

Your Moral World View

By David L. Miner
July, 2006

It is time we get real and honest about the moral world view which you seem to espouse. I say this because I don't really believe you are real and honest about your moral world view. I say this without knowing you. And I say this whether you are an atheist or a Bible-thumping born again Christian, a conservative Republican or a socialistic Democrat, or just plain confused.

I don't think you have thought about your moral world view enough to **be** real and honest about it. You might be parroting your parent's view, or your teacher's view or your political party's view. Or you might be taking a position on an issue because you are scared to death of the implications of the alternatives. It's possible you have taken a position and are too lazy to mentally walk through the implications of it. You might even have taken a position because you refuse to take the alternative view. But I don't really think you have developed your own moral world view based on thought and reason and commitment.

Before you explode in protest, let's explore this allegation for a moment.

But first, my purpose here isn't to change your moral world view. You have an absolute right to your moral world view, regardless of whether you base it on feelings or on fact or on an absolute absence of thought. If, on the other hand, after the thought required in this discussion, you realize your moral world view needs revision, then I will have accomplished far more than I could have hoped.

Let me give an example for your consideration. Let's say you have decided that there is no expression of religious philosophy or religious perspective that is acceptable when and if expressed or tolerated by any government individual or agency. After all, there is this "separation of church and state" thing, right? This decision results in your belief that all schools and other government agencies allow no religious expression in their documents or policies or buildings. And let's say that this belief and these efforts all stem from your conclusion that the Founding Fathers did not believe in God or else they would have written that belief into the Constitution. So, as a result of your beliefs, you agree with the current attempts to remove all crosses from government land, all references to the Ten Commandments from court buildings, and all expressions of Christmas and Easter from our schools.

My response, presented in the unfeeling and insulting manner I always try to avoid in person but relish in dispassionate presentations such as this, is simple – your beliefs, and the actions arising from them, are based on ignorance. Don't get me wrong, you have an absolute right to your beliefs, however they are derived. But when you reserve

the right to present or discuss your views, and those views are based on ignorance, then you grant the right, whether you like it or not, to the teacher in me to correct your ignorance. So here it comes.

First, every one of the Founding Fathers wrote and spoke extensively about their own sincerely-held beliefs in God as Creator. They all spoke and wrote that their religious views profoundly affected their personal lives and their political views. And they all spoke and wrote about their abhorrence of a government-sponsored or government-required religion or religious perspective.

Of course, there are many recent publications that offer quotes from many of the Founders which suggest the opposite is true. But look closely at those quotes and you will see every one of them are short quotes taken out of context when seen in the actual speeches and completed writings of those men and women. In other words, the political agendas of the authors led them to present incomplete quotes in such a way as to deceive you. Go back and read the complete speeches or articles and you will see a different story altogether. Every one of the Founders believed in a Creator and gave that Creator credit of the existence of this new nation.

Second, the Founding Fathers all wrote of their faith as one of the reasons WHY they wanted to break away from England and form their own nation. Their religious, shall we say "Christian", perspectives drove their political perspectives, and they clearly made no apologies for that fact. Hence, God was directly included in our country's Declaration of Independence and in America's special perspective on freedom.

Third, the Constitution left out references to God and any religious perspective because the Founding Fathers did not want their own or any other religious perspective to be endorsed by the government which that Constitution created, or the laws that came out of that government it created. Then the Founders repented (pun fully intended) of that decision to not even mention religion in the Constitution, and added the First Amendment to the Constitution. That Amendment totally restricted the federal government from creating or establishing any religion as the "federal" or government-adopted religion. At the same time, that Amendment totally restricted the federal government from infringing on or restricting in any way the practice of religious beliefs. So We The People are free to practice our religious perspectives any way we choose and the federal government cannot stop us. Nor can the federal government require any religious perspectives or expressions from us. In America's Constitution, we have government-mandated freedom of religion; we do not have government-mandated freedom *FROM* religion.

So the historical facts show us that our Founding Fathers had strong personal religious beliefs, which helped shape their political beliefs. And the historical facts put the fears of those Founders into writing, restricting the federal government from establishing any religious perspective as a State Religion, while, at the same time, restricting the federal government from passing any laws that limited the religious beliefs and practices of We The People.

So, if you believe the Founding Fathers had no close personal relationships with the Creator of the Universe, you are wrong. If you believe that the Founding Fathers refused to allow their religious perspectives to affect their political views, you are wrong. If you believe that no government individual or agency can allow any religious views to be expressed, you are wrong. The Constitution restricts ONLY the federal government, and does not and cannot restrict any state or local government in any way.

On the other hand, even if your stated reasons for your current political beliefs and actions are based in error, you have the absolute right to pursue your political beliefs and their resultant actions. As long, of course, as your political beliefs do not call for the overthrow of our federal Constitution or restricts my political beliefs and actions..

So let us continue in our discussion of your personal beliefs and the possible errors underlying those beliefs.

You probably believe that God created all people equal. Yet you most likely believe in spending tax dollars to help the less fortunate in their homes, schools, college or the job market, indicating that there really are some who are less equal than others. You probably believe in free speech, yet there are some beliefs that you don't want expressed in our schools, suggesting you believe that free speech should be limited. Most likely you subscribe to the oft-stated claim "You can't legislate morality." On the other hand, laws that allow or require us to treat homosexuals as "normal," which are inescapably and clearly based on some sort of morality, probably have your support. Even those who believe in the right to defend themselves against violence are often uncomfortable with the thought that the person sitting next to them in a restaurant or standing next to them in a line is carrying a concealed weapon. There are all sorts of inconsistencies in your belief system, almost certainly, and you probably have never really considered them.

I think it is time you examined what you really believe. Let's try an issue.

Suppose you believe in evolution. After all, don't the educational institutions of this Great Nation claim that evolution is a **fact** and that any belief to the contrary is merely a religious superstition? (By the way, even the educational talking heads spewing that belief from an overdose of damaged gray cells aren't being real and honest about it. You'll see that this is true shortly.) In fact, evolution is such a powerful and ubiquitous religious dogma in the educational arena that teachers are currently being censured and professors are being denied tenure if they are not ardent public supporters of evolution. How is that for inviting open thought and academic freedom? And you were so naive' as to think educators were open-minded...

So, you believe evolution is a fact. According to Charles Darwin and all of the prophets of this humanist religious philosophy (yes, evolution is clearly a humanistic religious philosophy, and for a number of reasons that we don't have the time or room to discuss in this short article), the two dominant forces producing change within the evolutionary

dogma are mutation and natural selection. Mutation is known within science to be the unique, unpredictable, unexpected and (not to be minimized) spontaneous change in genes and chromosomes that physically manifest in changes to the body of a plant or animal. Like fins and lungs and wings. Also like crops or gizzards in birds and multiple stomachs in cows and a single stomach in humans. A physical change, spontaneous and unpredictable, in the genes and chromosomes resulted in a physiological change in the organism.

That's mutation.

Then, assuming that the resultant change (mutation) is an improvement in procreation or survival in some subtle or obvious way, the population of that organism will breed with the mutated organism and produce more of the mutated organism, which will again be such an improvement in procreation or survivability that additional organisms within that population group will mate with the mutated organisms, producing over time a change in the dominant characteristics of that population. Any change that is a benefit to the survivability of the individual or the species will be carried forward. All changes NOT beneficial will die out.

That's natural selection.

It has been established time and again, by those who believe in spontaneous evolution and by those who don't, that almost all mutations result in the death of the organism. It has been suggested that perhaps one in a million births manifest a mutation, and perhaps one in ten million of those mutations might be beneficial enough to survive. (These are illustrative numbers. There are many scientific articles which establish calculated numbers.) It is a scientific fact that almost all mutations just aren't viable. You cannot mutate gills into lungs and expect a fish to survive beyond birth because the fish will drown. You cannot mutate wings into legs and expect a bird to live beyond birth because the bird will fall to the ground and die the first time its mother attempts to force it to fly. Almost all mutations result in death. Almost all of the rest of those mutations will not be selected to continue. And the very few mutations that might be viable must be accompanied by dozens and perhaps hundreds of otherwise spontaneous and unpredictable and unexpected mutations that are COMPATIBLE WITH EACH OTHER, and somehow all happened in the same embryo at the same time, in order to survive and propagate.

A simple example would be an opposable thumb in a monkey. Such a mutation could (would?) spontaneously and unexpectedly occur. (Obviously, it would **have** to occur spontaneously and unexpectedly unless you believe in Intelligent Design...) And this mutated monkey with its opposable thumb would be the only one on the planet with an opposable thumb, unless you postulate that an unpredictable and unexpected and identical mutation would occur in another monkey of the same or other species in the same or other local population. But let's keep this simple (relatively) by assuming this particular mutation occurred in only one monkey in one local population somewhere on this planet in some prehistoric time.

But this one mutant embryonic monkey would have had to experience a number of unique and unpredictable and compatible mutations at exactly the same time in this same monkey. In addition to the “simple” issue of turning the thumb around backward, you would have to assume that there would be an equal and matching change in the mental processes of that same unique monkey. After all, most and possibly all of the behaviors of that prehistoric species of monkey were instinctual. The spontaneous and unexpected appearance of an opposing thumb would have no instinctual behaviors associated with it. So, in order for that thumb to be useful for the monkey in survival, there would have to be some conscious thought processes while an infant and before growing to adulthood in order to effectively utilize that thumb, or else you would have to postulate that the monkey will at the same time have an additional mutation in instincts. Specifically, it would not be enough to **HAVE** an opposable thumb; the prehistoric monkey would have to learn how to use it or would have to receive from somewhere the instincts to use it. And not only that, but an opposable thumb would require dozens and possibly hundreds of spontaneous and unpredictable and unexpected and compatible mutations all at the same time within that same developing embryo. Not only would the bones have to be reshaped and rotated in order to be opposing, but the thumb itself would be a useless appendage unless the muscles and ligaments **also** underwent a spontaneous and unpredictable and unexpected and compatible mutation. Muscles do not “look around” and attach to a bone nearby -- they are programmed to attach to a particular bone in a particular place by genes. There is no benefit to having a useless collection of one much less the required 5 or 6 mutated bones unless you also had some compatibly-mutated muscles and ligaments. And naturally you would need to postulate a repositioning of blood vessels and nerves else these mutated bones and mutated muscles and mutated ligaments would have no blood supply while they are developing and no feeling afterward.

So we begin to see that even a “simple” mutation to an opposable thumb would require dozens and perhaps hundreds and possibly thousands of other spontaneous and unpredictable and unexpected and compatible mutations **at the same time** in order to allow that thumb to function.

But let’s assume that somehow these dozens and perhaps hundreds and possibly thousands of spontaneous and unpredictable and unexpected and compatible mutations all occurred in the same developing embryo in such a way that there would not only be an opposable thumb, but that it would be a **usable** opposable thumb. Of course, it would be a great convenience to that monkey if that same series of unique, unpredictable and spontaneous mutations would occur in both hands so the monkey would have two usable opposable thumbs. I mean, it would be kind of cruel if evolution gave the little monkey an opposable thumb on his right hand and a normal thumb on his left hand. Talk about confusing...

Anyway, let’s assume that an incredibly complex series of compatible mutations have occurred to a little boy monkey and let’s assume that at least one little girl monkey liked his opposable thumbs. If his opposable thumbs provided some advantage to this little

monkey (he could grab food better, hold onto it more strongly, protect his mate more effectively, swing higher and faster in the trees – some substantial advantage for this monkey to have opposable thumbs), then natural selection would allow him to mate and reproduce his thumbs.

POSSIBLY! It is probable that this new trait in this little boy monkey would overcome the odds and cause the little boy monkey to obtain a mate and produce offspring, just to have the trait die out and not be manifest in the offspring. Almost all mutations simply die out over time.

Wait a minute! We would have to postulate that opposable thumbs would be a dominant trait and not a submissive trait or else even if he DID mate it would never show up in his offspring and the trait would die out. Oh, this thing called mutation is so complex and confusing...

But, anyway, if your faith is strong enough to believe in this long and detailed series of events, all spontaneously occurring in the same monkey at the same time, then you do not understand the Law of Probability. It would make far more sense that you would expect to win the grand prize from Publishers Clearing House ten years in a row than you would believe in the opposable thumb scenario we described actually happening. And then you would have to assume that billions more of similar “miracles” would occur over time to in order for evolution to have produced the current variety of plants and animals we see today. My, do YOU have faith!

But I am not writing this article to refute Darwinian evolution...

Let's assume you believe absolutely and totally in this religious philosophy we call Darwinian evolution. And let's assume you believe absolutely and totally in the only mechanisms of Darwinian evolution – mutation and natural selection. And let's assume that you believe mankind has evolved from lower animals and – at this moment – sits at the top of the evolutionary ladder. And let's assume you believe that the human brain has evolved from the amoral world of merely instinctual behavior into the modern world of conscious thought with values and morals.

If you really believed all this, then you would end any and all forms of welfare. Affirmative action would be outlawed. Equality – racial, sexual, social – would be disallowed and seen as counter productive. Don't forget that evolution requires that only the strongest survive!

Now, now, I realize you are probably shouting bad things at me, but think about it!

The only things that are valid considerations in evolutionary development are mutation and natural selection. Natural selection, from amoebas to monkeys to mankind, is based on only three issues: food, reproduction, and mortality. If opposing thumbs ONLY offer that little monkey the ability to get more food or hang onto that food better, or ONLY offer that little monkey the ability to grab tree branches better and thereby

escape predators better, then that specific mutation will probably be selected and survive into future generations of monkeys.

So, what is it about the social “values” of welfare, affirmative action and equality (among many others) that enhance the cold and objective tenants of evolution?

Specifically, if a group of people need “help” to survive, then natural selection would demand their removal from the gene pool. If they can’t make it on their own, social and political demands for equality run counter to evolution’s stated beliefs. Natural selection in its very essence is competition. If an individual or group or company or nation cannot successfully compete, then it should be allowed to diminish and disappear.

This is the foundational goal of evolution! Remember “survival of the fittest?”

Handicapped people, older people, ***less capable people in any way*** simply do not meet the demands of evolution and, therefore, have no truly scientific justification or reason for existence. *And to assist those less fortunate is to defeat the foundational goal of evolution.*

The leadership of Planned Parenthood, in the early years of the 20th Century, saw the necessity of this argument and embraced the idea that the black race was inferior and should be reduced or eliminated. The resultant endorsement of government-sponsored abortion for minorities was their goal and their enactment of this belief. (Yes, I know Planned Parenthood never specified abortions for *only* minorities. But Planned Parenthood did write a number of articles embracing the reduction in minority populations, especially black Americans. And Planned Parenthood has for many years supported programs for government-paid abortions which clearly and specifically target minorities. So the net result is the FACT that the overwhelming majority of abortions performed by Planned Parenthood – the largest abortion provider in the world – is performed on minorities, especially of the black race.) Other anthropologist and humanist leaders, *some still in positions of leadership* in our educational and scientific institutions, believed that certain races were best suited for certain limited functions, with the higher functions reserved for the white or European races. Books like Orwell's *1984* and Huxley's *Brave, New World* underscored these beliefs.

These views make total sense in light of Darwinian Evolution, and these people were correct in their beliefs and actions according to that “scientific” system, even if they are castigated and abhorred by their socially-minded contemporaries.

Obviously, most Americans would shudder at these thoughts, and condemn those who hold these views. *Yet, they have no moral authority or scientific justification to do so if they embrace Darwinian evolution and the belief that humans are merely evolved animals, the result of mutation and natural selection!*

Oh, I know, you would probably claim that modern evolved man has developed higher values and that these values would condemn those individuals who espouse such

horrible ideas and ideals. And I would ask, WHY? What, according to the well-defined principles of Darwinian evolution, would advance the species by helping those who need help? Specifically? It might make some “enlightened” people FEEL BETTER, as long as it is other people's money that pays for this, but there is clearly no practical or evolutionary benefit. I would bet a steak dinner that you cannot list one benefit to humanity – a benefit as defined according to Darwinian evolution and not social or humanistic or spiritual values – that comes from helping economically disadvantaged or socially unproductive or mentally-deficient individuals and groups. Darwinian “values” would reward those who compete effectively and ignore those who cannot. Darwinian “values” would leave the “losers” alone to suffer their fate. Darwinian “values” would allow them to become a forgotten footnote in the history of the improvement of the species. Those of lesser intelligence or lesser abilities are an evolutionary dead-end, according to Darwinian “values” and true evolutionary principles.

I have debated these questions for more than 45 years with hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of evolutionists, and not one of them could give me good answers to these questions. The **ONLY** answers they could give were answers that I also would give – answers based on morals and values. But morals and values are spiritual answers and not scientific answers.

The *Scientific Method* is the foundation of all scientific inquiry. It is the bedrock of what is and what is not “scientific.” The *Scientific Method* disallows Intelligent Design, the only alternative to Darwinian Evolution. Intelligent Design presupposes a Designer, a supernatural being with supernatural powers that designed and created this world and everything in it. Intelligent Design is not considered scientific by those in control of our educational system, and therefore not considered suitable for academic acceptance and DEFINITELY NOT for science classes or scientific discussions, and simply because of the presuppositions of the supernatural. In other words, if it is not perceived by our five senses, if it is outside the natural world, as reasoned by those in control of American education, it is simply not scientific.

And I would submit to you that every reason you would give to me for embracing the social “values” of welfare, affirmative action and equality are totally outside the realm of the scientific. Therefore, they are totally outside the allowed tenants of Darwinian “values.” Therefore, they are totally opposed to Darwinian evolution.

Therefore, they are **WRONG** if you believe in evolution.

Empathy for those less fortunate, expressed in any way, is inconsistent with Darwinian Evolution. Actions to benefit those less fortunate clearly work to defeat Darwinian Evolution, and therefore to slow or eliminate the further evolution of humans.

Please understand that I have no problem with your inconsistency – believing in evolution yet reserving the right to “feel” things contrary to that belief – because my understanding of the Bible *requires* that same empathy from me. The “value” of each individual no matter how he or she fulfills utilitarian and evolutionary goals is declared

by the God of the Bible. So I can feel free to believe in the social “values” of welfare, affirmative action and equality because these values are not inconsistent with my belief system in any way. And therefore I can allow you to lie about or in any way controvert one of your core values, because I like the resultant actions of those lies.

On the other hand, you should have serious problems with your inconsistencies. It should bother you every day that your chosen belief in the foundational “truth” of Darwinian evolution does not allow you to embrace what your heart calls you to embrace. It should cause you to seriously re-evaluate your belief system if it cannot or does not allow you to feel and express the values that are at the core of your being.

The mere fact that you have these feelings and values is proof that Darwinian evolution is not true. The mere fact that you have these feelings and values is evidence of God and his Intelligent Design.

The mere fact that you have these feelings and values is clear evidence that you have not thought through your beliefs.

Or maybe that your religious belief in Darwinian evolution is wrong.

Perhaps you believe in Intelligent Design after all, and just don't want others to know...