point of view" he "was out of harmony with his brethren."<sup>17</sup>*

*Conditions deteriorated rapidly at BYU. When Joseph Peterson received a similar ultimatum, he promptly resigned. News of the development spread throughout faculty and students. Brimhall sent a lengthy letter to BYU trustee Reed Smoot. With forced optimism, Brimhall wrote of probable repercussions to the school and of his resolve to protect the church:*

*"We are having some little out-of-harmony conditions here. I do not look for a safe reconciliation. I have been hoping for a year or two past that harmony could be secured by waiting, but the delays have been [fraught] with increased danger. There is a possibility yet, but not a probability of adjustment. The school cannot go off and leave the church in any line of activity without perishing in the desert. . . . There are some people who predict the death of the college if these men go. I am ready to say that if the life of the college depends upon any number of men out of harmony with the brethren who preside over the church, then it is time for the college to die. I would rather the Maeser Memorial remain a sealed tomb containing our college hopes and ambitions until the day of a new educational resurrection than to have its doors thrown open to influences antagonistic to the heroism, inspiration and revelation of those who have made the school and who have the right to say, 'Thus far shall thou go and no farther.' The school follows the church, or it ought to stop."<sup>18</sup>*

*On 11 March, the *Deseret News*, attempting to answer criticisms that it had been less than objective in its coverage of the controversy, published a letter by William Chamberlin defending evolution together with an editorial attacking*

*Chamberlin's position. The next morning the Salt Lake Tribune carried a detailed account of the controversy, claiming that as many as 80 percent of the faculty sympathized with the Petersons and Chamberlin. When Joseph F. Smith was told that "a number of [Provo] merchants and others favoring the . . . teachers had withdrawn their patronage from the [White and Blue]," he "spoke up immediately and said that the First Presidency wanted no change in the paper's policy and . . . [said] he would instruct [Zion's Savings Bank] to keep the paper out of Financial difficulties." Smith also admonished his son, Andrew, a student at the high school adjoining BYU: "For my sake, my son, as well as your own[,] eschew the Petersons' and Chamberlin's evolution and all such things." On 13 March over 100 undergraduates assembled on campus in a mass rally to "stand by their teachers." The students distributed a petition "ratifying and endorsing the teaching of the professors, and praying for their retention by the Board of Trustees." Of a total college enrollment of 114 undergraduates, as well as a handful of professors, over 90 students and faculty signed the statement, which both the Tribune and the Herald-Republican printed. Predictably, the Deseret News chastised the students for airing their criticisms in print, especially in the Tribune, while Brimhall publicly scolded them for "dictating" to the "prophets."<sup>19</sup>*

*The following afternoon Brimhall met privately with Henry Peterson. Brimhall reported to Joseph F. Smith that they talked "for hours . . . and until away long in the night, but to no avail." "All that I needed to do," Peterson later wrote, "was to be a good boy, teach the permitted doctrine only, and I could stay with them. Think of it! I was invited to stay as a hypocrite teaching one thing to my students and believing and feeling another!" The next day, Brimhall wrote Peterson that he was being dismissed: "Under existing conditions, we cannot see our way clear to recommend you to the Board of Trustees as a member of the faculty of the Brigham Young University for the academic year 1911-12." Brimhall forwarded a copy of the letter to Smith, informing him, "This is the first time during our administration that we have had occasion to handle a teacher and the necessity is very, very painful to us." He reminded the church president that Peterson's brother, Joseph, had "tendered his resignation some time ago." That evening, an open letter from Henry Peterson appeared in the Provo Herald, advising readers: "Don't let people tell you from the pulpit or otherwise that to accept evolution means to foresake your faith or deny God." Within the week, Brimhall faced his faculty and "gave a brief history of recent events pertaining to the criticism of the work of the school, and impressed upon [them] the necessity of all members heartily supporting the school and the church." Two days later he warned a prospective teacher, "While the church does not presume to decide scientific questions, it does claim the right to decide as to what of science, or of anything else, is suited to the schools under its creation, and under its direction." "Your only safety," Reed Smoot counseled Brimhall, "lies in having the school follow strictly the policy mapped out by the teachers of the church."<sup>20</sup>*

*Previously silent on the issue, Joseph F. Smith published statements in the April issues of both the Juvenile Instructor and Improvement Era. In the Instructor, he wrote: "Some of our teachers are anxious to explain how much of the theory of evolution, in their judgment, is true, and what is false, but that only leaves their students in an unsettled frame of mind. They are not old enough and learned enough to discriminate, or put proper limitations upon a theory which we believe is more or less a fallacy. In reaching the conclusion that evolution would be best left out of discussions in our church schools we are deciding a question of*

*propriety and are not undertaking to say how much of evolution is true, or how much is false." In an earlier draft, Smith had added, "Without undertaking to say who has the best of the argument, the school authorities have thought it wise to ask our church school teachers to modify their instructions so as to eliminate dissension. If prudence had characterized these discussions, and our teachers who know the doctrines of the church had been more conservative, much of the sensation which has been created might have been avoided." The Improvement Era carried a statement expressing much the same sentiment, with an appended overview of the preceding three months' events.<sup>21</sup>*

*Also in April the Utah Educational Review printed a thoughtful dissenting critique of the controversy. Milton Bennion, Review editor and professor of philosophy and education at the University of Utah, argued that while church leaders emphasized their commitment to an absolute truth, the ability to understand that truth could be hampered by unchecked dogmatism. While agreeing that church leaders enjoy the right to supervise—even restrict—certain teachings, Bennion reminded readers that earlier scientific theories had once been branded heretical by the governing church. He urged church educational administrators to "grant the utmost liberty of belief in respect to the non-essentials [of faith] without questioning the fellowship of members who exercise this liberty," since "serious attempt on the part of church officials to dictate the methods and results of science in church schools" could "mean the death of higher education" in the church school system.<sup>22</sup>*

*In early April, Henry Peterson unsuccessfully petitioned Joseph F. Smith to reconsider the three professors' case. "I have found on direct statements from some members of the board," he wrote, "that they voted for the resolution that puts us out of the church school service on a misunderstanding. I thought I should like to have such corrected." Peterson evidently believed that their espousal of evolution and higher criticism had been taken as evidence of apostasy, and he assured Smith of their belief "in God and inspiration." In order that "the cause of education may be saved from further misunderstanding," he also asked that the church issue an official statement which "would quiet the fears of people instead of... further arousing them." He alleged that many "are already so fearful and supersensitive that [they] hardly dare to send their children to their own town schools for fear they will hear of evolution." Yet "every text book is written [with evolution] as the basic principle. Contrary to what some people say, the general principles of evolution are almost universally accepted."<sup>23</sup>*

*Throughout the following weeks, Brimhall was left to deal as best he could with dissatisfied faculty and students. In mid-May, he wrote again to Smoot, "I would be in perfect misery if I were not in harmony with those over me—I can stand it to be out of harmony with others. My policy has been to follow the interests of our faculty and also follow the interests of the student body, [but] I cannot be expected to follow either of the latter unless they are in perfect harmony with those above me." Smoot replied supportively, "If the time ever comes that it is impossible for me to be in harmony with my presiding officer, I will quickly resign, if it involves any great principle affecting my conscience or my religious beliefs."<sup>24</sup>*

*About this same time, Ralph Chamberlin, who had contemplated resigning, was asked to meet with Susa Young Gates, a member of the Board of Trustees. She told Chamberlin that she understood he had "recanted on the things [he] had been teaching." Chamberlin denied this and told her he would also resign. "I have an obligation to the students, and I'll teach them what I honestly believe can be supported by evidence." Joseph Keeler (a counselor to Brimhall in the BYU presidency) later asked, "Brother Chamberlin, why can't you teach this subject the way we want it taught, [instead of] the way you're teaching it?" Chamberlin replied, "I'm so constituted that I can't teach what I don't believe." Despite the Board of Education's ultimatum, Brimhall evidently promised Chamberlin he would not be required to modify his teaching if he remained. According to Chamberlin, Brimhall pleaded, "We want you to stay. . . . If you'll stay and work with us there isn't anything in the gifts of the church you can't have." Chamberlin refused because "these other men [had been] compelled to leave." Brimhall informed Joseph F. Smith of Chamberlin's resignation on 12 June.<sup>25</sup> Chamberlin's brother, William, would remain at BYU for another five years before finally resigning.*

*Christen Jensen, professor of history and political science, and his wife, Juliaetta, had hosted a party on 25 May honoring Joseph Peterson and his wife. Also in attendance were the Henry Petersons, the Chamberlins, and eleven other faculty and their wives. "The company was much of the 'insurgent' type," Mrs. Jensen wrote, "but we cared to have only those who are in sympathy with the three men who are to be dismissed at the close of school." She continued, "This fight has been extremely bitter in many ways. President Brimhall has talked to his faculty in the most insulting, uncultured manner such as no truly educated president would do to his faculty, many of whom are far, far superior to him in scholarship, and in everything else. I have lost all my respect for him. ... If the school is not injured I shall miss my guess." Within two weeks, Brimhall optimistically assured the faculty that "matters have been rectified. These particular difficulties will not recur."<sup>26</sup>*

*Ralph Chamberlin remained in Provo for one year before returning to the University of Utah and then to an appointment at Harvard. In early 1922, shortly after Franklin S. Harris's appointment as Brimhall's successor, Chamberlin applied to teach again but was told that "our funds will be very restricted this year." Harris explained that while he hoped Chamberlin could become "affiliated with the faculty here," he doubted that the school could offer a suitable salary for "a man of his training" and admitted that there was still "a little prejudice that needs to be overcome among some of the board."<sup>27</sup>*

*Henry Peterson had planned to run for Utah State Inspector of High Schools but was opposed by church authorities because of his "mode of thinking and causing doubt in the hearts of the children." He later moved to northern Utah where he taught in the Box Elder County School System and then at Utah State Agricultural College. When Peterson left BYU he sold his home, which he had built in 1911. Twelve years later the house was sold to the university. In 1927 the structure was renovated and has since served as the official residence of the university president.<sup>28</sup>*

*When Joseph Peterson left BYU he transferred to the psychology department of the University of Utah. In 1915, together with fourteen other faculty members, he*

*resigned in protest when four professors were dismissed during a struggle over church influence at the school. He then taught at the University of Minnesota, where he was appointed chair of the psychology department in 1918. He later moved to the George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tennessee. In 1934, he was named president of the American Psychological Association. He died the following year.<sup>29</sup>*

*The impact upon BYU of the three men's departure was profound. Although some patrons were reassured at the realignment of church and school, others feared that the university had been irreconcilably compromised. One student remembered: "It seems tragic that these men had to go. I am satisfied they were undermining no one's faith in God as he is defined in Mormon thought. They were good men in every sense of the word and had the students' best interests at heart." Thomas L. Martin, BYU dean of applied sciences, later lamented, "We lost much when [they] left us. If some of the narrowness which caused the upheaval in 1911 could have been prevented from exercising its power, I believe the vision that George Brimhall had in mind would have been accomplished; and if we could have had a free hand in dealing with these men and their associates, people would be singing our praises all over the country at the present time.<sup>30</sup>*

*Following the controversy, many faculty and students were reluctant to discuss some "matters of scientific and sociological value for fear of losing their positions and receiving the boycott of the church." Others began asking if there were "any [other] doctrines of the church which [were] inconsistent with the commonly accepted conclusions of science." School trustees approved a new teaching contract in October 1911 which required loyalty to church authorities as a condition of employment. Brimhall gradually eliminated classes in philosophy, ethics, and psychology, in favor of additional courses in religion, theology, and teacher training. Special summer school conferences stressed the importance of revelation, "which the 'evolution' and 'higher criticism' wave tends to obliterate." "I am more and more convinced," Brimhall wrote, "that while philosophy is valuable, there are so many more things of more importance to our young men and women that we shall be justified in eliminating some of our courses in philosophy and instituting other things that bear more directly on our practical lives, because I believe that a course in our theology and religion is wider and deeper than any course of ethics within our reach."<sup>31</sup>*

*In September 1911, Harvey Fletcher joined the BYU faculty with a doctorate in physics from the University of Chicago. Initially, he remembered, "they wouldn't let me teach theology . . . because I had a Ph.D." When William Chamberlin learned in mid-1916 that "most of [his crowded] courses had been cut out for [the] next year and that what [was] left had been put in the Department of Education," he resigned. One student later wrote, "William H. Chamberlin was a meek, humble, gentle, non-assertive man. . . . By force of his thinking and ideas . . . he had a tremendous influence with the upper classmen of the university." Another added, "He helped many students whose faith was disturbed by the impact of scientific and philosophical thought to achieve a more mature religious and intellectual perspective." William died five years later in Logan, Utah; a biography, authored by his brother, appeared in 1925.<sup>32</sup>*

*Other faculty losses after 1911 included James L. Barker, Edwin S. Hinckley, Earl Glade, Christen Jensen, and Harvey Fletcher. When Fletcher accepted a*

position at Western Electric, Brimhall told him that he was "being disloyal to the church" and asked him to talk with Joseph F. Smith. Smith gave Fletcher his blessing on Fletcher's promise that he would "keep [his] testimony strong and keep up [his] church activities." From 1911 to 1921, when Brimhall retired, the number of full-time faculty decreased some 30 percent. During this same period, the number of undergraduates jumped nearly threefold, but baccalaureate degrees declined over 63 percent and only two master's degrees were conferred. In efforts to counter predictions that the school could not weather the faculty losses, church appropriations were increased 50 percent beginning in 1912.<sup>33</sup>

The departure of Joseph and Henry Peterson, Ralph and William Chamberlin, and colleagues leveled a serious blow to the academic reputation of Brigham Young University—one from which the Mormon school did not fully recover until successive presidential administrations. At issue in the spring of 1911 was not only the question of a literalistic approach to religion, but the role of a church and its administrators to intervene in the daily curricula of an institution of higher secular learning. If science lost and religion won in 1911, defeat and victory would prove short-lived, even illusory, for such tension still exists at Brigham Young University<sup>34</sup>—more than eighty years after the Petersons and the Chamberlins left—suggesting, as Albert Einstein once observed, that "religion without science is blind, while science without religion is lame."<sup>35</sup>

#### About the Author

Gary James Bergera is director of publishing at Signature Books, Inc., Salt Lake City. "The 1911 Evolution Controversy at Brigham Young University" is adapted from Gary James Bergera and Ronald L. Priddis, *Brigham Young University: A House of Faith* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1985), pages 134-48.

#### \*\*\*\* Footnotes \*\*\*\*

1. Ralph V. Chamberlin, *Life and Philosophy of W. H. Chamberlin* (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1925), 137. For example, Joseph Peterson graduated from Brigham Young Academy in 1902, had taught LDS seminary in Idaho, and had just earned a doctorate degree from the University of Chicago, where he studied under pioneer behaviorial psychologist John B. Watson. See Ernest L. Wilkinson, ed., *Brigham Young University: The First One Hundred Years*, 4 vols. (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 1975-76), 1: 409-10, hereafter *BYU*; also Richard Sherlock, "Campus in Crisis—BYU, 1911," *Sunstone*, Jan./Feb. 1979, 11.

2. *Henry Peterson: Educator, 1868-1957* (n.p., 1982). Shortly after his arrival in Provo, Henry was called to serve on the LDS religion classes and general Sunday School boards. He was later appointed a member of an ad hoc committee to study the problems of church youth. See *Sunday School General Board Minutes*, 26 June 1907, 19 July 1909, archives, Historical Department, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, Utah, hereafter *LDS archives*; *Religion Class General Board Minutes*, 22 June 1910, 4 Apr. 1908, *LDS archives*.

3. *BYU, 409-10, 503; Sherlock, 11. A graduate of the University of Utah, Ralph Chamberlin had earlier taught math, science, language, and biology at the LDS College in Salt Lake City before continuing graduate studies at Stanford and Cornell, where he received a Ph.D. in 1905.*

4. *Joseph Peterson to Brimhall, 30 Aug. 1910, Brimhall Papers, Brigham Young University Archives, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, hereafter BYUA; Ralph V. Chamberlin to Brimhall, 3 Sept. 1910, Brimhall Papers.*

5. *Ralph V. Chamberlin, "Darwin Centennial Speech," 12 Feb. 1909, Chamberlin Papers, Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah; see the articles in the White and Blue, 16 Feb., 12 Nov., 24 Dec. 1909, 29 Apr. 1910, 31 Jan. 1911*

6. *Henry Peterson: Educator, 118-19.*

7. *Annie Clark Tanner, A Mormon Mother (Salt Lake City; Tanner Trust Fund, University of Utah, 1976), 216-17. See Edward J. Johnson, "George H. Brimhall Biography," BYUA.*

8. *BYU Faculty Minutes, 25 Sept. 1909, BYUA; George F. Richards Journal, 27 Sept. 1909, 22, 30 Oct. 1921, LDS archives; James E. Talmage Journal, 27, 30 Sept. 1909, Special Collections, Harold B. Lee Library, Brigham Young University; Anthon H. Lund Journal, 14, 15, 20 Oct. 1909, LDS archives; "The Origin of Man," *Improvement Era*, Nov. 1909, 75-81; *Divine Mission of the Savior, Course of Study for the Priests (2d Year), Prepared and Issued under the Direction of the General Authorities of the Church (Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1910), 35; Duane E. Jeffery, "Seers, Savants and Evolution: The Uncomfortable Interface," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought, Fall/Winter 1973, 61; cf. John A. Widstoe, Joseph Smith As Scientist, A Contribution to Mormon Philosophy) General Church Board, Young Men's Mutual Improvement Associations, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1908); "Editor's Table," *Improvement Era*, Apr. 1909, 489-94, and May 1909, 505-09. For Whitney's earlier views on evolution, see "Man's Origin and Destiny," *The Contributor*, June 1882, 268-70.**

9. *Cummings, "Autobiography," chap. 41, 2, LDS archives (cf. Cummings Journal, 22 Sept. 1917, LDS archives); Cummings to Brimhall, 27 Feb. 1908, Brimhall Papers.*

10. *Cummings, "Autobiography," chapters 41, 2-3; Henry Peterson: Educator, 123; General Church Board of Education Minutes, 2 Dec. 1909; Brimhall to Smith, 3 Dec. 1910, Brimhall Papers.*

11. *Cummings, "Autobiography," chapters 41, 5; Mark K. Allen, "The History of Psychology at Brigham Young University," 63, BYUA; Tanner, 216-17; Johnson; Faculty Minutes, 7 Dec. 1910.*

12. *Cummings to Smith and Members of the General Church Board of Education, 21 Jan. 1911, BYUA.*

13. *White and Blue*, 31 Jan. 1911; *Faculty Minutes*, 28 Jan. 1911; Ralph V. Chamberlin, "Evolution and Theological Belief," *White and Blue*, 31 Jan. 1911, a four-page supplement, reprinted in Chamberlin, *The Meaning of Organic Evolution* (Provo, UT: the Author, 1911), chap. 4.

14. *General Church Board of Education Minutes*, 3 Feb. 1911; Ivins, in Chamberlin, *Oral History*, 11, BYUA. See Ivins, "A Study of Evolution," *Improvement Era*, Dec. 1917, 161-66.

15. Chamberlin, *Oral History*, 6, 9-11; *Penrose Journal*, 10, 11 Feb. 1911, Utah State Historical Society; *Grant Journal*, 10, 11 Feb. 1911, LDS archives. Grant reported that Joseph B. Keeler also attended the first of the two meetings. *Richards Journal*, 10, 11 Feb. 1911; Francis M. Lyman et al, to Smith and Members of the Board of Trustees of the Brigham Young University, 11 Feb. 1911, BYUA (cf. Board of Trustees Minutes, 11 Feb. 1911); William H. Chamberlin, "The Theory of Evolution as an Aid to Faith in God and Belief in the Resurrection," *White and Blue*, 14 Feb. 1911.

16. Chamberlin, *Oral History*, 7-9.

17. Board of Trustees to Smith, 25 Feb. 1911, *Brimhall Papers*. See articles in *Salt Lake Tribune*, 23 Feb. 1911 (cf. 19 Feb. 1911); *Deseret News*, 21 Feb. 1911; and *Salt Lake Telegram*, 23 Feb. 1911.

18. See *Brimhall to Cummings*, 17 Mar. 1911; *Brimhall to Smith*, 17 Mar. 1911; *Brimhall to Smoot*, 8 Mar. 1911; all in *Brimhall Papers*.

19. *Deseret News*, 11 Mar. 1911; *Salt Lake Tribune*, 12 Mar. 1911 (cf. Chamberlin, *Oral History*, 8, and Edwin S. Hinckley to Brimhall, 24 Feb. 1911, *Brimhall Papers*); Heber Charles Hicks, "The Life Story of Heber Charles Hicks," 40-41, BYUA; Smith to Andrew K. Smith, 25 Feb. 1911, LDS archives (Smith evidently left school because of poor grades and excessive absences); *Daily Herald*, 14 Mar. 1911; *Salt Lake Tribune*, 15, 16 Mar. 1911; *Salt Lake Herald Republican*, 15 Mar. 1911; *Deseret News*, 16 Mar. 1911. For copies of the student petition, see *Brimhall Papers* and Chamberlin, W. H. Chamberlin, 149-51. Brimhall, in "Devotional Remarks," 16 Mar. 1911, BYUA, reprinted in *Deseret News*, 16 Mar. 1911.

20. *Brimhall to Smith*, 17 Mar. 1911, *Brimhall Papers*; *Brimhall to Peterson*, 16 Mar. 1911, *Brimhall Papers* (cf. Henry Peterson: *Educator*, 131-32); *Daily Herald*, 17 Mar. 1911; *Faculty Minutes*, 23 Mar. 1911; *Brimhall to Ericksen*, 25 Mar. 1911, *Brimhall Papers*; *Smoot to Brimhall*, 26 Mar. 1911, *Brimhall Papers*.

21. Smith, "Philosophy and the Church Schools," *Juvenile Instructor*, Apr. 1911, 208-209; Smith, "The Church and Science," *Smith Papers*; Smith, "Theory and Divine Revelation," *Improvement Era*, Apr. 1911, 548-51.

22. Bennion, "The 'Evolution' and 'Higher Criticism' Controversy at the Brigham Young University," *Utah Educational Review*, Apr. 1911 (cf. Joseph Peterson, "The Blessings of Science and Evils of Pseudo Science," *Utah Educational Review*, May 1911). Nine years later, the First Presidency considered Bennion as Cummings's replacement as superintendent of church schools and also as

*Brimhall's successor as BYU president. They decided, however, that the church needed a "Mormon spokesman" at the University of Utah and instead called his brother, Adam, as superintendent and Franklin Harris as president (see BYU, 233-34).*

23. *Peterson to Smith, 3 Apr. 1911, LDS archives.*

24. *Brimhall to Smoot, 11 May 1911; Smoot to Brimhall, 21 May 1911; both in Brimhall Papers.*

25. *Chamberlin, Oral History, 7; Brimhall to Smith, 12 June 1911, Brimhall Papers.*

26. *Juliaetta B. Jensen Journal, 25 May 1911, in Allen, 72; Faculty Minutes, 2 June 1911.*

27. *BYU, 428; Alien, 72-74; Chamberlin to Franklin S. Harris, 3 Jan. 1922, Harris Papers, BYUA; Harris to Chamberlin, 14 Mar. 1922, Harris Papers; Chamberlin to Harris, 29 Sept. 1923, Harris Papers; Harris to Chamberlin, 10 Oct. 1923, Harris Papers; Harris to Richard R. Lyman, 1 Oct. 1923, Harris Papers.*

28. *Anthon H. Lund Journal, 23 Apr. 1912; Ephraim Hatch, "History of the Brigham Young University Campus and the Department of the Physical Plant," 4:8-9, BYUA; BYU, 428; Allen, 72-74.*

29. *For the 1915 controversy at the University of Utah, see Joseph H. Jeppson, "The Secularization of the University of Utah, to 1920," Ph.D. diss., University of California, 1973, 180. For Peterson's later work, see Lyle Lanier, ed., Psychological Monographs, 1938, i-v, 1-237; and Peterson, "Completeness of Response as an Explanation Principle in Learning," Psychological Review, 1916, 153-62, "Aspects of Learning," Psychological Review, 1935, 1-27, Early Conceptions and Tests of Intelligence (Yonkers: World Book Company, 1924), and "The Scientific Study of Human Behavior," Brigham Young University Alumnus, 1927, 4-5.*

30. *Johnson; Martin to Heber C. Snell, 16 Mar. 1942, Snell Papers, Archives and Manuscripts, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.*

31. *E. E. Ericksen, The Psychological and Ethical Aspects of Mormon Group Life (Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1975), 65; Tanner, 216; Board of Trustees Minutes, 25 Oct. 1911; Daily Herald, 6 Oct. 1913 (cf. Board of Education Minutes, 29 Dec. 1913); Brimhall to Joseph Fielding Smith, 11 Mar. 1916, Brimhall Papers.*

32. *Fletcher, Oral History, 19 Sept. 1968, 43, BYUA; Fletcher, "Autobiography," 38, 42-43, BYUA; Chamberlin, W. H. Chamberlin, 211; "A Sentiment," White and Blue, 31 May 1916; Russel B. Swensen, "Mormons at the University of Chicago Divinity School: A Personal Reminiscence," Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought, Summer 1972, 38.*

33. Fletcher, "Autobiography," 42-43; "A Brief Survey of the Work of Brigham Young University From the Beginning of the School Year 1906-07 to the Close of the School Year 1913-14—Eight Years," Printed Material 34, e-2, BYUA.

34. For organic evolution and science at BYU after 1911, see Gary James Bergera and Ronald Priddis, *Brigham Young University: A House of Faith* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1985), 148-71.

35. In Stanley L. Jaki, *The Relevance of Physics* (Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press, 1966), 345.

**Improvement Era, Vol. 14:548-49; "Editor's Table: Theory and Divine Revelation"; 1910.**

*Our young people are diligent students. They reach out after truth and knowledge with commendable zeal, and in so doing they must necessarily adopt for temporary use many theories of men. As long, however, as they recognize them as scaffolding useful for research purposes, there can be no special harm in them. It is when these theories are settled upon as basic truth that trouble appears, and the searcher then stands in grave danger of being led hopelessly from the right way.*

*Recently there was some trouble of this kind in one of the leading Church schools--the training college of the Brigham Young University--where three of the professors advanced certain theories on evolution as applied to the origin of man, and certain opinions on "higher criticism," as conclusive and demonstrated truths. This was done although it is well known that evolution and the "higher criticism"--though perhaps containing many truths--are in conflict on some matters with the scriptures, including some modern revelation.*

*An investigation was instituted, founded on the charges of Superintendent H. H. Cummings of the Church schools, based on complaints from patrons of the school; and the General Church Board of Education appointed a committee to ascertain to what extent the teaching of unorthodox doctrines in the school by these instructors was based upon fact. The personnel of the committee was: Francis M. Lyman, Heber J. Grant, Hyrum M. Smith, Charles W. Penrose, George F. Richards, Anthony W. Ivins, Horace H. Cummings, and Dr. George H. Brimhall.*

*The committee met with Professors Henry Peterson, Joseph Peterson and Ralph V. Chamberlain--all three eminent scholars, able instructors, and men of excellent character--and the investigation was held. The meeting and examination were characterized by the utmost cordiality and freedom on both sides. The professors frankly admitted that they held to and taught the theories of evolution as at present set forth in the text books, and also theories relating to the Bible known as "higher criticism," which they appeared to view as conclusive and demonstrated; so that when these ideas and enunciations were in conflict with the scripture, ancient and modern, it required the modification of the latter to come into harmony with the former, carrying the impression that all revelation combines a human element with the divine impression and should be subject to such modification.*

*The Church, on the contrary, holds to the definite authority of divine revelation which must be the standard; and that, as so-called "science" has changed from age to age in its deductions, and as divine revelation is truth, and must abide forever, views as to the lesser should conform to the positive statements of the greater; and, further, that in institutions founded by the Church for the teaching of theology, as well as other branches of education, its instructors must be in harmony in their teachings with its principles and doctrines.*

*There was no inclination to interfere with the freedom of thought and expression of the opinion of the professors, but the committee, after carefully weighing the matter, concluded that as teachers in a Church school they could not be given opportunity to inculcate theories that were out of harmony with the recognized doctrines of the Church, and hence that they be required to refrain from so doing.*

*The committee so reported to the trustees of the Brigham Young University. This body later held a meeting at which they unanimously resolved, "that no doctrine should be taught in the Brigham Young University not in harmony with the revealed word of God as interpreted and construed by the Presidency and Apostles of the Church; and that the power and authority of determining whether any professor or other instructor of the institution is out of harmony with the doctrines and attitude of the Church, be delegated to the presidency of the university."*

## *Cummings and the 1922 Controversy*

### *Background*

*Horace Hall Cummings was born in Provo on June 12, 1858, and died in SLC on Aug 1, 1937. As a young adult, he worked as a printer's devil at Deseret News, quarried granite for the Salt Lake Temple, and worked for Deseret Woolen Mills.*

*Eventually, he found his niche as an educator when he took a job teaching at Mill Creek. He quickly moved his way up the educator's ladder from teaching at local schools and seminaries, to teaching at the University of Utah, and finally being called to be the General Superintendent of the Church Schools.*

### *Controversy at BYU*

*Toward the end of his life, Horace wrote an autobiography entitled, Gems From My Journal: Culled for My Children that was posthumously published in 1982. The following is chapter 26, "False Doctrines in Church Schools", which detailed the controversy surrounding the teaching of evolution at BYU from Horace Cummings' perspective. For an excellent overview perspective of the controversy, see Gary James Bergera's essay "The 1911 Evolution Controversy at BYU."*

## *Chapter 26*

### *False Doctrines In Church Schools*

*(pages 166 - 172)*

*From the earliest days in Utah, many of the young men who went east to study lost their faith in the gospel. Their previous faithfulness and good character was no assurance against this result. This was so general that careful parents, though appreciating the education acquired, dreaded to send their sons to eastern colleges. This feeling, I was told, was why President John Taylor withheld his approval when the B.Y. College Board wished to send me east for three years to prepare me to be the president of that school in 1881.*

*Since one truth cannot antagonize another truth, the truths taught in science, history, and philosophy should not conflict with any of the principles of the gospel. And they will not when both are rightly understood.*

*So much has already been written to harmonize so-called "religion" and science, that I do not care to add here my views, other than to express some reasons that occur to me for this result upon so many of our young people.*

*1st - Absence from Church activities, instructions, and environment allows the religious ideals and beliefs to lie dormant, while all the other powers of the mind are greatly stimulated and grow, wonderfully fast. This causes an unbalanced development much to the disadvantage of the religious side. In such an unfavorable environment, religious notions and ideals of youth gradually pass with Santa Claus to the realm of myth.*

*2nd - Both science and philosophy reject all recognition of the miraculous, which is the cornerstone of religion. Since the textbooks, the teachers, and the college atmosphere all breathe this spirit, our boys gradually adopt it, too. Their minds are not sufficiently mature and trained to overthrow the age-old, cunningly devised, and carefully arranged arguments that they meet. Unable to successfully resist, they finally, though often unwillingly, yield and accept these errors.*

*3rd - History gives many instances where the strongest religious tenets of both Christian and pagan religions have been disproved by science. This gives great*

*prestige to "science" as something to be absolutely relied upon, while religion is regarded as something made up of myths, having no solid foundation of reliability. Nor do they take our religion out of that class.*

*No one seems to counter with the fact that so called "science" has had more of its "principles" proved false by later experience than has "religion," so called. Not one principle taught by Christ has ever been disproved, but only man's notions. Dogmas of men have been disproved but not things revealed by God.*

*The Prophet Joseph Smith taught that God is governed by law as well as man, and all that He does is according to law. With Him there are no miracles. During the last half century, so many of God's laws have been revealed to and applied by man that our fathers knew nothing about, that we now perform hundreds of real "miracles", as they would call them. The passing of the Israelites through the Red Sea was no more of a miracle to King Pharaoh than it would have been for him to see a squadron of airships flying over it as we might do in our time. What will man not accomplish in another half century if he keeps on? And what cannot God do who knows all these laws of which we know so little? Is it sensible to doubt miracles? Moses seems to have overcome gravity in one way, modern man, in another. Because we do not understand how a thing is done, is that just grounds for disbelieving it?*

*4th - The growth of the theory of evolution, especially as applied to the origin of man, and the rapid spread of the cunning arguments of so-called "higher criticism," greatly increased the danger to our young people. But these things disturbed other churches before they reached us. They attack the fundamentals of all Christendom, and the controversy still rages.*

*But no serious complaints of these doctrines in our local schools occurred until shortly after I was called to supervise the Church schools. It seems that a number of teachers who had been east and become converted to these doctrines were engaged to teach in the B. Y. University at Provo. Being among the strongest and best educated men in the faculty, and sufficiently numerous to form a coterie having the same views, they were not easily turned from their errors. On the contrary, they converted many other teachers, and most of the students, to their views.*

*Complaints soon began to come to me against these teachings. I visited the school and explained to the faculty and student body the complaints that were coming to me from patrons of the school and stake presidencies and begged them to keep to themselves such views if they believed them. That school was established to teach the gospel of Christ and not to destroy faith in it.*

*Time passed, the teachers became bolder and bolder, and the complaints became louder and louder. Teachers in other Church schools began to follow their example, and the situation became quite alarming to me. Several times I took up the matter with the presidency of the school and the teachers concerned, but they seemed to think no harm was being done. More than a dozen stake presidencies visited me and complained about the false doctrines emanating from the BYU. They threatened to boycott the school.*

*At last I determined to carry the responsibility no longer and laid the matter before the General Board of Education. I mentioned in detail some of their objectionable doctrines, and the nature and source of the complaints received, and told how that spirit was spreading among the other schools.*

*Members of the General Board were thunderstruck. They could not believe such doctrines could be taught there. They instructed me to go to Provo and make a*

*thorough investigation of conditions there, and bring them a written report of my findings.*

*Accordingly, I spent about nine days in this school, visiting classes, talking with teachers and students, and in the evenings I visited some of the parents to see what they thought of the situation. I tried to get at the real condition and to present it in an unbiased way. I included nothing in the report that I did not see and hear myself, so there was no hearsay evidence in it.*

*The report was quite lengthy and is written in full in my journal, but I will give only a brief summary of some of its leading bad features:*

1. *The Bible is treated as a collection of myths, dramas, folk-lore, etc. and contains some inspiration. Its miracles are mostly fables or accounts of natural events recorded by simple people who injected the miraculous element into them, as most ignorant people do when things, strange to them, occur, e.g.:*
  - a. *The flood was only a local inundation of unusual extent.*
  - b. *The confusion of tongues came about by the scattering of the descendants of Noah when they became too numerous for the valley they originally occupied. Having no written language, their speech soon changed, each tribe's in a different way. There was no sudden or miraculous change in their language.*
  - c. *The wind blew the waters back, making a bare ridge across the Red Sea, so that the Israelites crossed it.*
  - d. *Christ's temptation is only an allegory of what takes place in each of our souls. There is no personal devil to tempt us.*
  - e. *John the Revelator was not translated. He died in the year 96.*
  
2. *The theory of evolution is treated as a demonstrated law, and their application of it to gospel truths gives rise to many curious and conflicting explanations of scripture. Its relations to the fall, the atonement, and the resurrection, are, perhaps, the most important and damaging to the faith of the students. It does away with the fall, and therefore, with the Redeemer from the fall, as well as the resurrection.*
  
3. *Philosophical theories are often carried to a ridiculous extent, and destroy faith, e.g.:*
  - . *Sin is the violation of a law resulting in pain. Righteousness is pursuing a course that brings happiness. No intelligent being would sin if he knew the full consequences. Hence, sin is ignorance, education or knowledge is salvation. Sinners should be pitied and enlightened and not blamed and punished. The criminal code and courts should be abolished and all prisoners released and put into schools. Gospel ordinances have no value except as props to weak mortals. Education is the only essential thing.*
    - a. *We should never agree. God never made two things alike. Only by taking different views of a thing can its true nature be known.*
    - b. *All truths change as we change. Nothing is fixed or reliable. As we grow or change our attitude toward any truth, that truth also changes.*

- c. *Memory gems are immoral, since fixing the words fixes the thought and prevents growth. One teacher thanked God that he could not repeat one of the Articles of Faith, and another took his children out of the Primary Association because they were taught to memorize scripture.*
4. *Visions and revelations are mental suggestions. The objective reality of the visit of the Father and Son to Joseph Smith was most strenuously denied. To get the real truth of any vision or revelation, ancient or modern, the mental and physical condition of the prophet receiving it must be known. After eliminating the personal equation, the remainder may be regarded as inspiration or divine.*
5. *Religion, like science, must be expressed in terms of KNOWLEDGE. FAITH was regarded with pity as superstition and is not characteristic of the intellectually trained.*

*The general attitude was not to accept anything pertaining to religion that could not be demonstrated in the laboratory. But not so with their explanations against religious beliefs. They did not question the explanation of the landslide as the cause for the waters of the Jordan stopping for the children of Israel to cross, but President A. H. Lund who has travelled through Palestine said there are no hills or ground steep enough in the Jordan Valley to permit a landslide. They likewise took for granted that a ridge, reaching almost to the surface of the Red Sea crosses that body of water where the Israelites crossed, and any strong wind from the right direction would uncover it so anybody could cross it on foot. In thus accepting things that were so contrary to all their former training and belief, many of both teachers and students confessed to me that the change they underwent was most painful indeed — they could neither eat nor sleep at first. I suggested that getting new light, especially on the gospel, was always a joy to me. But they compared it to the pain a child feels at first to learn that there is no Santa Claus, but afterwards learns that real parents are much better. Their new light now made them much more happy and satisfied than they were before.*

*Teachers urged the students not to let their parents or the authorities at home know what a change was taking place in their faith as they could not understand it and would blame the school. Likewise, they said if they were to be investigated, they wanted men of similar education to theirs, since none others could understand their views and judge them rightly. The Apostles were good men, but utterly unfit to judge them.*

*As the object of my visit became understood, the friendly, respectful spirit heretofore always shown me changed to one of opposition and fault finding. They said I wanted to destroy the "academic liberty" of some of their best teachers, and would kill the school. Theological work had never been so interesting and well patronized. The "new thought" was making a new school for the B.Y.U.*

*Realizing that the whole matter would be examined and decided on its merits, I avoided needless antagonisms and only replied that the school was maintained for the express purpose of instilling into the minds of the students faith in the gospel, and that the leaders of the Church had a right to determine what those principles are.*

*By the time my report was ready to present to Brother Brimhall, the President was united with me and thought I had handled the matter very gently. My report was considered in detail by the General Board of Education, who then referred it to a committee of six of the Apostles with President Brimhall and me associated.*

*The three leading teachers in this matter, Joseph and Henry Peterson and Frank Chamberlain appeared before that committee for a full day and admitted teaching everything I had charged in my report. It was decided that, since they would not promise to refrain from such objectionable teachings in the future, "their services be dispensed with." The other teachers promised to conform to the instructions of the School Board in that matter and were retained.*

*To illustrate the evils that grew out of those doctrines, one student said to me, "O, my! I could make my dear mother cry in a minute by telling her of the change that has come in my faith here."*

*Students ceased to pray, and the teachers did not pay their tithing as before. One or two left off their garments and denounced their faith. I heard of one father who came to the school in a rage and told of the loss of his son's faith and the change in his life that this caused. He had gone completely to the bad, and the father cursed the day he had let his son come to that school.*

*I copy the following from my journal:*

*"As the train passed through Provo, Dr. Taylor, a son of President John Taylor got aboard. He was a special teacher in the B.Y. University. I asked him if any of the teachers had resigned since I left home. (A number had threatened to resign if any were removed, and I rather wished a few of them would). He replied,*

*"None have resigned, and it would be a great calamity if they should."*

*In the conversation which followed he asked me if I believed the miracles of the Bible, and was greatly surprised to find that I did.*

*"Do you, with your knowledge of science, believe the story of Jonah and the whale?"*

*"There is nothing in that story more opposed to science," I replied, "than there is in the story of the death and resurrection of the Redeemer, of which he declared it was a type. I can believe one just as well as I can the other."*

*"So can I," he replied. "Both are fables."*

*"Well, I am surprised at you," said I, "and right here is where you and I differ absolutely. I not only believe that Christ was crucified, buried, and after three days raised from the dead, but also I believe that he appeared to the Nephites on this continent as described in the Book of Mormon. I believe all that the Bible and Book of Mormon say on this matter to be true literally - that those events took place actually as described."*

*He looked upon me in pity if not derision. This illustrates the attitude of the professors in the BYU against whom I made the complaint.*

*The spirit of "higher criticism" or modernistic philosophy, so prevalent among other denominations and in institutions of higher learning, had crept into the BYU so gradually that the presidency of the school scarcely recognized it and were loath to admit the damage being done.*

*But when President Brimhall, in doing block teaching, came upon BYU students who frankly told him they had quit praying as they had learned in the school that*

*there is no real God to hear them, he began to worry. He had a dream also which threw light on the situation. As I remember, it was somewhat as follows:*

*He saw several of the BYU professors standing around a peculiar machine on the campus. When one of them touched a spring, a baited fish hook attached to a long, thin wire rose rapidly into the air. He marveled at this "fishing in the air" and wondered what could be caught in that way.*

*Casting his eyes around the sky, he discovered a flock of snowwhite birds circling among the clouds and desporting themselves in the sky, seemingly very happy. Presently one of them, seeing the bait on the hook, darted toward it and grabbed it. Instantly one of the professors on the ground touched a spring in the machine, and the bird was rapidly hauled down to the earth.*

*On reaching the ground, the bird proved to be a BYU student, clad in an ancient Greek costume, and was directed to join a group of other students who had been brought down in a similar manner. Brother Brimhall walked over to them, and noticing that all of them looked very sad, discouraged, and downcast, he asked them:*

*"Why, students, what on earth makes you so sad and down-hearted?"*

*"Alas, we can never fly again!" they replied with a sigh and a sad shake of the head.*

*Their Greek philosophy had tied them to the earth. They could believe only what they could demonstrate in the laboratory. Their prayers could go no higher than the ceiling. They could see no heaven, no hereafter.*

*These experiences seemed to awaken in President Brimhall a realization of what was going on in the school, and he gave me the most enthusiastic support thereafter in setting things right.*

*Long and intense study of the highly intellectual theories of ancient philosophers often give our students a too-exalted view of their abilities and value. One of the leading teachers of Greek philosophy in our state University gave his class this question to debate: "Resolved, that Socrates brought more new truth to mankind than did Jesus Christ," and he seemed to think that the two individuals were about equal.*

*As wonderful and skillful as were those old theories, neither pagan nor so-called Christian philosophy ever prepared a people to meet God. For centuries Egypt was the seat of learning for the ancient Greeks and Romans, but its philosophy made it impossible for Moses to get the Israelites fit to see God. Enoch, after 300 years of hard work, succeeded wonderfully.*

*This generation must be prepared to meet Christ who will reign on the earth for 1,000 years, and we have not got 300 years to prepare them. God will "cut his work short in righteousness," and with the aid of wonderful modern inventions will spread truth over the earth, and perform the great work quicker than ever before; but I feel sure that pagan philosophy will not contribute to the desired end like revelation from God. The unadulterated, inspired truth, if not so handsomely dressed nor skillfully presented, will accomplish results far better than the theories of men.*

## *PART TWO:*

*The following correspondences include letters back and forth between various General Authorities, including B.H. Roberts, Joseph Fielding Smith, the First Presidency, and the Quorum of the Twelve involving the propriety of teaching evolution in manuals and over the pulpit and cover only the years between 1928 and 1931.*

*Journal entries from various authorities, related to the above correspondences, are also included here. As well, the full text of Joseph Fielding Smith's (in)famous 50-page response to B. H. Roberts, delivered in a meeting of the Twelve, is also included.*

*The various correspondences provide a fascinating and valuable "insider's view" into how the General Authorities deal with differing opinions involving doctrinal matters within their own ranks. To be sure, at times, the exchanges are quite frank and even heated. Surely, this is to be expected when authorities come to their position from such different backgrounds in education, as well as, church and business experience.*

*Much has been written, especially in the 1970s and 80s, regarding these correspondences in various journals including, but not limited to, Dialogue, BYU Studies, and Sunstone. B. H. Roberts' unpublished and final manuscript, The Truth, The Way, and The Life has now been published by Signature Books and much of this correspondence, or references to such correspondence, can be found in that volume, as well as, correspondences not included here.*

*The correspondences here included are from my personal files. All copies of various correspondences are in my possession. I have attempted to faithfully and accurately reproduce them here, while correcting obvious spelling and dating errors, when recognized.*

*September 17, 1928*

*President Rudger Clawson,  
Of the Council of the Twelve.*

*Dear Brother,*

*I note that in a letter signed by you under date of November 11, 1927, that the statement was made with reference to courses of study for the quorums of the Melchizedek Priesthood, that "The council of the twelve, the First Council of Seventy, and the Presiding Bishopric will give consideration of the texts and courses projected from time to time for these quorums. For the course of study for the quorums during 1928-29 the First Council have heard nothing concerning any plans for courses of study, for this year and naturally we feel*

*anxious as to what course of study you will propose for these quorums. In the meantime many inquiries come to the office of the First Council concerning course of study for this year and we can make no answer as to what is intended for them as outlines for study. Of course, we are deeply interested in our 185 quorums of seventy throughout the church and would like to see them provided with a suitable course to prepare them for their work in the ministry. In view of the fact that we have heard nothing from the council, of the Twelve on what their plans are, I beg leave, with the approval of the members of the First Council who are within reach, to submit to you and to your council a book upon which I have been working definitely for now over one year, and I might say for many years, and which I designed at the commencement of it as a course of study for our seventies quorums, and of course if suitable for them it may be equally suitable for the High Priests and Elders. The book in volume of matter is contains—between five and six hundred pages, more nearly six hundred than five hundred—therefore would be ample in quantity of matter for more than one year, perhaps even two or three years as a text book.*

*The title of the work is to be: The Truth, The Way, The Life, An Elementary Treatise on Theology. I hope to incorporate within its pages a full harvest of all that I have thought, and felt and written through the nearly fifty years of my ministry, that is, on the theme of the title. The present status of the work is that I have the whole subject covered, making in all 53 chapters, 43 chapters of which could not be placed in the hands of the printer and the remaining chapters will be re-written and completed for the printer by the 10<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> of October, and I am informed by the Deseret News Book Printing Department that they could produce such a work once the manuscript is in their hands in the course of four or five weeks, so that it will be possible to issue this book from the press by the middle of November if it is thought desirable to have it printed for the use herein proposed.*

*I spent the six months vacation accorded to me last summer by the First Presidency in dictating the rough draft of this book, and the last few months have been revising and directing the rewriting of it for use by the printer, until it is now brought to the status of preparation described above.*

*About one-half of the book is taken up with the first division of the subject: The Truth, and occupies 28 chapters of the 53. This part of the work deals with great fundamentals of the existence of things, what we know about the universe, the solar system, our own earth, with a treatise on creation, with man's advent to the earth, the preparation for man's life upon the earth, with the institution of the gospel in the council of God, the possibility and probability and the absolute assurance, at the last, of revelation and what revelation has brought forth as the Gospel.*

*The second part: The Way, is the development of the everlasting Gospel, in which a brief resume of the different dispensations of it are treated, and in this part the atonement of Jesus Christ is worked out under the scriptures and philosophy, as far as philosophy can be made to apply to it. Six chapters are devoted to that one theme alone. Then comes a chapter on the departure from the way and another chapter closing this middle section on the restoration of the way.*

*The third part: The Life, is a development of about six chapters of the perfect life of the Christ as the ideal of the Gospel.*

*This in headlines is a description of the treatment of the subject. Each chapter has been written with a design that it would make one lesson and a lesson analysis has been given of each chapter, two samples of which I am enclosing, being the analysis of each chapter of two divisions: Chapter I on The Truth, Chapter 29 on the introductory part: The Way this analysis will afford those who are going to use it as a text book the outlines of a lesson, and will constitute an easy division for assigning parts of the lesson to the respective students.*

*The experience of the First Council in conducting courses in theology for the five years through which our seventy's course of theology ran, some twenty years ago, lead us to believe that this method of providing lesson analysis will be again as successful as in our former experience.*

*All this, President Clawson, is submitted to your Council as an offering on the part of the First Council of Seventy for a course of Study—more especially for our seventies quorums. But it may be equally available for the quorums of the High Priests and Elders, and we feel that in this book we are following a line of subject matter that will give to them the proper comprehensive outline upon the gospel as a whole and prepare them for presenting more intelligently the simple, specific message that we have to offer the world.*

*Trusting that it may appeal to you and your council, and that we shall have a prompt consideration of it in time to make it available to our quorums of seventy during the present year.*

*All of which is*

*Respectfully submitted,*

*B. H. Roberts (signed)*

*P.S. I enclose you herewith the sample lesson analysis as referred to in the body of the letter.*

*Oct. 3, 1928*

*Elders George Albert Smith,  
David O. McKay,  
Joseph Fielding Smith,  
Stephen L. Richards and  
Melvin J. Ballard*

*The correspondence herewith enclosed was returned to the Council of the Twelve by the First Presidency, with verbal instructions that a committee be appointed (preferably the Committee of Courses of Study for the Melchizedek Priesthood) to examine the manuscript of Brother Roberts' work, and make a recommendation as to its suitability for the study of the High Priesthood.*

*You are now appointed to act as said committee, and to make report to the Council of the Twelve.*

*Sincerely your brother,*

*Rudger Clawson (signed)*

*October 10, 1929*

*President Rudger Clawson and  
Members of the Council of Apostles*

*Dear Brethren:*

*The sub-committee of the Council of Apostles appointed to read the manuscript written by Elder B. H. Roberts entitled, The Truth, The Way, The Life, makes the following report:*

*The committee secured the manuscript and very carefully and systematically read it through, sitting two sessions each week, until the work was finished.*

*In the main the manuscript is very worthy treating subjects dealing with the mission of Jesus Christ and gospel principles which it would be well for all members of the Church to understand. These subjects are faith promoting and would prove to be helpful to the young people of the Church. However the manuscript could be greatly reduced without injury to the thoughts expressed.*

*The members of the committee regret to say that there are some objectionable doctrines advanced which are of a speculative nature and appear to be out of harmony with the revelations of the Lord and the fundamental teachings of the Church. Among the outstanding doctrines to which objection is made are: The doctrine that there were races on the earth before Adam; That Adam was a translated being who came to this earth subject to death, and therefore, did not bring death upon himself and his posterity through the fall; That Adam was placed on the earth when the earth was in a desolate condition and before any*

*other life, belonging to the "dispensation of Adam" was on the earth; That all life preceding Adam was swept off, even to the fishes of the sea, by some great cataclysm so that a new start had to be made; That God the Father is still discovering hidden laws and truth which he does not know, but which are eternal.*

*The members of the committee met with Brother Roberts on two or three occasions and discussed these matters with him, making the request that he eliminate from his work these objectionable features, but this Brother Roberts has refused to do. At the last interview with him, he informed the committee that if he could not adjust matters and therefore did not obtain the approval of the committee, he would, perhaps, at some future time publish the work on his own responsibility.*

*The committee, therefore, recommends to the Council of the Twelve that a report of its findings be laid before the First Presidency, with the recommendation that in its present form the manuscript be not published.*

*Very respectfully submitted,*

*George Albert Smith (signed)  
Chairman of sub-committee*

*P.S. a list of objections is here attached.*

**LIST OF POINTS ON DOCTRINE IN QUESTION BY THE COMMITTEE IN RELATION TO B. H. ROBERT'S Ms.**

| <u>Ch.</u> | <u>Page</u> |  |
|------------|-------------|--|
| 1          | 8           | <i>The superiority of the Prophet's definition questioned.</i>   |
| 4          | 1           | <i>Size of the sun-figures do not agree with other figures.</i>  |
| 4          | 2           | <i>The number of sidereal days of Mars should be checked; also of Jupiter and Saturn.</i>                |
| 7          | 8           | <i>The wisdom in referring to Haeckel's theory, which is disputed by many scientists, is questioned.</i> |
| 16         | 7           | <i>Tree had seeds of life and death? The Scriptures do not say so.</i>                                   |
| 18         | 2           | <i>When does the spirit unite with the body? Statement questioned.</i>                                   |
| 27         | 5           | <i>Intelligence and Spirit-confusing terms.</i>  |
| 27         | 12          | <i>Spirit-body of Christ – the Word?</i>   |
| 27         | 12          | <i>Mind, spirit and soul? questioned.</i>  |
| 29         | 5           | <i>Baptisms for remission of sins – plural incorrect.</i>  |

|     |     |  |
|-----|-----|--|
| 30  | 6   | <i>Place of man in creation – This is not a doctrine of the Church.</i>          |
| 31  | 1   | <i>Races on the earth before Adam. This is not a doctrine of the Church.</i>     |
| 32  | 1   | <i>Reference to destruction of pre-Adamites. Objected to.</i>                    |
| 32  | 3   | <i>Adam in a desolate earth. Not accepted by the brethren.</i>                   |
| 34  | 2   | <i>Tree not evil?</i>  |
| 34  | 4   | <i>Like God in every respect?</i>  |
| 34  | 5   | <i>To know must experience – after “fall” sacrifice?</i>                         |
| 35  | 3   | <i>Translation development.</i>  |
| 35  | 1   | <i>Tree of life?</i>   |
| 35  | 6   | <i>Abel Adam’s “second son,” questioned.</i>                                     |
| 35  | 9   | <i>Cain’s sacrifice “Not what the Lord appointed.”?</i>                          |
| 35  | -   | <i>When did Adam receive law of sacrifice – in or out of the Garden of Eden?</i> |
| 36  | 8   | <i>Cain’s offering? Conflict with Temple account.</i>                            |
| 38  | 13  | <i>Esaias and Melchizedek the same? Conflict with D &amp; C.</i>                 |
| 84. |     |  |
| 38  | 14  | <i>Salem and Sameria the same? Not so.</i>                                       |
| 39  | 7   | <i>Comment on keeping “Commandments.”?</i>                                       |
| 41  | 1   | <i>Law of Moses not an eternal law.? Inference that it is.</i>                   |
| 41  | 4   | <i>Evolution and Devolution of worlds?</i>                                       |
| 41  | 8   | <i>Majesty of law – the law vindicated?</i>                                      |
| 41  | 9   | <i>Experimentation and righteousness.</i>  |
| 41  | 10  | <i>Vindication of law – 4<sup>th</sup> sentence.</i>                             |
| 42  | 9   | <i>Progression of God in Knowledge? (limiting God, questioned.)</i>              |
| 46  | 4   | <i>The cause of John Mark leaving the ministry?</i>                              |
| 47  | 13  | <i>Humble first form of the Church, ?</i>  |
| 50  | 6-8 | <i>Information on divorce? questioned.</i>                                       |

*SLC Thursday 22 May, 1930—Brother B. H. Roberts called, and we discussed the contents of his new book, telling him of the feeling of the brethren of the Twelve that they could not approve of some parts of it. He was determined not to make any change and finally requested that we drop the matter for the time being, as he was leaving for California to attend a stake conference and did not feel like discussing the matter. I feel very sorry to think that Brother Roberts is determined to put in the book some things that I think are problematical and cannot be demonstrated. In as much as the Church has furnished him a stenographer while he was in New York and since he returned, to compile this book, I thought that before it is published he must come to an understanding as to what shall go into it, and we object emphatically to his putting anything in it that the Presidency and Apostles cannot approve.*

*I intended to go through the temple, but on account of the Presidency’s interview with Brother Roberts it was too late for me to go. (Heber J. Grant Journal, pp. 80-81)*

*December 15, 1930*

*President Heber J. Grant  
and counselors,  
Building.*

*Dear Brethren,*

*I am writing you to ask if the article published in the Utah Genealogical and Historical Magazine of October, 1930, under the title "Faith Leads to a Fulness of Truth and Righteousness," dealing mainly with the antiquity of the life and death upon the earth and treated as a discourse by Elder Joseph Fielding Smith on the 5<sup>th</sup> of April, 1930, is a treatise on that subject that was submitted to and approved by the Council of the First Presidency and perhaps the Quorum of the Twelve? And is it put forth as the official declaration of the Church on the subject treated? Or is it the unofficial and personal declaration of the opinion only of Elder Smith?*

*In the latter event then I feel that that fact should have been expressed in the discourse; or if it is an official pronouncement of the Church then that fact should have been avowed; for the strictly dogmatical and the pronounced finality of the discourse demand the suggested explanation in either case.*

*If the discourse of Elder Smith is merely his personal opinion, while not questioning his right to such opinions, and also the right to express them, when so avowed as his personal opinions, yet I object to the dogmatic and finality spirit of the pronouncement and the apparent official announcement of them, as if speaking with final authority.*

*If Elder Smith is merely putting forth his own opinions I call in question his competency to utter such dogmatism either as a scholar or as an Apostle. I am sure he is not competent to speak in such manner from general learning or special research work on the subject; nor as an Apostle, as in that case he would be in conflict with the plain implication at least of the scriptures, both ancient and modern, and with the teaching of a more experienced and learned and earlier apostle than himself, and a contemporary of the Prophet Joseph Smith-who's public discourse on the subject appears in the Journal of Discourses and was publicly endorsed by President Brigham Young, all which would have more weight in setting forth doctrine than this last dictum of Elder Smith.*

*My question is important as affecting, finally, the faith and status of a very large portion of the Priesthood and educated membership of the Church, I am sure; and I trust the matter will receive early consideration. All which is respectfully submitted.*

*Very truly your brother,*

*BHR (signed)*

*Utah Genealogical Magazine; Joseph Fielding Smith; pp. 146-151; October 1930.*

#### PRE-ADAMITE THEORY NOT A DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

*Even in the Church there are a scattered few who are now advocating and contending that this earth was peopled with a race--perhaps many races--long before the days of Adam. These men desire, of course, to square the teachings in the Bible with the teachings of modern science and philosophy in regard to the age of the earth and life upon it. If you hear any one talking this way, you may answer them by saying that the doctrine of "pre-Adamites" is not a doctrine of the Church, and is not advocated nor countenanced in the Church. There is no warrant in the scripture, not an authentic word, to sustain it. But the revelations of the Lord reveal Adam as the "Ancient of days," Michael, the Archangel, who is appointed to have jurisdiction through all time and eternity on this earth and to preside over it, under the direction of Jesus Christ. He is called by the Lord the "first man of ALL men" upon the earth, and the Prophet Joseph Smith has said: "Commencing with Adam, who was the first man, who is spoken of in Daniel as being the 'Ancient of Days,' or in other words, the first and oldest of all." This is the doctrine which has been taught by authority in the Church regarding Adam.*

#### NO DEATH ON THE EARTH BEFORE ADAM

\* \* \*

*The Gospel teaches us that if Adam and Eve had not partaken of that fruit of the tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil they would have remained in the garden of Eden in that same condition prevailing before the fall. Under those conditions they would have had no seed. "Adam fell that man might be" as it was decreed in the heavens before the world was. Lehi has given us a very clear and comprehensive view of the mission of Adam and of the atonement of Jesus Christ, and the Book of Mormon is very explicit in teaching these fundamental doctrines. In regard to the pre-mortal condition of Adam and the entire earth, Lehi has stated the following: "And now, behold, if Adam had not transgressed he would not have fallen, but he would have remained in the garden of Eden. And all things which were created must have remained in the same state in which they were after they were created; and they must have remained forever, and had no end.*

*Is not this statement plain enough? Whom are you going to believe, the Lord, or men? \* \* \**

#### EXACT MANNER OF CREATION WILL YET BE REVEALED

*By revelation we are well informed that Adam was not subject to death when he was placed in the garden of Eden, nor was there any death upon the earth. The Lord has not seen fit to tell us definitely just how Adam came for we are not ready to receive that truth. He did not come here a resurrected being to die again for we are taught most clearly that those who pass through the resurrection receive eternal life, and can die no more. It is sufficient for us to know, until the Lord reveals more about it, that Adam was not subject to death but had the power, through transgressing the law, to become subject to death and to cause the same curse to come upon the earth and all life upon it. For this earth, once pronounced good, was cursed after the fall. It is passing through its mortal probation as well as the life which is upon it, and will eventually receive the resurrection and a place of exaltation which is decreed in the heavens for it.*

*The time will come when we shall be informed all about Adam and the manner of creation for the Lord has promised that when he comes he will make all these things known. \* \* \**

*For my part, I am willing to wait until this time to learn the truth of these things. This information was given to the Saints at one time in a former dispensation, but the Lord has said we may not have it in the days of wickedness;. When the Gentiles "shall repent of their iniquity, and become clean before the Lord," then it shall be revealed again. (Ether 4:6-7.)*

#### WHEN WE HAVE FAITH LIKE UNTO THE BROTHER OF JARED

\* \* \*

*So the brother of Jared wrote all about Adam; all about the creation and many other things, which the world in its great wisdom cannot have today because we are not willing in the spirit of faith, such as the brother of Jared had, to accept the things of the Lord. The wise men of today would find the things of the Lord in conflict with their theories, and because of the hardness of our hearts we must wait until, in the spirit of true repentance and faith, we are cleansed and wickedness is banished from the earth.*

#### THE "FALL OF MAN" AND DEATH LEAD TO PROGRESSION

*This much regarding Adam has been revealed: He transgressed the law under which he was living in the garden of Eden and was driven out to till the earth. A curse was placed upon the earth and upon all things, and they became mortal--the earth, animal life, plant life and man. But this mortality was the means of giving to all men the privilege of passing through pain, sorrow, temptation and joy, thus increasing their education in preparation for the life which is to come. We speak of this as a fall, but Adam descended that he might rise, for without these experiences neither he nor his children could have experienced the many vicissitudes of this present life. Without the atonement of Jesus Christ we could not pass through the resurrection and death would have held claim upon every creature.*

December 31, 1930

President Rudger Clawson,  
Building

Dear Brother,

*Referring to our telephone conversation of yesterday, I think very likely I misapprehended the purpose of your request for a more definite statement of my objections to the discourse of Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, published in the Utah Genealogical Magazine of October, 1930, that what was found in my letter to the First Presidency of December 15, 1930. At first, I thought you had in mind the preparation and submission of a paper presenting the whole volume of statement of facts together with such argument as I might wish to make in presenting the whole subject to the council of the twelve who are asked to consider the matter presented in Elder Smith's discourse and my letter.*

*Thinking of the matter afterwards, however, has convinced me that I was mistaken in that view, and desiring to facilitate progress in developing consideration of the subject before your memorable body, I herewith submit the following explanation of my letter.*

*First: the purpose of my letter meant to secure from the First Presidency a simple statement whether or not the discourse of Elder Smith had been submitted to them, and perhaps to the Twelve, and had been approved by them as representing what was to be considered the attitude of the Church upon that subject. If that were the case I tried to express the thought that that fact ought to have been mentioned in the discourse; because of the apparent air of finality and authority of the pronouncement. It occurred to me that if the discourse was to be regarded as the authoritative attitude of the Church it ought to have been made by someone else than Elder Smith, or else the announcement made that he was authorized to speak for the Presidency and other authorities on the subject.*

*Second: If the dogmatic and apparently final utterance on the subject treated was after all but the expression of Elder Smith's personal views, then such fact ought somewhere to appear in the discourse that the hearers and readers might know what weight to accord the pronouncement made.*

*Third: I meant to imply by what was said in my letter that if the discourse of Elder Smith was but the expression of his personal views, then I questioned his competency to speak with such dogmatic finality as he does in the discourse on the subject, (a) either by reason of his general learning or any known special research on the subject involved, and (b) that as an apostle Elder Smith was not competent to make such a positive and apparently not-to-be questioned pronouncement, because an earlier and a more experienced and learned apostle had made a directly opposite statement, on the subject, which statement Brigham Young, President of the Church, publicly approved, both which statement and approval, were published in the Journal of Discourses.*

*Fourth: I meant to imply in my letter that in view of all this, Elder Smith was not warranted in making such a positive and dogmatic statement, and that I had the right to know if he spoke by the authority of an agreed upon attitude of the present administration of the church or not—hence the questions of my letter to the First Presidency.*

*Fifth: To all this I add the following: I call in question the accuracy of Elder Smith's position in reference to the whole doctrine of his discourse, as being contrary to a great volume of well developed and ascertained truth, established by the researches of scientists of highest character, of profoundest learning, and world-wide research. I hold his doctrine contrary at least to the plain implications of the scriptures; as tending also to reduce the church of the New Dispensation to the character of a narrow, bigoted sect, forsaking the God-given world movement idea of it; and as injurious to the continued faith in, and adherence to, the teachings of the Church not by a "scattered few," but by a very great number of its membership.*

*Of course, I stand ready to maintain the truth of these statements if given the opportunity, and I respectfully ask for permission to do so.*

*Very respectfully,*

*BHR (signed)*

*Jan. 2, Fri. (1931) – Attended a 9:30 a.m. meeting of the Council of the Twelve, held in President Rudger Clawson’s office. The purpose of this gathering was to consider a protest made by Elder Brigham H. Roberts, senior president of the First Council of the Seventy, against a discourse delivered by Elder Joseph Fielding Smith of the Council of the Twelve at a genealogical conference held in April last. The main point at issue is the affirmation by Elder Smith that prior to the Fall, there was no death of either plants or animals upon the earth. At today’s meeting Elder Roberts responded to an invitation and made an oral and extemporaneous address, supporting his protest. It should be said that what is herein called a “protest” was simply a letter addressed to the First Presidency, later referred by them to the Twelve, asking whether the utterances of Elder Smith were to be considered as expressions of personal opinion or as authoritative statements sustained by the First Presidency and Twelve. By common consent and agreement Brother Roberts is to present his views in writing. (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:31)*

*Jan. 7, Wed. (1931) – Attended a meeting of the Council of the Twelve, beginning at 9:30 a.m. Elder B. H. Roberts read a carefully prepared and lengthy paper on the subject of the Antiquity of Man, summarizing much geological evidence, and arguing for the existence of pre-Adamites. The paper, covering fifty typewritten pages, was taken under advisement by the Council. (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:31)*

*Jan. 14, Wed. (1931) - ...Had a somewhat extended conference with Presidents Heber J. Grant and Anthony Ivins on the question of the Antiquity of Man, these brethren having invited me to give my opinion on certain points. (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:32)*

*January 14, 1931*

*President Rudger Clawson  
and Members of the Council of Apostles*

*Dear Brethren:*

*December 15, 1930, Elder B. H. Roberts wrote to the First Presidency asking them if certain remarks made by me before a gathering of Genealogical workers in Barratt Hall, April 5, 1930, were given as an “official declaration of the Church,” or was but an expression of my personal opinion. In case it was my personal opinion then Elder Roberts entered objection “to the dogmatic and finality spirit of the pronouncement” on the grounds that Elder Smith is incompetent” to utter such dogmatism either as a scholar or as an Apostle.”*

*Elder Roberts' communication, which did not set forth the nature of the objections he raised, was placed by the Presidency in the hands of President Rudger Clawson with the request that the Council of the Apostles investigate the matter. Acting upon this request President Clawson invited Elder Roberts to appear before the members of the Council with a detailed statement of his objections and there make such presentation of his views as he might desire. On January 7, 1931, Elder Roberts appeared before the Council and in some detail registered his objections, which have to do with certain statements that were made pertaining to the questions that there was no death upon this earth before the fall of Adam, and that the theory of pre-Adamites is not a doctrine of the Church. At the conclusion of Elder Roberts' statement I was invited to prepare a statement which would also be given a hearing before the members of the Council.*

*That I am surprised that Elder Roberts, with his experience should question what I said, is stating it mildly, for, let it be understood, I lay no claim to originality for anything proclaimed in that discourse. What was said on that occasion has been said, just as dogmatically, in my judgment, as I declared it, and that too by Apostles and leading brethren of the Church from the beginning. All my life I have been taught these doctrines and believe most firmly that they are imbedded in the revelations given to the Church, and hence in perfect harmony with the plan of salvation. For these reasons, I made the remarks I did in a positive and dogmatic manner, in answer to questions asked me at the time, and in full confidence that they are true. I am perfectly willing to leave the matter in the hands of my brethren, when I am through with this paper, whether or not I have sufficient grounds for speaking as one who has authority rather than as one of the scribes.*

*We are living in a most wonderful age of discovery and invention. Ancient prophets saw our day and wrote of it. Daniel proclaimed that "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." But no knowledge or discovery, by which the world is benefited, has come to light, except the Lord has willed it. We all know that great benefits have come to mankind through these discoveries, and I fully affirm what Elder Roberts has said, that there are many truths made known that have not been proclaimed by direct revelation. With my brethren I stand ready to accept any truth, from any source it may come; but that which comes through the researches of men, must conform to and harmonize with, the revealed word of the Lord to his servants the prophets. The Latter-day Saints are not bound to receive the theories of men when they do not accord with the word of the Lord to them, no matter how great the weight of evidence may appear to be in favor of the theory, or how many men of world renown may accept it as established truth. I firmly believe that the "key of truth" which I proclaimed in that discourse is perfectly sound. The revealed truth from God, is the measuring rod, the test tube, the crucible, by which we may prove all things advocated by man.*

*While considering the great volume of light which has come through man's research, let us not be unmindful of the fact that the adversary of righteousness is also giving revelation and poisoning the minds of men. Never in the history of the world has he raged in the hearts of men and stirred them up against that which is good more than he is now doing. Never has his dominion appeared to be so firmly established. He has poisoned the minds of the mighty with false*

*theory, philosophy and doctrine, so that we may verily declare that the time spoken of by Paul is here: "And for this cause (i.e. because they hearken to Satan), God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." 2 Thes. 2:11*

*It does not always follow that it takes the "competent" and the "wise" in the learning of the world, to confound the mighty. The Lord said he would call upon the weak things of the world to "break down the mighty and strong ones, that man should not \* \* trust in the arm of flesh." (D & C 1:19) Moreover, said the Lord, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." 1 Cor. 1:19)*

*I believe in the doctrine that there are "worlds without number," which the Father has created and that they have been, are now, and will be for ever, peopled with sons and daughters "begotten unto God." This is the great work of God. The doctrine of organic evolution which pervades the modern-day sciences, proclaiming the edict that man has evolved from lower forms of life through the Java skull and last, if not least, the "Peiping man," who lived millions of years ago, is as false as their author who reigns in hell! Well, that's dogmatic, and it's true!*

*I believe that there are many worlds that have passed away, that is to say, they have filled their mortal existence and have been crowned with eternal glory; that there are worlds now passing through the mortal probation, and when they pass away and are raised in their resurrection, others will come, for there is no end to the work of the Lord. I do not deny, but firmly believe, that men have lived and died and passes through the resurrection on other worlds in similar scenes we are now enacting. My remarks in the discourse are, I believe, in strict accord with the word of the Lord and pertain solely to this earth and its inhabitants.*

### THE WEAKNESS OF GEOLOGICAL TESTIMONY

*The greater part of Elder Roberts' paper has to do with the testimonies of the world's eminent scientists in relation to the story told in geology. I shall not, at this time, endeavor to enter into a lengthy discussion of this phase of the question. However, it may be well for us to consider some of the salient features taught geologists. Geology is a modern science. It is that branch of science which endeavors to solve the problem relating to the structure of the earth; its behavior in its various parts and its physical and biological history. In it like in other branches of science, theories have been advanced, discarded, changed and modified. "No one can judge fully of the weakness of the present geological theories, or forecast the future development of the science, who does not have clear and somewhat full ideas regarding the history of the science with which we are dealing," says one eminent geologist, who adds: "in geology, facts and theories are still in-extricably commingled and in the ordinary college text book of the science, the most absurd and fantastic speculations are still taught to the students with all the solemnity and pompous importance which might be allowable in speaking of the facts of chemistry of physics." – George McCready Price, Professor of Geology, Union College, Nebraska – The New Geology, p. 587.*

*Professor A. G. Werner (1749-1817), is the originator of the "onion-coat" theory of Geology. This theory had undergone some changes but still forms the basis of geological lore in the orthodox school in the study of this science. For one hundred years the remains of plants and animals embedded in the rocks, and known as fossils, have formed the basis for determining the age of the rocks and their history. These fossiliferous rocks have been named and classified according to the fossils which they happen to contain. This is purely an artificial arrangement. Speaking of this arrangement, Professor Price remarks: "A card catalogue or index is a very useful thing in a library, but it would strike us as highly absurd if some antiquary should come along and solemnly assure us that this card catalogue showed the real history of the order in which the books listed had been published. Suppose he should affirm that all the books listed under A and B had been issued first, while those under X, Y, and Z had been issued last. Would we not think that this antiquary ought probably to be put into some institution for his own protection, if not for the protection of the public?"*

*"But the geological classification as currently taught, base on the grade of fossils contained in the various rocks, is just as purely artificial as the card catalogue of a library, and has no more time-value to its subdivisions. It is merely a convenient working classification, that is all, something to help us to name and handle the numerous fossiliferous deposits in different parts of the world. It has been made a fetish, and evolutionary theories about the development of the various types of life have been allowed to take possession of it. But they do not own it, and we who have had our eyes opened regarding the folly of trying to tabulate all the rock deposits in a serial order according to the grade of fossils they contain, can still make use of this classification, even though we have discarded the traditional time-values so long associated with these systems." The New Geology, p. 294.*

### FATAL MISTKES OF GEOLOGISTS

*One of the fatal mistakes made by geologists is to approach their work with the bias that the present day rate of change and condition has been the same which have prevailed always in the past. They make no allowance for difference in conditions during all the million of years which they claim for the age of the earth, contrary to a little common sense.*

*Another fatal mistake is in their conclusion, upon which all their deductions are based, that this earth and all upon its face, have continued from the beginning in their present form and condition as respecting life and death: That all animate things upon the earth have always lived in the midst of the struggle for existence, hatred, and enmity of each other; war, strife and death, both among men and animals. In other words that the doctrine of Manichaeism, or that evil has existed from the very beginning of things, and is coeval with the good is the basis for their conclusions. We will have more to say of this anon.*

*The geological groups are as followed: the Primary or Primitive, known as Archaean and Algonkian, in which few or no fossils are found. The Paleozoic, which is divided into the following system: Cambrian, Ordovician, Silurian, Devonian, Carboniferous and Permian. In this group, we are informed, the invertebrates, fishes and insects, coal-plants and amphibians appeared. Then the Messozoic group, containing the Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous. During*

*the periods of this group, we have coming on the earth, palms conifers, and reptiles. The next group is called Cenozoic, and is divided into the Tertiary, Quaternary, or Post-Tertiary, or Pleistocene. During these ages mammals and man are said to have made their appearance on the earth.*

### ORTHODOX GEOLOGISTS ARE EVOLUTIONISTS

*I have listed these ages that we might discover how closely interwoven this grouping is with the theories of evolution. Moreover, to point out the fact that these eminent geologists are organic evolutionists. It is not clear to me how any geologist of the orthodox school can possibly be any thing but an evolutionist. The eminent authors quoted by Elder Roberts endeavor to show that man has evolved through inferior races, the Heidelberg man, the Piltdown man, and others. Carried back to its final analysis, we have the doctrine that all life commenced in the Primitive or early Paleozoic ages, and therefore man has come up from the invertebrates. How are we going to accept part of their inductions, especially that relating to time, and discard the rest and maintain that all men, whether pre-Adamites or Adamites, are begotten sons and daughters unto God? If we are going to accept the theories of geology in relation to time it is inconsistent to reject their theory of evolution for the two are inseparably connected. Yet, surely, no Latter-day Saint who accepts the revelations of the Lord can believe that the Lord placed man on the earth millions of years ago in a body unfit for exaltation, for he has declared that man, on this earth and on millions of other earths, is his off-spring. What are these scientists trying to do in their researches, such as Roy Chapman Andrews, is carrying on in Mongolia at this time? They are trying to strengthen their theory the lower animals forms may be linked with human beings walking the earth today.*

### FOSSILS DO NOT TELL THE AGE OF THE ROCKS

*According to the theory of geology fossiliferous rocks tell the story of the age of life upon the earth, as one group might be related to another. It is a logical view to take, if we follow that theory, that we should find always, everywhere, upon the face of the globe, where there are natural stratigraphic formations, the older fossils below, and the younger above. This was verily believed to be true when the theory was advanced, and, with orthodox geologists it is still an obsession in the face of abundant evidence to the contrary. In various parts of the earth, there are comparatively great areas where the younger fossiliferous rock are below and the older on top in natural conformity, apparently undisturbed from the day they were laid down. Let us remember that, "All the stratified beds, or those containing fossils, are of quite limited extent, varying from a few square yards to a few acres to a few hundred square miles in area." (New Geology, p.?). These beds may be a few inches or several feet thick and are usually spread out over one another in successive layers. But they are not found with the "older" rocks always below. There is extending from Montana into Alberta from the Glacier Park and including the Chief mountain seen from the Cardston Temple, a distance of five hundred miles Cretacious beds below the Cambrian and other Paleozoic rock. In India, England, various parts of Europe, in Florida, California, Utah and Idaho, and many parts of the earth, Tertiary beds were laid down before the Cambrian. "Are we not then," says one learned geologist, "face to face with the possibility that samples of all these various types of life may have lived contemporaneously in scattered localities all over the world? In other*

words, how are we to prove that there were not distinct floral and faunal districts and regions back at the earliest period of which we have scientific knowledge?" (Price, *New Geology*, p. 612)

That fossils are found in the rock is a fact. That the grouping and classifying of these fossils in what is called geological ages, determines their relative relationship as to time, is not a fact, but a theory. This theory held almost complete sway during the nineteenth century, but there is arising in the twentieth century a new school of geologists, who show that this is not a fact, and based on new discovery, or more intelligent consideration of facts, they have propounded the following formula: "Any kind of fossiliferous beds whatever, 'young' or 'old', may be found occurring conformably on any other fossiliferous beds, 'older' or younger."— (*The New Geology*, p. 638)

When we consider these facts we are brought face to face with the thought that after all, geological ages, as they have been expressed in the terms of millions of years, must be greatly modified. Thomas Henry Huxley, an advocate of evolution, had himself said: "all that geology can prove is local order of succession." (*Discourses Biological and Geological*, pp. 279-288.)

Professor George M. Price, in his lecture before the Victoria Institute, or Philosophical Society of Great Britain, of which society he is an eminent member (which lecture won the Lanhorn Orchard prize in 1925) has this to say to that body of world renowned educators: "The question asked has taken the following shape: If the Cambrian and the Ordovician forms of life are not actually older than the Cretaceous and the Tertiary, might we not reasonably expect to find some localities where the Cretaceous or Tertiary animals and plants were buried first, and the Cambrian and the other Paleozoic laid down afterwards? Certainly; and I have pointed to the famous area in Alberta and Montana, where, over an area some 500 miles long and 40 to 50 miles wide, Cretaceous beds are below and Cambrian and other Paleozoic rocks on top, with every physical evidence that they were actually laid down in this relative order. In the Salt Range of India, Tertiary beds were manifestly laid down before the Cambrian.

"From these and many similar examples found in various parts of the world, I have drawn the conclusion –surprising, but seemingly inevitable – that intrinsically, and as of necessity, no particular type of fossil life is older or younger than any other. In other words, what we have in the rocks as the geological formations are merely the buried floras and faunas of the world before the great world-cataclysm of the Deluge, all of which were once living contemporaneously together, It is a purely arbitrary and artificial scheme by which the evolutionary geologists have arranged these buried floras and faunas, found in widely scattered localities such that no possible stratigraphical relationship can be made out of them, in an alleged chronological sequence. In a word, there are absolutely no solid scientific facts to hinder us from believing that these buried floras and faunas really represent the life of the Antedeluvian world, which was destroyed and buried by this great world-cataclysm." (*Journal of Transactions, Victoria Institute Vol. 57*)

### OUR OWN MOUNTAIN RANGES

*Before leaving this subject I desire to call your attention to the conditions to be seen in our own mountain ranges. Today they are broken up into cracks and seams, geological "faults" are discovered in many places, and the mountains are distorted. Our geological friends, while admitting that these ranges are "young" from the standpoint of geological time, yet declare that they have been in this broken and fragmentary condition for untold ages. In the Book of Mormon we have the story how they were so broken up and the time is fixed, less than two thousand years ago!*

*I realize that this discussion is largely foreign to the points at issue, but that being so, my only excuse for including it is that a greater part of the other paper dealt solely with the opinions and conclusions of man, who disregard aid of revelation from the Lord. I shall leave this question, therefore, of man's geological lore and after we will consider it from the word of the Lord, and let Him speak through his prophets.*

### REVELATION SUPERIOR TO SCIENCE

*So far as the philosophy and wisdom of the world is concerned, it means nothing to me, unless it conforms to the revealed word of the Lord. I repeat my words: "Any doctrine, whether it comes in the name of religion, science, or philosophy, or whatever it may be, that is a conflict with the revelations of the Lord, will fail. It may appear to be very plausible; it may be put before you in such a way that you cannot answer it; it may appear to be established by evidence that cannot be controverted, but all you need to do is to abide your time. Time will level all things. You will find that every doctrine, theory, principle, no matter how great it may appear; no matter how universally it may be believed, if it is not in accord with the word of the Lord, it will perish. Nor is it necessary for us to try to stretch the word of the Lord to make it conform to these theories and teachings. The word of the Lord shall not pass away unfulfilled." I say this dogmatically because it is gospel truth! Truth is dogmatic. Revelation from God is dogmatic. Others, better qualified than I, have said it dogmatically.*

*Rather than to follow the "wisdom" and "prudence" of the wise and learned men of the world, we have a more sure word of prophecy whereupon we do well that we take heed, "as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in our hearts," and that is the voice of prophecy and revelation. And unto this authority I shall now turn, trusting that I may not place upon any private interpretation. Perhaps I should have started here, ignoring all the world made wisdom.*

*President Joseph F. Smith has said:*

*"The Church holds to the definite authority of divine revelation which must be the standard; and that, so called "science" has changed from age to age in its deductions, and as divine revelation is truth, and must abide forever, views as to the lesser should conform to the positive statements of the greater; and, further, that in institutions founded by the Church for the teaching of theology, as well as other branches of education, its instructors must be in harmony in their teachings with its principles of doctrine...."The truth persists, but the theories of philosophy change and are overthrown. What men use today as a scaffold for scientific purposes from which to reach out into the unknown for truth, may be*

*torn down tomorrow, having served their purpose; but faith is an eternal principle through which the humble believer may secure everlasting solace. It is the only way to find God.” (Era 14:549-551.)*

### PRE-ADAMITE THEORY NOT A DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

*I AM CALLED IN QUESTION BECAUSE I HAVE BEEN BOLD TO DECLARE DOGMATICALLY THAT THE “PRE-Adamite theory is not a doctrine of the Church,” and to tell the members of the Church they are to understand it is not a doctrine of the Church. Moreover, because I said the Lord had declared that Adam was the “First man of All men, upon the earth, and that there was no death in the earth before the fall of Adam. In defense of his position, Elder Roberts proclaims that an Apostle far more capable and able to discuss the question than I am, has proclaimed the contrary. He then quotes from a discourse delivered by Elder Orson Hyde, October 6, 1854, in which Elder Hyde was speaking on the question of marriage. Incidentally in his remarks he dwelt on the meaning of the word “replenish” and said there were races of men on this earth before the days of Adam. His deduction was based upon his interpretation of the meaning of the word “replenish.” I hesitate most seriously in accepting the statement that President Brigham Young endorsed this incidental remark. It is true that President Young followed Orson Hyde and bore testimony to what he had said, but all that President Young commented on was the other part of the sermon. He did not mention pre-Adamite doctrine on this or any other occasion. If we are forced to conclude that this fragment of Elder Hyde’s discourse was included in the general statement of President Young, then we are face to face with the proposition that President Young had to contradict himself. Not only that, but he is placed in opposition to the revelations of the Lord and the expressed views of many of his brethren of the General Authorities, including one entire Presidency, who spoke officially. Therefore I regret that President Young has been mentioned as an advocate of this theory.*

### THE WORD “REPLENISH”

*Elder Hyde made the word “replenish” the basis for his unfortunate remark. It is true that the primary meaning of the word is to fill again. But the word, as Elder Roberts was kind enough to show, has other meanings. I need not discuss them here. I may be pardoned for expressing the thought, however, how would Elder Hyde who was (no)? linguist, have explained the use of the word “firmament” as used in the Scriptures? The Prophet Joseph Smith uses this word as well as “replenish” but surely we cannot accept the primary meaning. We often hear of a man having his appendix removed. Does that mean that it was moved once before?*

*Elder Hyde should have stated what the word “replenish” was translated from. Had he done so his whole argument would have fallen to the ground. The Hebrew verb (?) (male) which is the word in the 28 verse and also the 22 verse of the first chapter of Genesis, does not mean replenish, or refill or to make full after once being made empty. Elsewhere in the scriptures it is translated fill according to the meaning of the word. Why the translators of the King James Bible translated this verb in verse 22, “fill” and then in verse 28 “replenish” would be an interesting thing to know. The same word is used in Isaiah 27:6, 56:12, Jer. 13:13, Ezek. 3:3 and 9:7, and in two-score other places in the Bible, but not*

*n the sense of making full again. Moreover, in the Douay version the word is translated fill, properly, in the 28<sup>th</sup> verse in reference to man: "And God blessed them saying: Increase and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it, and rule over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and the beasts, and the whole earth, and every creeping creature that moveth upon the earth."*

*I very greatly regret that I am forced to impeach the testimony of Elder Orson Hyde, who was neither in harmony with the Hebrew meaning of this word or with his brethren, as subsequent testimony will show.*

### THE PLACE OF MAN IN THE ORDER OF CREATION

*We have been given four accounts of the order of creation and an all material points these fur agree. They are: Genesis, Chapters 1 and 2. Moses, Chapters 2 and 3; Abraham, Chapters 4 and 5; and the revelation given through the Prophet Joseph Smith and which is had in the Temple. One of our brethren recently remarked that the latter story is the measuring rod by which we are to be governed. With this I fully agree. The ordinances of the Temple are intended for members of the Church who have proved themselves worthy of increased knowledge and blessings. In the house of the Lord we are taught the order of creation. We are given to understand that this instruction is to teach us how this world was formed and the purposes of its creation. That we may be more fully instructed and impressed, the scenes are enacted. I do not feel at liberty, however, to go into the details as there portrayed. The brethren are acquainted with this story. We are taught that there was no death in any of earth's creations, neither plant, fish, fowl, beast or man. The instructions given here are very clear and positive and it surely is a deception if there were other races preceding Adam. If this story is not true, then there can be little real purpose in these ordinances in the Temple. They are futile, meaningless, and not worthy of the place we give them.*

*The four narratives we have of creation teach us that man was the last of the creations on the earth, he having been placed here after all things were prepared for him. The order of sequence as related in the first chapter of Genesis, the second chapter of Moses and the fourth chapter of Abraham agree and are historically correct. Verse five of chapter three of Moses is but an explanation of the fact that all things were created in the spirit before they were naturally in the earth. The same is true of verse five, chapter two in Genesis. These expressions about the spirit creation are not intended to change the order of creation physically on the earth as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis. The reference to the heaven is a reference to the expanse surrounding the earth and has nothing to do with the sidereal-heavens. This is evident from the statement in regard to the heavens and the earth passing away:*

*"And then shall the end come, and the heaven and the earth shall be consumed and pass away, and there shall be a new heaven and a new earth.*

*"For all old things shall pass away, and all things shall become new, even the heaven and the earth, and all the full-nes thereof, both men and beasts, and the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea." D. & C. 29: 23-24*

*The thought that man was the first living thing upon the earth and that he was placed here in a state of desolation, before there was any vegetation or animal life on land, in the air, or in the sea, does violence to the entire account of creation as well as to reason. Such an idea naturally causes such thoughts as these: What was the length of this desolation when he was alone? What purpose could there have been in placing him here before the earth was prepared for him. If the desolation was long or short, it must have been a very comfortless place. Certainly it was not the place the Lord called "good" or "finished."*

*The idea that man was the first physical creature on the earth is based on the expression in the Book of Moses 3:7:*

*"And the Lord God, formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul, the first flesh upon the earth, the first man also; nevertheless, all things were before created; but spiritually were they created and made according to my word."*

*The clause "the first flesh upon the earth," is interpreted to mean the first living creature. The expression must be capable of other and more consistent meaning to make it harmonize with the scriptures. I will say that this expression at one time was a great mystery to me, and I therefore made inquiry of a former President of the Church, and received this explanation which clears up all the mystery. It is simply a statement of the fact that Adam—the first man on the earth—was, by reason of transgression the first to partake of mortality. That is, the fall brought upon him death. "Mortality" and "flesh" are often used as synonymous terms. The account in Genesis of creation informs us that Adam and Eve were the first to become subject to death. This fall brought death into the world, also sorrow and sin, and this mortal condition was extended so that it eventually embraced every creature on the land, in the air, or in the sea. In this way all creatures became "flesh," but not until after man had so become. To show that the word is "flesh" is used in this sense in the scriptures I will give a few examples:*

*"Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord."—Jer. 17:5.*

*"Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh.*

*"For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."—Romans 8:12.*

*"Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man"—John 8:15*

*"That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lust of men, but to the will of God.—1 Peter. 4:2*

*"And the days of the children of men were prolonged according to the will of God, that they might repent while in the flesh, wherefore their state became a state of probation.—2 Nephi 2:21*

*“For all flesh is corrupted before me and the powers of darkness prevail upon the earth, among the children of men, in the presence of all the host of heaven”  
—D. and C. 38:11*

### ADAM THE FIRST MAN OF ALL MEN ON THE EARTH

*There is not one word of evidence in the scriptures that any race of people ever inhabited this earth before the advent of Adam. The doctrine of “pre-Adamites” appears in opposition to the entire plan of creation. This teaching that there were races here before the time of Adam is only an hypothesis. It cannot be anything more, and the result of such teaching will end in uncertainty, confusion and disagreement, for there is no revelation supporting it.*

*It is very strange that the Lord would reveal to Moses important knowledge regarding all of his creations and then, with some detail, recount to him the history of the genesis of this earth, going back to the beginning and explaining the development step by step on land, in the sea, in the air,—and yet, not one word of any former races of people. The Lord revealed to Abraham knowledge of the council in heaven, and spoke of the intelligences there organized, and how they were chosen to come to this earth, but not one word of any peoples preceding Adam. In that story given to Abraham, the Savior is represented as having said:*

*“We will go down, for there is space there, and we will take of these materials, and we will make an earth whereon these may dwell; and we will prove them herewith, to see if they will do all things whatsoever the Lord their God shall command them; and they who keep their first estate shall be added upon...and they who keep their second estate shall have glory added upon their heads for ever and ever.”*

*Abraham was one of these spirits chosen before he was born. However, in all the knowledge the Lord gave to him of other worlds and their inhabitants, and the detail concerning the creation of this earth, there is not one thought concerning any race before Adam. It certainly seems reasonable to believe if there had been earlier races here the Lord would have been willing to at least inform Abraham and Moses and Joseph Smith of that fact, by some definite indisputable expression, but not a word! These great prophets all received information regarding the children of God on other worlds, and Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon were made aware of the fact that they are all—no matter what part of the universe they may inhabit—“begotten sons and daughters unto God.”*

*Said the Lord to Moses:*

*“World without number have I created; and I also created them for mine own purpose; and by my Son I created them, which is mine Only Begotten.*

*“And the first man of all men have I called Adam, which is many.”*

*It may be contended that this reference to Adam is generic and does not refer to the man Adam as an individual. This does not seem to conform to the thought expressed, for it is stated that “the first of All men have I called Adam, which is*

*many.” This certainly has reference to Adam the individual whose name means “many” because he is the father of all. A similar meaning is found in the name “Eve,” which means the mother of all living.*

*We read that Adam is Michael, called the Ancient of Days, because he is the first man. The Savior said to Joseph Smith that he could “drink of the fruit of the vine” with the holy prophets among whom will be numbered “Michael, or Adam, the father of All, the prince of all, the ancient of days. D. and C. 27:11.*

*“If there were races on the earth before Adam, what kind of beings were they? Answering this question, I think we would be forced to say they would have been children of God, his offspring, just as we are said to be<sup>3</sup>. They would, then, have been living souls, that is to say, spirits and bodies combined. They would then have been created to live forever, just as we were. Since the great work and glory of the Lord is to “bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man.” It is reasonable to expect, then, that these “pre-Adamites would have been entitled to the same kind of blessings which we are promised. They would have had the plan of salvation. They would also have had among them prophets, men holding Priesthood; and they would have to be subject to the laws of the Gospel as well as to other laws. How could it be otherwise? They would not have been created for naught, since the Lord has declared that he saves all the workmanship of his hands, even the animal life, and “not one hair, neither mote, shall be lost.” Is it possible in the light of the revelations concerning man and his destiny to conceive of the thought that there could have been men who were not children of God?*

*If children of God and entitled to these blessings of salvation then there would have been men holding keys before Adam. Such prophets we would expect to precede Adam in point of authority on the earth, just as Adam precedes Noah who also was the first man of the race after the flood. But what do we discover? That it is Adam who stands at the head and who holds the keys of Salvation for this earth and will be crowned when he delivers up his authority to Jesus Christ. Do not “pre-Adamites” have a claim upon this earth? Why is it they have been ignored in the restitution of all things?*

### WAS ADAM A TRANSLATED BEING?

*The belief that Adam was a translated being who came here from some other world having in him the seeds of death temporarily suspended, does not harmonize with the scriptures. From the beginning of the world prophets and saints have been translated and taken from the earth. Some of these translated prophets such as John and the three Nephites have remained on the earth ministering among mankind. Translated beings have full possession of all their faculties. They have knowledge of good and evil, in fact they are in possession of greater wisdom and power than men who have not received that change. All their faculties are quickened and their powers enlarged. Such men have been sent to restore keys and authority in various dispensations.*

*Was this the case with Adam? Did he come to the earth with all his faculties and powers unimpaired? Did he have knowledge of good and evil? We are informed that he did not even know that he was naked. He was “innocent” because he had not come in contact with sin. His faculties were not fully awakened and he*

*was in a state where he could do "no good for he knew no sin" having no joy for he "knew no misery." This is not the condition of those who are translated. What object could the Lord have had in placing Adam on this earth a translated being, who had passed through experience in some other sphere, and then take from him his knowledge leaving him in a state less capable than a man in full mortality? Reason opposes the thought that the Lord took from Adam his knowledge and left him in the innocent state of a new born babe, where he knew no good for he knew no sin, just to create a condition where the man would have to transgress so that knowledge could come back to him. And then, when he did transgress and gained this knowledge, place a penalty upon him and his posterity which was so powerful and awful in its nature, that it required an infinite atonement by the shedding of the blood of the Son of God to make amends. The whole story of translation in the cause of Adam is absurd. We are forced to the conclusion that Adam was not a translated being.*

### ADAM'S BODY CREATED FROM THE GROUND

*Another difficulty confronting such a theory is the statement that Adam received his body out of the dust of the earth. I will cite some scripture:*

*"And I the Lord god, formed man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."—Moses 3:7*

*"By the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou shalt return unto the ground—for thou shalt surely die—for out of it was thou taken: for dust thou wast, and unto dust shalt thou return. \* \**

*"And I, the Lord God, said unto mine Only Begotten: Behold the man is become as one of us to know good and evil, and now lest he put forth his hand and partake also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever,*

*"Therefore, I the Lord God, will send him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken."—Moses 4:25-29*

*"And the Gods formed man from the dust of the ground, and took his spirit (that is, the man's spirit), and put it into him; and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—Abraham 5:7.*

*Once more the Temple comes to our aid with definite information that Adam's body was of the dust of the earth.*

*This is what Alma taught to Corianton:*

*"Now, behold, my son, I will explain this thing unto thee: for behold, after the Lord God sent our first parents forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground, from whence they were taken, yea, he drew out the man." etc. —Alma 42:2*

### WAS ADAM SUBJECT TO DEATH BEFORE THE FALL

*It is perhaps needless for me to say much on this question, for later I will show the true status from other testimony.*

*Translated beings are subject to death: in them death is merely suspended. The scriptures teach us that Adam was told that if he partook of the fruit of the tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil he would surely die. That death was to be twofold, spiritual and temporal. The first was banishment from the presence of the Lord, the second the separation of spirit and body. Before the Fall Adam was not subject to death. There is no advantage to be gained by quibbling upon this point. The fact is clearly stated that he would have lived forever had he not transgressed the law. He became subject to death because he broke the law under which he was living. We all know it was part of the plan and was necessary. But we are confronted with a fact stated by an ancient prophet, that Adam would not have died had he not transgressed, but would have lived forever.*

*“And now, behold, if Adam had not transgressed he would not have fallen, but he would have remained in the Garden of Eden. And all things which were created must have remained in the same state in which they were after they were created; and they must have remained forever and had no end.” –2 Nephi 2:22*

*No amount of sophistry can change this fact. Adam had the power, had he refused to eat the forbidden fruit, to have remained forever and had no end. There is but one conclusion, which is, that his condition was one where death was not enthroned and had no power. Again, this passage proves the point that ALL things would also have remained in like condition with him. The inevitable conclusion then is that because Adam transgressed, all things had to suffer the curse of that fall. The earth was cursed at that time and also “fell” carrying with it into the mortal condition all life upon its face.*

*I care not what word may be used. Our language is imperfect. I know of no other word that will fit the description other than that Adam was immortal, that is not under the ban of death, before the fall, and mortal afterwards. If some other term will express the thought, all well and good. But these are the facts as we have to face them.*

*Alma said in his instruction to his wayward son:*

*“Therefore, as the soul could never die, and the fall had brought upon all mankind a spiritual death as well as a temporal; that is they were cut off from the presence of the Lord,” etc.*

*If the fall brought temporal death, then again, I say there was no temporal death before the fall, suspended or otherwise.*

*What did Christ come into the world to do? To bring to pass the resurrection, for, as Paul says, All men had died through Adam’s fall; but all men were to be made alive through Jesus Christ who is the resurrection and the life. Adam as a translated being could not be held responsible for passing death on to his posterity, we would have to go farther back for the cause than that, and this we are forbidden to do by a multitude of scriptures.*

### THE RESTORATION OF ALL THINGS

*The scriptures are no more explicit in saying that we are living in the last dispensation than they are in saying that Adam was living in the first. There is as good reason for us to disregard revelation and say that other races will follow us on earth, as to say there were races before Adam. Yet we know that the Millennial reign is at our doors, and it is to be followed by the death and resurrection of the earth. In this present dispensation there is to be a restitution of all things. Peter says that Christ will come in the “times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.” Paul wrote to the Ephesians: “That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he (God) might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him.” –Eph. 1:10*

*The Lord gave to Joseph Smith further light about this restoration; see Section 29, and 88 and 133, of the Doctrine and Covenants. In this restoration we learn that Adam will take his place at the head, under Jesus Christ. He fought the battle against Lucifer in heaven; he will lead the righteous in the final conflict. He is to be crowned with glory over this earth and its inhabitants. Should these pre-Adamites have something to say or do in this restoration? Where are their prophets? How can it be a restoration of all things pertaining to this earth if they are left out of it? Yet they are not mentioned or in any way accounted for in the restoration, which leads to but one conclusion, they never did exist on this earth.*

*They are not accounted for in the opening of the seven seals by the Lamb of God, neither in the sounding of the trumpets of the seven Angels spoken of in section 88. The seventh angel, who is Adam, will “swear in the name of him who sitteth upon the throne, that time shall be no longer. “Satan will be bound,” and after the thousand years are completed the mortal existence of this earth will end. It will then take its place among the exalted worlds and all things upon it shall be celestial.*

### THE EARTH TO BE RENEWED

*In one of the Articles of Faith we say: “We believe \* \* \*that Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and, that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory.” If it is to be renewed and to receive its paradisiacal glory, then there is to be a restoration to something like it was in the days of Adam’s sojourn in Paradise. Perhaps we can get some idea from the revelations what kind of a world this was in Adam’s day. When the earth is renewed we learn that wickedness will cease; continents and islands will be joined again like they were in the beginning, before they were divided. Mountains are to be leveled and valleys exalted; the sea will be driven back into the north. There will be no enmity between beasts. Men will live in peace and without pain or sorrow. No man will die until he is old for death will be banished save for the sudden change to immortality in the twinkling of an eye.*

*If this is being renewed as in the days of Paradise, then we discover somewhat the meaning of the term “good” spoken of the earth by the Lord in the days of Adam. For there was no enmity between man and beast, or beast and beast; there was no pain or sorrow, there was no death. Let me ask these pertinent*

*questions. Is it not plain that the earth did not fall until after Adam did? What kind of beings then would pre-Adamites be? Necessarily immortal beings. Or did the earth pass through several falls? And was it renewed several times? That is out of the question.*

*It is the scientific belief that this earth came into existence with the same physical imperfections that we find upon it now. Scientists maintain that all life since the beginning, has been mortal, changing, dying. That is to say, there never was a fall in which the earth and all animal life was engulfed, for they were always subject to mortal death. If this were true, then the earth and all life upon it would have no claim on a restoration—but the earth receives ordinances and transgresses not. The scriptures say that Jesus came to restore that which was lost. How could he restore that which was never taken away? And therefore, if we hold to the doctrine of pre-Adamite races, and that they and all life were always subject to death, then consistency demands us to say that they have no claim on the mercies and the atonement of Jesus Christ. Who redeemed them, if they had a fall some hundreds of thousands, or millions of years ago? And if they were redeemed, why did not the earth partake of that same redemption?*

*We will let others who are more worthy speak. I shall begin with the Prophet Joseph Smith:*

#### TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH SMITH

*“Commencing with Adam, who was the first man, who is spoken of in Daniel as being the ‘Ancient of Days,’ or in other words, the first and oldest of all, the great grand progenitor of whom it is said in another place he is Michael, because he was the first and father of all, not only by progeny, but the first to hold the spiritual blessings, to whom was made known the plan of ordinances for the salvation of his posterity unto the end, and to whom Christ was first revealed, and through whom Christ has been revealed from heaven, and will continue to be revealed from henceforth. Adam holds the keys of the dispensation of the fullness of times i.e. THE DISPENSATION OF ALL TIMES have been and will be revealed through him from the beginning...*

*“And again, God purposed in himself that there should not be an eternal fullness until every dispensation should be fulfilled and gathered together in one and in those dispensations unto the same fullness and general glory, should be in Christ Jesus; therefore he set the ordinances to be the same for ever and ever, and set Adam to watch over them, to reveal them from heaven to man, or to send angels to reveal them...*

*“These angels are under the direction of Michael or Adam, who acts under the direction of the Lord.”—History of the Church, 4:207f.*

*This is in harmony with the revelation coming through Joseph Smith: “Who hath appointed Michael, your prince, and established his feet, and set him upon high, and given unto him the keys of salvation, under the counsel and direction of the Holy One, who is without beginning of days or end of life.” D. and C. 78:16.*

*Again the Prophet said: “This, then, is the nature of the Priesthood; every man holding the presidency of his dispensation, and one man holding the presidency*

*of them all, even Adam; and Adam, receiving his presidency and authority from the Lord, but cannot receive a fullness until Christ shall present the kingdom to the Father which shall be at the end of the last dispensation.” History of the Church 4:207f.*

*“The Priesthood was first given to Adam; he obtained the first Presidency, and held the keys of it from generation to generation. He obtained it in the Creation, before the world was. He is Michael the Archangel, spoken of in the scriptures. History of the Church, 3:385.*

*“Daniel in his seventh chapter speaks of the Ancient of Days; he means the oldest man, our father Adam, Michael, he will call his children together and hold a council with them to prepare them for the coming of the Son of Man. He (Adam) is the father of all the human family and presides over the spirits of all men, and all that have had keys must stand before him in his grand council. This may take place before some of us leave this stage of action. The Son of Man stands before him, and there is given him glory and dominion. Adam delivers up his stewardship to Christ, that which was delivered to him as holding the keys of the universe, but retains his standing as head of the human family.” History of the Church, 3:386-7.*

#### TESTIMONY OF PRESIDENT OF BRIGHAM YOUNG

*“It is a true saying of the Savior’s \* \* \*. He came for the express purpose of dividing the righteous from the wicked. This formed as much a part of his holy ministry as nay other part of the will of his Father.*

*“We see this principle verified from days of old. It was demonstrated in the very commencement of the peopling of the earth. How soon an opposition was introduced in the morning of creation, when righteousness was proclaimed, when truth was revealed, when the light and knowledge of eternity shone with lustrous beauty upon Adam and his children. Cain must rise up and slay his brother while they were walking with the Lord. \* \* \*.*

*“It is very true, had not sin entered into the world, and opposition been introduced, death would not have entered. From that time to this death, opposition, selfishness, amalice, anger, pride, darkness and wickedness of every description that could be invented by the children of men, as they have multiplied and spread abroad on the earth have increased.”—J. of D. 1:234-5.*

*“How did Adam and Eve sin? Did they come out in direct opposition to God and his government? No. But they transgressed a command of the Lord, and through that transgression sin came into the world. \* \* \* Then, came the curse upon the fruit, upon the vegetables, and upon our mother earth; and it came upon the creeping things, upon the grain in the field, the fish in the sea, and upon all things pertaining to this earth, through man’s transgression.” J. of D. 10:312.*

#### TESTIMONY OF PRESIDENT JOHN TAYLOR AND PARLEY P. PRATT

*Elder John Taylor, in 1852, published a very excellent little work called "The Government of God." In it he quotes at some length from the writings of Elder Parley P. Pratt, and incorporated them in his theme. I quote from both of these authors from this work that we may have before us their united testimony, which is as follows:*

**EXCERPTS FROM PRESIDENT JOHN TAYLOR'S  
"THE GOVERNMENT OF GOD"**

*"Now, restoration signifies a bringing back, and must refer to something which existed before; for if it did not exist before, it could not be restored. \* \* \*page 106.*

*"Now, we can never understand precisely what is meant by restoration, unless we understand what is lost or taken away, for instance, when we offer to restore any thing to a man, it is as much as to say he once possessed it, but had lost it, and we propose to replace or put him in possession of that which he once had; therefore, when a prophet speaks of the restoration of all things, he means that all things have undergone a change, and are to be again restored to their primitive order even as they first existed.*

*"First, then, it becomes necessary for us to take a view of creation as it rolled in purity from the hand of its Creator; and if we can discover the true state in which it then existed, and understand the changes that have taken place since, then we shall be able to understand what is to be restored; and thus our minds being prepared, we shall be looking for the very things which will come, and shall be in no danger of lifting our puny arm, in ignorance, to oppose the things of God.*

*"First, then, we will take a view of the earth, as to its surface, local situation, and productions.*

*"When God had created the heavens and the earth, and separated the light from the darkness, his next great command was to the waters, Gen. 1"9—"And God said, let the waters under the heavens be fathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so." From this we learn a marvelous fact, which very few have ever realized in this benighted age; we learn that the waters, which are now divided into oceans, seas, and lakes, were then all gathered together, into one vast ocean; and consequently, that the land, which is now torn asunder, and divide into continents and islands, almost innumerable, was then one vast continent or body, not separated as it is now.*

*"Second, we hear the Lord God pronounce the earth, as well as every thing else, very good. From this we learn that there were neither deserts, barren places, stagnant swamps, rough, broken, rugged hills, nor vast mountains covered with eternal snow; and no part of it was located in the frigid zone, so as to render its climate dreary and unproductive, subject to eternal frost, or everlasting chains of ice, --*

*"Where no sweet flowers the dreary landscape cheer,  
Nor plenteous harvests crown the passing year;*

*But the whole earth was probably one vast plain, or interspersed with gently rising hills, and sloping vales, well calculated for cultivation; while its climate was delightfully varied with the moderate changes of heat and cold, of wet and dry, which only tended to crown the varied hear, with the greater variety of productions, all for the good of man, animal, fowl, or creeping thin; while from the flowery plain, or spicy grove, sweet odors were wafted on every breeze; and all the vast creation of animated being breathed nought but health, and peace, and joy.*

*“Next we learn from Gen. 1:29:30, --‘And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree, yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat. And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat; and it was so.’ From these verses we learn that the earth yielded neither nauxious weeds not poisonous plants, not useless thorns and thistles; indeed, every thing that grew was just calculated for the food of man, beast, fowl and creeping thing; and their food was all vegetable, flesh and blood were never sacrificed to glut their soul, or gratify their appetites; the beasts of the earth were all in perfect harmony with each other; the lion ate straw like the ox—the wolf dwelt with the lamb—the leopard lay down with the kid—the cow and bear fed together, in the same pasture, while their young ones reposed, in perfect security, under the shade of the same trees; all was peace and harmony, and nothing to hurt nor disturb, in all the holy mountain.*

*“And to crown the whole, we behold man created in the image of God, and exalted in dignity and power, having dominion over all the vast creation of animated beings, which swarm through the earth, while at the same time, he inhabits a beautiful and well-watered garden, in the midst of which stood the tree of Life, to which he had free access; while he stood in the presence of his Maker, conversed with him face to face, and gazed upon his glory, without a dimming veil between. O reader, contemplate for a moment this beautiful creation, clothed with peace and plenty; the earth teeming with harmless animals, rejoicing over all the plain; the air swarming with delightful birds; whose never ceasing notes filled the air with varied melody; and all in subjection to their rightful sovereign who rejoiced over them; while, in a delightful garden—the capitol of creation,—man was seated on the throne of his vast empire, swaying his scepter over all the earth, with undisputed right; while legions of angels encamped round about him, and joined their glad voices in grateful songs of praise, and shouts of joy; neither a sigh not groan was heard, throughout the vast expanse; neither was there sorrow, tears, pain, weeping, sickness, nor death; neither contentions, wars nor bloodshed; but peace crowned the seasons as they rolled, and life, joy and Love reigned over all his works. But, O! how changed the scene. \* \* \*.*

*“First, man fell from his standing before God, by giving heed to temptation; and this fall effected the whole creation, as well as man, and caused various changes to take place; he was banished form the presence of his Creator, and a veil was drawn between them, and he was driven from the garden of Eden, to till the earth, which was then cursed for man’s sake, and should begin to bring forth thorns and thistles; and with the sweat of his face should earn his bread, and in sorrow eat of it, all the days of his life, and finally return to dust. \* \* \*.*

*“Now, reader, contemplate the change. This scene, which was so beautiful a little while before, had now become the abode of sorrow and toil, of death and mourning;*

*the earth groaning with its production of accursed thorns and thistles; man and beast at enmity; the serpent slyly creeping away, fearing lest his head should get the deadly bruise; and man startling amid the thorny path, in fear, lest the serpent’s fangs should pierce his heel, \* \* \* all flesh becomes corrupt, the powers of darkness prevail, and it repented Noah that God had made man. \* \* \**

*“How far the flood may have contributed, to produce the various changes, as to the division of the earth into broken fragments, islands and continents, mountains and valleys, we have not been informed; the change must have been considerable. But after the flood in the days of Peleg, the earth was divided. – See Gen. 10:25, --a short history, to be sure, of so great an event, but still it will account for the mighty revolution, which rolled the sea from its own place in the north, and brought it to interpose between different portions of the earth, which were parted asunder, and moved into something near their present form; this together with the earthquakes, revolutions, and commotions which have since taken place, have all contributed to reduce the face of the earth to its present state; while the great curses which have fallen upon different portions, because of the wickedness of men, will account for the stagnant swamps, the sunken lakes, the dead seas, and great deserts. \* \* \**

*Then speaking of the restoration we have a continuation as follows:*

*“Thus you see, every mountain being laid low, and every valley exalted, and the rough places being made plain, and the crooked places straight, that these mighty revolutions will begin to restore the face of the earth to its former beauty. But all this done, we have not yet gone through our restoration; there are many more great things to be done, in order to restore all things. \* \* \**

*“Thus, having cleansed the earth, and glorified it with the knowledge of God, as the waters cover the sea, and having poured out his Spirit upon all flesh, both man and beast becoming perfectly harmless, as they were in the beginning, and feeding on vegetable food only, while nothing is left to hurt or destroy in all the vast creation, the prophets then proceed to give us many glorious descriptions of the enjoyment of its inhabitants. \* \* \**

*“A great council will then be held to adjust the affairs of the world, from the commencement, over which father Adam will preside as head and representative of the human family. (The government of God.) pages 107-115.*

*The greater part of this which I have read was first published in The Voice of Warning, in the year 1837. A second edition was published in 1839, and one other edition was published, perhaps two were published, before the death of the Prophet Joseph Smith. Five editions were placed before the people before the close of 1846. The Prophet Joseph Smith saw this work and commented favorably upon it in his journal. You will discover from this beautiful story told at least seven years before the death of the Prophet, and many times repeated, endorsed in full by an apostle who became a President of the Church, that the story of creation and life on the earth as told by Elder Roberts’ scientific*

witnesses is far a field from the story told by the Lord in revelation. Suppose you should say to one of these world-wise intellectuals that about six thousand years ago all the land surface was in one place. There were no islands and continents; the sea was in one place and in the north; suppose you should tell them that in the near future, all the physical divisions of the earth shall go back again to their primitive condition and be restored? Would they believe you? Would they not think any one claiming such a thing a fool? Well, this is what prophecy and revelation teach us concerning the physical surface of this earth. Read Isaiah, John's Revelation, section 133 of the Doctrine and Covenants. These testimonies, I believe to be a sufficient answer to all the learned witnesses of geology and biology the world can produce.

In this same work, The Government of God, President Taylor further says: "If Satan be indeed the God of this world, and rules in the hearts of the children of disobedience, he is only an usurper. It is not his rightful dominion, for all things were created by Christ, and for Christ, whether they be principalities, or powers, or thrones, or dominions, all these were created by him, and for him, and he only has a right to rule; but Satan has subverted the ways of God, deceived the human family, introduced misery, and confusion, and blighted this beautiful creation with his contaminating curse."—page (?)

#### TESTIMONIES OF ELDER ORSON PRATT

At the funeral of Caroline G. Smith, wife of William Smith, in Nauvoo, May 24, 1845, Elder Orson Pratt said:

"In the morning of creation all things were pronounced good by the Creator, as they rolled into organized existence unsullied and without a curse. Man, the last and noblest of God's creation was placed in the garden of Eden, being governed by laws and restricted by commandments, not being subject to sickness, disease, or death. Adam was placed upon the earth an immortal being. He was placed in the garden to dress, beautify and adorn it, and to hold the supremacy of power over all the things of God's creation.

"Instead of our first parents eating animal food, they subsisted upon herbs and the fruits of the earth, which were originally designed for the food of man, and had they not transgressed they would have both been living upon the earth at the present day, as fair, as healthy, as beautiful and as free from sickness and death, as they were previous to the transgression. What was that transgression? It was violating a single commandment of God, and disregarding the counsel of those immortal beings who stood above them in authority. \* \* \*. His was a simple commandment; but the violation of it subjected Adam to the Fall from his exalted station in the favor of God. Consequently a curse was placed upon all created things, and in the posterity of Adam were sown the seeds of dissolution \* \* \*.

"\* \* \* That transgression subjected him to a curse and that was a fall from a state of immortality to that of mortality; consequently you see that it was through his agency that death entered the world."—Times and Seasons 6:918-19.

August 29, 1852, the First Presidency made known to the people generally, the revelation on plural marriage. Elder Orson Pratt was appointed by President

Young to preach a discourse preparing the way. In the course of his remarks, Elder Pratt said:

*"The Lord Himself solemnized the first marriage pertaining to this globe, and pertaining to flesh and bones here upon this earth. I do not say pertaining to mortality; for when the first marriage was celebrated, no mortality was here. The first marriage that we have any account of, was between two immortal beings—old father Adam and old mother Eve; they were immortal beings: death had no dominion, no power over them; and they were capable of enduring for ever and ever in their organization. \* \* \*.*

*"What would you consider, my hearers, if a marriage was to be celebrated between two beings not subject to death? Would you consider them joined together for a certain number of years, and that then all their covenants were to cease for ever, and the marriage contract to be dissolved? Would it look reasonable and consistent? Every heart would say that the work of God is perfect in and of itself, and inasmuch as sin had not brought imperfection upon the globe, what God joined together could not be dissolved, and destroyed and torn asunder by any power beneath the celestial world, consequently it was eternal; the sealing of the great Jehovah upon Adam and Eve was eternal in its nature. \* \* \*. J. of D. 1:58*

*It is well at this point for us to understand that the evidence points to the fact that President Brigham Young endorsed these remarks by Elder Pratt, which you can readily see are in conflict with the remark of Elder Hyde relied upon by Elder Roberts for his views. I have already quoted from President Brigham Young his views which accord with these remarks by Elder Pratt.*

#### EXCERPTS FROM A DISCOURSE DELIVERED BY ORSON PRATT

S. L. Tabernacle, July 25, 1852, Designated as  
Funeral Sermon of all Saints and Sinners:  
Also, of the Heavens and the Earth

*" \* \* \* I will take a text, which you will find recorded in the 51<sup>st</sup> chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah, and the sixth verse---*

*"Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath, for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished."*

*"All things with which we are acquainted, pertaining to this earth of ours, are subject to change; not only man, so far as his temporal body is concerned, but the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, the fishes of the sea, and every living thing with which we are acquainted—all are subject to pain and distress, and finally die and pass away; death seems to have universal dominion in our creation. It certainly is a curious world; it certainly does not look like a world constructed in such a manner as to produce eternal happiness; and it would be very far from the truth, I think, for any being at the present time to pronounce it very good; everything seems to show us that goodness, in a great degree, has fled from this creation. If we partake of the elements, death is there in all its*

*forms and varieties; and when we desire to rejoice, sorrow is there, mingling itself in every cup; and woe, and wretchedness, and misery, seem to be our present doom.*

*There is something, however, in man, that is constantly reaching forward after happiness, after life, after pleasure, after something to satisfy the longing desire that dwells within his bosom. Why is it that we have such a desire? And why is it that it is not satisfied? Why is it that this creation is so constructed? And why is it that death reigns universally over all living earthly beings? Did the great Author of creation construct this little globe of ours subject to all these changes, which are calculated to produce sorrow and death among the beings that inhabit it? Was this the original condition of our creation? I answer, no; it was not so constructed. But how was it made in the beginning? All things that were made pertaining to this earth were pronounced 'very good.' Where there is pain, where there is sickness, where there is sorrow, and where there is death, this saying cannot be understood in its literal sense; things cannot be very good where something very evil reigns and has universal dominion.*

*"We are, therefore, constrained to believe, that in the first formation of our globe, as far as the Mosaic history gives us the information, everything was perfect in its formation; that there was nothing in the air, or in the waters, or in the solid elements that was calculated to produce misery, wretchedness, unhappiness, or death, in the way that it was then organized; not but what the same elements, organized a little differently, would produce all these effects; but as it was then constructed, we must admit that every particle of air, of water, and of earth, was so organized as to be capable of diffusing life and immortality through all the varied species of animated existence—immortality reigned in every department of creation; hence it was pronounced very 'good.'*

*"When the Lord made the fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea, to people the atmospheric heavens, or the water elements, these fowls and fishes were so constructed in their nature as to be capable of eternal existence. To imagine anything different from this, would be to suppose the Almighty to form that which was calculated to produce wretchedness and misery. What says the psalmist David upon this subject? He says that all the works of the Lord shall endure forever. Did not the Lord make the fish? Did he not make the fowls of the heavens? Yes. Did He not make the beasts of the field, and the creeping things, and the insects? Yes. Do they endure for ever? They apparently do not; and yet David says all His works are constructed upon that principle. Is this a contradiction? No. God has given some other particulars in relation to these works. He has permitted the destroyer to visit them, who has usurped a certain dominion and authority, carrying desolation and ruin on every hand: the perfections of the original organizations have ceased. But will the Lord for ever permit these destructions to reign? No. His power exists, and the power of death exists; but His power exceeds all other powers; and consequently, wherever a usurper comes in and lays waste any of His works, he will repair those wastes, build up the odd ruins, and make all things new: even the fish of the sea, and the fowls of the heavens, and the beasts of the earth, must yet, in order to carry out the designs of the Almighty, be so constructed as to be capable of eternal existence.*

*"It would be interesting to know something about the situation of things when they were first formed, and how this destroyer happened to make inroads upon this fair creation; what the causes were, and why it was permitted.*

*"Man, when he was first placed upon the earth, was an immortal being, capable of eternal endurance; his flesh and bones, as well as his spirit, were immortal and eternal in their nature; and it was just so with all the inferior creation—the lion, the leopard, the kid, and the cow; it was so with the feathered tribes of creation, as well as those that swim in the vast ocean of waters; all were immortal and eternal in their nature; and the earth itself, as a living being, was immortal and eternal in its nature. 'What! Is the earth alive too?' if it were not, how could the words of our text be fulfilled, where it speaks of the earth's dying? How can that die that has no life? 'Lift up your eyes to the heavens above,' says the Lord, 'and like upon the earth beneath; the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner. What! The earth and the heavens to die? Yes, the material heavens and earth must all undergo this change which we call death; and if so, the earth must be alive as well as we. The earth was so constructed that it was capable of existing as a living being to all eternity, with all the swarms of animals, fowls, and fishes that were first placed upon the face thereof. But how can it be proved that man was an immortal being? We will refer you to what the Apostle Paul has written upon this subject: he says that by one person came death; and he tells us how it came: it was by the transgression of one individual that death was introduced here. But did transgression bring in all these diseases and this sorrow, this misery and wretchedness, over the whole face of this creation? Is it by the transgression of one person that the very heavens are to vanish away as smoke, and the earth is to wax old like a garment? Yes, it is by the transgression of one; and if it had not been for his transgression, the earth never would have been subject to death. Why? Because the works of the Lord are so constructed as to exist for ever; and if death had come in without a cause, and destroyed the earth, and laid waste the material heavens, and produced a general and utter overthrow and (?) this fair creation, then the works of the Lord would have ceased to endure according to the promise, being imperfect in their connection. \* \* \*"*

*Continuing and speaking of the fall, Elder Pratt says:*

*"The Lord had a purpose in view, though He constructed this fair creation, as we have told you, subject to immortality, and capable of eternal endurance, and though He had constructed man capable of living forever, yet He had an object in view in regard to that man, and the creation he inhabited. What was the object? And how shall this object be accomplished?*

*"Why, the Lord wanted this intelligent being called man, to prove that inasmuch as he was an agent, He desired that he should show (?) approved before his Creator. \* \* \*"*

*"Adam was appointed Lord of this creation: a great governor, wielding the scepter of power over the whole earth. When the governor, the person who was placed to reign over this fair creation, had transgressed, all in his dominions had to feel the effects of it, the same as a father or a mother, who transgresses*

*certain laws, frequently transmits the effects thereof to the latest generations.”—  
J. of D. p.284.*

**THE EARTH—ITS FALL, REDEMPTION, AND FINAL DESTINY—  
THE ETERNAL ABODE OF THE RIGHTEOUS**

*A discourse by Professor Orson Pratt*

*“The earth was formed to be inhabited—it was designed to be the abode of animated existence—the dwelling place of beings capable of enjoying life and happiness.*

*“At the time of its creation, it was pronounced by its Author to be “very good.” The term “very good” could have no meaning, unless spoken with reference to beings who should be capable of experiencing some benefit from its construction. However, beautifully formed—however grand and magnificent its motions—however skillfully its elements are combined, or its parts proportioned to each other, yet, if not designed to be connected with perceptive beings, the earth could not be pronounced good.*

*“A man of inanimate elements cannot be organized in any possible form or proportion so as to benefit or injure itself, and therefore cannot be good nor bad with reference to itself. Goodness and its opposite quality, when applied to unconscious matter, always have reference to conscious beings capable of deriving happiness or misery from these qualities. This was the meaning of the Creator when he ascribed the quality of goodness to the earth; it contained every necessary ingredient to render happiness to the beings who were designed to occupy it.*

*“After having made every necessary preparation, countless species of living, moving beings came from the spirit world to inhabit earthly bodies, and take up their abode upon this magnificent creation. Among the rest, man—the offspring of deity—left his ancient home—his brother and sister spirits, and came to a world most beautifully adapted to his future wants. Here he entered a tabernacle of flesh and bones, and received dominion and authority over all the lower orders of existence.*

*“Here immortality reigned, and death had no dominion. The elements were so wisely arranged and proportioned, that life was derived from all things ordained for the use of man or beast, fowl, or fish. The -----(?) and the air. Life pervaded every vegetable and fruit not forbidden to man. Life reigned triumphantly throughout this vast creation. Death was unknown; it had not been seen, heard of, nor experienced in all the varied ranks of earthly beings.*

*“Here, then was a creation “very good,” inhabited by beings capable of eternal existence, both body and spirit. Here was a creation adapted to the wants of all its inhabitants, calculated to preserve unchanged that immortality with which they were endowed. Here, then, was a creation worth possessing as an eternal abode.*

*“Such was the inheritance given to man, with its vast treasures and sumptuous luxuries—such was the gift of heaven under certain restrictions. These*

restrictions were not complied with—man fell—a great change came over the fair face of creation—the earth was cursed—sickness, pain and misery ensued—immortality yielded to mortality—death reigned triumphantly throughout the animal kingdom—the everlasting inheritance on the newly-formed earth was forfeited—all seemed to be lost—forever lost! While all creation groaned in utter despair and death, a voice was heard; not a voice of wrath and indignation, but a voice of mercy and compassion—the voice of the Creator, proclaiming himself the Redeemer; love flowed through every sentence—man listened with eagerness—the door of hope was opened—despair fled away—all things again assumed a new aspect. The earth, though cursed, was to be redeemed—the body, though corruptible, was again to put on incorruption—all things lost by the first transgression were to be restored again in their primitive excellence and beauty.

“Though this great redemption was to be universal, yet the change was to be gradual or progressive, not immediate; the effects of the fall were to continue for a season, until all the inhabitants of the spirit world, designed for this creation, should learn by bitter experience, the unhappy consequence of sin. Hence, the while world still groans under the sad effects of the original transgression. Sorrow, mourning, and death still prevail—the aged, middle-aged and infant still feel the force of these evils—all are made partakers in a greater or less degree of the wretchedness and misery of the fall—none escape—none can proclaim themselves immortal, or free from these direful effects.

“The universal redemption of the posterity of Adam from the fall will be fully accomplished after the earth has been filled with its measure of inhabitants, and all men have been redeemed from the grave to immortality, and the earth itself has been changed and made entirely new.

“But a universal redemption from the effects of original sin has nothing to do with redemption from our personal sins; for the original sin of Adam, and the personal sins of his children, are two different things. The first was committed by man in his immortal state; the second was committed by man in a mortal state; the former was committed in a state of ignorance of good or evil; the latter was committed by man, having a knowledge of both good and evil. As the sins are different, and committed entirely under different circumstances, so the penalties are different also. The penalty of the first transgression has an eternal separation of body and spirit, and eternal banishment from the presence of Jehovah; while the penalty of our own transgressions does not involve a disunion of body and spirit, but only eternal banishment. The first penalty not only shut man out from the presence of God, but deprived him eternally of a body. The second penalty permits him to retain his body, though in a banished condition. As the penalties are different, so also is the redemption. Redemption from the first penalty is unconditional on the part of the man; redemption from the second penalty is conditional. Unconditional redemption is universal; it takes within its scope all mankind; it is as unlimited as the fall; it redeems men from all its effects; it restores to them their bodies; it restores to them the presence of God.

“The children of Adam had no agency in the transgression of their first parents, and therefore, they are not required to exercise any agency in their redemption

*from its penalty. They are redeemed from it without faith, repentance, baptism, or any other act, either of the mind or body.*

*“Conditional redemption is also universal in its nature; it is offered to all, but not received by all; it is a universal gift, though not universally accepted; its benefits can be obtained only through faith, repentance, baptism, the laying on of the hands, and obedience to all other requirements of the Gospel.*

*“Unconditional redemption is a gift forced upon mankind, which they cannot reject, though they were disposed. Not so with conditional redemption; it can be received or rejected according to the will of the creature.*

*“Redemption from the original sin is without faith or works’ redemption from our own sins is given through faith and works. Both are gifts of free grace; but while one is a gift forced upon us unconditionally, the other is a gift merely offered to us conditionally. The reception of the one is compulsory; the reception of the other is voluntary. Man cannot by any possible act, prevent his redemption from the fall; but he can utterly refuse and prevent his redemption from the penalty of his own sins.*

*“The earth, like the posterity of Adam, was cursed because of the original sin, and like them, it will be redeemed unconditionally, and restored again into the presence of god. So far as the original sin is concerned, mankind and the earth keep pace with each other. When one falls the other falls also. When one is redeemed, the other is redeemed also.*

*“Had there been no other sin but that of Adam’s, the redeemed earth would have become the eternal abode of all the posterity of Adam, without one exception. But both man and the earth have been still further corrupted by other sins. The posterity of Adam have transgressed the code of laws given since the fall, and subjected themselves to its penalty. This penalty does not interfere with the first penalty. Man will be redeemed from the first before the second will be fully inflicted. When his redemption from the first death is completed, then comes the judgment, when his own sins will be inquired into, and not Adam’s. As he stands before the judgment seat, he will find himself entirely innocent of Adam’s transgression, and entirely redeemed from the effects of it, but he still finds himself guilty of his own individual sins, the penalty of which is a second death, not a dissolution of body and spirit like that of the first death, but a banishment from the presence of God, and from the glory of his power.*

*“Redemption from the second death, as we have already observed is conditional. Man having voluntarily committed sin, must voluntarily comply with the conditions of redemption; otherwise he must suffer the penalty. If any should feel disposed to doubt whether the second penalty will be inflicted, let them look at the infliction of the first, during the last 6,000 years. The first death, with all its attendant evils, has extended its ravages among all nations and generations since the first law was broken. If God, then, has fulfilled His word in the first provocation, to the very letter, why should any one suppose that he will not inflict the second death as a penalty of the second provocation?*

*“All generations bear witness to the faithfulness of His word spoken in the garden of Eden. Why, then, should we suppose that justice shall be frustrated,*

*and His word become null and void in regard to any future penalty with which the sinner is threatened? If the sin of one man brought the first death upon unnumbered millions, why not the sin of each man bring the second death upon himself? There is no escape for the sinner from the second death, only through the conditions of the Gospel. All who will believe in Christ, and repent of their sins, and be baptized by immersion for the remission of them and receive the Holy Ghost through the ordinance of the laying on of hands, and continue faithful unto the end, shall escape the penalty of the second death. All who reject these conditions must suffer it, for the word of God cannot become void, and justice be thwarted from his stern decrees.*

*“Though all mankind are to be fully redeemed from the effects of the original sin, yet we have great reason to fear that but few will be redeemed from their own sins. Those few who are redeemed will receive the earth for an eternal inheritance; for the earth, as we have already observed, will be unconditionally redeemed from the curse of the original sin, and so far as that sin is concerned, it will be no obstacle to the earth’s entering into the presence of God. But as the earth has been corrupted by other sins than the original, it must partake of the curses of the second death, after it is redeemed from the curses of the first, unless God has provided a way for its sanctification and redemption therefrom. It has seemed good unto the great Redeemer to institute ordinances for the cleansing sanctification, and eternal redemption of the earth, not from the original sin, but from the sins of the posterity of Adam.*

*“The first ordinance instituted for the cleansing of the earth, was that of immersion in water; it was buried in the liquid element, and all things sinful upon the face of it were washed away. As it came forth from the ocean flood, like the newborn child, it was innocent, it arose to newness of life; it was its second birth from the womb of mighty waters—a new world issuing from the ruins of the old, clothed with all the innocence of its first creation. As man cannot be born again of water, without an administrator, so the earth required an agency independent of itself to administer this grand cleansing ordinance, and restore it to its infant purity. That administrator was the Redeemer himself.*

*“The second ordinance instituted for the sanctification of the earth, is that of fire and the Holy Ghost. The day will come when it shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, and all that do wickedly shall be as stubble; after which the glory of God shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the deep. Here then is a baptism of fire first, then of the Holy Spirit. As man receives the baptism of fire and Holy Spirit through the laying on of the hands of a legal administrator, so the earth receives the same, not through its own agency, but through the agencies ordained of God. As man becomes a new creature by being born again, first of water, then of the spirit, in the same manner the earth becomes a new earth by being born again of these cleansing and purifying elements. As man becomes a righteous man by the new birth, so the earth becomes a righteous earth through the same process.*

*“Righteousness will abide upon its face, during a thousand years, and the Savior will bless it with his personal presence, after which the end soon comes, and the earth itself will die, and its elements be dissolved through the agency of a fire. This death, or dissolution of the earth, is a penalty of the original sin. Infants and righteous men die, not as a penalty of their own sins, but because Adam sinned;*

*so the earth dies or undergoes a similar change, not because of the transgressions of the children of Adam, but because of the original transgression. But all mankind are made alive from the first death through the resurrection, so the earth will again be renewed, its elements will again be collected; they will be recombined and reorganized as when it first issued from the womb of chaos. As the bodies of the righteous are made immortal, eternal, unchangeable, and glorious, so the earth itself will be constructed as to be capable of everlasting endurance. Immortality will be indelibly stamped upon every department of this creation. It will be crowned with the presence of God the Father, and shine forth in all the splendors of celestial glory. But who will be its inhabitants? Those who have passed through the same process of purification, and no one else. As all who partake of the second death must be banished from the presence of God, it necessarily follows, that they must be banished from the glorified earth; for that is redeemed into the presence of God, and enjoys the glory of His power; and no beings can inhabit it but those who are sanctified by the same ordinances and law.*

*“As the earth passes through its great last change, two of its principal cities—the Old Jerusalem of the eastern continent, and the New Jerusalem of the eastern continent, and the New Jerusalem of the western continent, will be preserved from the general conflagration, being caught up into heaven. These two cities, with all their glorified throng, will descend upon the redeemed earth, being the grand capitals of the new creation. “Without” (or exterior to these holy cities, and upon other creations of an inferior order, far separated from the glorified earth) “will be dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. (Rev. xxii. 15.) These are they that are banished from the presence of God, and from the glory of a celestial earth.*

*“It is the meek only who shall receive the promised inheritance—they are the lawful heirs. “Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth,” was the promise of the great Redeemer.*

*“But who are the meek? By what peculiarities are they distinguished from other men? There must be some qualities about them far superior to the generality of mankind, or they would not become the exclusive heirs of the new earth. The law of meekness includes all the laws of the Gospel, with its ordinances and blessings, Priesthood and powers, through obedience to which mankind become justified, purified, and glorified. Such are the meek of the earth, and none others. And as the Gospel has not been preached not administered by authority on the eastern hemisphere for the last seventeen centuries, consequently, during that time, there have been none possessed of the requisite qualities of meekness sufficient to entitle them to the promised inheritance upon the new earth. A few only will be saved—a few only will receive the law of meekness and continue therein.*

*“Different portions of the earth have been pointed by the Almighty, from time to time, to His children, as their everlasting inheritance. As instances—Abraham and his posterity, that were worthy, were promised Palestine. Moab and Ammon—the children of righteous Lot—were promised a portion not far from the boundaries of the twelve tribes. The meek among the Jaredites, together with a remnant of the tribe of Joseph, were promised the great western continent. The righteous of all nations who shall in this dispensation be gathered to that land,*

*will receive their inheritance in common with the meek who formerly sojourned upon the land. In the resurrection, the meek of all ages and nations will be restored to that portion of the earth previously promised to them. And thus, all the different portions of the earth have been and will be disposed of to the lawful heirs; while those who cannot prove their heirship to be legal, or who cannot prove that they have received any portion of the earth by promise, will be cast out into some other kingdom or world, where, if they ever get an inheritance, they will have to earn it by keeping the law of meekness during another probation.*

*How great will be the disappointment to the rich, the high and the noble, who have rejected the messages of eternal truth, sent forth in different ages for the redemption of men, when they find that there is not a foot of the new earth that they can call their own; the whole of it having been lawfully disposed of to the poor and the meek.*

*“Howl, then, ye rich men, who reject the message of the servants of God; for your portion is in this life, and you have no claim upon the everlasting inheritance. God will rescue the earth from under your dominion, and give it to those unto whom it is promised. Howl, for the miseries that shall come upon you!*

*“It has been conjectured by some, that the earth will not be sufficiently capacious to accommodate the nations of the righteous. But such a conjecture will appear erroneous to any one who will exercise his reasoning powers sufficient to calculate the superficial contents of our globe, and compare the same with the probable number of inhabitants who are destined for this creation.*

*“In round numbers the surface of our terrestrial spheroid contains 197,000,000 of square miles, or over one hundred and twenty-six thousand millions of acres. Now, if from the creation of the earth to its final glorification, there should elapse a period of eight thousand years, or eighty centuries, and if we should suppose the population to average one thousand millions per century (which is probably an average far too great,) yet there would be an abundance of room upon the new earth for all this vast multitude. There would be over one acre and a half for every soul.*

*“But when we reflect how few will be saved—how few have received the plan of redemption, even when it has been proclaimed by authority in their ears, and how many generations have passed away unto whom the almighty has sent no message, we are compelled to believe that not one per cent of all this immense population shall, through obedience to the Gospel, become lawful heirs to the new earth, then there will be over one hundred and fifty acres for every soul. If the new earth contains only the same proportion of land as the old, there would still be about forty acres for every redeemed soul. But the new earth is represented by the Apostle John, as being without any sea, which increases its capacity for inhabitants above the old four fold.*

*“The farmer who is looking forward to the new earth for his everlasting inheritance, need have no fears of being too much limited in his possessions. There will be ample room for the delightful pursuits of the agriculturalist. He can have his pleasure-grounds; his orchards of the most delicious fruits; his gardens decorated with the loveliest flowers; and still have land enough for the raising of*

*the more staple articles, such as manna to eat, and flax for the making of fine robes, etc.*

*“Who, in looking upon the earth as it ascends in the scale of the universe, does not desire to keep pace with it, that when it shall be cleansed in its turn, among the dazzling orbs of the blue vault of heaven, shining forth in all the splendors of celestial glory, he may find himself proportionably advanced in the scale of intellectual and moral excellence? Who, but the most abandoned, does not desire to be counted worthy to associate with those higher orders of beings who have been redeemed, exalted, and glorified, together with the worlds they inhabit, ages before the foundations of our earth were laid? O man, remember the future destiny and glory of the earth and secure thine everlasting inheritance upon the same, that when it shall be glorious, thou shalt be glorious also. (Journal of Discourses, Volume I, pp. 328 top 334)*

*DISCOURSE BY ELDER ORSON PRATT,  
Delivered in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City,  
Sunday Morning, August 1<sup>st</sup>, 1880*

*“ \* \* \* This world, however, is not now as it was in the beginning, that is when I speak of the beginning, I have no reference to the beginning of the earth, in its present organization; I do not have reference to the beginning of duration, for it had no beginning; I do not have reference to the beginning of an endless past, but I have reference to the beginning relative to our little globe. In the beginning of our creation, the earth was very fair, quite different from what it is now. There were no children of mortality upon it; no animals that were mortal upon it, no birds, nothing wherein we observe life in this creation existed in its mortal states; but everything that had life was immortal; every bird, fish, fowl, insect, creeping thing, cattle, and man—all were immortal. The earth had no curse resting upon it; the earth itself was immortal, and would have continued in all its glory, as it issued from the hand of the Creator to the present time, without any curse, had it not been for the transgression of our first parents. That was the introduction of mortality, of pain and sorrow, misery and wretchedness, not only upon man, but upon all creation that then existed; everything was brought under the dominion of the curse. The curse came upon man—that being who could stand in the presence of God and converse with him face to face—the seeds of mortality were sown in his immortal body;—a change came and his whole system was affected thereby. The seeds of death were placed within the tabernacle of man, within the tabernacle of the lion, of the ox, and every beast of the field, and every fish of the sea, and every fowl of the air. A very great change then came over this creation. First, it was spiritual in all its blessings and fullness of life and glory. Then it was reduced to a temporal condition, wherein misery and wretchedness existed.” (Journal of Discourses, Volume 21, page 323).*

*This great man died one year later, and thus we see that this doctrine was declared by him all the days of his life. For preaching it he was never called in question, but was sustained by his brethren who expressed similar views. In the Christmas greetings from the First Presidency in 1911, they had this to say: “The erection, during the past year, of monuments to Oliver Cowdery \* \* \* Christian D. Fjelsted, \* \* \* to Orson Pratt, the famous preacher, author, astronomer, philosopher and pioneer, and other mementoes to illustrate champions of eternal*

*truth, are worthy of special mention.” M. Star. Vol. 74:5. Orson Pratt is acknowledged as one of the greatest champions of Gospel truth that this Church has produced. Surely his words are worthy of grave consideration.*

TESTIMONY OF FRANKLIN D. RICHARDS

*“Adam stands at the head of the human race on this planet, as the great patriarch of all the earth’s families; we should and will honor him as the Ancient of Days (Dan. 7:13) with whom we shall ‘have to do’ in matters pertaining to earth. Adam in his pre-existence was Michael, the archangel, a mighty being in heaven and on earth. But we do not worship him.” Era 17:709.*

*And now, I will conclude this array of testimony with a statement from a proclamation from a Presidency of the Church, published in November 1909, under the caption “The Origin of Man.”*

*“The conclusion is irresistible, that if the Son of God be the express image (that is, likeness) of His Father’s person, then his Father is in the form of man; for that was the form of the Son of God; not only during his mortal life, but before his mortal birth and after his resurrection. \* \* \* Then if God made man—the first man—in His own image and likeness, he must have made him like unto Christ, and consequently like unto men of Christ’s time and of the present day. \* \* \**

*“Adam, our great progenitor, ‘the first Man,’ was, like Christ, a pre-existent spirit, and like Christ he took upon him an appropriate body, the body of a man, so became a ‘living soul.’ The doctrine of the pre-existence,—revealed so plainly, particularly in latter-days, pours a wonderful flood of light upon the otherwise mysterious problem of man’s origin. It shows that man, as a spirit, was begotten and born of heavenly parents, and reared to maturity in the eternal mansions of the Father, prior to coming upon the earth, in a temporal body to undergo experience in mortality. It teaches that all men existed in the spirit before any man existed in the flesh, and that all who have inhabited the earth since Adam have taken bodies and become souls in like manner.*

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

*(signed)*

*Joseph F. Smith  
John R. Winder  
Anthon H. Lund*

*“First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.”—Era 13:75-81*

*With this great array before me of revelation and Scriptural interpretation by the leading Authorities of the Church from the beginning, and having imbibed this doctrine from contact with some of them, and from my study of the Scriptures, I*

*certainly feel that I both have the authority and the justification to speak with emphasis and dogmatically upon these subjects for which Elder Roberts has called me in question. If I am wrong, then the revelations are wrong—I have not placed private interpretation upon them—but the same interpretation that the leading elders of the Church have placed upon them, including the Prophet Joseph Smith. If I am wrong, then these intellectual giants who have gone before, and who have proclaimed the message of Salvation with vigor, power and positiveness, are also wrong. There is no alternative. If what I have said gives offense to a group of “intellectuals” within the Church who think more of the philosophy of men than they do of the revelations of God, then I might, if not considered presuming, say to them, they ought to humble themselves, get the Spirit of the Lord and have more faith in his proclamations.*

*But what of the vast majority of the people who believe in the Scriptures? I am a witness that the preaching of the theory of “pre-Adamites by Elder Roberts in the congregations of the Saints, has caused indignation, some resentment, and a great deal of serious concern.*

*I think I have shown that my views, as I said in the beginning, have been expressed just as emphatically, dogmatically, and also officially, by Presidents and Apostles of the Church. That is my authority for speaking as I did. And while it may be considered by some that I have no right to utter such thoughts with such “finality of spirit,” and that I am incompetent to speak, “either as a scholar or as an Apostle,” yet there is one truth which I shall presume to express in spite of these restrictions.*

*For the argument’s sake let us say, if there were pre-Adamites upon this earth, the Lord for some good reason known to himself, has kept that knowledge a secret to himself. Is it not our duty, then, to wait until he shall speak before we proclaim that as a doctrine? By doing so we may save ourselves from falling into the abyss of eternal darkness.*

*Moreover, while we all have the happy privilege of freely bathing and glorying in the effulgent splendor of divine truth revealed; yet there is but one at a time on the earth who holds the keys of revelation yet to come. When the Lord has new truth to make known it will come through him, and not another.*

*Very sincerely, your brother,*

*(signed) Joseph Fielding Smith*

*SLC Friday 16 January (1931) -- President Clawson reported regarding the discussion between Joseph Fielding Smith and B. H. Roberts. He decided that the Twelve should hear the case before reporting to us. As Brother Roberts had appeared before the Twelve and stated his case it is only fair that they should hear Brother Smith also. (Heber J. Grant Journal, 1931, p.12)*

*January 21, 1931*

*President Heber J. Grant & Counselors.*

*Dear Brethren:*

*We, the Council of the Twelve, to whom was referred the letter of Elder B. H. Roberts addressed to the First Presidency, a criticism of a certain discourse delivered by Elder Joseph Fielding Smith and published in the Genealogical Magazine, October, 1930, beg leave to report that we have given the time of three rather lengthy meetings to this matter.*

*At the first meeting Elder Roberts read and submitted a paper embodying his views at some length on the theory of pre-Adamic races, based on scientific investigation—a theory, we understand, which Elder Roberts has promulgated in some of his public utterances among the Latter-day Saints.*

*At the third meeting Elder Joseph Fielding Smith read and submitted a paper in which he defended the claim he made in the sermon published in the Genealogical Magazine above referred to, viz.,; that pre-Adamic races on the earth is simply a theory and not a Church doctrine, and is not true. This he sought to prove by quoting Joseph Smith, the Prophet, Brigham Young, Parley P. Pratt, Orson Pratt, John Taylor and other high Church Authorities, particularly the late First Presidency, Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder and Anthon H. Lund.*

*He also quoted a number of passages from the Bible, Book of Mormon, Doctrine & Covenants and Pearl of Great Price, pointing to the facts, as he construed them, that there were no pre-Adamic races of man on the earth, neither was there death upon the earth prior to the time of Adam.*

*We quote a sentence from Elder Roberts' letter: 'If Elder Smith is merely putting forth his own opinions I call in question his competency to utter such dogmatism either as a scholar or as an Apostle. I am sure he is not competent to speak in such manner from general learning or special research work on the plain implication at least of the scriptures, both ancient and modern, and with the teaching of a more experienced and learned and earlier Apostle than himself, and a contemporary of the Prophet Joseph Smith.'*

*This reference and language we regard as very offensive on the part of Elder Roberts, who fails to show the deference due from one brother to another brother of higher rank in the Priesthood. However, it may be said that these brethren affirmed at the close of the meeting that they entertained no ill feeling, one toward the other.*

*Elder Roberts' letter is herewith returned, and the two papers alluded to are now submitted to the Presidency. The Twelve await your further instructions relative to this matter, if you have any to give.*

*Sincerely your brethren,*

*The Council of the Twelve  
By (signed) Rudger Clawson, Pres."*

*Jan. 21, Wed. (1931) – Sat with the Council of the Twelve, which convened at 1:30 p.m., and listened with interest and profit to a lengthy paper read by Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, in reply to the paper presented by Elder B. H. Roberts, regarding the Antiquity of Man, and, as Elder Smith affirmed, the utter absence of death in any form upon the earth before the time of Adam's fall. Like the paper of Elder Roberts, this was taken under advisement. (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:33)*

*SLC Sunday 25 Jan. (1931) - At ten o'clock this morning President Ivins and I met at the office and we read part of the communication of Joseph Fielding Smith to the Apostles, and part of the communication from Brother B. H. Roberts. Brother Ivins took these documents home with him Saturday and read them, and so after reading part of these documents he suggested that we go home for lunch, and as he had read them that I read the balance that I had not yet read and that we wait and let Brother Nibley see them before coming to any decision. Brother Roberts has been teaching that this earth was inhabited prior to the advent of Adam, and Brother Smith has been preaching that it was not so inhabited. The total number of pages in the two documents is 108.*

*Later in the day and this evening I read the balance of these articles. As soon as Brother Nibley comes home the Presidency ought to go over these carefully and make a decision. (Heber J. Grant Journal, p. 19)*

*After reading the articles by Brothers Roberts and Smith, I feel that sermons such as Brother Joseph preached and criticisms such as Brother Roberts makes of the sermon are the finest kind of things to let alone entirely. I think no good can be accomplished by dealing in mysteries, and that what I feel in my heart of hearts these brethren are both doing. (Heber J. Grant Journal, pp. 19-20)*

*SLC Wednesday 25 Feb. (1931) - At 11:00 met Brother Brigham E. Roberts and the Presidency discussed his disagreement with the preaching of Brother Joseph Fielding Smith. Our discussions lasted until after 1:00. (Heber J. Grant Journal, p.44)*

*SLC Monday 30 March (1931) - The Presidency spent about an hour discussing differences of opinion regarding the creation of the earth, etc. as expressed in the controversy between Brothers B. H. Roberts and Elder Joseph Fielding Smith. Brother Ivins is preparing a paper on the subject. (Heber J. Grant Journal, pp. 62-63)*

*April 5, 1931*

*TO THE COUNCIL OF THE TWELVE,  
THE FIRST COUNCIL OF SEVENTY,  
AND THE PRESIDING BISHOPRIC*

*Dear Brethren:*

*On the 5<sup>th</sup> of April, 1930, at a conference of the Genealogical Society of Utah, Elder Joseph Fielding Smith delivered a sermon under the title "Faith Leads to a Fullness of Truth and Righteousness."*

*This sermon was published in the Utah Genealogical and Historical Magazine, and copies of it in pamphlet form were distributed, which gave it wide circulation.*

*In the sermon referred to, Elder Smith devotes the greater portion of his remarks to the subject of the creation of the earth and the relationship of our Father Adam to it and its inhabitants. He refers to the conflict which exists between geologists and the scripture dates which are given, in regard to the period of time that has elapsed since the creation to the present, and definitely states that there was no death upon the earth, either vegetable, insect or animal, prior to the fall of man, and that human life did not exist upon the earth prior to Adam.*

*On the 15<sup>th</sup> of December, 1930, Elder B. H. Roberts submitted the following letter to the First Presidency:*

*“President Heber J. Grant, and  
Counselors, Building*

*Dear Brethren: I am writing you to ask if the article published in the Utah Genealogical and Historical magazine of October, 1930, under the title “Faith Leads to a Fulness of Truth and Righteousness,” dealing mainly with the antiquity of life and death upon the earth and treated as a discourse by Elder Joseph Fielding Smith on the 5<sup>th</sup> of April, 1930, is a treatise on that subject that was submitted to and approved by the Council of the First Presidency and perhaps the Quorum of the Twelve? And is it put forth as the official declaration of the Church on the subject treated: Or is it the unofficial and personal declaration of the opinion only of Elder Smith?*

*In the latter event then I feel that that fact should have been expressed in the discourse; or if it is an official pronouncement of the Church then that fact should have been avowed; for the strictly dogmatical and the pronounced finality of the discourse demand the suggested explanation in either case.*

*If the discourse of Elder Smith is merely his personal opinion, while not questioning his right to such opinions, and also the right to express them, when avowed as his personal opinions, yet I object to the dogmatic and finality spirit of the pronouncement and the apparent official announcement of them, as if speaking with final authority.*

*If Elder Smith is merely putting forth his own opinions I call in question his competency to utter such dogmatism either as a scholar or as an Apostle. I am sure he is not competent to speak in such manner from general learning or special research work on the subject; not as an Apostle, as in that case he would be in conflict with the plain implication at least of the scriptures, both ancient and modern, and with the teaching of a more experienced and learned and earlier Apostle than himself, and a contemporary of the Prophet Joseph Smith—whose public discourse on the subject appears in the Journal of Discourses and was publicly endorsed by President Brigham Young, all which would have more weight in setting forth doctrine than this last dictum of Elder Smith.*

*My question is important as affecting, finally, the faith and status of a very large portion of the Priesthood and educated membership of the Church, I am sure; and I trust the matter will receive early consideration. All which is respectfully submitted.*

*Very truly your brother,  
(signed) B. H. Roberts"*

*The sermon referred to, with this letter, was handed by the Presidency to the Council of the Twelve with the request that the matter be taken up, and the difference of opinion which existed between the two brethren be composed.*

*At a meeting of the Council of Twelve, Elder Roberts was invited to be present and submit his findings upon the question at issue, the principal point involved being: Is the age of the earth greater than that set forth in the scripture, as it is given in the Bible, and was Adam the first human life upon it, or does he represent the first of the human race that now occupy it, and may human life have existed prior to his advent.*

*Elder Roberts appeared before the Council of Twelve and submitted a paper of fifty pages, in which he quotes copiously from the sermon of Elder Smith, and then proceeds to discuss the following statements made in the sermon:*

*"All life in the sea, on the earth, in the air, was without death. Things were not changing, as we find them changing in this mortal existence, for mortality had not come. I denounce as absolutely false the opinion of some that this earth was peopled by a race before Adam. I do not care what scientists say in regard to dinosaurs and other creatures upon the earth millions of years ago, that lived and died, and fought and struggled for existence."*

*Elder Roberts quotes from the scripture and extensively from the conclusions reached by the leading scientists of the world, to show that the earth is older than the time given to its creation in Genesis indicates. He places much stress upon the command of the Lord to Adam in which he says: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." The word replenish he defines to mean to do a thing which has been done before, or refill that which has been made empty.*

*He quotes a statement made by Apostle Orson Hyde who, at a general conference of the Church, held October, 1854, declared that there were people upon the earth prior to the advent of Adam. Brigham Young and other of the presiding officers were present, and after the remarks made by Elder Hyde, President Young arose and said: "I do not wish to eradicate any items from the lecture Elder Hyde has given us this evening, but simply to give you my views in a few words on the portion touching Bishops and Deacons. We have had a splendid address from Brother Hyde, for which I am grateful. I say to the congregation treasure up in your hearts what you have heard tonight, and at all other times."*

*Two weeks after Elder Roberts had submitted his paper Elder Smith appeared before the Council of Twelve and submitted a paper consisting of fifty-eight pages, in which he answers the arguments advanced by Elder Roberts, his contention being that Adam was the first man to come to this earth, and that*

*consequently it could not have been previously inhabited by man; that there was no death upon the earth prior to the fall, neither vegetable, insect, or animal, which of course includes man.*

*In support of his argument he quotes extensively from the scripture, and from sermons of presiding men of the Church, particularly from the sermons of Orson Pratt, who refers to Adam as the first man, the first of all men, the Ancient of Days, etc. To meet the argument of Elder Roberts in the application of the word replenish he shows that the word may be used, and signifies, to fill as well as to fill again.*

*To meet the statement of Orson Hyde, Elder Smith says that Orson Hyde was not discussing the subject of Pre-Adamites, but was preaching upon marriage, and referred to Pre-Adamites incidentally. He admits that President Young was present, and that he endorsed the remarks made.*

*While there are many quotations cited by Elder Smith which refer to Adam as the first man, the following is the only one in which a pre-Adamic race is referred to. It is quoted under the heading: "Testimony of Charles W. Penrose":*

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

*(signed) Joseph F. Smith  
John R. Winder  
Anthon H. Lund*

*While this quotation is signed by the Presidency of the Church, it is given under the heading of "Testimony of President Charles W. Penrose."*

*After hearing granted to Elder Smith the following communication was received by the Presidency:*

*January 21, 1931*

*President Heber J. Grant & Counselors,  
Dear Brethren:*

*We, the Council of the Twelve, to whom was referred the letter of Elder B. H. Roberts addressed to the First Presidency, a criticism of a certain discourse delivered by Elder Joseph Fielding Smith and published in the Genealogical Magazine, October, 1930, beg leave to report that we have given the time of three rather lengthy meetings to this matter.*

*At the first meeting Elder Roberts read and submitted a paper embodying his views at some length on the theory of pre-Adamic races, based on scientific investigation – a theory, we understand, which Elder Roberts has promulgated in some of his public utterances among the Latter-day Saints.*

*At the third meeting Elder Joseph fielding Smith read and submitted a paper in which he defended the claim he made in the sermon published in the Genealogical Magazine above referred to, viz.; that pre-Adamic races on the earth is simply a theory and not a Church doctrine, and is not true. This he sought to prove by quoting Joseph Smith, the Prophet, Brigham Young, Parley P. Pratt, Orson Pratt, John Taylor and other high Church Authorities, particularly the late First Presidency, Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder, and Anthon H. Lund*

*He also quoted a number of passages from the Bible, Book of Mormon, Doctrine & Covenants and Pearl of Great Price, pointing to the facts, as he construed them, that there were no pre-Adamic races of man on the earth, neither was there death upon the earth prior to the time of Adam.*

*We quote a sentence from Elder Roberts' letter: "If Elder Smith is merely putting forth his own opinions I call in question his competency to utter such dogmatism either as a scholar or as an Apostle. I am sure he is not competent to speak in such manner from general learning or special research work on the plain implication at least of the scriptures, both ancient and modern, and with the teaching of a more experienced and learned and earlier Apostle than himself, and a contemporary of the Prophet Joseph Smith."*

*This reference and language we regard as very offensive on the part of Elder Roberts, who fails to show the deference due from one brother to another brother of higher rank in the Priesthood. However, it may be said that these brethren affirmed at the close of the meeting that they entertained no ill feeling, one toward the other.*

*Elder Roberts' letter is herewith returned and the two papers alluded to are now submitted tot the Presidency. The Twelve await your further instructions relative to this matter, if you have any to give.*

*Sincerely your brethren,  
The Council of the Twelve  
By (signed) Rudger Clawson, Pres."*

*It will be observed that no suggestion is made in this communication regarding the attitude of the Council of Twelve in respect to the question involved in the controversy under consideration.*

*On February 9<sup>th</sup> the following communication was received from Elder Roberts:*

*"President Heber J. Grant and Counselors,  
Building*

*Dear Brethren:*

*I feel almost as if I ought to apologize in addressing this letter to you lest you think that I am over-persistent in the representation of things referred to herein.*

*You will recall that the letter I wrote to you asking the questions in relation to the status of Elder Joseph Fielding Smith's discourse published in the Genealogical Magazine for October last, was referred to the Twelve for consideration. Agreeably to a request of theirs I submitted a paper (fifty type-written pages) setting forth precisely some of the objections I had to the discourse. Two weeks later, bringing us to January 21, Elder Smith submitted a paper of about the same length to the Apostles, myself being present. Since which time I have understood that a report was made to the First Presidency of which I have no copy. That is now three weeks ago and just what the status of the discussion or action upon it is I have not, up to the present, learned.*

*The questions involved are of very great importance from my standpoint. As for instance, I would not like the matter to go to judgment as matters now stand until I have an opportunity to point out what to me are the weakness and inconsistency of Elder Smith's paper. There was really no discussion on the subject before the Twelve, except the presentation of these two papers, and they represent solely the basis of discussion, not the discussion itself. And I have much more to present after hearing Elder Smith's reply to my paper, which should be said before any decision is rendered.*

*To me both the discourse on the points questioned and the paper in defense of them is slighter than a house of cards. Yet it was on such pabulum as this that suspended the publication of my book – now in manuscript – “The Truth, The Way, The Life!” This book from my judgment of it is the most important work that I have yet contributed to the Church, the six-volume Comprehensive History of the Church not omitted.*

*Life at my years and with an incurable ailment is very precarious, and I should dislike very much to pass on without completing and publishing this work. I therefore ask that in any arrangement that may be made for a further hearing, I may be permitted to present my views on Elder Smith's paper in reply to mine, and if the position he has taken can be met successfully, then I think the principal cause of suspending the publication of my work, “The Truth, The Way, The Life” will be removed. All which is respectfully submitted,*

*Very truly your brother,  
(signed) B. H. Roberts”*

*After receipt of this latter communication the Presidency carefully reviewed the papers which had been submitted to the Council of Twelve, and after prayerful consideration decided that nothing would be gained by a continuation of the discussion of the subject under consideration.*

*The statement made by Elder Smith that the existence of pre-Adamites is not a doctrine of the Church is true. It is just as true that the statement: “There were*

*not pre-Adamites upon the earth”, is not a doctrine of the Church. Neither side of the controversy has been accepted as a doctrine at all.*

*Both parties make the scripture and the statements of men who have been prominent in the affairs of the Church the basis of their contention; neither has produced definite proof in support of his views.*

*We quote the following from the Millennial Star, February 19, 1931:*

*“The sun is giving out energy daily. In a few million (or billion) years its energy will be gone. The other heavenly bodies are radiating and losing their heat; and in time they will be no better off than the age-bitten sun. The universe will run down. Then, on earth, there will be no summer and winter, perhaps no light and day, but just eternal twilight of middle African temperature, in the monotony of which all life will perish. So warns Sir James Jeans, famous British scientist, and brilliant writer and lecturer. Well for us that day is distant – a billion years or so – but, think of the grandchildren.*

*There is a ray of hope.*

*Dr. Robert A. Millikan, famous American scientist, and brilliant writer and lecturer, has discovered cosmic rays, sources of energy, that come from the uttermost confines of the universe to replenish the energy we lose by radiation. Out in the depths of space, by means unknown to us, the lost energy is assembled, converted, concentrated and sent back to delay the evil day. In short, Dr. Millikan says that this is a self-winding, self-repairing deathless universe. Day and night, summer and winter, may follow one another endlessly. That is more cheerful.*

*Whom are we to believe? These men are both world famous; both experimenters of the first rank, both honest men. Perhaps Dr. Millikan gives us a clue in his address as retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, delivered last Christmas week. He says:*

*“If Sir James Jeans prefers to hold one view and I another on this question, no one can say unsay. The one thing of which you may all be quite sure is that neither of us knows anything about it.”*

*This is the frank and truthful admission of one of the foremost scientists of the world, an honest man, earnestly searching after truth, which he admits has not been definitely discovered.*

*The Prophet Joseph Smith said: “Oh, ye elders of Israel, hearken to my voice; and when you are sent into the world to preach, tell those things you are sent to tell; preach, and cry aloud, “Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand; repent and believe the Gospel.” Declare the first principles, and let mysteries alone, lest ye be overthrown...Elder Brown, when you go to Palmyra say nothing about the four beasts, but preach those things the Lord has told you to preach about – repentance and baptism for the remission of sins.”*

*We call attention to the fact that when one of the general authorities of the Church makes a definite statement in regard to any doctrine, particularly when*

*the statement is made in a dogmatic declaration of finality, whether he express it as his opinion or not, he is regarded as voicing the Church, and his statements are accepted as the approved doctrines of the Church, which they should be.*

*Upon the fundamental doctrines of the Church we are all agreed. Our mission is to bear the message of the restored gospel to the people of the world. Leave Geology, Biology, Archaeology and Anthropology, no one of which has to do with the salvation of the souls of mankind, to scientific research, while we magnify our calling in the realm of the Church.*

*We can see no advantage to be gained by a continuation of the discussion to which reference is here made, but on the contrary are certain that it would lead to confusion, division and misunderstanding if carried further. Upon one thing we should all be able to agree, namely, that Presidents Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder and Anthon H. Lund were right when they said: "Adam is the primal parent of our race."*

*April 7 (1931) – Free discussion ensued and decision approved. The subject of pre-Adamites not to be discussed in public by the brethren either for or against the theory as the Church has not declared itself and its attitude on the question. (George F. Richards, Diary)*

*Apr. 7, Tues. (1931) – Attended a called meeting of the General Authorities of the Church, all present, beginning at 9:00 a.m. and lasting until nearly 1 p.m. The principle subject was the consideration of a subject brought to the front by Elder B. H. Roberts, who addressed a letter to the First Presidency asking whether certain utterances by Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, made at a meeting under Genealogical Society auspices last October, were to be accepted as an expression of personal opinion or as an authoritative pronouncement. Involved in this question is that of the beginning of life upon the earth, and as to whether there was death either of animal or plant before the fall of Adam, on which proposition Elder Smith was very pronounced in denial and Elder Roberts equally forceful in the affirmative. As to whether preadamite races existed upon the earth there has been such discussion among some of our people of late. The decision reached by the First Presidency, and announced tot his morning's assembly, was in answer to a specific question that obviously the doctrine of the existence of races of human beings upon the earth prior to the fall of Adam was not a doctrine of the Church; and, further that the conception embodied in the belief of many to the effect that there were no such preadamite races, and that there was no death upon the earth prior to Adam's fall is likewise declared to be no doctrine of the Church. I think the decision of the First Presidency is a wise one in the premises. This is one of the many things upon which we cannot preach with assurance and dogmatic assertions on either side are likely to do harm rather than good. (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:42)*

*April 10, 1931*

*George Albert Smith, Chairman*

*David O. McKay*

*Joseph Fielding Smith*

*Stephen L. Richards*

*Melvin J. Ballard*

*Members of Committee*

*Dear Brethren:*

*Under the reference made by the First Presidency to the Twelve on Thursday, I appoint you as the committee to call in Brother Roberts and to make an earnest effort to compose matters and induce him, if possible, to consent to the elimination from his manuscript of any illusion to the theory of a pre-Adamic race or races already reported by your committee.*

*If Brother Roberts refuses to eliminate from the manuscript the objectionable features referred to he should be given to understand that his manuscript cannot be published and could not be used as a text book by the quorums of the Priesthood of the Church.*

*Trusting that Brother Roberts will see the wisdom of making the concessions desired, that an excellent work may not go unpublished and be lost to the Church, I am*

*Sincerely your brother,*

*(signed) Rudger Clawson*

*Aug. 9, Sun. (1931) - I was the speaker at the afternoon services in the Tabernacle, taking the subject "The Earth and Man." (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:58)*

*"The Earth and Man"*

*By James E. Talmage*

*Address Delivered in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, Utah, Sunday, August 9, 1931. Originally published in the Deseret News, Nov. 21, 1931; subsequently published as a pamphlet by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1931; later published in The Instructor, vol. 100, no. 12 (Dec. 1965), pg. 474-477; continued in vol. 101, no. 1 (Jan. 1966), pg. 9-15. (Mimeographed copy of a reprint from The Deseret News in my possession).*

*"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." (Gen. 1:1-2).*

*Any question as to when that beginning was is largely futile because [it is] unanswerable. In the first place we have no time unit by which to measure*

*back through the ages to the time at which, so far as the earth is concerned, time began.*

*Years are as inadequate in any attempted survey of the stages of earth development as are miles to the astronomer who would span the distances of interstellar space. He speaks in terms of light-years, such unit being the distance traversed by a ray of light speeding on at the rate of approximately 186,000 miles per second throughout a year.*

*Secondly, we are without information as to what stage of earth development is indicated by "the beginning." And what is a beginning in nature? At best it is but a new start in advance of what had passed up to that point of time; and every beginning is an ending of what went immediately before, even as every consummation is a commencement of something greater, higher, and therefore superior to the past.*

#### *The Earth Older Than Man*

*To the thoughtful mind there can be no confusion of the beginning spoken of in the opening verse of genesis with the advent of man upon the changing earth; for by the scriptural record itself we learn of stage after stage, age after age of earth processes by which eventually this planet became capable of supporting life -- vegetable, animal and human in due course.*

*Whether or not scientists have been able to see, however dimly, the way by which the earth as an orb in space was formed, matters little except as a subject of academic interest. For many years it was very generally believed that the earth, once formless and void, passed through stages of cooling of superheated gas to liquid, thence to the solid state, as the Nebular Theory assumed; but this conception has given way to the later thought that the earth as a solid spheroid has resulted from the bringing together of particles once diffused in space -- this being the basis of the Planetesimal Hypothesis.*

*But this we know, for both revealed and discovered truth, that is to say both scripture and science, so affirm -- that plant life antedated animal existence and that animals preceded man as tenants of earth.*

#### *Life and Death Before Man's Advent*

*According to the conception of geologists the earth passed through ages of preparation, to us unmeasured and immeasurable, during which countless generations of plants and animals existed in great variety and profusion and gave in part the very substance of their bodies to help form certain strata which are still existent as such. [This was written before the introduction of radioactive isotope dating techniques.]*

*The oldest, that is to say the earliest, rocks thus far identified in land masses reveal the fossilized remains of once living organisms, plant and animal. The coal strata, upon which the world of industry so largely depends, are essentially but highly compressed and chemically changed vegetable substance. The whole series of chalk deposits and many of our deep-sea limestones contain the skeletal remains of animals. These lived and died, age after age, while the earth was yet unfit for human habitation.*

#### *From the Simple to the Complex*

*From the fossil remains of plants and animals found in the rocks the scientist points to a very definite order in the sequence of life embodiment, for the older rocks, the earlier formations, reveal to us organisms of simplest*

*structure only, whether of plants or animals. These primitive species were aquatic; land forms were of later development. Some of these simpler forms of life have persisted until the present time, though with great variation as the result of changing environment.*

*Geologists say that these very simple forms of plant and animal bodies were succeeded by others more complicated; and in the indestructible record of the rocks they read the story of advancing life from the simple to the more complex, from the single-celled protozoan to the highest animals, from the marine algae to the advanced types of flowering plant -- to the apple-tree, the rose, and the oak.*

*What a fascinating story is inscribed upon the stony pages of the earth's crust! The geologists, who through long and patient effort has learned at least a little of the language in which these truths are written, finds the pages illustrated with pictures, which for fidelity of detail excel the best efforts of our modern engravers, lithographers and half-tone artists. The pictures in the rocks are the originals, the rest at best but copies.*

*In due course came the crowning work of this creative sequence, the advent of man! Concerning this all-important event we are told that scientists and theologians are at hopeless and irreconcilable variance. I regard the assumption or claim, whichever it be, as an exaggeration. Discrepancies that trouble us now will diminish as our knowledge of pertinent facts is extended. The creator has made record in the rocks for man to decipher; but He has also spoken directly regarding the main stages of progress by which the earth has been brought to be what it is. The accounts can not be fundamentally opposed; one can not contradict the other; though man's interpretation of either may be seriously at fault.*

#### *Adam a Historic Personage*

*So far as the history of man on the earth is concerned the scriptures begin with the account of Adam. True, the geologist does not know Adam by name; but he knows and speaks of man as an early, continuing and present form of earth-life, above and beyond all other living things past or present.*

*We believe that Adam was a real personage, who stands at the head of his race chronologically. To my mind Adam is a historic personage, not a prehistoric being, unidentified and uncertain.*

*If the Usher chronology be correct, or even approximately so, then the beginning of Adamic history as recorded in scripture dates back about 4000 years before the birth of Christ. We as a Church believe that the current reckoning of time from the birth of Christ to the present is correct, namely 1931 years -- not from last New Year's day, January 1, but from the month that came to be known among the Hebrews as Nisan or Ahib, corresponding with our late March and early April. So we believe that we are now living in the 1931st year since the birth of Christ, and therefore 5931 years since the beginning of the Adamic record.*

*This record of Adam and his posterity is the only scriptural account we have of the appearance of man upon the earth. But we have also a vast and ever-increasing volume of knowledge concerning man, his early habits and customs, his industries and works of art, his tools and implements, about which such scriptures as we have thus far received are entirely silent. Let us not try to wrest the scriptures in an attempt to explain away what we can not*

*explain. The opening chapters of Genesis, and scriptures related thereto, were never intended as a text-book of geology, archaeology, earth-science or man-science. Holy Scripture will endure, while the conceptions of men change with new discoveries. We do not show reverence for the scriptures when we misapply them through faulty interpretation.*

#### *Primary and Secondary Causes*

*There has been much discussion over the alleged conflict between the teachings of science and the doctrines of the revealed word concerning the origin of man. Let it be remembered that the term origin is almost invariably used in a relative sense. The mind of man is unable to grasp the fundamental thought of an absolute or primary origin. Every occurrence man has witnessed is the result of some previously acting cause or purpose; and that cause in turn was the effect or result of causes yet more remote. Perhaps we have never been able to trace an effect to its primary or original cause. Man may say that he understands the origin of an oak in the acorn form from which it sprang; but is not the acorn the fruit of a yet earlier oak, and so in reality rather a continuation than a beginning? Yet there is something fascinating in the thought of a beginning; the persistence of a process once started is far less mysterious than its inception.*

*It is not enough to refer effects to the First Great Cause; it is unsatisfying and not always reverent to answer questions as to how things came to be what they are by the easy statement that God made them so. With such an answer the scientific man has little patience. The fact that all created things are the works of God and that all processes of nature are due to Him as the administrator of law and order is to the scientific mind an axiom requiring neither argument nor demonstration. The botanist knows that God makes the plant grow; but he, weak mortal, is devoting time and energy of body, mind and spirit, to a study of the way in which God works such a marvelous miracle. The geologist knows that God created the earth; but the best effort of his life is put forth in the hope of finding out in some degree, however small, the method by which the Creator wrought this wondrous world. The astronomer gazing into the starry depths sees in their orderly procession the Lord Eternal walking in His majesty and might; and in humility the student of the heavenly bodies spends days and nights striving to learn a little of the way in which God worked out the marvel of the universe.*

*In proportion as any one of these may learn of the ways of God he becomes wise. To be able to think as God thinks, to comprehend in any degree His purposes and methods, is to become in that measure like unto Him, and to that extent to be prepared for eventual companionship in His presence. The scientist is busily engaged in the study of secondary causes -- the ways and means by which God works and through which He accomplishes His miracle, ever beginning, never ending -- and in his search for the truth the student of science scarcely dares lift his eyes to look toward the First Great Cause, the Eternal Power that stands and operates behind and above all the secondary causes, or what we call the processes of Nature.*

#### *The Origin of Man*

*The question involved in the origin of man, therefore, is not raised as a challenge to the belief and declaration that he came to earth through Divine direction, but it is in the nature of an inquiry as to the conditions under which*

*he came. There are many who claim that man's advent upon the earth was effected through processes of evolution from lower forms, processes that had been operative for ages, processes by which man is made kin to the brute and a development from the lowest type of organism. Others affirm that he differs from all mortal creatures of lower rank, not only in degree but in kind; in short, that he is not one with the animal creation and that therefore his coming was in no sense a natural and necessary result of earlier animal life. Discussion on this question has developed intense animus, and too often the quest for truth has been lost sight of in the strife for triumph.*

*In speaking of the origin of man we generally have reference to the creation of man's body; and, of all the mistakes that man has made concerning himself, one of the greatest and the gravest is that of mistaking the body for the man. The body is no more truly the whole man than is the coat the body. The man, as an individual intelligence, existed before his earthly body was framed and shall exist after that body has suffered dissolution. Let it not be assumed that belief in the existence of man's spirit is a conception founded upon scriptural authority only; on the contrary, let it be known that it is in accordance with the best and most advanced scientific thought and philosophic belief of the day to hold that man consists of spirit and body; and Divine revelation makes plain that these together constitute the soul.*

*We have difficulty in comprehending processes for which we find no analogy in things familiar. Even were it possible for us to know in detail the way in which the body of man was formed and then endowed with the power of procreation, insuring the perpetuity of the race, it would throw but little light upon the subject of the ultimate origin of man. We know but little of things beyond the sphere upon which we live except as information has been revealed by a power superior to that of earth, and by an intelligence above that of man. Notwithstanding the assumption that man is the culmination of an evolutionary development from a lower order of beings, we know that the body of man today is in the very form and fashion of his spirit, except indeed for disfigurements and deformities. The perfect body is the counterpart of the perfect spirit and the two are the constituent entities of the soul.*

#### *By What Standard?*

*Much depends upon the standard by which we judge as to whether any particular organism shall be pronounced of high or lower rank. By the standard of powers of flight, in which the bird excels, man is a very inferior being; if judged by fleetness of foot he is far below the deer; by gage [gauge] of strength he is inferior to the horse and the elephant; and yet man holds dominion over these and all other living things of earth. In certain important points of body-structure man stands low in the scale if he be graded strictly in accordance with the accepted standard of mammalian anatomy.*

*In the course of creative events the earth came to a condition fitted for the abiding place of the sons and daughters of God; and then Adam came forth upon the earth. But the beginning of man's mortal existence upon the earth was not the beginning of man; he had lived before, even as he shall live after the earth has passed away and its place taken by a new earth and a new heaven.*

### *Man and the Ape*

*It has been stated by certain extremists that evolution affirms that man is in the line of posterity from the ape. But scientists today discredit this view. The most that even radical evolutionists assert is that the similarity of structure between man and certain apes indicates the possibility of a common ancestor of the two but between man and the ape there are more essential differences than resemblances.*

*True, man does not excel in strength of limb, agility, or speed, but in the God-given powers of mind and in the possession of superior ambition and effort. Hear the words of one who until his death was regarded as among the foremost of American geologists, James D. Dana:*

*"Man's origin has thus far no sufficient explanation from science. His close relations in structure to the man-apes are unquestionable. They have the same number of bones with two exceptions, and the bones are the same in kind and structure. The muscles are mostly the same. Both carry their young in their arms. The affiliations strongly suggest community of descent. But the divergencies ... especially the cases of degeneracy in man's structure, exhibited in his palmigrade feet and the primitive character of his teeth, allying him in these respects to the Lower Eocene forms, are admitted proof that he has not descended from any type of ape. In addition, man's erect posture makes the gap a very broad one. The brute, the ape included, has powerful muscles in the back of the neck to carry the head in its horizontal position, while man has no such muscles, as anyone of the species can prove by crawling for a while on 'all fours.' Beyond this, the great size of the brain, his eminent intellectual and moral qualities, his voice and speech, give him sole title to the position at the head of the kingdoms of life. In this high position, he is able to use Nature as his work-mate, his companion, and his educator, and to find perpetual delight in her harmonies and her revelations. ...*

*"Whatever the results of further search, we may feel assured, in accord with Wallace, who shares with Darwin in the authorship of the theory of Natural 'Selection, that the intervention of a Power above nature as at the basis of man's development. Believing that Nature exists through the will and ever-acting power of the Divine Being, and that all its great truths, its beauties, its harmonies, are manifestations of His wisdom and power, or, in the words nearly of Wallace, that the whole universe is not merely dependent on, but actually is, the will of one Supreme Intelligence. Nature, with man as its culminant species, is no longer a mystery." James D. Dana, Manual of Geology, 4th edition, page 1036.*

*These lines were written before the death of the writer -- and constitute his last testament and testimony as to the origin of the species to which he himself belonged.*

### *Man's Place in Nature*

*In the work already cited, the same author wrote:*

*"Man stands in the successional line of the quadrumana, at the head of the animal kingdom. But he is not a primate among primates. The quadrumana are, as Cuvier called them, quadrumana from the first to the last. They are brute mammals, as is manifested in their carnivore-like canines and their powerful jaws; in their powerful muscular development; in their walking on all*

*fours, and the adaption thereto exhibited in the vertebrae, producing the convexity of the back; and also in other parts of the skeleton. Man, on the contrary, is not quadrumanous. ...*

*"Man was the first being, in the geological succession, capable of an intelligent survey of Nature and a comprehension of her laws; the first capable of augmenting his strength by bending nature to his service, rendering thereby a weak body stronger than all possible animal force; the first capable of deriving happiness from truth and goodness; of apprehending eternal right; of reaching toward a knowledge of self and God; the first, therefore, capable of conscious obedience or disobedience of a moral law, and the first subject to debasement of his moral nature through his appetites.*

*"There is in man, therefore, a spiritual element in which the brute has no share. His power of indefinite progress, his thoughts and desires that look onward even beyond time, his recognition of spiritual existence and of a Divinity above, all evince a nature that partakes of the infinite and divine. Man is linked to the past through the system of life, of which he is the last, the completing, creation. But, unlike other species of that closing system of the past, he, through his spiritual nature, is more intimately connected with the opening future." -- Dana, pages 1017-18.*

#### *A Later Authority*

*Let me cite a later authority than Dana. Among the living no anthropologist has been more pronounced in upholding the theories of Darwin and Lamarck than Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn.*

*By the theories mentioned man was said to have risen from tree-climbing ape-like ancestors. In his address as retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, December, 1929, Dr. Osborn affirms the untenability of the views he had so long and aggressively advocated. He regards the human bones unearthed at Piltdown, Sussex, England, as typical of the "Dawn Man," who was in every distinguishing characteristic, a man, not part man and part ape, but as to brain capacity and other evidences of mentality equal to some races now living. Yet Osborn holds to a communal origin of man and anthropoids related in structure, away back in the late Tertiary age of geologic history.*

*[In the 1965 Instructor version, a footnote points out that more recent analysis of the Piltdown Man skull has revealed that it is not an authentic specimen -- it had been "planted", evidently as a hoax.]*

*Thus theories come, endure for a season and go, like the fungi of the night; nevertheless they serve their purpose as temporary aids in human thought and endeavor.*

#### *The Time Element*

*The outstanding point of difference between those who take the opening chapters of Genesis and cognate scriptures as a the whole and only reliable record of the creation of earth and man, and the students of earth-science who fail to find an adequate record in scripture, is the point of time during which man in some state has lived on the planet.*

*Geologists and anthropologists say that if the beginning of Adamic history dates back but 6000 years or less, there must have been races of human sort upon earth long before that time -- without denying, however, that*

*Adamic history may be correct, if it be solely regarded solely as the history of the Adamic race.*

*This view postulates, by application of Dana's affirmation already quoted: "that the intervention of a power above Nature" brought about the placing of, let me say, Adam upon earth.*

*It is but fair to say that no reconciliation of these opposing conceptions has been effected to the satisfaction of both parties. We have not yet learned how to correlate geologic time-periods with terms of years, except as estimates, for which no absolutely dependable foundation may be found.*

#### *Nobility of Adam's Race*

*I do not regard Adam as related to -- certainly not as descended from -- the Neanderthal, the Cro-Magnon, the Peking or the Piltdown man. Adam came as divinely directed, created and empowered, and stands as the patriarchal head of his posterity -- a posterity, who, if true to the laws of God, are heirs to the Priesthood and to the glories of eternal lives.*

*Were it true that man is a product of evolution from lower forms, it is but reasonable to believe that he will yet develop into something higher. While it is a fact that eternal progression is a characteristic of man's Divine birthright, as yet we have learned nothing to indicate that man shall develop physically into any other form than that in which he now appears.*

*Many attempts have been made by those who regard man as an animal to frame some definition by which he may be distinctively described among his fellow animals; but of such attempts none have been satisfactorily successful. The difficulty lies in the fact already stated, that man differs from the animal creation not only in degree but in kind; he is the only being who has any conception of a preexistent state or an existence beyond the grave; the only being whose thoughts turn toward God and who feels in his soul the inspiring impulses of kinship to Deity. Believe not those who would make man but little above the brutes, when in truth he is but little below the angels, and if faithful shall pass by the angels and take his place among the exalted sons of God. The spirit of man is the offspring of the Eternal Father, and his body, if unmarred, is in the very form and fashion of that spirit.*

#### *The Ante-Mortal State*

*We have been told that Jesus Christ is in very truth our Elder Brother, and as to His preexistence in the spirit state there is little room for question. That His spirit was in the form of the earthly body which He afterward took, and which body was slain, buried, and resurrected, and with which body He ascended into heaven, is attested by scripture. Going back to the time immediately following the dispersion from Babel, we read of a prophet to whom the unembodied Lord revealed Himself, saying: "Behold, this body, which ye now behold, is the body of my spirit; and man have I created after the body of my spirit; and even as I appear unto thee to be in the spirit will I appear unto my people in the flesh." (Book of Mormon, Ether, 3:16).*

*It is evident from this scripture that in His preexistent state, that is to say in the state in which He existed prior to His earthly birth, Jesus Christ had the same form and stature that He afterward presented in the flesh. By natural processes His spirit shaped for itself a body from the material of earth, which body underwent a course of graded development until it reached maturity, in*

*which state that body was the counterpart tot he spirit whose material tabernacle it was. As with Jesus, so with all the sons and daughters of God; each had a spiritual existence before he entered upon this stage of mortal existence, and in each case the body is formed and fashioned by the power of the immortal spirit. In this process of body-shaping, the spirit may be hindered, hampered, and interfered with, through influences of heredity, through prenatal defects, or through accident and disease.*

*As to how were formed the bodies of the first human beings to take tabernacles, the revealed word gives no details while science has practically nothing to offer by way of explanation. As Dana so positively declares in the work already cited "Man's origin has thus far no sufficient explanation from science."*

*Man's mortal existence is but temporary to this earth; he came hither from another realm, in which he lived in an unembodied state and to which, in the natural order, he shall return in a disembodied state, following the change known as death. After the Body of the first man had been made ready through the direct operation of the creative power, the spirit of man entered that body. Note the sublimity of the scriptural declaration: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen 2:7).*

#### *A Power Above Nature*

*In the study of all the created things over which he has dominion, man has found it possible to investigate with some degree of success the secondary causes, or natural processes through which the creative power has operated to bring about the system that we designate as nature; but in the study of his own eternal self he is brought at once to the contemplation of the First Great Cause as to his origin. The power that lies at the basis of man's development is "a Power above Nature." That is to say, man, as a mortal being, exists as the result of a special and particular creation. Through graded stages the earth was brought into a state suited to the support of life. In orderly sequence plants and animals appeared; and when at last the world was prepared for its royal ruler, he came, even as had been declared:*

*"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.*

*"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.*

*"And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." (Gen. 1:26-28).*

*Such is the declaration of scripture regarding Adam's advent upon earth; and such is a fair summary of our knowledge upon the subject.*

#### *Evolution, True and False*

*Evolution is true so far as it means development, and progress, and advancement in all the works of God; but many of the vagaries that have been made to do duty under that name are so vague as to be unacceptable*

*to the scientific mind. At best, the conception of the development of man's body from the lower forms through evolutionary processes has been but a theory, an unproved hypothesis. Theories may be regarded as the scaffolding upon which the builder stands while placing the blocks of truth in position. It is a grave error to mistake the scaffolding for the wall, the flimsy and temporary structure for the stable and permanent. The scaffolding serves but a passing purpose, important though it be, and is removed as soon as the walls of that part of the edifice of knowledge have been constructed. Theories have their purpose and are indispensable, but they must never be mistaken for demonstrated facts. The Holy Scriptures should not be discredited by theories of men; they can not be discredited by fact and truth. Within the Gospel of Jesus Christ there is room and place for every truth thus far learned by man or yet to be made known. The Gospel is not behind the times, on the contrary it is up-to-date and ever shall be.*

*It is natural for the young and immature mind to think that what to it is new must of necessity be new to the world. Comparatively inexperienced students are discovering from time to time apparent discrepancies between the faith of their fathers and the development of modern thought; and these they are apt to magnify and exaggerate, when as a matter of fact, their great-grandfathers met the same seeming difficulties and yet survived. Believe not those who assert that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is in any way opposed to progress or inconsistent with advancement.*

#### *In the Lineage of Deity*

*Man is the child of God, he is born heir to boundless possibilities, the inheritor of the eternities to come. Among mortal beings, the law holds true that the posterity of each shall be after his kind. The child therefore may become like unto the parent; and man may yet attain the rank of godship. He is born in the lineage of Deity, not in the posterity of the brute creation.*

*I cite my words of an earlier day, with a quotation [neither the pamphlet nor the Instructor copy give the citation].*

#### *Man's Relative Littleness*

*The insignificance of man in comparison with the earth on which he dwells, and even with the limited topographical features of his world, has oft times been dwelt upon. Draw to scale a towering mountain and a man standing at its base or on its summit -- what does the man amount to? But then the earth as a planet is small compared with some others of its own system, to say nothing of the relative sizes of earth and sun. In turn, our entire solar system, in the measurement of which miles cease to have meaning -- so vast it is -- ranks low in dimensions as we gage [gauge] it with other families of worlds in the great galaxy of stars to which it belongs, and that immeasurable galaxy is but one among many, and not the greatest of them all.*

#### *Dream Vision of the Infinite*

*This hour is not well suited to the presentation of mathematical data relating to the extent of the universe; though it may permit us to indulge the contemplation of thought-pictures, bewildering though that indulgence may be. John Paul Richter's Dream Vision of the Infinite has been brought to English readers through several renditions; and I ask you to follow or accompany me through one of these, generally worded along the lines of the version given us by Thomas DeQuincey:*

*"God called up from dreams a man into the vestibule of heaven, saying 'Come thou hither and I will show thee the glories of my house.' And to the servants that stood around the throne he said 'Take the man and strip from him his robes of flesh; cleanse his vision and put a new breath into his nostrils; only touch not with any change his human heart -- the heart that fears and trembles.'*

*"It was done; and, with a mighty angel for his guide, the man stood ready for his infinite voyage. Then, from the terraces of heaven, without sound or farewell, they wheeled away into endless space. Sometimes, with solemn flight of angel wing, they fled through Zaarrahs of darkness, through wildernesses of death that divided the worlds of life. Sometimes they swept over frontiers that were quickening under prophetic motions from God.*

*"Then, from a distance that is counted only in heaven, light dawned for a time through a sleepy film. By unutterable pace the light swept to them, they by unutterable pace to the light. In a moment the rushing of planets was upon them; in a moment the blazing of suns was around them.*

*"Then came eternities of twilight, that revealed, but were not revealed. To the right hand and the left towered mighty constellations, that by self-repetitions and answers from afar, that by counterpositions, built up triumphal gates, whose architraves, whose archways -- horizontal, upright -- rested, rose -- at altitudes, by spans -- that seemed ghostly from infinitude. Without measure were the architraves, past number were the archways, beyond memory the gates!*

*"Within were stairs that scaled the eternities above, that descended to the eternities below; above was below, below was above to the man stripped of gravitating body. Depth was swallowed up in height insurmountable; height was swallowed up in depth unfathomable. Suddenly, as thus they rode from infinite to infinite, suddenly as thus they tilted over abysmal worlds, a mighty cry arose -- that systems more mysterious, that worlds more billowy, other heights and other depths were coming, were nearing, were at hand!*

*"Then the man sighed and stopped, shuddered and wept. His overladen heart uttered itself in tears; and he said 'Angel, I will go no father; for the spirit of man aches with this infinity. Insufferable is the glory of God. Let me lie down in the grave and hide myself from the persecutions of the infinite; for end, I see, there is none!'*

*"And from all the listening stars that shone around issued a choral chant, 'The man speaks truly; end is there none that ever yet we heard of.' 'End is there none?' the angel solemnly demanded. 'Is there, indeed, no end? And is this the sorrow that kills you?' Then the angel threw up his glorious hands to the heaven of heavens, saying 'End is there none to the universe of God! Lo, also, there is no beginning!'"*

#### *The Spiritual Grandeur of Man*

*What is man in this boundless setting of sublime splendor? I answer you: Potentially now, actually to be, he is greater and grander, more precious according to the arithmetic of God, than all the planets and suns of space. For him were they created; they are the handiwork of God; man is His son! In this world man is given dominion over a few things; it is his privilege to achieve supremacy over many things.*

*"The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handiwork." (Psa. 19:1). Incomprehensibly grand as are the physical creations of the earth and space, they have been brought into existence as means to an end, necessary to the realization of the supreme purpose, which in the words of the Creator is thus declared:*

*"For behold, this is my work and my glory -- to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man." (Pearl of Great Price, page 4).*

*It is decreed that this earth shall become a celestialized, glorified sphere; such is the revealed world. Science has nothing to say on the matter; it can neither refute nor prove. But the Lord, even God, hath spoken -- and so shall it be! Amen.*

September 9, 1931.

President Rudger Clawson  
And members of the Council of Twelve,  
47 East South Temple Street,  
Salt Lake City, Utah,  
U.S.A.

Dear Brethren:

*A letter enclosing Brother Talmage's sermon *The Earth and Man*, and requesting me to comment on the address for your next quarterly meeting, followed me to London where I am for the moment engaged in a variety of duties. In obedience to this request, I am sending on the following hurried notes.*

*I have read Brother Talmage's address twice and with care. The subjects therein treated, delicately yet forcefully, are of high importance to our youth who in the midst of modern-day knowledge are seeking to anchor their faith. And, I suspect that many of the older people are "at sea" on the same subjects. I am pleased, indeed, that the address was delivered publicly and hope that it may soon be published. It will guide, also, our missionaries, who, without a published pronouncement, fall into many errors in their private discussions, and often are placed at a disadvantage, especially in street meetings where open comment is allowed, and where the heckler is ever present.*

*It is exceedingly difficult to present such a subject in a sermon, where the limitations of time make full declarations and explanations of meaning impossible. However, Brother Talmage has so well condensed his statements in this address, that those who disagree with hi, will find it difficult to misquote or misinterpret him.*

*The theses which he defends represent Gospel truths as I understand the Gospel. I shall not suggest any changes in the text. Were Brother Talmage to enlarge the address, I would suggest certain amplifications, and the inclusion of more quotations from very recent writers (to meet possible objections), but the theses themselves I would recommend to be left unchanged.*

*I am especially pleased that attention is called to the fact, admitted by all profound workers in religion or science, that our knowledge is secure only to a certain point. The unknown is vast, and will require eternity for its exploration.*

*I am equally happy that the address calls attention to the nature of a scientific inference. The confusion of facts and inferences lies at the bottom of many of the differences among mankind.*

*True, the written or spoken word always suggests ideas, and requires some inferences; but such inferences should not be set up as final truth. We speak guardedly, as we should, of a scientific theory; but a theory in religion has no claim for greater respect than a theory in science. The fact of the matter is that during my life in the Church I have heard as many theories concerning religious matters, as I have heard in my professional life concerning scientific matters. A theory is a theory, whether in science or religion, and should not overawe us. Whenever I have kept that simple rule in mind, I have never found a conflict between science and religion. But, it is granted that such an attitude places many current ideas in the group of unknowns.*

*Perhaps, my personal views in this important field, may in part be expressed by my reaction to three questions asked, in a letter received almost coincidentally with the receipt of Brother Talmage's sermon. The writer, a recently released missionary, is a thorough latter-day saint, son of a well-known, devoted latter-day saint family. He is now studying in a European university. His missionary career was such as to entitle him to a super-honorable release, were such a thing possible. He asks three questions which among others have been asked me at least one hundred times while I have served in the European missions, and hundreds of times before, and which are answered in the Talmage address.*

1. *Did the creation of the earth occupy more than six days?*
2. *Was man the last of God's creations to come upon the earth?*
3. *How did man come upon the earth?*

*He quotes from our sacred scriptures to explain the cause of his confusion, and requests a reconciliation between scriptural statements and scientific findings. He also points out a lack of agreement among several scripture texts, pertaining to these subjects.*

*This brother, as many others, has fallen into the error of reading isolated texts instead of the full meaning of the messages of inspired men, and of accepting such texts without going back to their original meaning. Christendom has split time and again over texts. It is a truism to say that anything may be proved by the Bible—that is by the use of texts. The Lord inspires men with truth; they express the divine message as best they can. Prophets are instruments. Just as Brother Talmage has sought to set forth a few divine truths in a short sermon, so the prophets have ever attempted to express to the world the truths revealed to them. The Book of Mormon is a true record, translated by the gift and power of God, yet in it Nephi, Lehi, Alma, Moroni and the others speak with human imperfections in form and style. Moroni's plea for merciful criticism is one of the*

most beautifully pathetic passages in the world's literature. The scriptures bear only one message when read properly. A whole false theology might be built upon Brother Talmage's statement on page 8 that "the body is no more truly the man himself than is the coat the body." But, the context and later passages make the meaning fully plain and reasonable. The concern of the scriptures is to teach principles of faith and conduct. Details of fact are used to promote righteousness and human happiness, not to furnish information which man should dig out for himself.

Was the earth made in more than six days? The controversy has raged about the word "day", used in varying senses in the scriptures. When the day of twenty four hours seemed insufficient; the day of a thousand years was hit upon with equally dismal results. If my correspondent had read the fifth chapter of the Book of Abraham, and Alma's statement that "all is one day with God, and time only is measured unto men", he might have realized that the creative "days" were creative periods.

Was man the last of God's creations to come upon the earth? My correspondent quotes the Book of Moses, 3:7, as the disturbing text. A full reading of chapters 2 and 3 would show that chapter 3 deals with the spiritual creation of man, and that verse 7, when the advent of man is recounted, a "living soul, the first flesh upon the earth, the first man also"—terms in apposition—merely declares, though with tremendous meaning, that Adam was the first of the pre-existent children of the Lord to take upon himself an earth-body.

How did man come upon the earth? The young missionary has not learned the difference between an inference and a fact, and that the coming of man under the law of evolution has not risen, even in the minds of its most earnest, really scientific, advocates, above the position of an inference, subject to replacement as newer knowledge comes. He quotes Lehi's words that were it not for the transgression of Adam "all things which were created must have remained in the same state in which they were after they were created; and they must have remained forever, and had no end," and asks how that may be squared with man's knowledge of fossil remains. Yet, the brother, if he had read the whold chapter would have found there a splendid and luminous statement of the fact that Adam's progress on earth and hereafter, and that of his children, in accordance with a great plan, demanded that he use his will in choosing his course of action, and that in the transgression in Eden he chose to taste the bitter, that he might know the greater good. If Adam had not done this, the plan would have failed, all things "must have remained forever, and had no end." That is, the plan of progress for all things would have been defeated. And, it may be suggested that the transgression of Adam probably began in the eternities when he accepted the earthly commission, the consummation of which occurred in Eden. With respect to the question of man's origin, my correspondent is also troubled by the finds of what appears to be prehistoric men or man-like beings. I answered by suggesting, as has Brother Talmage, that we are descended from a man, Adam, an historic personage. We do not know all that has happened upon the earth, during its long existence; the Lord has not revealed all of his works to us, as yet.

So run my thoughts in this London hotel room. Brother Talmage has touched, intelligently and courageously, upon subjects which, really, are agitating the

*minds of young and old, many of whom dare not speak out for fear of ostracism. We are bound to have individual views, but they should not be pressed as certainties. Meanwhile, the subjects dealt with in the sermon in question seem to me to be beyond the field of inference; the word of revelation, fully read, is clear concerning these questions.*

*I had no idea that I would write so long a letter. Perhaps I have been led along unconsciously by the memory of the discussion concerning similar matters which occurred while I was home last spring when one of our council made clear and convincing argument regarding the pre-Adamite theory. Let him who may read this epistle to you, leave out most of it at his discretion. I trust, however, that I have made my thinking clear. If wrong, I am always ready to be corrected without hurt feelings. Of one thing I am certain, that over here, texts do not bring many into the Church, but hundreds are coming in annually, when they catch the great vision and full meaning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. And of another thing I feel as certain, that our young people must be helped in their search for truth by clear, clarifying statements concerning the conceptions that trouble them most in this new day.*

*All is well with us here.*

*May the Lord bless you and yours. I wish I could sit in with you at your meeting.*

*Sincerely and affectionately your brother,*

*(signed)*

*John A. Widtsoe.*

*Nov. 16, Mon. (1931) – I was called into brief consultation by the First Presidency on the subject of my Tabernacle address of August 9. (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:67)*

*SLC Monday Nov. 16, (1931) -- Brother James E. Talmage called and the Presidency went over his sermon delivered in the Tabernacle two or three months ago, which had been referred to the Apostles. They had not been able to agree on it. We asked him to go over his sermon and make some slight changes that had been suggested by the brethren, which he agreed to do. The matter had been in obedience as to its publication for many weeks. (Heber J. Grant Journal, p. 218)*

*SLC 17 Nov. (1931) -- At 11:30 Brother James E. Talmage called, and we went over his address delivered in the Tabernacle a number of weeks ago, and authorized its publication and also gave authorization for it to be printed in the same form as the radio addresses, for distribution. (Heber J. Grant Journal, p. 209)*

*Nov. 17, Tues. (1931) – According to appointment made yesterday the First Presidency gave special attention to the matter of my Tabernacle address before referred to, going over it with considerable care, though it was apparent to me that the brethren had before considered it among themselves and had*

*reached their decision. This they announced to me by way of instruction to send back the copy which I had recalled from the printer, and to have the address published in the Deseret News of next Saturday evening, and further to have it printed in pamphlet form. I shall make further comment when the address is actually in print. (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:67)*

*November 20, 1931*

*Report of President Clawson made at the regular weekly meeting of the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve, October 1.*

*The Council of the Twelve were in session on Tuesday, September 29, their quarterly meeting day.*

*I am prompted to give rather a full report of our proceedings because of the importance already attached to Brother Talmage's sermon which was referred to the Twelve for their opinion as to whether or not it should be published.*

*The whole day was given over to a consideration of this matter. Nearly all, if not all, the brethren spoke expressing their views with reference to various portions of the sermon which, in the views expressed, were quite fully analyzed.*

*Early in the discussion one of the brethren said he could not see an objectionable utterance in the sermon whatever, that, in his opinion, it is exactly what is needed to be placed in the hands of our young people who are tinged with skepticism, to reconcile them to the teachings of the gospel. He reported that a great number of copies of the sermon had been applied for to distribute among the young people of the Church.*

*Others of the brethren did not apparently entertain this view.*

*The consensus of opinion was, as I interpreted it, that inferences might be drawn from the sermon, if published in its present form, that would lead to much discussion in the Church and possibly put into the minds of many people doubts in relation to the correctness of some matters, or doctrines, given to the Church by Divine Revelation. As for instance, it is well understood by the brethren of this Council to be a doctrine of the gospel, given to the Church by Divine Revelation, through Joseph Smith, the Prophet, that Adam was the first man (on the earth); that he was and is the Father of the human family, and presides over the human family under Christ; that he is the Ancient of Days, which in itself is a very significant title; that mortality and death upon the earth came through the fall and the fall came by the transgression of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. I take it for granted that the brethren of this Council accept these doctrines as fully and completely without mental reservation.*

*This was one phase of the question under discussion. Now, let me point out the other principal phase briefly, and as fairly as I am able to do..*

*The sermon in one paragraph sets forth the claim, (which to do justice to Brother Talmage, is given as the views of eminent scientific men) that there was life and death upon the earth in an endless succession of animals and plants running*

*back into the ages and ages that are past, thus leaving one to infer that there was life and death upon the earth before Adam, or prior to the fall.*

*Wherever in the Church the discussion takes this phase our young people will be left to choose between Divine Revelation and the claims of science, which latter are often based on theory.*

*And again, the scientific theory, or claim, is set forth in the sermon to the effect that man finally emerged, or was developed from and through a line of animal life reaching back, into numberless ages of the past, to the protoplasm. This of course is the doctrine of evolution and is as I understand it repugnant to the teachings of the Church of Christ.*

*Should this phase of the sermon be discussed among our people, many misleading inferences would be drawn, and questions like this might arise: If there was life and death and a race of man before the fall of Adam, then there must have been two Adams and two falls, also two fathers of the human family? All of which would lead to utter confusion.*

*Finally a motion was made and seconded to the effect that in the opinion of the Twelve the sermon should not be published. This motion, after some further discussion, was followed by a substitute motion to the effect that the sermon be returned to Brother Talmage and that he be requested to remodel it if possible by cutting out the objectionable features. Brother Talmage consented to do this.*

*The substitute motion was adopted. The matter will be further considered by the Twelve. I may be permitted to say that throughout the discussion good feelings were maintained by the brethren who appeared, notwithstanding difference of opinion, to desire to do the right thing.*

*Note: When this report was made to the Council some of the brethren took exception to the expression, "reaching back into numberless ages of the past to the protoplasm." I presume I should have said "reaching back into numberless ages of the past to the single-celled protoplasm."*

*November 20, 1931*

*Hon. Reed Smoot  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C.*

*(Personal)*

*Dear Brother Smoot:*

*Enclosed is an advance copy of a pamphlet carrying the much discussed address "The Earth and Man." Since you left us the matter of the proposed and*

*opposed publication of this address has had further consideration, the final and deciding stages of which, so far as I have learned, are about as follows:*

*Two weeks ago the Presidency called for a report on the matter and for an explanation as to the cause of the long delay. On being informed of the diverging views of some of the brethren the Presidency (President Ivins presiding in the absence of President Grant), announced that they would reassume charge. On Monday last, the 16<sup>th</sup>, I was called into consultation and saw that the Presidency had already arrived at a decision; but they desired to consider with me some of the minor changes that had been proposed, and this was done on the following morning. Then I was instructed to send the copy to the printer without further delay. The address will appear in tomorrow evening's Deseret News, and by special direction of the Presidency the address is issued in pamphlet form I shall see that a package of these pamphlets is sent you as soon as delivery is made here by the printers.*

*You will observe that the one proposed change to which you objected has not been made, the brethren having expressed your own thought that this point is important. A very slight re-wording has been made; but as a matter of fact there are none but such slight and minor changes, excepting one proposed by myself—the cutting out of about half of the long quotation from Dana, the doing of which is an advantage.*

*Then I consider the extent of the collateral or but remotely connected subjects that have been discussed in connection with the consideration of this address I am astonished at my own remarkable ability (?) to crowd so much into that forty minute talk. Yesterday after the decision had been announced a query was introduced as to whether all individual life forms below the status of man – these including the higher animals and plants down to the coral polyps and the bacteria – are to be separately, that is individually, resurrected! The subject was carried over for further consideration, and I wish you could be here to take part in the friendly discussion. Of course, all the brethren accept the decision of the First Presidency with good feeling.*

*Cordially your brother,*

*(signed)*

*James E. Talmage*

*Kindly give my very best regards to Sister Smoot and be assured of prayerful and loyal support in your exacting service.*

*Nov. 21, Sat. (1931) – the address of August 9 appears in the Church section of this day's Deseret News, and the delivery of the pamphlets carrying the address was made to us today. The cause of the long delay in publishing this address, and some incidental points of interest, should perhaps be noted here. The*

subject is "THE EARTH AND MAN." A copy of the complete pamphlet will be bound in with this Journal. See entry herein for Tuesday, April 7, 1931.

On April 5, 1930, Elder Joseph Fielding Smith of the Council of the Twelve made an address at the Genealogical conference, which was published in "The Utah Genealogical and Historical Magazine" of October, 1930. This address was entitled "Faith Leads to a Fulness of Truth and Righteousness."

The following is taken from page 148 of the magazine referred to:

"No Death on the Earth Before Adam"

"As I have read, the Lord pronounced the earth good when it was finished. Everything upon its face was called good. There was no death in the earth before the fall of Adam. I do not care what the scientists say in record to dinosaurs and other creatures upon the earth millions of years ago that lived and died and fought and struggled for existence. When the earth was created and was declared good peace was upon its face among all its creatures. Strife and wickedness were not found here, neither was there any corruption. I do not know how long the earth was in course of preparation. I do not care. That has nothing to do with the plan of salvation. It is sufficient for me to know that after some lengthy period of time, or times, called days, the earth was finished and pronounced good by its Creator. All life in the sea, the air, on the earth, was without death. Animals were not dying. Things were not changing as we find them changing in this mortal existence, for mortality had not come. Today we are living in a world of change because we are living under very different conditions from those which prevailed in the beginning and before the fall of man."

Elder B. H. Roberts, Senior President of the First Council of Seventy, inquired by letter addressed to the First Presidency as to whether these utterances of Elder Smith were to be construed as an expression of his personal opinion or as a doctrine of the Church. The Twelve considered the matter in several sessions and reported to the First Presidency, whose action is noted herein under date of April 7 last. Many of our students have inferred from Elder Smith's address that the Church refuses to recognize the findings of science if there be a word in scriptural record in our interpretation of which we find even a seeming conflict with scientific discoveries or deductions, and that therefore the "policy" of the Church is in effect opposed to scientific research.

In speaking at the Tabernacle on August 9 last I had not forgotten that in the pronouncement of the First Presidency mentioned under date of April 7 last it was advised and really required that the General Authorities of the Church refrain from discussing in public, that is preaching, the debatable subject of the existence of human kind upon the earth prior to the beginning of Adamic history as recorded in scripture; but, I had been present at a consultation in the course of which the First Presidency had commented somewhat favorably upon the suggestion that sometime, somewhere, something should be said by one or more of us to make plain that the Church does not refuse to recognize the discoveries and demonstrations of science, especially in relation to the subject at issue. President Anthony W. Ivins, of the First Presidency, presided at the Tabernacle meeting, and three members of the Council of the Twelve were

*present – Elders George F. Richards, Joseph Fielding Smith and Richard R. Lyman. Of course, Elder Smith, and in fact all of us, recognize that my address was in some important respects opposed to this published remarks, but the other brethren named, including President Ivins, expressed their tentative approval of what I had said.*

*I am very grateful that my address has come under a very thorough consideration, and I may say investigation, by the First Presidency and the Council of the Twelve. The discussions throughout as relating to the matter have been forceful but in every respect friendly, and the majority of the Twelve have been in favor of the publication of the address from the time they first took it under consideration. I have hoped and fervently prayed that the brethren would be rightly guided in reaching a decision, and, as the Lord knows my heart, I have had no personal desire for triumph or victory in the matter, but have hoped that the address would be published or suppressed as would be for the best. The issue is now closed; the address is in print. (James E. Talmage Journal, 29:68-69)*

*(Sometime in November (?)--UNKNOWN letter from SWG (Grant's daughter ?) to Widtsoe)*

*“Joseph says that following a meeting of the General Authorities last April when you were home, he had a strong impression come to him to the affect that J.E. would never meet until he had obtained the privilege of giving him (J.) a public rebuke in the Tabernacle. Joseph told Brothers McKay and Whitney of this impression at that time. He says Brother Whitney was in full accord with him in his views on these matters now being questioned. Sometime about June, when Joseph was in the office of President Ivins discussing genealogical matters, President I. said to him in substance that J. E. was very anxious to answer him in the Tabernacle, and had been to the Presidency several times asking for this privilege but that the brethren had said to him the it was not the proper thing to do, and would only make matters worse. Time passed and late in September the announcement made in the Deseret News that J.E. was to speak on a certain question the following Sunday. It was to be the public rebuke. In that meeting President Ivins said to Joseph, who was there, that J.E. had been asking for the opportunity for a long time and finally the brethren had yielded. Joseph made no protest although he did not feel that it was right for J.E. to speak as he did. President Grant, himself, raised the question about the wisdom of publishing these remarks, and they have been held up from that time until now, although J. E. has been pleading constantly with the brethren to have his discourse published. I understand now that they are going to let him have his way. However, a strange thing occurred in a meeting of the Twelve. J. E. said, when the discourse was in question, that the Presidency (?) requested and appointed him to speak as he did, and he had not (?) it. This, as you may be sure raised the ire of Joseph. He arose and said that President Ivins said that J. E. had made repeated requests to (?) and the brethren had requested he should be the one. Joseph (.....?) of President I. said this he lied. This was intended, however, to convey the impression that Joseph had lied, but the brethren all knew who was telling the truth. Later in a meeting where President I. was present the matter of this discourse was mentioned. Joseph said to President I. “You will remember telling me that Brother T. had been down to you brethren*

*asking for the privilege of making answer to me, and you said you thought it should not be done." And the answer was "yes." Then by contortions the other man tried to twist the saying, but the brethren all knew that Joseph had spoken the truth, which was admitted by President Ivins.*

*I learn from other sources that J. E. and Guy (?) have been in the office of President Ivins repeatedly and have forever been condemning Joseph and asking that something be done to put him straight. The constant hammering has done its work, it seems. About half of the brethren are with Joseph, and the other half stand the other way, some of them, however, asking for some "modifications" in the discourse under question.*

*Joseph thinks it is very strange that the brethren are willing to listen to J.E. and publish what he says which is intended to put him right, and at the same time they are endeavoring to correct my father, Brigham Young, John Taylor, Joseph F. Smith and Orson and Parley Pratt, all of whom have said the same things which Joseph said and which have stirred up the evolutionists in the Church. Moreover, he says, if he is entitled to a rebuke, it is not the place of J. E. to administer it, but J. E. thinks it is.*

*(signed) SYG(?)*

*(November ?)  
Hon. James E. Talmage  
47 East South Temple Street  
Salt Lake City, Utah.*

*Dear Brother Talmage:*

*I sincerely thank you for your letter of November 20, 1931, in which you enclose an advance copy of a pamphlet of the much discussed address "The Earth and Man," delivered by yourself in the Salt Lake Tabernacle.*

*I am also pleased that you have sent me a package of the pamphlets for I shall take occasion to see that some of my particular friends will receive a copy of the same. I read the address over this morning and I haven't a word of complaint to offer against it and I am sure that it will be received by many of our thinking young men and women and greatly appreciate by them.*

*Give my kindest regards to Sister Talmage. With very best wishes for your future happiness, I remain*

*Your brother,*

*Reed Smoot*

*Blanding, Utah*

May 26<sup>th</sup> 1948

Elder John A. Widtsoe  
Salt Lake City.

Dear Brother Widtsoe,

Your article, "Were There pre-Adamites?" in the May number of Improvement Era, borders on a problem which has been put up to me by young people and skeptics, and I would appreciate what you have time and patience to say about the kind of answer I have made.

The evidences of the Cro-Magnon, Neanderthal and other races living from fifteen to sixty thousand years ago, or even earlier, is such that I do not challenge it, and in admitting that there may have been such ancient races, I do not admit that I am compromising in the least our belief that Adam was, "the first flesh upon the earth, the first man also." Moses 3:7

Also, if I concede that geologists have some reason for saying this earth may be two billion years old, I am still not yielding any doctrine of the scriptures as I understand them.

Men may have been here long before Adam came out of the garden of Eden, but as "the first flesh on earth," Adam, "The Ancient of Days," and one of the Creators of the earth, was here even before the introduction of the most primitive form of life which we find in the Cambrian layer. I know of no scripture indicating how long it has been since the introduction of that life in the Cambrian layer, or wherever it was that the first life was introduced.

That introduction of life on this earth was after the six creative periods spoken of in the accounts of the creation. When I contemplate the ponderous depth of strata from the bottom of Grand Canyon to what was the top of the mountains over Bryce Canyon country, it seems to prove a very great lapse of time, yet all of that was laid down after the end of the six creative periods, following the introduction of life on earth.

The "Garden eastward in Eden," would have, of course, to be something of comparatively recent geologic times. The record of the ice ages, as interpreted by many geological researchers, is quite in agreement with what we are told about the garden and its river parted into four heads.

My chief reason in wanting to be right on these matters, is that I might make a safe answer and defense of the scriptures such as I wanted very much to have some one make for me fifty years ago when I was troubled about the seeming contradiction between things as they appear and that which is written.

Do I have the right slant on it? An increasing number of people come to me for explanations of matters seeming to conflict with the revealed word, and while there are many things I do not have to answer, and am not able to answer, I want to be prepared to give safe answers about matters which can and should be answered.

*Your endorsement or your corrections will be duly appreciated.*

*Yours very sincerely,*

*Albert R. Lyman*

*June 14, 1948*

*Mr. Albert R. Lyman  
Blanding, Utah*

*My dear Brother Lyman:*

*Your interesting letter of May 20<sup>th</sup> really does not require any answer beyond my saying that in my thinking I follow yours as your letter states it. Further, as I say in my little article on Pre-Adamites, the Lord made the earth and in the making He may have done many things not according to my particular opinion, but whatever he did He had a right to do. If He chose to place man-like beings upon the earth before the days of Adam, I really have no right to find fault with that any more than with the placing on the earth of the great variety of life which we know lived there. There is nothing definite in the scriptures or in modern revelation as to the age of the earth. Personally, I take discoveries relative to that subject at face value, and set aside for later consideration the theories of men. Often there are contradictory theories in men's interpretations of facts.*

*I have often said, as you say in your letter, that Adam was no doubt upon this earth long before it had reached the condition to permit a Garden of Eden to be planted for he was one of those who, under God's command, organized the earth. Neither am I upset over the statement that Adam's was the first flesh upon the earth, because it seems from the context and from common sense, for that matter, that that means the first flesh of Adam's kind. There is so much connected with these matters that we do not understand that I am willing to take what little we know of a factual nature without offering any interpretations that may mislead others. Apparently, in your discussion of the subjects in your letter, you have followed almost precisely the method I have followed. I am glad of that, of course.*

*Leaving that subject, may I ask when are you going to write another book for the benefit of the Saints? Are you at work on something now, or is your present work so consuming that you have no time left for anything else?*

*Thank you for your letter. Let me have another.*

*All good wishes to you.*

*Cordially yours,*

*John A. Widtsoe*

Notes on a Conversation with President Joseph Fielding Smith in his Office.  
11:30 a.m.. Wednesday, December 29, 1954, on the Subject of the Book: Man,  
His Origin and Destiny. Present: Dr. and Mrs. Richard Poll

*President Smith began by remarking that he wondered if I knew what bad company I was in in the Mormon Seminar. He described Sterling McMurrin as the leader of the group and a man completely without a testimony. The bishop had planned to institute excommunication proceedings when President McKay had intervened, expressing a desire to talk to McMurrin first. President Smith did not know what the outcome might be.*

*My defense of the Seminar was based on the fact that many shades of opinion are represented in the group, and that its meetings are not devoted to theological matters but reports and discussions on topics which are amenable to academic investigation.*

*President Smith explained that he had long been concerned over the problem of evolutionist teaching and its effect on testimony, and that he had not published the book entirely on his own initiative. Two or three of the Apostles and two members of the First Council of Seventy had read the manuscript and urged him to publish it. While he did not state that it should be taken as an authoritative Church pronouncement, he declared that he would be happy to retreat from any position taken in the book which could be shown to be contrary to Scripture.*

*Question was raised concerning whether the Gospel requires a literal acceptance of the scriptures. President Smith answered in the affirmative. Question was then raised concerning the adequacy of the Scriptural references, about three in all, upon which the doctrine depends that there was not death upon the earth before the fall; this is the doctrine which is chiefly at issue between the literalists and many geologists, biologists, and historians in the Church. His reply was that these Scriptures are unequivocal, and sufficient for him.*

*President Smith read extensively from the Scriptures to demonstrate that the prophets have taught that the world was created, according to the Lord's time, in seven thousand years; that it has a temporal history of seven thousand years; and that the millennium and the [?] of the earth as a celestial abode are imminent. The recent earthquakes were cited as evidence on this point. He pointed out the Scripture that all life existed spiritually, before being placed on the earth, and repeatedly emphasized that God did not create death. Death is the consequence of the Fall, physically as well as spiritually, and for all forms of life, as well as the children of Adam. This belief is held to be basic to an understanding of the Atonement of Christ, though President Smith acknowledged that there are those in the Church who apparently accept the Atonement without following the literalist explanation of creation and the Fall.*

*Asked if there has not been difference of opinion on this subject among the General Authorities since the early days of the Church, President Smith stated that that is possibly true. He is also aware that many prominent scientists of the Church, who have no desire to weaken the faith of members young or old, do not share his*

*views; Henry Eyring had recently spent three hours pointing that out to him without, apparently, giving President Smith opportunity to state his own case.*

*Agreement was reached that teachers and leaders who seek deliberately to ridicule the Scriptures and undermine confidence in the Church are not entitled to approval or support. Agreement was also reached that scientists can be as dogmatic as other folks, and that scientists who are dogmatically anti-religious are not good scientists.*

*Question was raised several times during the conversation about the large number of teachers in the Church who do not denounce or debunk, but who do not find it possible to accept all the doctrines which Brother Smith presents as fundamental. They very much desire to remain tentative in their opinions on these matters. President Smith expressed awareness of the size of the group, and remarked that some of them apparently regard him as without competence in the field of science. He assured that he did not think that they should be excommunicated or barred from teaching.*

*The conversation concluded with our affirmation that we belong to the group in the Church who find it difficult to accept all the Scriptures literally, but who are desirous of learning the truth and constructively serving the Church. In the university environment we are persuaded that the quest for truth flourishes best when the area is rather narrowly defined within which absolute truth is regarded as already known. President Smith approved of the idea, but pointed out that insofar as he is concerned, where the Lord has spoken through the Scriptures, there is the truth.*

*The hour and a half session ended on cordial terms. We left with the impression that President Smith was quite as concerned about justifying his own position as about criticizing ours. Since both sides are apparently on the defensive, we feel more optimistic about the possibility of "peaceful coexistence."*

*Campus Memorandum*

*Brigham Young University*

*From: Richard Poll*

*To: President Ernest L. Wilkinson*

*Date: Jan. 31, 1955*

*Subject: Man, His Origin and Destiny*

*You may be interested in President Smith's comments to me at the close of last Tuesday's assembly when my wife and I went up to greet him and Sister Smith. His words were "There is no turning to the right, or turning to the left on what I said today.. We, of course, offered no argument, in fact, except for a couple of [?], minor points, our "amens" were sincere. And the greetings were cordial.*

*You may be also interested in the attached letters, both of which came to me through round-about channels. The first is the one which I mentioned to you as being distributed in some of the Religion classes. The second was, as I understand, written by Henry Eyring at the suggestion of Elder Adam S. Bennion.*

*At the risk of being charged with tale-bearing, and realizing the shortcomings of hearsay evidence, I would like to add one more point, because I feel strongly that the agitation of the subject of evolution and creation by some members of the*

*faculty is not helpful either to the university or to the Church. A student reported to Brother John Hale Gardner that a member of the Religion faculty had made substantially this statement: "The fundamentalist position gives no trouble to really great scientists; it is only pip-squeaks like we have here at the "Y" who cause trouble."*

*As I suggested in our evening conversation, which both Gene and I enjoyed very much, if the folks who subscribe to the literalist position will stop making an issue of it, there will be no difficulty whatever, with the faculty members of the Widtsoe-Talmage persuasion.*

*signed/  
Richard D. Poll*

*Anonymous account of Dr. Richard D. Poll's sacrament meeting talk  
Feb. 27, 1955*

*On February 27, 1955 Dr. Richard D. Poll, second speaker on the Oakhills Second Ward Sacrament meeting program, with at least the active encouragement of the Bishop, J. Roman Andrus, talked as follows, as far as I am able to understand and interpret his message.*

*Dr. Poll stated that he and his wife Gene interviewed President David O. McKay a few weeks ago at which time President McKay stated clearly and positively that the principles precepts of organic evolution were in no way incompatible with the Gospel of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. About thirty minutes later, they interviewed President Joseph Fielding Smith, whom stated clearly and definitely that the principles and precepts of organic evolution were positively incompatible with the Gospel of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. Now said Poll: here is a clear case of contradictory statements by two men sustained as Prophets of God. I have three alternatives said Poll,*

*1. Decide which of these contradictory prophets is a false prophet. This I do not care to do because of the experience of the apostate groups such as the Hedrickites, Reorganized Church, Fundamentalists, etc.*

*2. Try to convince myself that I did not understand them and that consequently they are not actually and do not actually contradict each other. This I cannot do because I know and am positive that they did and do contradict each other.*

*3. Conclude that they are both wrong and that neither one knows sufficient about this subject to be able to make a statement. I accept the latter as the truth of the case, said Poll. (In other words Poll suggests that neither President David O. McKay nor Joseph Fielding Smith knows what he is talking about).*

*Some in the congregation were elated by Dr. Poll's talk, such as those so-called educated progressives who have been and are critical of the authorities and doctrines of the Church. Others, who I consider to be more faithful, felt very bad, such as the Stake Relief Society President, who with tears in her eyes said to me as we were filing out of the chapel, "What are we going to do, I am terribly*

*confused and upset.” In my opinion the affect of this talk from a BYU professor has been and will be very damaging to our young people as well as the weaker of our adults.*

*This talk culminates a long series of insinuations and innuendos by several of the [?].*

*Several months ago Dr. Poll in a Sunday evening meeting ridiculed, in my opinion, the simple positive testimonies of many of our saints.*

*Some time later in a Sunday fast and testimony meeting Dr. Poll stated that he was not sure the Gospel was true, but he thought and believed it was. He stated that one could get to truth by any of several methods, such as revelation, inspiration, study, and by doubting. He said he was trying to get the truth by doubting and that he believed that one method was just as good as any other.*

*Referring to Dr. Poll’s testimony in the above paragraph, the Ward Sunday School Superintendant took the time the same Sunday evening in the Oakhills Second Ward stating that he was not sure that the Gospel was true, nor the Church right, but that he believed that it was. He stated that his method of trying to find out was by studying in his biological laboratory. He also stated that his respect for the Bishop kept him in town on Sunday, otherwise he thought he would be up the canyon where he felt he could serve God just as well as in a chapel. This man within the last two weeks has been ordained an High Priest.*

*About three weeks ago the instructor in the Oakhills Second Ward High Priests group, in talking about the pomp and ceremony of the Great Apostate Church during the early centuries after Christ wondered if we weren’t coming to the same condition because among other things the congregation always arises when President McKay enters the auditorium. Immediately the group leader arose and said that there was something which in his opinion was much more serious and that was the fact that at the dedication of the BYU McKay building he never saw so many big black Cadillacs in his life. At this juncture Dr. Poll said this subject is extremely important and suggested that the discussion be continued next Sunday as the time was up. The next Sunday, because of Stake Quarterly conference, etc., this subject was not pursued.*

*In the discussion with Dr. Poll last night after his talk first referred to above he stated that President McKay stated that President Joseph Fielding Smith’s book, “Man, His Origin and Destiny” was only one man’s opinion and was not the doctrine of the Church and pounding the desk with his fist said “you can quote me on that.”*

*Dr. Poll also said that he, Poll, prophesized that in the next 25 years his position and that of his group would be completely vindicated and that President Joseph Fielding Smith’s book and ideas would be considered one of the great errors of our times.*

*Letter to a Miss Perry, from Joseph Fielding Smith  
Dated October 8, 1955*

*Dear Miss Perry:*

*It was with feelings of regret that I received your letter of October 5, 1955, in which you declare most emphatically your belief in the theory of organic evolution. I take it that you are a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints—at least nominally, and a student at the Brigham Young University.*

*It is true that the Lord has given us reason which he expects us to use; but he has offered us something, if we are willing to receive it, which is far superior to reason. That is faith in his abiding and eternal TRUTH.*

*Truth that is found through obedience to the divine principles of the Gospel and in the revelation of the Lord. In order to obtain this it is necessary to obtain humility and to put our trust in Him. Reason will lead us to destruction, if it is not coupled with faith in the fundamental principles on which the kingdom of God is built. You seem to think that the teachings of the organic evolutionists have been clearly and definitely proved, that their theories are so well established that they are beyond reasonable contradiction. If so, than the revelations of the Lord, as proclaimed in the history of the Bible, the Book of Mormon, Pearl of Great Price and Doctrine and Covenants, are not revelations, not accurate history, and are not to be believed. You may answer that you find no conflict between the evolutionary theories and the revelations in these books. If so, that I must question your wonderful powers of reason, beyond the gift that “makes man more than the beast of the earth,” from which according to your theory he has descended. You admit frankly that you “cannot believe in both evolution and the L.D.S. teachings on the subject.” That being the case it may be futile for me to say anything more. Your mind is closed against the revealed word of the Lord. This, I am sure, is most regrettable. The book which I wrote for the purpose of helping our young people to understand the light and have faith in the revealed Gospel, and in the divine mission of Jesus Christ, falls on deaf ears and you come from a good family, perhaps with ancestors who have fought for and maybe laid down their lives in the cause of the restored Gospel, and every soul is precious in the eyes of our Eternal Father. Therefore grant me the privilege of presenting a few fundamental principles as I understand them which come to us through the revelations of Jesus Christ. IF organic evolution be true, than these principles fall to the ground and Jesus Christ is NOT the Savior of the fallen world, and the Redeemer of all who repent and receive his Gospel. This would be, to my mind, the greatest calamity that ever befell the world!*

*1. Adam was the first man on earth. This is taught in the Bible, Book of Mormon, Pearl of Great Price and Doctrine and Covenants. “And I the Lord God, formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. the FIRST MAN also; nevertheless, all things were before created; but spiritually were they created and made according to my word.” Moses 3:7. “And of Enos, and of Seth, and of Adam, who was formed of God, and the first man on the earth.” Luke 3:45 N.T. “And from Enoch to Abel, who ws slain by the conspiracy of his brother, who received the priesthood by the commandments of God, by the hand of his father Adam, who was the first man” D & C 84:16.*

*Those who accept evolution of [?] by reject this doctrine!*

2. *The scriptures teach that Adam was the first flesh on the earth. This has reference to the Fall. Evolution contradicts this doctrine, for evolution denies completely the Fall.*
  
3. *The scriptures teach that Adam was not subject to the mortal and spiritual death before the Fall and that the Fall brought these deaths into the world. This doctrine is emphatically denied by evolution.*
  
4. *These Scriptures teach that Jesus came into the world to atone for Adam's transgression and through his death redeemed Adam and all mankind from the effects of the Fall. Thus restoring ALL mankind to immortal life through the resurrection of the dead. Evolution denies all of this in its claim that death was always here and therefore there was NO life to which mankind could be restored.*
  
5. *The doctrines of these Scriptures and the revelations to the Church teach that death is to be destroyed, being the last enemy to be destroyed. (1Cor. 15:26; D. & C. 29:26; John 5:25-29; Revelations 20: 12-14.) All of this evolution contradicts.*
  
6. *These scriptures teach that this earth is passing through seven days of temporal existence of one thousand years of our days, and that it was not temporal before the Fall. This is clearly stated in the Bible, the Doctrine and Covenants and the Pearl of Great Price, but all of this is definitely and positively denied by organic evolutionists.*
  
7. *These divine records promise us that the earth on which we dwell will be renewed and restored to its primitive beauty for one thousand years, the last mortal day, and be cleaned of all its iniquity, and then will die, for it is a living mortal body, subject to the FALL, and REDEEMED by Jesus Christ. It will then receive the resurrection and become a celestial earth and the abiding place of the righteous. Evolution contradicts all of this.*

*Moreover, the Gospel teaches that MAN is the offspring of God! That He is our Eternal Father—the Father of our Spirits, that our spirits are eternal and so likewise the spirits of every other living creature. Evolution denies this!*

*The Gospel teaches us that our Father has created "Earths without number" as habitations for HIS children, and as one earth passes away to its exaltation after its resurrection another comes and there is no end to his works nor to his words. The Lord has revealed to us that the inhabitants of these other worlds are his begotten children, and that they have been transplanted to these worlds when they have been prepared for them. There is no beauty, no reason, no justice in Organic Evolution.*

*"Organic Evolution ridicules religion. It denies the Fatherhood of God and the Sonship of Jesus Christ. It places man as the natural kin of the animal, a descendant of a bat, a worm, and an amoeba. Those who like it may have this doctrine, but they have no right to attempt to drag their fellow men, who are 'begotten sons and daughters unto God,' down to their level." Man: page 187.*

*Organic Evolution begins with an hypothesis and ends with one.*

*This may be sufficient for the time.*

*Very sincerely,*

*Joseph Fielding Smith*

*Letter from Joseph Fielding Smith to Miss Perry  
Dated Nov. 3, 1955*

*Dear Miss Perry,*

*I have your letter of October 31, 1955. My suspicions are confirmed in relation to the discourse by Dr. James E. Talmage, which was delivered in the Tabernacle August 9, 1931. There was no time at the stake conference in Provo for me to follow this matter through, but I was sure it was that discourse. Now let me tell you something of its history.*

*This discourse was delivered and when it was brought to the attention of the brethren of the First Presidency and the Apostles action was taken that it should not be published. A great many complaints came into the office of the First Presidency criticizing this discourse. The matter was placed in the hands of the Council of the Twelve for consideration, and they reported adversely, saying that it should not be published. However it was taken out of their hands and without their consent or approval was published and also issued in pamphlet form. No doubt it is a sweet morsel to the evolutionists who are keeping it alive, but it never has received the sanction, or approval, of the First Presidency and the Apostles. Those who are using it have no business to do so and make it appear that it went out with the sanction of the authorities of the Church. I have all the information here in this office confirming what I am telling you.*

*Regarding the lime or other fossils, they forget that some sixteen hundred years passed between the Fall of Adam and the flood, when the whole face of the earth was changed. You will discover if you only ask the question that these evolutionists do not believe in the fall, or in the flood, especially the flood. Both of these doctrines are contrary to their theories. I hope you will read carefully the chapter on the flood in the book *Man: His Origin and Destiny*.*

*It is true we need not believe every word spoken by the general authorities. It is true that they do not always speak by the inspiration of the Lord. President Joseph F. Smith has called attention to this in *Gospel Doctrine*, p. 73.*

*Very Sincerely your brother,*

*Joseph Fielding Smith*

*Dr. A. Kent Christensen  
Department of Anatomy  
Cornell University Medical College  
1300 York Avenue  
New York 21, New York*

*Dear Brother Christensen,*

*I have your letter of January 25, 1959 in which you ask for a statement of the Church's position on the subject of evolution.*

*The Church has issued no official statement on the subject of the theory of evolution.*

*Neither "Man: His Origin and Destiny" by Elder Joseph Fielding Smith, nor "Mormon Doctrine" by Elder Bruce R. McConkie, is an official publication of the Church.*

*Evolution is a theory. You say that biologists would agree on the general lines of what happened, although there may be less agreement about just how it happened. While scientific people themselves differ in their interpretations and views of the theory, any conflicts which may seem to exist between the theory and the truths of revealed religion can well be dealt with by suspending judgment as long as may be necessary to arrive at facts and at a complete understanding of the truth.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*David O. McKay  
(President)*

*Letter from Assistant Secretary to: The First Presidency to Mr. Robert C. Stones  
Dated: April 21, 1960*

*Mr. Robert C. Stones  
Riverside Trailer Court  
Provo, Utah*

*Dear Brother Stones:*

*In reference to your letter of April 18, 1960, addressed to President David O. McKay, I have been asked to acknowledge for him as he is under a very heavy schedule of duties associated with the general administration of the Church.*

*I have been directed to say that the enclosed statements published in the Improvement Era over the signature of President Joseph Fielding Smith and his counselors express the position of the Church upon the subject of the "origin of man."*

*I have also been directed to say that the Church has made no official statement on the subject of evolution. It is a scientific theory and is subject to and is undergoing modification from time to time. Scientific people seem to differ in their interpretation and views of the theory. A biologist expressed the opinion that biologists would agree on the general lines of what happened, although there may be less agreement about just how it happened.*

*While scientific people themselves differ in their interpretation and views of the theory, any conflict which may seem to exist between the theory and truths of revealed religion can well be dealt with by suspending judgment as long as may be necessary to arrive at the facts and complete understanding of the truth.*

*The authorities of the Church rely upon the revelation of the Lord for information about the creation of man.*

*I have also been directed to say that the book to which you refer in your letter (Man: His Origin and Destiny by Joseph F. Smith) expresses the views of the author, for which he assumes full responsibility. The book was not published, approved, or authorized by the Church, nor did the author intend that it be.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*(signed) A. Hamer Reiser  
Assistant Secretary to: The First Presidency*

*Letter from Secretary to the First Presidency, Joseph Anderson to Dr. Harold Bissell*

*Dr. Harold J. Bissell, Professor of Geology  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, Utah*

*Dear Dr. Bissell:*

*Your letter of February 10<sup>th</sup> telling us of your work at the Brigham Young University in geology, and questions that are put to you at times, has been received. In your letter you ask for a statement from the First Presidency that you might read to honest, inquiring students regarding the question of "organic evolution" and the status of the work by President Joseph Fielding Smith entitled, "Man: His Origin and Destiny."*

*The Brethren feel very sure that serious reflection on the matter will persuade you of the problems and resulting difficulties that would come to the First Presidency from any announcement that they might make on this matter of "organic evolution." You will appreciate that any statement they might make on this subject would be presumed to meet the problem as it is now understood by the scientists and the people. They feel sure that you will also appreciate that the problem as it now exists under the theories of present scientists might well not be the problems that will exist 50 or 100 years from now any more than that an explanation made to meet the theories of 100 years ago would meet the problems of today. As the Brethren*

*understand, science must never accept any alleged solution of the problems of science (and they are many and indifferent fields), as the final truth. As a matter of fact, some of the older Brethren know that the explanations made 50 years ago are quite inapplicable to what are virtually the same problems of today. For example, the character and structure of the atom and molecule, etc., etc. At that time the scientists told us there were 76 elements and they did not anticipate the discovery of any more. Now they advise us that there are more than 130 elements, and the end is not yet. Furthermore, you will appreciate that anything they might say to you in this personal letter that you request would not remain personal with you, nor with them, nor with your students. It would become a public document, and the Brethren say they would not wish to make any statement that might not be made public. We seem to be in an age of such great and fundamental scientific readjustments on many matters, which age we have come to speak of as the nuclear age, that to attempt to harmonize the spiritual truths of the Gospel with the scientific theories would be futile, not because spiritual truths are not truths, because they are, but because the theories are admittedly largely hypothetical and subject to change. The Brethren sometimes say that this harmonizing of which so much is sometimes said should be harmonizing of science with spiritual truth, and not the harmonizing of spiritual truth with science, which latter can be accepted only when science comes to the ultimate truth, and nobody knows when that will be.*

*This would seem sufficiently to cover the general problem of "organic evolution;" however, apparently one of your difficulties has to do with President Joseph Fielding Smith's book, "Man: His Origin and Destiny." You will find in the Improvement Era, volume 13, pages 75 to 81, a statement by the First Presidency of the Church, at that time Presidents Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder and Anthon H. Lund, on this very question of the origin of man. This will give you the position of the Church as of that time, and there has been no change. For your further information I am pleased to send you a copy of a sermon by Dr. James E. Talmage entitled "The Earth and Man," which may also be of some interest to you.*

*Faithfully your brother,*

*(signed) Joseph Anderson  
Secretary to the First Presidency  
Letter from secretary to David O. McKay to Mr. Pertti Felin  
Dated: May 8, 1964*

*Mr. Pertti Felin  
F-3116 Helaman Halls  
Brigham Young University  
Provo, Utah*

*Dear Brother Felin:*

*President McKay, who is recuperating at home from an illness, has asked me to acknowledge for him your letter of May 6, 1964, wherein you ask regarding the Church's position on the theory of evolution.*

*I have been directed to say that the Church has issued no official statement on this subject. It is a theory, and it is subject to and undergoing modification from time to time, at least in the differing interpretations of scientific people. Under these circumstances, any conflict which may seem to exist between the scientific theory and the truth of revealed religion should be dealt with by suspending judgement as long as may be necessary to arrive at the facts and a complete understanding of the truth.*

*While the theory is subject to controversy and differences of opinion in the scientific world, the authorities of the Church rely upon the revelations of the Lord for information about the creation of man.*

*Enclosed you will find copies of statements which appeared in Church literature on this subject. One is entitled, "The Origin of Man," a statement by the First Presidency. The other is an address given in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, August 9, 1931 by Dr. James E. Talmage, entitled "The Earth and Man."*

*Sincerely yours,*

*(signed) Diane Middlemiss  
Secretary to:  
President David O. McKay*

*Letter to Eugene Thompson from Joseph Anderson, Secretary to the First Presidency*

*Dated: August 24, 1971*

*"Referring to the quotation you submit relative to a discussion between President Joseph Fielding Smith and Dr. James E. Talmage, it would seem that this is hearsay. However, under direction of the brethren, I am pleased to send you herewith a statement by the First Presidency of the Church, at that time Presidents Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder, and Anthon H. Lund, which appeared in the Improvement, volume 13, pages 75 to 81, on this very question of the origin of man. This will give you the position of the Church as of that time, and there has been no change."*

*(the quotation submitted)  
Oral History of BYU, #17  
Harvey Fletcher, p. 11*

*You know they're not always agreeing in the Twelve on some of these things, particularly when it deals with science. He (now referring to Brother Widtsoe) said brother Joseph Fielding Smith and brother Talmage used to have it pretty hot sometimes, and he said that brother Talmage, see he talked about fossils and that was part of his subject as a geologist, went down to Adam-ondi-aman where the alter of Adam is supposed to be and he had a pick and*

*picked around through it and finally found a fossil right in the cement of this altar. He found two or three of them and brought them up[ and put them in a bag and brought them home. He said he came back at (sic) one of the meetings of the Twelve, and he said, "Now brother Joseph, I understand that you thoroughly believe and are very sure that the first man on earth was Adam, the first life was Adam." He said, "I certainly do believe that." He said, "Well, what about these?" Then he handed out the fossils, and said, I found these in the altar."*

*Letter from John Davidson to President Marion G. Romney  
Dated: September 4, 1980*

*President Marion G. Romney  
47 E. South Temple Street  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111*

*Dear Mr. Romney:*

*On page four of The Ensign (September, 1980) you state: "There were no pre-Adamic men in the line of Adam...there was no death in the world before Adam...If, however, there are some things in the strata of the earth indicating there were men before Adam, then they were not the ancestors of Adam. And we should avoid using language and ideas that would cause confusion on this matter."*

*Since beginning my in-depth studies of Mormon history, I have been deeply interested in the authoritative position which the LDS First Presidency occupies, particularly in those matters concerning doctrinal proclamations. One of the sermons I enjoyed most was given by Mr. J. Reuben Clark at the Brigham Young University some twenty-five years ago. As you may recall, Mr. Clark spent a great deal of time emphasizing that no person in the LDS Church (including any of its general officers) possessed any authority to make a new doctrinal statement for the church in general unless that statement was made by the LDS President or by the President's direct authorization. Interestingly enough, Mr. Clark gave that discourse to apparently quell certain dogmatic writings and speeches by Mr. Joseph Fielding Smith concerning organic evolution, death before the fall of Ada, etc.*

*I am aware that the subject of organic evolution, etc. has been a very sensitive one for the Mormons, and for Christians in general. I am also aware that while most Mormons oppose the theory, some LDS have tried to accommodate it—among them several LDS general officers, such as James Talmage, Brigham H. Roberts, Frederick Pack, Nels Nelson, and others. The last position officially taken by the LDS First Presidency and Quorum of Twelve Apostles came after lengthy debates between Mr. Roberts and Mr. Smith concerning the issue of "pre-Adamites" and "death before the fall" which occurred during 1930-1931. The First Presidency stated in a memo dated April 5, 1931:*

*"After receipt of this latter communication the Presidency carefully reviewed the papers which had been submitted to the Council of Twelve, and after prayerful*

*consideration decided that nothing would be gained by a continuation of the discussion of the subject under consideration.*

*The statement made by Elder Smith that the existence of pre-Adamites is not a doctrine of the Church is true. It is just as true that the statement: "There were not pre-Adamites upon the earth", is not a doctrine of the Church. Neither side of the controversy has been accepted as a doctrine at all.*

*Both parties make the scripture and the statements of men who have been prominent in the affairs of the Church the basis of their contention; neither has produced definite proof in support of his views.*

*We quote the following from the Millennial Star, February 19, 1931:*

*"The sun is giving out energy daily. In a few million (or billion) years its energy will be gone. The other heavenly bodies are radiating and losing their heat; and in time they will be no better off than the age-bitten sun. The universe will run down. Then, on earth, there will be no summer and winter, perhaps no light and day, but just eternal twilight of middle African temperature, in the monotony of which all life will perish. So warns Sir James Jeans, famous British scientist, and brilliant writer and lecturer. Well for us that day is distant – a billion years or so – but, think of the grandchildren.*

*There is a ray of hope.*

*Dr. Robert A. Millikan, famous American scientist, and brilliant writer and lecturer, has discovered cosmic rays, sources of energy, that come from the uttermost confines of the universe to replenish the energy we lose by radiation. Out in the depths of space, by means unknown to us, the lost energy is assembled, converted, concentrated and sent back to delay the evil day. In short, Dr. Millikan says that this is a self-winding, self-repairing deathless universe. Day and night, summer and winter, may follow one another endlessly. That is more cheerful.*

*Whom are we to believe? These men are both world famous; both experimenters of the first rank, both honest men. Perhaps Dr. Millikan gives us a clue in his address as retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, delivered last Christmas week. He says:*

*"If Sir James Jeans prefers to hold one view and I another on this question, no one can say unsay. The one thing of which you may all be quite sure is that neither of us knows anything about it."*

*This is the frank and truthful admission of one of the foremost scientists of the world, an honest man, earnestly searching after truth, which he admits has not been definitely discovered.*

*The Prophet Joseph Smith said: "Oh, ye elders of Israel, hearken to my voice; and when you are sent into the world to preach, tell those things you are sent to tell; preach, and cry aloud, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand; repent and believe the Gospel." Declare the first principles, and let mysteries alone, lest ye be overthrown...Elder Brown, when you go to Palmyra say nothing*

*about the four beasts, but preach those things the Lord has told you to preach about – repentance and baptism for the remission of sins.”*

*We call attention to the fact that when one of the general authorities of the Church makes a definite statement in regard to any doctrine, particularly when the statement is made in a dogmatic declaration of finality, whether he express it as his opinion or not, he is regarded as voicing the Church, and his statements are accepted as the approved doctrines of the Church, which they should be.*

*Upon the fundamental doctrines of the Church we are all agreed. Our mission is to bear the message of the restored gospel to the people of the world. Leave Geology, Biology, Archaeology and Anthropology, no one of which has to do with the salvation of the souls of mankind, to scientific research, while we magnify our calling in the realm of the Church.*

*We can see no advantage to be gained by a continuation of the discussion to which reference is here made, but on the contrary are certain that it would lead to confusion, division and misunderstanding if carried further. Upon one thing we should all be able to agree, namely, that Presidents Joseph F. Smith, John R. Winder and Anthon H. Lund were right when they said: “Adam is the primal parent of our race.””*

*As a result of this incident, Mr. Roberts and Mr. Smith were both told to not publish any further material relative to “pre-Adamites” and “death before the fall” etc. This situation remained stable until after Mr. Roberts’ death when Mr. Smith proceeded to publish Man: His Origin and Destiny and promulgate his views among the LDS church. As for LDS members who did not share his views on this subject (among them LDS President David O. McKay), their position is perhaps best illustrated by an excerpt from a letter by Mr. James E. Talmage which is found in “A Turbulent Spectrum: Mormon Reactions to the Darwinist Legacy”, Richard Sherlock, Journal of Mormon History Vol. 5 (1978), page 40:*

*“I cannot agree with your conception that there was no death of plants and animals anywhere upon this earth prior to the transgression of Adam, unless we assume that the history of Adam and Eve dates back many hundreds of thousands of years. The trouble with some theologians—even including many of our own good people—is that they undertake to fix the date of Adam’s transgression as being approximately 4000 yers before Christ and therefore about 5932 years ago. If Adam was placed upon the earth only that comparatively short time ago the rocks clearly demonstrated that life and death have been existent and operative in this earth for ages prior to that time.”*

*What all of this is leading up to is this: Is your statement in the September 1980 Ensign article (cited above) made strictly as a personal opinion, or have you been instructed by either President Spencer W. Kimball or the united First Presidency to make a new doctrinal position for the entire church? Your Ensign statement is clearly different from the position taken by the LDS First Presidency in 1931, so this point is unclear.*

*I appreciate the time which you are taking with my letter, and will await your response in the near future.*

*May God bless you in your efforts to make the world a better place to live, and to bring people to Christ.*

*Sincerely,*

*(signed)  
John Davidson*

*Letter from John Davidson to Marion G. Romney  
Dated: October 6, 1980*

*President Marion G. Romney  
47 E. South Temple St.  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111*

*Dear Mr. Romney:*

*As it has been over a month since I wrote you, I am a bit concerned that my previous letter did not reach you. I am therefore enclosing a photocopy of same to re-inform you of my request.*

*Thank you very much for your time.*

*Sincerely,*

*(signed)  
John Davidson*

*Enclosure (letter of September 4, 1980)  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 843, Los Gatos, CA 95031*

*Letter from Marion G. Romney to John Davidson  
Dated: October 8, 1980*

*Mr. John Davidson  
P.O. Box 843  
Los Gatos, CA 95031*

*Dear Mr. Davidson:*

*Responding to the question on page 3 of your letter to me of September 4, 1980, in which you ask:*

*"Is your statement in the September 1980 Ensign article...made strictly as a personal opinion, or have you been instructed by either President Spencer W. Kimball or the united First Presidency to make a new doctrinal position for the entire church?"*

*The statement was made strictly and only as my personal opinion.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*(signed)  
Marion G. Romney*

*Before Adam*

*Hugh W. Nibley (1980)*

*I am often asked by students: What about those people that lived thousands of years before Adam? They usually ask after class and expect me to give a definitive answer before leaving the room. Why don't I bring up the subject in class? I did for twenty years, and then gave it up? it was a waste of time. Within the past ten years, however, things have changed so much that it is time to resume the discussion if only to reorient my own thinking on a subject that is impossible to avoid.*

*The Latter-day Saints are the only Bible-oriented people who have always been taught that things were happening long, long before Adam appeared on the scene. They have never appreciated just how revolutionary that idea is. It does away with creatio ex nihilo, which, ever since the triumph of the School of Alexandria, has been for Christian and Jewish theologians alike the only possible definition of the word creation. In the April 1980 National Geographic Magazine is a reproduction of a heroic relief sculpture on the wall of the so-called National Cathedral in Washington, D.C., showing eight full-grown human beings popping out of a turmoil of cloud.<sup>1</sup> It is entitled "Creatio ex nihilo Out of the, Void." It should not be hard to confound such an absolute concept, since any alternative will do; and long before the time of Christ the ancient Sophists, supplanting religion by naturalism, came up with a scenario very close indeed to what we think of as evolution. And so we get at an early time (at the trial of Socrates, in fact? at which, incidentally, Socrates is the defender of religion? not the other way around!) the sight of an apostate religion squaring off against an always inadequate science. And the issue is never the merits of the evidence but always the jealous rivalry of the contestants to see which would be the official light unto the world.*

*Right down to the present day we have been the spectators of a foolish contest between equally vain and bigoted rivals, in which it is a moot question which side heaps the most contempt on God's creatures. For the fundamentalist, to*

*associate man too closely with God's other creatures was the supreme insult to God and man. Man, say the Christian theologians, faithfully following Aristotle, is the rational animal? the only rational animal. All other beings in nature are soulless, speechless, thoughtless automata. Moreover, Adam was not only the only rational, immortal creation of God on earth, but the only intelligent actor on any solid world anywhere, being created out of nothing on the only inhabited planet in the entire universe? the solid earth, which was obviously the heavy center of everything, around which all other things revolved and onto which everything fell. Beside that, all was spirit.*

*The evolutionists took the doctors at their word and had a very easy time showing that man shares so many visible qualities and traits with other animals that if animals are mere "things" then so is man. Since they are able to survive and function simply as organisms reacting to an environment and nothing more, then man, being animal, has no more need of a soul than they have. The philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer, in his "Essay on the Christian System," said that the two fatal flaws of Christianity were (1) denying spirit and mind to any other creatures but ourselves (which both fundamentalists and Darwinists do) and (2) allowing life to no other world but our own. Adam in a vacuum? all alone in the society of God's creatures and all alone in the emptiness of space, the only thinking animal on the only inhabited spot in all the emptiness of space! When it began to appear that the earth was only one among countless possible earths and not the one-and-only center of everything, the discovery was viewed by both sides as the fatal blow to the dignity of man and the integrity of the Bible. This has always amazed me. Why on earth should the idea of life on other worlds lead scientists like G. B. Kistiakowsky, D. N. Michael, Harlow Shapley, Arnold Toynbee, and Otto Struve to assume as a matter of course that such a situation renders God expendable and the Bible unacceptable? 2 Such a conclusion follows only from the all-or-nothing premises of Alexandrian absolutism: the universe and truth and God could not be otherwise by very definition than as the doctors of the fourth century described them; any changes in the scenario would require scrapping the whole thing, including God. It only shows, for Latter-day Saints, how "strongly riveted [were] the creeds of the fathers, who have inherited lies, upon the hearts of the children, and filled the world with confusion!" (D&C 123:7.) Strongly riveted, indeed! Those preconceptions were the very thing that Joseph and Brigham had the most difficulty in coping with among the Saints? who cling to them to this day. 3*

*This futile quarrel should be no concern of ours. For one thing, we have a story to tell before Adam. Religion and science have none, absolutely none.*

*For the churchmen, the whole universe comes into existence in the week before Adam's own creation. But for the scientists, too, there is nothing to tell before the history. They set the stage for human history, but until a man with a book walks onto the stage there is no story, no play. Science studies the properties and the sets for the play, but the set is the play. The medium is the message. There is no more to follow. All around us in the universe, things are just happening. If they didn't happen one way, they would happen another. What difference does it make? The scientists of past decades have been proud of the erhabene Zwecklosigkeit, the "majestic meaninglessness" of it all. Since this is not to be my subject, one quotation, the classical remark of Tyndal, will suffice: "In the purely natural and inevitable march of evolution, life? is of profound*

*unimportance,? a mere eddy in the primeval slime." 4 The wise men gloried in the strength of mind and character that enabled them to look an utterly indifferent universe in the face without flinching (after all, they had tenure), insisting that the rest of us rid ourselves of our infantile longings for more. When we visit the planets and their satellites today, what do we find? Nobody at home! Somewhere the side of a cliff slips and slumps, somewhere dense clouds of dust are blown by super-winds, somewhere gas or magma seeps through cracks in the ground or huge blocks of ice collapse or collide, somewhere a meteor lands without a sound, somewhere. What difference does it make? It is all, as some of my professors used to remind their impressed but unhappy classes with malicious glee, utterly meaningless. Mount St. Helens takes on interest only because we are here. Globes on which nothing happens for millions of years are just as interesting as those on which change is taking place all the time. The static condition is in itself a happening, and with nobody around to measure the time, one scenario moves as fast as another.*

*When science takes us to human prehistory, it is just more of the same. Since World War II, an immense lot of digging has been done all over the world, and the result is a great accumulation of properties? but still no play. We learn from what is being turned up that people lived in shelters of various kinds, ate food that they gathered or hunted, warmed themselves and cooked with fire, wore clothing as they needed it, had pots to cook and store food in, had children, drank water, breathed air, and so on. And that is the whole story. The table is now set for the banquet, but no live guests ever show up. We sit in the darkened theater waiting for the show that never begins. It won't begin until we get a written record. Listen to the latest word on the subject by one of the foremost prehistorians, A. J. Jelinek (1977): "The overriding impression of the technological evidence in the archaeological record is one of almost unimaginable monotony? The most overwhelming example?is? Olduvai Gorge, where for approximately a million years no significant innovation is discernable." Even the later innovations "take place over hundreds of thousands of years; this means that we are talking about tens of thousands of generations of hominids maintaining patterns of technological traditions without discernable change.*

*No Adam, no play, These can't be our people. Science promised an exciting new world, a great show, to which H. G. Wells offered to conduct us, but it all went stale in his own lifetime. To paraphrase the eminent biologist René Dubos, existentialist nausea has found its home in the most affluent and technologically advanced parts of the world. The most poignant problem of modern life is probably man's feeling that life has lost its significance. The view that the modern world is absurd is no longer limited to the philosophical or literary avant-garde. It is spreading to all social and economic groups and affects all manifestations of life. 6*

*I spend my days in the midst of noise, dirt, ugliness, and absurdity, in order to have easier access to well-equipped laboratories, libraries, museums, and a few sophisticated colleagues whose material existence is as absurd as mine. I doubt that mankind can tolerate our absurd way of life much longer without losing what is best in humanness.7 It is religion that makes man humble in the face of nature, Dubos infers, and science that makes him arrogant, not the-other way around.8*

*The humanists have always known that they have no play. Euripides has a little song to that effect, which he repeats no fewer than five times. What it says is, in effect, "I know this play makes no sense, but neither does anything else!" Shakespeare's last word on the subject in his last play, *The Tempest*, was: "Our revels now are ended. These our actors? are melted into air, into thin air: and, like the baseless fabric of this vision, the cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces, the solemn temples, the great globe itself, yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve, and, like this insubstantial pageant faded, leave not a rack behind." (Act 4, scene 1, lines 148-56.) That's all there is. No one is going anywhere. Or take the highest achievement of modern theater, a play that won the Nobel Prize, no less. The characters in *Waiting for Godot*, writes an admiring critic, "have nothing to say, nor have they anything to do. Language for them is a means for expressing the meaninglessness of existence? Godot is a symbol of hope that keeps man waiting for something big to happen, but that never happens. On the whole, all that man does centres round his physical needs and devices to kill time."<sup>9</sup>*

*Now as to the past, when I first joined the army I was sent to weather school and became a weatherman, working with the primitive charts and diagrams of the day. Coordinating the information that came over the teletype from a hundred other weather stations, I tried to report and predict the weather at Godman Field, Kentucky. Wouldn't it be wonderful, I thought in those days, if we had a movie that showed us all the moving storms and fronts. Then instead of having to throw the models together with feverish haste to project the past into future weather, I would only have to look at the moving picture and know exactly what was going to happen tomorrow. Meteorologists can do that today. It is all before our very eyes on the evening news. Seeing is believing. We are going to be hit by a big one tomorrow (which turns out to be a beautiful day), or that big clear spot shows perfectly heavenly weather ahead (so it snows and sleets all day tomorrow). Now imagine that instead of a weather-eye, enabling such brilliant predictions a few hours ahead, we had a satellite picture showing the earth over millions of years. Every time we stop the picture we ask the scientist what is going to happen next. And so he tells us with great confidence. Can we trust him? We can check on the weather day by day and make corrections and adjustments and keep score. But as Professor Campbell, formerly of UCLA, reminds us, the paleontologist cannot do any of that. He cannot observe processes but only results. He has no regular sequence of pictures before his eyes but only a few badly blurred snapshots of the earth over the last three million years. Studying these, the specialists try to tell us just what happened. Am I willing to stake my eternal salvation on their highly conflicting opinions? The little pictures are very few in number, very far apart, and very badly damaged. Every authority today emphasizes that, more than ever before. In the place of connections between the specimens, we have only resemblances, and it is on them that we base our whole story? classification, taxonomy, biosystematics? it is all a question of endlessly debated definitions, not a whit different from the harangues of the ancient Sophists. In the same breath, the experts today emphasize the scarcity and bothersome overabundance of evidence, the paradox resulting from a sudden accumulation of evidence during the past decade.*

*Upstairs in the old Education Building at Brigham Young University, there stood for many years a tall, thin, glass showcase. On the top shelf was a human skull; below it was the cast of a Cro-Magnon skull; then Neanderthal; and so on until we got to a skull of a gorilla. Here before our very eyes was an unimpeachable sermon on how man came to be. But things have changed now. "As late as 1955," writes Professor B. G. Campbell, fossils "could be fitted into a relatively simple and not very controversial phylogenetic lineage. The numerous fossils now known offer alternative interpretations." Not so compellingly simple as before, but how many alternative interpretations? "The number of possible hypotheses are both theoretically and practically unlimited."<sup>10</sup> J. J. Jerison wrote in 1975, "The simple picture of evolution from an australopithecine to a habiline to a pithecanthropine to a sapient grade is obviously inadequate."<sup>11</sup> He added rather wistfully, almost regretfully, "Things would actually fit together more easily if the dating of the new specimen at 2.8 million years ago were in error."<sup>12</sup> The equally eminent D. Pilbeam comments on the same development: "Until a few years ago relatively simple schemes that viewed past hominoids as foreshadows of living ones functioned very well as organizing paradigms." Today, "classification of past forms on the basis of present-day distinctions may not be very useful. Interconnections among fossil species and between them and the present species are increasingly difficult to draw. Concern with phylogeny? is perhaps on the wane."<sup>13</sup> "A great deal of heated debate has occurred over the past ten years or so concerning hominid origins. The last decade has seen a number of significant changes? We are now in a period of uncertainty. This contrasts with the preceding period, during which much seemed so clear-cut and obvious."<sup>14</sup>*

*The sensational new discoveries in Africa only remind the researchers how much they have been missing and how much they're still missing. "Whence came these late Neogene hominoids?" asks Professor Pilbeam of the Olduvai population. The question remains unanswered because "our knowledge of the fossil record is sparse, and heavily skewed toward representation of jaws and teeth."<sup>15</sup> And Professor Jelinek informs us that "the entire excavated area of occupation surfaces (all over the world) is well under the size of a modern football field." At Olduvai, 80 percent of the material comes from a band of strata representing only 4 percent of the time-span of occupation.<sup>16</sup> As opposed to the certitudes that were the most characteristic? as well as the most obnoxious? trait of past generations of the Darwinian ministry, Campbell reminds us, "We know that we can never do more than present hypotheses on the basis of the presently available evidence. As timebound creatures, no ultimate truth about the origin and evolution of mankind can ever be known to us."<sup>17</sup> "If nothing else," Professor Pilbeam concludes his study, "perhaps the only thing that is certain is that the next decade will provide us many surprises."<sup>18</sup> If that is certain, we should in all conscience postpone any further discussion or debate on such matters for at least another ten years. I could have saved myself a lot of trouble by simply ignoring the experts for thirty years. It is sad to think how many of those telling points that turned some of our best students away from the gospel have turned out to be dead wrong!*

*Now it is admitted, in the words of W. W. Howells, that all those years when everybody was sure of the answers, "no scheme was presented that intelligibly interpreted the fossil record."<sup>19</sup> And now the interpretation is far more difficult than ever, because there are just too many types to relate and explain. It is a*

*strange fact, "a paradoxical problem," as Pilbeam puts it, that "the hominids are one of the poorest represented of fossil mammal groups, relative to their apparent past diversity."<sup>20</sup> An astonishing number of different types are running around (there are seven at Olduvai), and yet so very few specimens! What is wrong? It is no longer enough to fall back, as S. Washburn does, on the old chestnut: "Surely as more fossils are found?[his tool theory] will be found to have been a major factor."<sup>21</sup> What kind of science is that? basing our theories on evidence not yet discovered?*

*This is a reminder that those who study the origin of man begin with the final answers. The ultimate questions that can only be answered after all the returns are in are the very questions with which Lyell and Hutton and Darwin began their explorations. Our thrilling detective drama begins by telling us who did it and then expects us to wait around with bated breath while the detective brings in the evidence. The premise is stated, for example, by G. G. Simpson: "In the evolutionary pattern of thought there is no longer need or room for the supernatural. The earth was not created: it evolved. So did all the animals and plants that inhabit it, including our human selves,? mind and soul, as well as brain and body. So did religion."<sup>22</sup> Well, if we grant that, we already have the answer to the big questions. We know the final score. And as giving the plot away spoils the fun, so Simpson must go back to the Bible whenever he wants to interest an audience.*

*Here it is important to bring to attention the great number of knowledge banks that must be brought under contribution before we can get it all together. There was a time when the Bible was the only knowledge bank. Some fathers of the church, like Hilary, declared that anything not specifically stated to have happened in the Bible could not possibly have happened anywhere. When Aristotle's only knowledge bank became available, the doctors of the church diligently accommodated the Bible to his teachings. With the study of the heavens, the stars became the next great source of guidance to the real nature of things. Then Bacon opened the book of nature. Next, geology and biology called the tune. Geology took a direct look at the past? we had to believe what it told us? while biology examined the active processes that brought about the visible changes. On these two hung all the laws and the prophets.*

*And why not? Where else could one turn for answers? It is an illusion to look elsewhere, Freud explained in a famous essay, "The Future of an Illusion," for what other science is there except science? Duly impressed, the world failed to ask whether those data, no matter how concrete and precise, were adequate for the immense burden of proof that was needed. The prestige of science rested on shocking oversimplification and elaborate tautologies. "Never mind the details," we were told. "We can fill them in later"? which means, as noted, that the great search for truth begins with the final answers.*

*Darwin decided at the age of twenty that the Bible was a fraud. He claimed he felt no distress and never doubted for a single second that his conclusion was correct.<sup>23</sup> In a disarming article, T. Dobzhansky admits that his own beliefs are based on anything but exhaustive evidence and that others with competent knowledge of that evidence do not agree with his conclusions.<sup>24</sup> In other words, his model doesn't work, but that is no reason for rejecting it or looking for another model. After all, it is scientific. He has put a great deal of time and study*

*into it. It is based on known facts and sound reasoning. Why should he give it up for gross superstition, mysticism, and ignorant religious ranting? There's always the assumption that there is no other alternative to my science but your anti-science. Your knowledge bank does not count if it obfuscates mine. As usual, Dobzhansky rests his case on discoveries yet to be made: "Guessing where new discoveries are likely to be made is a risky venture in science. And yet, a scientist is constantly forced to take this risk.<sup>25</sup> True, and for that very reason, as Karl Popper reminds us, a scientist can never be dogmatic. But Dobzhansky is nothing but dogmatic. Well, again, why not? Here were the sciences which in time would give us all the answers. We are quite sure of that, so why not accept their conclusions now? That is just what the public has done, and the results have been paralyzing. The Darwinian Sleep has done much more damage than the Newtonian Sleep? a dullness of mind that cripples curiosity with the authority of the Approved School Solution.*

*The two big questions today, Dobzhansky says, are (1) the mechanisms of evolution? the very question that Darwin was supposed to have answered for all time, and (2) "the biological uniqueness of man," which is the real Adam question. How do you define man? How do you define Adam? There were a lot of creatures running about long ago who looked like men, but for that matter there are a lot of them today; you can go to Hogle Zoo [in Salt Lake City, Utah] and see some of them, but they are not men. Are these zoo critters ancestral to us? No, for they are contemporary. And what about the other creatures who disappeared long ago? Are they ancestral to us? That is just the question, and there is no agreement on it. Since World War I, homo erectus has been found all over the Old World, the term including a number of prehistoric types. "Where did Homo Erectus come from?" asks W. W. Howells. "Where did he go? The paths are simply untraced. Above all, the nature of the line leading to living man remains a matter of pure theory."<sup>26</sup> In September 1979, 150 of the world's leading paleontologists met at the Eighth Pan-African Congress of Prehistory and Quaternary Studies in Nairobi. The main issue discussed was, "What is the definition of Homo?"<sup>27</sup> How do you know a true man when you see him? Well, he looks like a man. Again, there are creatures in the zoo that look like men. "In recent years the old concept of a single, steadily evolving lineage from ape to man has been completely replaced by at least three and possibly more different forms of early man evolving simultaneously in Africa." By two million years ago "at least two forms of hominids were living," and one of them "died out perhaps a million years ago." <sup>28</sup> And the other? It was no more manlike than many of the others. What evidence have we that it did not also die out? Pilbeam writes that three hundred individuals found in East Africa represent at least seven hominid species. He also notes, "These species do not resemble any of the living Old World higher primates." In fact, they seem to have been in many ways distinctly different from all later hominids.<sup>29</sup> The tool-using Dryopithecids "disappear around 8 or 9 m[illion] y[ears] ago"; the Rampithecidae about 8 million years ago.<sup>30</sup> Campbell thinks they were related to us "on a personal assessment of very complex and conflicting evidence," but he concedes that Leakey and Napier and others do not think *Anthropus africanus* was ancestral to *H. habilis*.  
31*

*A contemporary theory of great importance is that evolution has been directed and boosted through the ages as various homonid species have fortuitously adopted tools. After the initial innovation, the use of a particular tool could go on*

*by simple imitation, yet Washburn claims that tools have made us what we are. He tells us that the famous chopper tool "remained in day-to-day use as a major element in the human tool kit for about two million years."<sup>32</sup> One would think that 2 million years without a change would show quite remarkable immunity in these creatures to any didactic influence of the coup de poing, Faustkeil, or hand-ax. Perhaps the nature of the instrument itself is to blame. In 1964, President Barnes, of the American School in Beirut, gave me what is perhaps the first Mousterian artifact ever recognized in Palestine, an excellent example of an Acheulean point, discovered by Fredrick Bliss, the founder of the University, at Buri-el Khadr. What puzzles me is what it could have been used for, for it was of marly chert, and I doubt if it could cut cheese. When I dropped it from a height of about nine inches on the tile floor, the top of the point broke off with the greatest of ease. So I was not surprised to read recently that while "there is virtually no evidence of nonlithic tools" for our pre-Adamites, and that these hand-axes are "the hallmark of most Middle Pleistocene cultures, prehistorians are still without firm evidence relating to the function of these first recognized and most elaborate of Lower Paleolithic stone tools."<sup>33</sup> Hundreds and thousands of them, the standard all-purpose tool of 2 million years of diligent use? but what on earth were they used for? Yet Washburn assures us that thanks to such tools alone "the human way and the brain evolved together to produce ancient man of the genus Homo about half a million years ago. Then the brain evolved under the pressure of more complex social life until the species Homo sapiens appeared perhaps as recently as 50,000 years ago."<sup>34</sup> Fortuitously discovered tools vigorously pushed man toward his full-blown glory, and yet 2 million years of that exhilarating process left not the slightest effect on their users. Just how powerful is the influence of the gadgets?*

*"Considerable academic debate surrounds the date for the appearance of modern man," Washburn tells us. "By 35,000 years ago, however, the hunting populations of western Europe were biologically indistinguishable from modern man."<sup>35</sup> Yet he also tells us that "man began when populations of apes, about a million years ago, started the bipedal, tool-using way of life."<sup>36</sup> In the same volume of essays, H. de Lumley reports on the 350,000-year-old village of Terra Amata, with its well-made huts, central heating (a hearth), and a special compartment for tool-making, the oldest known man-made structures.<sup>37</sup> What kind of men? R. G. Klein tells us that "modern man (Homo sapiens) seems to have made his first appearance between 45,000 and 35,000 years ago," and then goes on to describe one of some 100 Pleistocene sites in the Ukraine between 80,000 and 75,000 years old, where the people wore furs and beaded garments, buried their dead, and built substantial heated huts.<sup>38</sup> The artifacts were Mousterian and, to quote the same scientist, "Mousterian artifacts invariably belong to Neanderthal man."<sup>39</sup> But didn't Neanderthal man become extinct? Some say he did, some say he didn't. Which is it to be, 2 million years, 1 million years, half a million years, 50,000 years, or 35,000 years? Each one introduces a new species, though all of them used tools.*

*According to Klein, when "true sapiens" appears, it is with a sudden "quantum advance in human culture evolution."<sup>40</sup> By definition evolution comes only by minute and gradual steps? a quantum advance must be something else. T. Dobzhansky, who lays particular emphasis on the tiny steps of micro-evolution, explains the anomaly by noting that culture brings an entirely new element into the picture: "The cultural evolution of mankind is superimposed on its biological*

*evolution; the causes of the former are nonbiological." But once caused, he insists, they contribute to biological changes by natural selection. "Genes determine the possibility of culture but not its content, just as they determine the possibility of human speech but not what is spoken."<sup>41</sup> Whatever is behind it, it is the culture that marks the appearance of man as such, just as by very definition it is the written record that begins his history.*

*When about twenty years ago it was decided that man himself is the chief conditioner of his evolution, scientists began to view him as outside and independent of the mainstream of organic evolution. Here was a new dimension, an evolution that no longer operated on blind chance. To define true man is to discover the uniqueness of man, that which he does not share with any other creature. It can only be his culture. And when do you get a real culture? Not until you get Adam. Those 100,000-year-old villages have nothing to tell us that we do not know. It is time we got to Adam.*

*To recapitulate, religion has no plot. Science has no plot. This means that Joseph Smith is the only entry. He, at least, has given us a picture. But is it a convincing picture? The fact is, we have never looked at it closely! We have drawn back from that assignment, preferring to save a lot of trouble and take sides with the traditional schools.*

*The stories of the garden of Eden and the Flood have always furnished unbelievers with their best ammunition against believers, because they are the easiest to visualize, popularize, and satirize of any Bible accounts. Everyone has seen a garden and been caught in a pouring rain. It requires no effort of imagination for a six-year-old to convert concise and straightforward Sunday-school recitals into the vivid images that will stay with him for the rest of his life. These stories retain the form of the nursery tales they assume in the imaginations of small children, to be defended by grownups who refuse to distinguish between childlike faith and thinking as a child when it is time to "put away childish things." (1 Corinthians 13:11.) It is equally easy and deceptive to fall into adolescent disillusionment and with one's emancipated teachers to smile tolerantly at the simple gullibility of bygone days, while passing stern moral judgment on the savage old God who damns Adam for eating the fruit he put in his way and, overreacting with impetuous violence, wipes out Noah's neighbors simply for making fun of his boat-building on a fine summer's day.*

*This is another case of what I have called the gentile dilemma or, if you will, the devil's dilemma.*

*Joseph Smith gave the world something that nobody else could. That is why I say that Joseph Smith, with nothing going for him and everything going against him, simply could not lose. He told us what the play is all about. If you can come up with a better story than his, more power to you, but up until now no one else has had any story at all to place before us. If only for that reason, I believe, the Prophet's story deserves a hearing.*

*The Latter-day Saints have four basic Adam stories, those found in the Bible, the book of Moses, the book of Abraham, and the temple? each seen from a different angle, like the four Gospels, but not conflicting if each is put into its proper context. And what is that context? One vitally important principle that*

*everyone seems to have ignored until now is the consideration that everything is presented to us in these accounts through the eyes, or from the point of view of, the individual observers who tell the story. Historians long ago came to realize that the boast of German Geschichtswissenschaft? to report what happened at all times "wie es eigentlich geschah," the whole truth, the complete event in holistic perfection as it would be seen by the eye of God? is a philosopher's pipe dream. And, indeed, it is from the philosophers that we got it, rooted as the fathers and the doctors are in the sublime absolutes of Alexandria: There is God and God only, and his holy and infallible book was written by his very finger, untouched by the human mind. We must credit the Moslems with carrying this doctrine all the way. Not only is it the crime of Shirk to credit the existence of anything besides God, but his book is as divine and ineffable as he is. I have been told that it is presumptuous for mortals, let alone infidels, to pretend to understand anything in it.*

*The Latter-day Saints, inheritors of the Christian version of this teaching, are constantly converting statements of limited application to universal or at least sweeping generalities. To illustrate, I was told as a child that the Rocky Mountains, the Appalachians, and the Andes all came into existence overnight during the great upheavals of nature that took place at the time of the Crucifixion? an absurdity that plays into the hands of critics of the Book of Mormon. But what we find in the 3 Nephi account when we read it carefully is a few sober, factual, eyewitness reports describing an earthquake of 8-plus on the Richter scale in a very limited area. Things that appear unlikely, impossible, or paradoxical from one point of view often make perfectly good sense from another. The Nautical Almanac gives the exact time of sunrise and sunset for every day of the year, yet astronauts know that the sun neither rises nor sets except from a particular point of view, the time of the event being strictly dependent on the exact location. From that point of view and that only, it is strictly correct and scientific to say that the sun does rise and set. Just so, the apparently strange and extravagant phenomena described in the scriptures are often correct descriptions of what would have appeared to a person in a particular situation. You and I have never been in those situations. To describe what he sees to people who have never seen anything like it, the writer must reach for metaphors and similes: "His eyes were as a flame of fire; the hair of his head was white like the pure snow;? his voice was as the sound of the rushing of great waters." (D&C 110:3; italics added.) There was no fire, no snow, no rushing waters, but that is as near as Joseph Smith and Sidney Ridgon could come to telling us what they experienced when "the veil was taken from [their] minds, and the eyes of [their] understanding were opened!" (D&C 110:1.) They were reporting as well as they could what they had seen from a vantage point on which we have never stood.*

*A recent study points out that the charge that Abraham's story in the Bible must be fictitious because no one could know the highly intimate things reported there? nobody, Hamming admits, unless it were Abraham himself. The earliest Abraham books are supposed to be autobiographies, and the story told from his point of view makes perfectly good sense. So with Noah in the ark. From where he was, "the whole earth" (Genesis 8:9) was covered with water as far as he could see; after things had quieted down for 150 days and the ark ground to a halt, it was still three months before he could see any mountaintops. But what were conditions in other parts of the world? If Noah knew that, he would not*

*have sent forth messenger birds to explore. The flood as he described it is what he saw of it. "He sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters were abated from off the face of the ground." (Genesis 8:8.) Couldn't he see for himself? Not where the dove went. It was not until seven days later that he sent it out again; and after flying all day, the bird came back with a green leaf fetched from afar; "so Noah knew that the waters were abated from off the earth." (Genesis 8:11.) Still he waited another seven days. When the dove did not return, Noah had his answer. In some distant place, trees were bearing and there was birdfood to be found. But not where Noah was. All that time he had not dared to open up.*

*Note that the author does not fall into the literary trap of telling where the birds went and what they saw. That became a standard theme of early Oriental literature, faithfully reflected in the classical stories of the sea-eagle and the hoopoe. All Noah tells us is what he saw of the birds and the flood. The rain continued at least in spots, for there was that magnificent rainbow. Why do Christians insist on calling it the first rainbow, just because it is the first mentioned? Who says that water drops did not refract light until that day? Well, my old Sunday School teacher, for one, used to say it. The rainbow, like the sunrise, is strictly the product of a point of view, for which the beholder must stand in a particular place while it is raining in another particular place and the sun is in a third particular place, if he is to see it at all. It is a lesson in relativity.*

*This principle is recognized today as "the anthropic cosmological principle." I refer you to the April 1980 Scientific American. It specifies that what an observer is able to see of the universe actually makes a difference in the real nature of that universe: "Man's experience is a constraint on the kinds of universe he could observe. Many features of the universe that are remarkable to ponder are inevitable prerequisites of the existence of observers."<sup>42</sup> Though the authors say it is a mystery why this should be so, still "the principle overcomes the traditional barrier between the observer and the observed. It makes the observer an indispensable part of the macrophysical world." <sup>43</sup>*

*Nowhere is the principle of this relativity more clearly proclaimed than in the cosmologies of the book of Moses and the book of Abraham. Both epics begin in realms above, far from the earth (which has not yet come into existence). At each step it is made perfectly clear who is speaking and from what vantage point. "I dwell in the midst of them all;? I came down in the beginning in the midst of all the intelligences thou hast seen." (Abraham 3:21; italics added.) First, second, and third persons appear in a large cast of characters leaving one place for another. "We will go down, for there is space there, and we will take of these materials, and we will make an earth whereon these may dwell." (Abraham 3:24; italics added.) What a world of inference opens up as we are launched into the mighty drama! Yet we immediately begin to feel ourselves into the situation. Those to whom the speaker refers (and there is no doubt who he is!) are known to Abraham from aforetime? they are "all the intelligences thine eyes have seen from the beginning." (Abraham 3:21; italics added.)*

*Before being introduced to his home planet, Abraham is given a view of the cosmos, in the which he is reminded again and again that all distances, directions, and motions are to be measured with respect to his own position only. From another position, the picture might well look very different.*

*Kolob, as we noted, is not the center of the universe but governs only one class of stars: "I have set this one to govern all those which belong to the same order as that upon which thou standest." (Abraham 3:3; italics added.) In the apocryphal Abraham literature, which has very recently and very suddenly taken on extreme importance in the eyes of the learned world, this point of vantage is a place in the heavens to which Abraham has been taken. There he is at first terrified because he finds no place on which to stand, until the angel who is with him gives him a correct orientation by drawing a round diagram of things. This is reflected in Facsimile No. 2 of the Book of Abraham, but we cannot discuss that here.*

*Time also is not reckoned in absolutes but is limited to Abraham's system; "the reckoning of the Lord's time" is not reckoned absolutely but "according to the reckoning of Kolob"? an in-between element to gear Abraham's time to a larger but not necessarily the largest system. There is also reckoning by sun and moon, relative to "the earth upon which thou standest." (Abraham 3:4?5.)*

*In verse 6 the expression "set time" is used four times, reminding us that there is more than one frame of time reference. One must in the "times of reckoning" take into account that "two facts" can exist, the one not excluding the other. This is one of the mysteries of cosmology today. The Doctrine and Covenants explains it by the necessity of limiting all "existence" to closed systems, for "otherwise there is no existence." (D&C 93:30.)*

*Kolob's influence and time governs "all those planets which belong to the same order as that upon which thou standest"? the expression here used for the seventh time. (Abraham 3:9; italics added.)*

*After being apprised, like Moses, of the endless nature of God's works? "I could not see the end thereof"? Abraham is reminded of the glory elsewhere "before the world was." (Abraham 3:22.) Then, at the beginning of chapter 4, we see a delegation going "down" to organize this earth and its heaven. To begin with, we see bare rock, "empty and desolate," as the other planets and satellites of the system seem to be today, "because they had not formed anything but the earth." (Abraham 4:2.) Then the whole thing is water-covered beneath a dense envelope of cloud? "darkness reigned upon the face of the deep." But things were already being prepared for what was to follow, for the Spirit of the Gods was brooding upon the face of the waters." Dictionaries define brooding as "to sit or incubate (eggs) for the purpose of hatching." As Milton puts it "dovelike sat'st brooding on the vast Abyss and mad'st it pregnant." Also, "to dwell continuously on a subject." Brooding is just the right word? a quite long quiet period of preparation in which apparently nothing was happening. Something was to come out of the water, incubating, waiting? a long, long time.*

*Next, in verse 3, "there was light." Where? It is an exercise in point of view again. All this time the Gods had been dwelling in light and glory, but the earth was dark. It was to where "darkness reigned," according to our text, that the light came. (Abraham 4:2.) This was not the first creation of light. Wherever light comes into darkness, "there is light."*

*The next verse reminds us that light itself is relative, a part of the energy spectrum seen by some being with the capacity to be aware of it: "They*

*comprehended the light, for it was bright" (Abraham 4:4), that is, visible. Basic chemicals react to light, but are they aware of it? do they comprehend it? In verse 5 we are introduced to the dualism of night and day, land and water, which is peculiar to the earth and conditions of all life upon it.*

*The creation process as described in the Pearl of Great Price is open ended and ongoing, entailing careful planning based on vast experience, long consultations, models, tests, and even trial runs for a complicated system requiring a vast scale of participation by the creatures concerned. The whole operation is dominated by the overriding principle of love. You may accept the Big Bang, with its potential for producing all that came thereafter, but by any reckoning the earth was definitely not among the instantaneous productions of the first millisecond or even of the first fifteen minutes. No matter how you figure, it came along much, much later after a great deal had happened. "Worlds without number" had already come into existence and gone their ways: "And as one earth shall pass away, and the heavens thereof even so shall another come; and there is no end to my works, neither to my words." (Moses 1:38.)*

*Consider how it was done: "And the Gods said: We will do everything that we have said, and organize them." (Abraham 4:31.) "And the Gods saw that they would be obeyed, and that their plan was good." (Abraham 4:21.) "We will end our work, which we have counseled? And thus were their decisions at the time that they counseled among themselves to form the heavens and the earth." (Abraham 5:2?3.) After the talk they got down to work. "The Gods came down and formed these the generations of the heavens and of the earth, . . . according to all that which they had said ... before." (Abraham 5:4?5.) They worked through agents: "The Gods ordered, saying: Let [such-and-such happen]"; and it was so, even as they ordered." (Abraham 4:9, 11.)*

*What they ordered was not the completed product, but the process to bring it about, providing a scheme under which life might expand: "Let us prepare the earth to bring forth grass" (Abraham 4:11; italics added), not "Let us create grass."*

*"Let us prepare the waters to bring forth abundantly? And the Gods prepared the waters that they might bring forth great whales, and every living creature that moveth." (Abraham 4:20.) Note the future tense: the waters are so treated that they will have the capacity. The Gods did not make whales on the spot but arranged it so that in time they might appear. They created the potential. "And the Gods saw that they would be obeyed, and that their plan was good" (Abraham 4:21), that is, it was working, not because they were doing it all themselves? there were other agents at work: they were being obeyed. By whom? Well, the land animals, we are told, which "would obey." (Abraham 4:25.) "And the Gods watched those things which they had ordered until they obeyed." (Abraham 4:18.)*

*"They obeyed" is the active voice, introducing a teaching that, in my opinion, is by far the most significant and distinct aspect of Mormonism. It is the principle of maximum participation, of the active cooperation of all of God's creatures in the working out of his plans, which, in fact, are devised for their benefit: "This is my work and my glory?"(Moses 1:39.) Everybody gets into the act. Every creature, to the limit of its competence, is given the supreme compliment of being left on*

*its own, so that the word "obey" is correctly applied. "We will go down, for there is space there, and we will take of these materials, and we will make an earth whereon these may dwell." (Abraham 3:24.) Why? "And we will prove them herewith, to see if they will do all things whatsoever the Lord their God shall command them." (Abraham 3:25.) What he commands is what will best fulfill the measure of their existence, but they are not forced to do it? they are not automata. Adam was advised not to eat the fruit but was told at the same time that he was permitted to do it. It was up to him whether he would obey or not. If he did obey, he would qualify for a higher trust.*

*Abraham 4:11?12 continues: "Let us prepare the earth to bring forth grass? And the Gods organized the earth to bring forth grass from its own seed,? yielding fruit [the fruit is the seed], whose seed could only bring forth the same? after his kind; and the Gods saw that they were obeyed." Here are levels of independence down to a complete programming by which the "seed could only bring forth the same." It reminds us of DNA, but nothing is completely automatic, for the Gods watched those things which they had ordered "until they obeyed," that is, until they could be trusted to carry on on their own. This is not Deism, the prearranged harmony of Leibniz, for the Gods keep up an active interest in the operation in which indeed things often go awry: "We shall go away now," they say, "but we shall visit you again," which they do from time to time, keeping up an active interest. The most important provision of all is, "We will bless them," and "cause them to be fruitful and multiply." (Abraham 4:28.) That blessing of everything makes all the difference. The Darwinists might say, "You people are simply describing a natural process in humanized terms," for they have always made much of the completely natural, inevitable, mindless, undirected, spontaneous, mechanical aspect of natural selection necessary for its operation as a purely and completely physical law. They ever gloated on the unfeeling cruelty of the whole thing? "nature red in tooth and claw," as Kipling put it. The blessing is the whole difference between a play and no play.*

*After the earth is set up we are shown everything from Adam's point of view. In Genesis 2:5, we are definitely referred to a pre-temporal creation, then (2:8) we see a garden planted, and (2:15) a man put into the garden, where he is wonderfully at home. He can eat of every tree in the garden (2:16). He lives on terms of greatest intimacy with other creatures, naming and classifying them as he takes his place among them, in the manner of Claude Levi-Strauss's "primitives." (Genesis 2:19?20.) When Adam eats the fruit his eyes are opened? he is a piqueah, one who sees things as they were not seen before, who sees things which he in another condition could not see. He is in a new ambience. Cast out of the garden, he finds himself in a dry climate and changes his diet from fruit to grains, which he must work hard to cultivate.*

*The book of Abraham is more specific. After the great cycles of creation come the smaller cycles, starting with a very dry planet followed by a very wet phase. (Abraham 5:5?6.) Man is formed of the elements of the earth like any other creature, and he lives in a very lush period, a garden, which is however reduced to an oasis in an encroaching desert. (Abraham. 5:7?10.) To this limited terrain he is perfectly adapted. It is a paradise. How long does he live there? No one knows, for this was still "after the Lord's time," not ours. (Abraham 5:13.) It was only when he was forced out of this timeless, changeless paradise that he began to count the hours and days, moving into a hard semi-arid world of*

*thorns, thistles, and briars, where he had to toil and sweat in the heat just to stay alive and lost his old intimacy with the animals. (Genesis 3:17-19.)*

*The questions most commonly asked are: When did it happen? How long did it take? Our texts make it very clear that we are not to measure the time and periods involved by our chronometers and calendars. Until Adam underwent that fatal change of habitat, body chemistry, diet, and psyche that went with the Fall, nothing is to be measured in our years, "for the Gods had not appointed unto Adam his reckoning." (Abraham 5:13.) Until then, time is measured from their point of view, not ours. As far as we are concerned it can be any time, and there would be no point to insisting on this again and again if all we had to do to convert their time to our time was multiply our years by 365,000. Theirs was a different time. The only numbers we are given designated the phases of periods of creation: "and this was the second time" (Abraham 4:8), "and it was the third time" (4:13), and so on. The periods are numbered but never measured. The Gods called them "days," but the text is at great pains to make clear that it was day and night from their point of view, when our time had not yet been appointed. "And the Gods called the light Day, and the darkness they called Night. And from the evening until morning they called night;? and this was the first, or the beginning, of that which they called day and night. (Abraham 4:5.) Doctrine and Covenants 130:4-5 explains that "the reckoning of God's time, angel's time, prophet's time, and man's time [is] according to the planet on which they reside." That implies different time schemes at least. In moving from one system to another one also changes one's timing. "There are no angels who minister to this earth but those who do belong or have belonged to it. (D&C 130:5.)*

*"It was from morning until evening that they called day; and it was the fifth time." (Abraham 4:23.) How long is such a time? In the "fourth time," we read, "the Gods watched those things which they had ordered until they obeyed." (Abraham 4:19, 18.) That important word "until" tells us two things: (1) that they took all the time that was necessary, no matter how long it might have been, measuring the period in terms not of a terminal date but in terms of the requirements of the task; (2) "until" means up till a certain time, but not thereafter. When things were running smoothly, they were left on their own, which implies a shift from one time-scale to another. When, for example, "the Gods prepared the earth to bring forth" (Abraham 4:24), after they had prepared the waters to do the same long before, how long do you think that took? Again, the record is deliberately vague.*

*The relative times are clearly shown when "the Gods organized the lights in the expanse of the heaven." From our position that is just what they are lights, nothing more. "And caused them to divide the day from the night?" Such a division had already taken place at the beginning, but this was a new time-system for this earth. "And organized them to be for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years." (Abraham 4:14.) A sign is a symbol, a mark, an arbitrary indicator, a means of measuring. It is only a sign relative to a particular observer. These lights were not originally created as markers of time, but they could be used as such, they could be "organized for" such. The moon was not created for my convenience; but just the same, from where I stand it can be made to serve a number of special purposes. Aside from measuring time, those heavenly bodies do "give light upon the earth?, the greater light to rule the day, and the*

*lesser light to rule the night; with the lesser light they set the stars also." (Abraham 4:15?16.)*

*Here we get what is perhaps the most striking instance of "anthrocentric cosmology." An astronomer (I think at Notre Dame) recently calculated the probability of a planet in the solar system having a moon (just one moon, at that) that subtended exactly the same arc in the sky as does the sun from the surface of the same planet. The chances are astronomically remote, so remote, indeed, that there seems to be something deliberate about what is otherwise a stunning coincidence. From no other point of view in all the universe will the sun and the moon have exactly the same size. It is also arranged that the stars come out with the moon though the ancients knew perfectly well that they were there in the daytime too; yet for us, again from our point of view only they are simply not there. The North Star does not really stand still while the other stars circle around it (move away from the earth and all your calculations will be spoiled). Hence the repeated insistence on specifying, according to the time appointed as that "upon which thou standest." (Abraham 3:3.)*

*What the book of Abraham shows me is that we are in the midst of eternity, surrounded by evidence of the fact. Every morning on the way to work, I behold those very old rocks at the base of Rock Canyon and think how everywhere around us in space float masses of rock like that, that never, never want to change and really never need to. What does a million years mean to them? For that matter, what does ten minutes? If they were blasted tomorrow, reduced to powder or vapor, nothing would be lost. That is the First Law: The stuff is there. In whatever form it may take, it is always all there. That is the first point scored by the book of Abraham, the first great mystery. Don't ask why it is there. Nobody can tell you. In 1951, the Pope officially declared for the Big Bang theory, because it looked to some like a creatio ex nihilo. Actually, it is just the opposite: the Big Bang took place precisely because all that the universe contains was already compressed within that primal singularity so tightly that it had to explode. It was all there, always. So we begin with an imponderable given quantity: "See, yonder is matter unorganized," or as the Book of Abraham puts it, "We will go down, for there is space there, and we will take of these materials, and we will make an earth whereon these may dwell." (Abraham 3:24.)*

*Mystery No. 2: Why should it be so organized? Its natural state calls for progressive disorganization, the Second Law. But organizing is the exact reversal of that law. Whose idea was it to build this elaborate organization which we can see for ourselves exists, however contrary to natural law? Many scientists are puzzling over that just now. Trust the book of Abraham to anticipate such problems; this sort of thing has been going on for a long, long time. It is planned, programmed, and tested. The "anthropic cosmological principle" recognized that the state of organization depends on the observer. He reads order into the chaos. We may be looking at total chaos or at nothing, but to us it makes sense. Not just to me but to us. If it were only to me it could be an illusion, so we check with each other. Many find the whole thing absurd. Eminent scientists tell us that we are living in an absurd world. But that only means that we know that it should be different. When I say it is absurd, I am complaining that what I see is "not the way it really is." And who are we? Abraham sees that as the ultimate question and meets it handily: intelligence awareness is the*

*beginning and ending of it all. You start out with "intelligences," beyond which nothing is to be said. You can doubt everything else, but that much you must grant there were those intelligences, because they still are. What the book of Abraham tells me is that, if this moment of consciousness is real, then it is all real. I can bear unshakable testimony to one thing: I am here. I am under no obligation to explain it or prove it before it can be believed.*

*Let us consider our Adam. What kind of being is he? The same kind as ourselves, but what is that? He plays a surprising number of roles, each with a different persona, a different name, a different environment, a different office and calling: (1) he was a member of the presidency when the earth project was being discussed; (2) he was on the committee of inspection that came down from time to time to check up on the operation; (3) then he changed his name and nature to live upon the earth, but it was a very different earth from any we know; it had to be a garden place specially prepared for him. (4) When he left that paradise, he changed his nature again and for the first time began to reckon the passing of time by our measurements, becoming a short-lived creature subject to death. (5) In this condition, he began to receive instructions from heavenly mentors on how to go about changing his condition and status, entering into a covenant that completely changed his mentality and way of life. "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit," when "that which is natural" became spiritual. (1 Corinthians 15:45?46.) The man Adam passes from one state of being to another, and so do we: "as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." (1 Corinthians 15:49.) (6) In time he died and became a spirit being, the head of all his spirit children in the waiting-place, according to common Christian tradition as well as our own. (7) Then he became, after Christ, the firstfruits of the resurrection and returned triumphantly to his first and second estates (8) to go on to glory and eternal lives.*

*In these seven or eight Adams, we have another fundamental teaching that sets Mormonism off from all contemporary religion and science. The one views man's life on earth as a one-act drama: Adam fell, Christ redeemed us, and that is the story. Before Adam, there was nothing. Science tells us that the drama is pointless, because there is really nothing after it. We, on the other hand, see an ongoing epic of many episodes, each one a play in itself a dispensation.*

*The fifth chapter of Genesis begins with a very important episode, the formal establishment of Adam's family organization. It begins with a book, a book of remembrance or genealogy, entitled "The Book of the Generations of Adam." It begins, "In the day the Gods set apart [bara-we are being very literal here] Adam in the likeness of the Gods [bi-dmuth elohim] he made him. Male and female he set them apart, and gave them a blessing, and gave them their names as Adam, in the day he set them apart." (See Genesis 5:1?3.) Next comes Seth in the proper line of Adam, and the patriarchal line follows. The preceding chapter tells of the division into Cainites and Sethites, and it is significant that the line of Cain is omitted from the genealogy of Adam. The book of Moses tells of multitudes of Adam's children born before Cain and Abel (Moses 5:12, 16). They had followed Satan by choice and were disqualified as sons of God. We read in Moses: "And unto thy brethren have I given commandment, that they should choose me, their Father. But behold, their sins shall be upon the heads of their fathers; Satan shall be their father." (Moses 7:33, 37.) Those who accepted the covenant were*

*called sons of God and also the sons of Adam: "And this is the genealogy of the sons of Adam, who was the son of God." (Moses 6:22.) Only those qualify as Bene-Adam who are still in the covenant. Bene-Adam, however, is the normal Jewish word for human beings. The Septuagint considers Adam a proper noun from Genesis 2:16 on; the Vulgate from 2:19 on; Adam appears for the first time as a proper noun in the standard Hebrew Bible only after Genesis 4:25. In that text twenty-two of the twenty-seven occurrences of the name are accompanied by the article: "the man." They are not proper names. In Genesis, E. Lussier concludes that Adam has four senses:*

1. "Man," a particular man, the first man (sixteen times).
2. The first husband (nine times).
3. Generic, "mankind" (two times).
4. As a proper name? once!<sup>44</sup>

*So we might well ask: What about those people who lived before Cain and Abel? What about those who disappeared from sight? What about those who were not even warned of the Flood? What about those many, many who visited the earth as resurrected beings? What about the Watchers? What about the sons of God who should not marry the daughters of men, and vice versa? And what about the giants they begot when they did marry? What about the comings and goings of Enoch's day between the worlds? What about his own status as "a wild man"? a strange thing in the land"? (Moses 6:38.) Who were his people, living in a distant land of righteousness, who never appear on the scene? What about the Three Nephites, whose condition so puzzles Moroni, until he is told that they are neither mortal nor immortal? (Mormon 8:10?11.) What about the creatures we do not see around us? What about the Cainites? What about the nations among whom Noah will have surviving progeny?*

*Speaking of Noah, God promised Enoch "that he [God] would call upon the children of Noah; and he sent forth an unalterable decree, that a remnant of his seed [Enoch's through Noah] should always be found among all nations, while the earth should stand; and the Lord said: Blessed is he through whose seed Messiah shall come." (Moses 7:51?53.) Methuselah boasted about his line as something special. (Moses 8:2?3.) Why special if it included the whole human race? These blessings have no meaning if all the people of the earth and all the nations are the seed of Noah and Enoch. What other line could the Messiah come through? Well, there were humans who were not invited by Enoch's preaching? not included among the residue of people not entering Enoch's city. They were "the residue of the people which were the sons of Adam; and they were a mixture of all the seed of Adam save it was the seed of Cain, for the seed of Cain? had not place among them (Moses 7:32.)*

*One thing we should understand is that the image of the pre-hominid is not a discovery of modern science any more than the idea of evolution is. Primitive man is the easiest thing in the world to imagine. Just look at your neighbor. The Greeks were fascinated with him, and so were the Middle Ages. Albrecht Altdorfer's painting "Der Wilde Mann," done in the early sixteenth century, showing a real ape-man at home with his family, is as good as anything H. F.*

*Osborne ever turned out. Albrecht D?Iso was intrigued by the subject. Herbert Spencer had only to lean back in his armchair to turn out the First Principles. I have never found students the least hesitant to write papers on "A Day in the Life of Primitive Man." They know all about it. They don't have to look up a thing.*

*This is a natural product of the silliest doctrine of all that of cultural evolution. Taking one's own, contemporary civilization as the very latest civilization (which it is) and therefore the best (which it is not), it is the easiest thing in the world to classify all other civilizations on a scale of proximity to your own in time and spirit. Chr<sup>失</sup>en de Troyes in the twelfth century begins his famous work with such a classification. This is just as sound and scientific as textbooks on cultural anthropology used for years.*

*But is it logical to begin at the top, as our Adam does? The Adam tradition has it that Adam was the best and greatest, the most perfect of all men. Isn't that getting the normal process of things backwards? Not at all, in some things. If you want to found a university, do you begin by gathering a colony of very stupid and ignorant people and wait for it to evolve into an increasingly glorious institution? Does a university evolve? It accumulates books and buildings and staff; and if size is what makes a university, then we do indeed progress. But as often as not the big problem is to keep it from deteriorating!*

*So it is with Adam. Must modern man be an improvement on him? Such is that absurd doctrine of cultural evolution with which the schools have been saddled for a century. I well remember my old music teacher, Mr. Seyler, shaking his head with wonder at how Mozart could possibly have written such wonderful music two hundred years ago!*

*Those soporific words "gradually" and "step by step," repeated incessantly, are aimed at covering an ignorance that is both vast and surprising. One is lulled, overwhelmed, and stupefied by the gradualness of it all, which is at best a platitude, only good for pacifying the mind. The lazy word "evolution" has blinded us to the real complexities of the past. It raises an appalling number of questions to which we have no answer. Our ignorance not only remained vast, but became pretentious as well.<sup>45</sup>*

*Are we superior to the ancients? "If man had originally inhabited a world as blankly uniform as a high-rise housing development, as featureless as a parking lot, as destitute of life as an automated factory, it is doubtful that he would have had a sufficiently varied experience to retain images, mold languages, or acquire ideas."<sup>46</sup>*

*If unused organs atrophy, we are losing rather than gaining brain-power. A. R. Wallace sorely offended Darwin by asking him, If every organ represents that minimal response to which it has been pressured by the need for survival, whence the brain, that marvelous organ endowed with a hundred times more power than any primitive has ever needed for survival or any modern man ever makes use of? What possible environment could, as a requirement for survival or any other purpose, have called forth such a prodigal reservoir of intellect? We can only look to a "first primeval childhood" far different from anything we know and conclude that Adam's background reaches into a past more marvelous than any we can imagine.*

*That is another thing the most recent studies are bringing to light more clearly all the time: uniformitarianism is assumed in all calculations, but now it begins to look to the naturalists as well as the physicists that things were far, far different back there than we can ever imagine them, recalling H. R. Haldane's famous remark that the universe is not only stranger than we think it is but stranger than we ever can think it to be.*

*One of those innumerable hypotheses that Professor Campbell mentions, now released for serious discussion by recent discoveries, is that human life may have been transplanted directly from some other planet. Speculating on the subject, we have the romantic Carl Sagan; Leslie E. Orgel of the Salk Institute; Francis H. C. Crick, a Nobel laureate; and others. One eminent scientist, Albert Rosenfeld, confesses, "I'm somehow not surprised at the idea that someone out there put us here. And if such a magical, mysterious, and powerful intelligence exists that is utterly beyond human imagining, can you give me a good reason why I shouldn't call it God?"<sup>47</sup>*

*Which takes us back to the issue with which the Adam question began and which has always been the central issue of human paleontology: a matter of definitions. They may seem trivial, secondary, na جمی؟ but the experts have never been able to get away from it. Evolution and natural selection were never defined to D a r w i n ' s satisfaction. Today all the specialists are trying to agree on a clear definition for man: when is a homo a homo, and how much? And one of our biggest stumbling blocks is not knowing how Adam relates to other beings, earthly and heavenly. That is the root of the Adam-God misunderstanding ( U n t i*

*we care to look into the matter seriously, I will keep my opinions in a low profile.)*

*Do not begrudge existence to creatures that looked like men long, long ago, nor deny them a place in God's affection or even a right to exaltation for our scriptures allow them such. Nor am I overly concerned as to just when they might have lived, for their world is not our world. They have all gone away long before our people ever appeared. God assigned them their proper times and*

*functions, as he has given me mine: a full-time job that admonishes me to remember his words to the overly eager Moses: "For mine own purpose have I made these things. Here is wisdom and it remaineth in me." (Moses 1:31.) It is Adam as my own parent who concerns me. When he walks onto the stage, then and only then the play begins. He opens a book and starts calling out names. They are the sons of Adam, who also qualify as sons of God, Adam himself being a son of God. This is the book of remembrance from which many have been blotted out. They have fallen away, refused to choose God as their father, and by so doing were registered in Satan's camp. "Satan shall be their father, and misery shall be their doom." (Moses 7:37.) Can we call them sons of Adam, bene-Adam, human beings proper? The representative Egyptians, Babylonians, Greeks, and Romans, to name only the classic civilizations of old, each fancied themselves to be beings of a higher nature, nearer to gods than others who inhabited the land with them (and before them), or who dwelt in other lands. And yet they did not deny humanity to them.*

*Adam becomes Adam, a hominid becomes a man, when he starts keeping a record. What kind of record? A record of his ancestors, the family line that sets him off from all other creatures. Such records begin very early, to judge by the fabulous genealogic knowledge of the Australian aborigines (A. P. Elkin) or the most "primitive" Africans (L. Frobenius). Even written records go back to ages lost in the mists of time, the Azilian pebbles, the marking of arrows, and the identity of individuals in their relationships with each other.<sup>48</sup> Whether former speculation about life on other worlds is now to be upgraded to life from other worlds remains to be seen, but Adam is wonderful enough without that. That gap between the record keeper and all the other creatures we know anything about is so unimaginably enormous and yet so neat and abrupt that we can only be dealing with another sort of being, a quantum leap from one world to another. Here is something not derivative from anything that has gone before on the local scene, even though they all share the same atoms.*

*"Before Adam" is the edited text of an address given to the BYU community on April 1, 1980.*

#### Notes

1. Jordan, Robert Paul, "Washington Cathedral, 'House of Prayer for All People'," *National Geographic Magazine*, April 1980, pp. 566-67.
2. *Life on Other Worlds*, Symposium (CBS), sponsored by Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Mar. 1, 1961.
3. Smith, Joseph, *History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, 7 vols., 2nd ed. rev., edited by B. H. Roberts (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1932-51), 5:362; *Journal of Discourses*, 26 vols. (London: Latter-day Saints Book Depot, 1854-86), 10:147.
4. Cited in Joad, Cyril Edwin Mitchinson, *Guide to Philosophy* (New York: Dover, 1946), p. 524.
5. Jelinek, Arthur J., "The Lower Paleolithic: Current Evidence and Interpretations," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 6 (1977): 28.

6. Dubos, René *So Human an Animal* (New York: Scribners, 1968), pp, 14,15.
7. Dubos, p. 195.
8. Dubos, p. 209.
9. Singh, R. S., *Absurd Drama 1945?1956* (Delhi: Hariyana Press, 1973), p. 5.
10. Campbell, Bernard G., "Conceptual Progress in Physical Anthropology: Fossil Man," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 1 (1972): 27.
11. Jerison, Harry J., "Fossil Evidence of the Evolution of the Human Brain," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 4 (1975): 46.
12. Jerison, p. 46.
13. Jerison, p. 46.
14. Pilbeam, D., "Recent Finds and Interpretations of Miocene Hominoids," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 8 (1979):339f.
15. Pilbeam, p. 339f.
16. Jelinek, p. 20.
17. Campbell, p. 27.
18. Pilbeam, p. 350.
19. Howells, William W., "Homo Erectus," in B. M. Fagan, ed., *Avenues to Antiquity, Readings from the Scientific American* (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1976), p. 30.
20. Pilbeam, p. 350.
21. Washburn, Sherwood L., "Tools and Human Evolution," in. Fagan,p.27.
22. Simpson, G. G., quoted by John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood* (Philadelphia: Baker Book, 1961), p. 443.
23. Darwin, Charles, *The Autobiography of Charles Darwin and Selected Letters* (New York: Dover, 1958), p, 62.
24. Dobzhansky, Theodosius, "Evolution at Work," *Science* 127 May 9, 1958): 1092.
25. Dobzhansky, p. 1092.
26. Howells, p. 35.

27. *B. Rensberger, in New York Times, Sept. 10, 1979.*
28. *Rensberger.*
29. *Pilbeam, p. 343.*
30. *Pilbeam, p. 341.*
31. *Campbell, pp. 43, 44.*
32. *Washburn, p. 5.*
33. *Jelinek, pp. 16, 19.*
34. *Washburn, p. 15.*
35. *Washburn, p. 6.*
36. *Washburn, p. 15.*
37. *Lumley, Henry de, "A Paleolithic Camp at Nice," in Fagan, p. 39f.'*
38. *Klein, Richard G., "Ice-Age Hunters of the Ukraine," in Fagan, pp. 66, 71.*
39. *Klein, p. 73.*
40. *Klein, p. 75.*
41. *Dobzhansky, p.1097.*
42. *Bartow, John D., and Joseph Silk, "The Structure of the Early Universe," Scientific American 424 (April 1980):127.*
43. *Bartow, p. 128.*
44. *Lustier, Ernest, "Adam in Genesis 1, 1?4, 24, " Catholic Biblical Quarterly 18 (1956): 137?38.*
45. *Santillana, Giorgio de, Hamlet's Mill (Boston: David R. Godine, 1069), pp. 68?71.*
46. *Cited in Dubos, p. 174.*
47. *Discussed in Rosenfeld, Albert, "Did Someone Out There Put Us Here?" Saturday Review, Nov. 20, 1973, p. 59.*
48. *Nibley, Hugh, "The Arrow, the Hunter, and the State," Western Po1itical Quarterly 2 (1949): 328?44.*

