

CREATION AND EVOLUTION

Presented to:
Merritt Horn
The Boulder School
for
Students of The URANTIA Book

Wanda Dean White

PREFACE

The conflicts between science and religion have always fascinated me, sometimes I have been amused, sometimes frustrated, but always interested in ideas and philosophies that have attempted to coordinate, unify, and bridge the gaps between the two. I have been especially interested in bridging the gaps between those extreme naturalists who refuse to allow for any divine creator behind our discoverable laws, and those fundamentalists who base their beliefs on a literal interpretation of the Genesis story of creation.

I had already reconciled my own fundamentalist background with a belief in evolution long before reading The URANTIA Book. I had no real conflicts since the evidence for evolution always seemed to far outweigh the opposing evidence. Since my first introduction to evolution in high school biology, I have always viewed it as God's way of creating and had no real problem accepting a liberal version of Christianity without a literal interpretation of scripture.

Before reading The URANTIA Book I taught science for over ten years in Alabama and Tennessee, the heart of the Bible belt, where most of my students had been taught a literal interpretation of scripture. I always felt the need to arouse an interest and curiosity about evolution in my students. I carefully took note of how my students felt about it and how much they already knew about it. I usually managed to have the word "evolution" crop up in class, as it inevitably does in today's textbooks, and would encourage class comments and discussions. Through dialogue, without being dogmatic about my beliefs, I always managed to tell them some things about the theory. Occasionally I would become enthused over the discussion and would receive comments, such as, "But Mrs. White, don't you believe that God created us?" I always replied with assurance that I did believe that God created everything, but it might be possible that evolution was one of the ways God created. Many times, "with tongue in cheek", I managed to interest students in evolution with no serious repercussions

from parents or school boards.

After reading the fifth epochal revelation almost five years ago, I have made an effort to understand the teaching methods of Jesus. Jesus instructed Simon to, "always strive to put something into hungry souls, not to always strive to take something out." (p.1592:4) The midwayers tell us that as a teacher, "Jesus never once attacked the errors or mentioned the flaws in other teachings. He always selected the truth in what they taught and then proceeded to embellish and illiminate the truth in their minds." (p.1456:0)

With many failures behind me in trying to follow the example of Jesus, I realize the importance of being well versed in many scientific views of evolution before attempting to teach it. The better informed we are about how evolutionary thought has evolved throughout history and how both scientists and religionists have viewed the conflicts, the better we we can understand where our students are and what truths they already understand. We can accept our students as they are and present to them enlightened concepts without attacking their errors directly.

This paper is a short summary of evolutionary thought on our planet from our earliest recorded history to the Urantia revelations. It is written to help clarify my own thoughts and help other students to understand evolutionary theory more clearly. It is intended to help me, and hopefully, others, in our encounters with those who do not believe in evolution; those who fear that a study of it may destroy their faith in God; those who seek a better understanding of creation and evolution; and those who believe in evolution, but refuse to see it as a process, planned and directed by God.

CONTENTS

Preface	I
Evolution Before Darwin.....	1
Charles Darwin.....	5
After Darwin.....	7
Teilhard de Chardin.....	11
<u>THE URANTIA BOOK</u>	14
Conclusion.....	18
References.....	22

EVOLUTION BEFORE DARWIN

In this section I obviously cannot trace the complete history of the development of the concepts of evolution, so this is only a brief sampling of the ideas advanced during different ages, from the early Greeks to Darwin as outlined in Gardner's History of Biology.

The earliest concepts of evolution recorded in history are in the writings of the early Greek philosophers. In the sixth century B.C., we have in the school of Thales, philosophers who were trying to understand the basis of all things. Two writers of this period tried to explain the universe in rational terms and developed crude theories of evolution. Anaximander(611-547) visualized all things as having come from a primordial fluid or slime to which they ultimately return. This was the first concept of "spontaneous generation", the idea that all living things arose from primordial matter. He said that man himself was first shaped like a fish and lived in water. Later, when he became capable of terrestrial life, he burst forth from his fishlike capsule and assumed human form on land. Xenophanes(570-480) was the first to recognize that fossils were once living organisms, and that marine fossils on land indicated that the earth was once covered by the sea.

In the sixth century B.C., we also have the roots of the idea that reality is a process. Heraclitus(556-460) who once said that "you cannot step in the same river twice", thought reality was change and flux. His ideas were in sharp contrast to Parmenides(550-470), who said that underlying every change was something fundamental that did not change. Parmenides became the father of Greek metaphysics and later of western thought. Some feel that his concepts were static and did not lead to the idea of change and process that is necessary to understand evolution.

In the fifth century B.C., Empedocles(504-433) first proposed a clear concept of evolution. He believed in spontaneous generation and that the whole world was the product of fire, air, water, and earth. These were the accepted theories of the times. In addition Empedocles recognized two forces-love,

which was constructive and joined things; and hate, which was destructive and tore things apart. He said the earth came first, then plants, whose buds gave rise to animals. In some slime buds developed into organs of the body. On some plants legs, arms, necks, heads, or other organs developed. When love prevailed they united and when hate prevailed they tore apart. The germ of the idea of natural selection was present since most of his creatures were monsters, but the few forming that were more adapted could survive. In at least three ways he approached modern views: (1) higher forms of life gradually evolve, (2) plants evolve before animals, and (3) better adapted forms tend to replace less adapted ones.

In the fourth century B.C., Aristotle(384-322) had a great impact on evolutionary thought. He was a vitalist, believing that all living things were animated by a vital force or guiding intelligence, not by something in matter. This internal force operated constantly to improve the world and out of this developed the idea of the "ladder of nature". This ladder went from inanimate matter to plants to animals to man. This concept which did not allow for change from one species to another became known as "the fixity of the species", and eventually led to the idea that change could occur within species, and was brought about by necessity. Aristotelian concepts included a grand design and a purposefulness of all events, which was the first argument of teleology, an argument for purpose and concludes that such purpose is evidence for a supreme mind.

During the third century B.C., Epicurus(341-270) and Democritus(460-362) were materialists and mechanists, meaning they tried to explain the universe in terms of natural causes. They opposed Aristotle's argument of teleology, but Aristotle dominated scientific thought for almost two thousand years.

During the period between these ancients and modern times(500-1450 A.D.) called the middle ages, the classical period of science declined, preoccupation with spiritual matters took precedence over scientific matters, and major

conflicts between religion and science did not develop until later. For centuries the churches were the primary centers of learning. St. Augustine(354-430) a leader of the early Christians, in the fourth century A.D., and St.Thomas(1225-1275) whose concepts still dominate catholic theology, in the thirteenth century A.D., both rejected literal interpretations of the story of a special creation in Genesis. They both suggested an allegorical naturalistic interpretation patterned after Aristotle.

During the renaissance, Leonardo de Vince(1452-1519) realized that fossil marine shells must have once been under water; Copernicus(1564-1642) developed his theory of a sun centered universe; and Galileo(1473-1543) challenged the church with his defense of Copernicum astronomy.

In the seventeenth century, natural philosophers such as, Bacon(1561-1639), and Descarte(1596-1650) tried to develop systems of thought to interpret the universe. Life was a part of the system and advances in evolutionary thought was there, but the idea of the "fixity of the species" was not challenged in biology.

In the eighteenth century, Maupertius(1698-1759) proposed a general theory of evolution which has recently been rescued from obscurity. He developed a theory of heredity based on animal breeding and investigations of human heredity. He actually applied probability theory to his findings a century before Mendel. He was so far ahead of his time that his theories were never understood or appreciated during his lifetime. During this centurey Buffon(1707-1788) recognized the possibility of change from one species to another and the similarities between apes and man; but it was evident that he did not want to arouse the displeasure of the church. He ended up writing an apology for his writings and contradicting himself. Also, during this century, Erasmus Darwin(1731-1802), Charles' grandfather, formed his theory of evolution. This was the first clear theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics, meaning that the effects of the environment are transmitted to offspring.

In the early nineteenth century, Jean Baptiste Lamarck(1744-1892) wrote more extensively about evolution than anyone previously. The essence of "Lamarckism" can be summarized as follows:

- (1). The environment modifies plants and animals.
- (2). New needs modify old organs and bring new ones into being.
- (3). Use and disuse modify development.
- (4). Modifications are inherited.

These laws imply that life, by its inherent power tends continually to increase, and recognizes mind as an active agent in the process. The development of organs are determined by the use of those organs, and all that has been changed in an individual is preserved in reproduction and transmitted to offspring. Today's laws of inheritance in genetics offers little credence to this theory. Western science has always maintained that there is no critical evidence to support "Lamarckism". However, until recently, it has been the recognized official doctrine of evolution in Russia, under the name of "Michurinism". Lamarck's theory still crops up among those who view evolution from a teleological approach, since he did recognize the ability of the mind of the organism to affect change; mind was an active agent in the process and implies less support to blind chance, and more support to a divine creator.

CHARLES DARWIN

Charles Darwin published Origin of Species in 1859, and it supported the idea that one species can change to another. The means by which this occurs is called "natural selection" and has become synonymous with the word "Darwinism". The essence of the theory can be stated as follows:

- (1). All organisms have a tendency to increase in a geometric ratio, which means that offspring are always more numerous than their parents
- (2). In spite of the tendency to progressive increase, the number of a given species actually remains more or less constant.
- (3). There is a struggle for existence, since more young are produced than can survive.
- (4). All organisms vary and some variations are more advantageous than others, so the fittest survive.
- (5). Variations arise by chance, but are preserved according to their fitness to survive, and these variations are inherited.
- (6). Through the accumulation of favorable characteristics, new species develop.

Darwin was just far enough ahead to be a leader in evolutionary theory, but not far enough ahead to be ignored. The idea of "natural selection" was already in many scientific writings; but it was Darwin who breathed life into the idea. He had the perception to discover evidence, and the time and industriousness to fill hundreds of pages with minutely observed facts to support it.

Alfred R. Wallace went down in history as the co-discoverer of natural selection. After writing an article about the introduction of new species he wrote a letter to Darwin outlining his theory and asked Darwin to send it on to their mutual friend, Lyell, if he deemed it worthy. This letter had an impact on Darwin; he had just spent over twenty years writing a three volume series about the same subject. Darwin's close associates persuaded him to present a short abstract of his book, and Wallace's paper and Darwin's abstract were read together before

the Linnaean Society of London. The theory appeared in print in the journal of the society in 1858, with both men as authors. It attracted little attention.

Origin of Species, a shortened version of Darwin's work was published in 1859, and provoked widespread reactions, both favorable and unfavorable. Few people outside scientific circles cared about plant and animal transmutations. Darwin did not discuss man in the book, but in the conclusion he said that, "much light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history." (p.473) The learned and educated saw that it did concern man, and the press saw within it the so called "ape theory". Soon, what has become known as the "age of agnosticism" began.

Darwin changed the existing static notion of the "fixity of the species" into a concept of change and process. He implied that all things are in process and supported the principle of increasing complexity: that all things change from the simple to the complex. While Darwin never argued against a teleologic approach to evolution, nor refuted his belief in a Divine designer of the process, many of his followers did. Darwin concluded his masterpiece with the following:

"There is grandeur in this view of life with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, while this planet has gone circling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, and are being evolved." (p.474)

Darwin's theory did imply the principle of uniformity, which asserts that past events can be understood in terms of processes going on now; the present is the key to the past. This refuted the conventional explanation of earth movements, layers of fossils, and change being explained on the basis of the flood of Noah mentioned in Genesis. This led many of Darwin's friends into a rejection of any divine direction or interference into the theory of natural selection.

AFTER DARWIN

The conflicts between science and religion arising over Darwinism are complex, but mostly centered around a few issues, such as: the challenge to scripture; the challenge to human dignity; the challenge to design; and evolutionary ethics.

An allegorical interpretation of Genesis had been suggested by St. Augustine and St. Thomas, as mentioned before, and a literal interpretation of scripture had already been challenged by Copernicus and Galileo, but for some Bible literalists there could be no compromise. Archbishop Usser in the seventeenth century had calculated on the basis of old Testament narratives, that the earth was created in four thousand and four B.C., and was accepted as church doctrine. Immediately following Darwin's Origins, Philip Gosse, a Biblical literalist, even argued that God had put fossils in misleading places to test man's faith.

In the decade following the publication of Orgins, many protestants interpreted Genesis symbolically, some saying the Bible was a human record of man's evolving, and saw a divine guidance within evolution. Catholics were reluctant to accept any concept of evolution, but eventually acknowledged the evidence and preserved man's uniqueness by insisting on the creation of a soul in a special divine act.

Before Darwin, man had never been considered an animal. Man alone had a soul; but some saw Darwinism putting man within nature, not without. Darwin, in the Descent of Man, published several years after Origins, stressed the similarity of man and animals. Some argued that a moral sense could now be seen to originate within natural selection, since fidelity and self sacrifice could be seen to have survival value.

Natural selection implied that variations arise by chance; and this seemed to be antithetical to any design by a Creator. Chance appeared to be blind and purposeless. Asa Gray, a friend of Darwins and America's leading biologist from Harvard University, maintained that evolution could be understood only

in purposeful terms, despite the occurrence of waste and struggle. He defended the idea of a Creator working through the process to produce a gradually unfolding design. James McCosh, President of Princeton University, said that God only established the initial design, but continues to work through and within it in a way in which creative activities of God are expressed in time. In the case of human origin, he speculated that it might be necessary to assume additional divine action, if man's unique spiritual features are to be accounted for. He urged the Presbyterian church to accept evolution in their doctrine.

Early in the twentieth century, the Fundamentalists began lobbying for legislation to stifle the heretical theory of evolution. Several bills prohibiting its teaching were narrowly defeated in several states, but an antievolution bill, the Butler act, became law in March 1925, in Tennessee. The American Civil Liberties Union immediately prepared to contest its constitutionality. John Scopes became the "guinea pig" in the test case in July 1925, in Dayton, Tennessee. The trial became a battle between the defense lawyer, Clarence Darrow, and the states lawyer, William Jennings Bryan. The eleven day trial drew evangelists, eccentrics, and fanatics, among the visiting thousands. Brian testified as a Biblical expert, and Darrow's grilling of him angered the judge. Darrow practically asked for a guilty verdict so he could appeal to a higher court. The defendant was found guilty and fined one hundred dollars. On appeal the act was upheld, but Scopes' fine was dismissed on a technicality.

Following this initial triumph of the antievolutionists, several states initiated bills similar to the Butler Act. Only one of twelve bills voted passed; this was in Mississippi.

In April 1967, a science teacher in Jackson, Tennessee was fired for discussing the theory; but later that same month the Tennessee State Senate voted to amend the Butler Act, allowing teachers to refer to evolution only as a theory, as long as they maintained that God's creation is a fact, consistent with the Bible.

A similar movement occurred during 1969 in California. The State Board of Education approved a set of guidelines for textbooks, directing that the creation story be taught as an alternative to evolution. The California Supreme Court decided against this policy in 1972, but said that textbooks should refrain from "scientific bias" in teaching that evolution is the only possible explanation.

During 1969, three Catholic nuns were dismissed in a Staten Island Parochial school for teaching "evolution vs. creation"; the Rotenberry Act, which forbade the teaching of evolution in public schools was repealed in Arkansas; and a bill to repeal Mississippi's ban on teaching it was defeated. This left Mississippi as the only state with laws still forbidding any talk of the theory.

In August 1975, a U.S. District Court and the Tennessee Supreme Court declared unconstitutional a 1973 law requiring textbooks to provide equal space for religious theory in schools. The decision was based on the premise that equal space for religion in public school would violate the First Amendment's guarantee of separation of church and state.

An effort by fundamentalist against evolution in America's schools increased in 1980 with the formation of the Moral Majority, headed by Reverend Jerry Falwell. Directly related were three legal events in 1981 in which creationists, believing in a literal Genesis interpretation, started a push to have creation taught along with evolution in public schools. In March, in Seagrams v. California, creationists gained national attention when a state Superior Court ruled that evolution is a theory about which scientists only hypothesize. Arkansas in March, and Louisiana in July, adopted laws requiring equal time for the teaching of "evolution theory" and "creation science." Similar bills have been considered in twenty one states. The model "equal time evolution/creation bill" developed by the Institute for Creation Research(ICR) carefully omits reference to religion and God in order to withstand constitutional challenge of church and state separation. ICR wants a similar bill introduced in the U.S. Congress to halt evolution lectures

in national parks and museums and to make "creation science" based on Genesis eligible for research grants.

The U.S. is now in the midst of this fundamentalist upsurge, called the evangelical right, which has achieved unusual political influence. They are encouraging all creationists to dislodge evolution and weaken science in public schools; striking at what they call "secular humanism." This creationists movement associates evolution with humanism, moral decay, and atheism, and place on it blame for crime, drugs, abortion, women's rights, and homosexuality.

The debate still goes on and has raised many philosophical questions and examined many areas of conflict. It does not appear to be ending. The creationists see evolutionists as elitists who are unwilling to even allow discussion on an issue important to many people, and the evolutionists see the creationists as religious fanatics who are trying to make religion into science. Both sides seem to have fixated on their reasoning and positions.

TEILHARD de CHARDIN

A few writers during the mid-century such as Alfred North Whitehead, Paul Tillich, and Teilhard de Chardin attempted to write metaphysical systems which were inclusive of both science and religion. Many of the concepts are similar to URANTIA Book concepts, and were being written during the time the revelation was given to us. Apparently these philosophers never read each other or ever heard of the revelation.

I have become especially intrigued with the writings of Teilhard and his contributions to both science and religion. In his own field of paleontology his contributions were noteworthy, he was with the expedition that discovered the first Sinanthropus fossil (Peking man) and visited and wrote about other sites of fossil man. His essays, papers, and letters recorded many important aspects of primitive man and how man evolved on our planet.

Because of his evolutionary interest and his love for evolution, and the interest he provoked among both scientists and religionists, I include a section on him in this paper.

As a Jesuit Priest, Teilhard powerfully expressed a vision of an evolutionary process which was basically spiritual in character. All of his writings were striving for a harmonious synthesis between Christian doctrine and evolution. His writings aroused the wrath of his ecclesiastical superiors, and he was never allowed to publish his writings during his life. They were published posthumously by his friends. Such complete works cannot even be summarized in a paper of this nature, but I will attempt a few relevant concepts.

Teilhard's basic creed can be stated in his own words from How I Believe:

"I believe that the Universe is an Evolution.
I believe that Evolution proceeds toward Spirit.
I believe that Spirit is fully realized in a form of personality.
I believe that the supremely personal is the Universal Christ."(p.1)

Three concepts from Teilhard's masterpiece, The Phenomenon of Man, relevant to this paper can be stated as: (1) the continuity of the levels of reality, (2) the directionality of evolution, and (3) the convergence of evolution to the Omega point.

In his continuity concept, Teilhard traces four stages of evolution from matter to mind to thought to society. The levels are continuous with each other, "a single process without interruption."(p.71) Each level has its roots in earlier levels, and represents the flowering of a potential already present. The higher is existent in the lower forms, and everything has existed from the very beginning of creation. He does not impute self-consciousness or reflection to lower organisms, but talks about an inner aspect of all things referred to as "the within of things". This inner aspect finally develops into mind. He maintained that evolution does not occur as gaps or discontinuities, but there are thresholds or critical points where real breakthroughs to new levels and real novelty occurs.

The directionality of evolution is expressed as a trend toward complexity and greater consciousness. There is also a trend toward personalization and individuation that is significant for the future and for the immortality of the personality. In his idea of convergence he pictures stages of expansion, radiation, and diversification, followed by phases of consolidation, unification, and "involution". Human societies diversify, then converge toward unification, which will lead to a single "inter-thinking" fabric of humanity. He says that despite directionality, there has been groping along the way. He defines this as "directed chance", or "the blind fantasy of large numbers combining with the precise orientation of a specific target."(p.72) He therefore holds that mutations and natural selection play important roles; the "chance at the bottom and freedom at the top",(p.78) provide the possibility for growth. Chance opportunities are, in part, a function of the internal life of the individual organism, and "the within of things" appears to be a channel for a transindividual upward striving that

takes advantage of chance.

The convergence of evolution to the "Omega point" is one concept many scientists rejected. A theme running through Teilhard's writings is the incompleteness of evolution. Creation is continuing throughout evolution, and the universe is still in the process of being born. The social stage is moving toward something higher, a superorganism which is achieved without the loss of individuality. He believed that when man became individualized and had to emphasize the "I" part of himself in order to survive, his personality developed. This personality is now becoming obsolete and must give way to the evolution of a more unified personality. Individuals become more personal, and a new humanity will evolve; the bonds of union in the new humanity will be love. The lines of convergence through love will converge into the birth of a single, hyperpersonal center he calls "Omega", which he identifies with God. It is both immanent and transcendent, for he describes it as not only a future emergent or a distant summit, but already actual. It is attracting from ahead, not pushing from behind. Its properties include autonomy, actuality, irreversibility, and transcendence. He says the same conclusions about God and about universal love are central to Christianity.

Central to Teilhard's philosophy was the belief that a Universal love "is not only psychologically possible, it is the only complete and final way in which we are able to love."(p.463) This gives a larger dimension to love as it extends the love of ourselves, our family, our friends, and our country to a love of all humanity, and to a love of the entire cosmos.

THE URANTIA BOOK

No writing on our planet has so reconciled science and religion as the Urantia papers. No paper of this nature can be more than a brief outline of creation and evolution as they are presented by the manifold personalities writing these papers. I will limit this brief outline to five concepts relevant to creation and evolution in this paper. They are: (1) the evolutionary Deity, called the Supreme Being, (2) the nature of creation and evolution, (3) the overcontrol of evolution, (4) the evolution of humans on our planet, and (5) the destiny of evolution.

Before revealing the evolutionary processes, the revelators trace creativity from the absolute level, through an absolute or transcendental level, then to a finite level. The finite level is the evolutionary level of reality we are now participating in, called the supreme age. Within this supreme age the Supreme Being is in the process of becoming. The Supreme Being, the evolutionary Deity, is the unifier of all space/time reality and is the embodiment of all experience on the evolutionary level.

Evolution is the key modus operandi of the finite universes. It slows down the transformative process to the point where creatures can understand what is going on, and can participate in it. It is a transformative technique that can be defined as "creativity-in-time". We are told of perfectly created beings who start with an original status bestowed on them by their creators; while evolutionary beings earn their status and participate in their own creation. This means that creatures can play a conscious part in their own evolution. The creative plan of Deity is gradually unfolding and progressively developing through the interaction of both the creators and creatures. The capacity of all evolutionary creatures is being realized within this interaction in the evolutionary universes of space and time.

Space and time are created realities that make evolution possible, and within space and time Universe Rulers plan and direct the processes. The revelators tell us of many

celestial beings who are involved in the overcontrol of evolution. These numerous overcontrollers are providing potentials and functioning within the process. Some of these include: (1) The Master Physical Controllers, (2) The Seven Master Spirits, (3) The Life Carriers, (4) The Adjutant Mind Spirits, (5) The Thought Adjusters, and (6) Ministering Spirits, such as the seraphim and midwayers.

The Master Physical Controllers evolve the physical vehicle, the mind potential, and control pre-mind life. Life itself comes from the Seven Master Spirits, through the Universe Mother Spirit. Life Carriers bring or formulate life on the planets. They are capable of manipulating the environment in such a way that timing of events and processes can foster evolution. They are involved in three levels of life, the electro/physical, the mid-phase, and the morontia phase. The Adjutant Mind Spirits bestow mind upon animal life after it has evolved to a level capable of utilizing it. Primitive animals may have intuition, understanding, courage, knowledge, and counsel. When worship, followed by wisdom is bestowed then man has evolved. Thought Adjusters are then bestowed on will creatures and continue throughout life to provide direction toward a conscious level of our own evolution, and move us in the direction of spirit. Seraphim and midwayers minister to us, can manipulate the environment in some ways and foster social evolution.

Throughout this interaction of creators and creatures presented in the Urantia papers we are told that our own mind and spirit play an important part in evolution. The revelators present the history, dynamics, and destiny of evolution in such a way that the physical, mindal, and spiritual are all integrated and unified. They integrate the mechanisms of the physical with the purposes of mind and spirit overcontrol. The basic philosophy of evolution presented is that matter is ultimately subject to the mind, and that mind is eventually controlled by spirit. They tell us that, "in the cosmic evolutionary laboratories mind is

always dominant over matter, and spirit is ever correlated with mind."(p.740:1) .

After revealing to us the long processes that occurred on our planet before life occurred, the revelators tell us that the actual biological history of our planet started about six hundred million years ago. After the physical processes were prepared and geologic evolution was ripe for life implantation, the Life Carriers began their function on Urantia. They tell us: "We brought no life to Urantia. Urantia life is unique, original with the planet...all life appearing was formulated by us right here on the planet."(667:5)

After life processes were started there was a progression from plants to animals to man. Man appeared about a million years ago, springing from the same tribe and species as modern day simians, but not from the same parents. There was not a gradual progression from lemurs to apes to man, as Neo-Darwinism is interpreted today, but several mutations resulting in giant leaps. There was a leap from lemurs to dawn-mammals to mid-mammals to primates to humans. Each of these from the dawn-mammals to man occurred as mutant twins. These twins subsequently mated and began new species. Modern day simians sprang from mutant twins in the mid-mammals, and man sprang from mutant twins in the primates. The primate line leading to man became extinct.

About five hundred thousand years after man appeared on Urantia another mutation resulted in the six colored races. These races scattered and blended, and some became extinct. About forty thousand years ago Adam and Eve were sent to our planet as biological uplifters of the primitive races. We are told that the plans for our planet was for Adam and Eve's progeny to mate with evolutionary races and uplift them. Their life plasma was needed to bring about improvements in biologic evolution, but the plan was aborted when Adam and Eve fell into error and seriously handicapped the plan. We are now told that the rate of the progress of evolution largely depends upon our own fostering of our

highest potentials. The Life Carriers now tell us: "Mankind on Urantia must solve its mortal development with the human stock it has...in a general way, man's evolutionary destiny is in his own hands and scientific intelligence must sooner or later supersede the random functioning of the uncontrolled natural selection and chance survival."(p.734:3)

As to the destiny of evolution on our planet, the revelators tell us that we are evolving to an age of perfection, called the age of "light and life". The final stage of evolution in the age of supremacy will be when all planets and all universes have evolved to perfection and The Supreme Being has become the Evolutionary Deity.

A Mighty Messenger who has evolved from a mortal to a higher status tells us:

"The advanced stages of a world settled in light and life represent the acme of evolutionary material development.(p.629:6) Mortal creatures living on a sin-stricken, evil-dominated, self-seeking, isolated world, such as Urantia, can hardly conceive of the physical perfection, the intellectual attainment, and the spiritual development which characterizes these advanced epochs of evolution on a sinless sphere.(p629:5) If the mortals of distraught Urantia could only view one of these more advanced worlds long settled in light and life, they would nevermore question the wisdom of the evolutionary scheme of creation. Were there no future of eternal creature progression, still the superb evolutionary attainment of the mortal races on such settled worlds of perfected achievement would amply justify man's creation on the worlds of time and space." (p.631:5)

CONCLUSION

Because of the overwhelming and awe inspiring teachings about creation and evolution in The URANTIA Book, it may become far too easy for readers to fall into a belief that we are the exclusive possessors of truth. I am sure the revelators were well aware of the risks when they gave us these advanced truths, along with such cautions as, "it is always difficult to induce evolutionary minds suddenly to accept advanced truth. Man is an evolutionary creature and in the main must get his religion by evolutionary techniques.(p.1012:0) They also tell us that "truth is relative and expanding; it lives always in the present, achieving new expression in each generation of men-even in each human life."(p.888:1) Truth cannot be contained in a book, not even a URANTIA Book. Truth is dynamic and active and is recognized in our lives as we interact with it, not possess it.

I now believe more strongly than ever that the measure of our success in teaching evolution lies in our tolerance and our ability to be positive toward all people, even the fundamentalist. If we are to do justice to our revelation, then our interface with all religionists should be harmonious and positive. I believe that any group proclaiming they have the truth will only gain recognition for its arrogance. If we assume we have the whole truth in our encounters with fundamentalists, then our encounters will be laced with conflict. We must not be intollerant of their assumptions and their refusal to accept twentieth-century scientific enlightenment or the advanced truths about creation and evolution revealed in our new revelation.

In our encounters with fundamentalist, we can concentrate on the positive truths grasped by them, believing with them in the revelatory quality of the Bible. The Urantia revelators tell us that Christianity contains the best of the twentieth-century religious concepts and "contain enough of Jesus teachings to immortalize it."(2086:4) We can affirm with them that Jesus was both human and divine; that he is the creator and the "only begotten son" in our universe. We now understand

Jesus as a Paradis Creator Son, rather than the Eternal Son, or Second Person of the Trinity; but the Biblical concept of Christ is still literally true, he is both the Creator and Saviour of our universe.

We are told that it is not so much what we do in this world that determines our survival as what we are striving to do. We should recognize that all our brothers are striving and be tolerant of their closed-mindedness toward enlightened truth. We can pray sincerely for their spiritual growth, not from a position of arrogance, but from a more foreseeing and forward-looking vision that "will attract all that is good in the mind of man and challenge that which is best in the human soul."(p.43:3)

As students of the revelation, we have much in common with most mainline Christians today, who have recognized the evidence for evolution, and have depicted divine creativity, not just as once-for-all, but as continuing within the process of evolution. Many mainline Christians have seen that our efforts, not an atoning sacrifice, brings us closer to God. We can recognize with them that Jesus is a great teacher sent from God, and the "fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man" is the central theme for them as well as for us who are aware of the revelation. We can relate to these Christians better if we draw no barriers separating us into "readers" and "non-readers".

The integrated, holistic view of the universe, presented in the Urantia papers has been seen by some far-reaching religious philosophers such as Tillich, Teilhard, and Whitehead. Some of their concepts pertaining to the continuity within evolution; the directionality of evolution; both the transcendence and the immanence of God within the process; the future reality of an evolutionary Deity; the nature of evil being that of error and estrangement, are all concepts of evolution presented in the new revelation. As students of this revelation we need to recognize that God reveals to those who dare to reach out to a level of mind referred to in the Urantia papers as the "superconscious level, the zone of immediate contact with the indwelling spirit entity, the thought

adjuster."(1099:4) There is a realm of ascending intellectual activity which very religious philosophers are striving to reach. God's revealing of Himself is continuous and there may be those who have attained this level. There may be those even now who are reaching out to the superconscious and thinking thoughts and truths we never dreamed of. We are told that in a few short years many of the statements in our revelation will need revising "in consequent of additional scientific developments and new discoveries."(1109:3) We need to expand our vision to recognize that truth is given to us through writers in the past and present, and will continue to be given to us in the future. The truth contained in the Urantia papers point not to the Book but to God. If others see in us not just a reader, but one who is open to new truths in all areas of life then we can be more effective kingdom workers. Hopefully, all students will make an effort to keep up with contemporary theories in evolution and new theories in philosophy, science, and religion.

As students of the revelation, we probably have little in common with those who believe in evolution, but do not see it as a divine plan unfolding. There are many interpretations of evolution which reject any divine guidance. Some of the naturalistic philosophers have rejected the idea of God working within the process, but have allowed for the possibility of a First Cause. These agnostic thinkers do not reject the existence of some kind of transcendent reality, but hold that God can play no part in our understanding of evolution. Others think that any concept of God is completely unnecessary. These atheistic thinkers see evolution occurring by inherent motion, random variation, and natural selection without any divine source or divine intervention. They usually reject arguments for God from alleged shortcomings in the theories and see the so called "God of the Gaps" as a hinderance to scientific inquiry.

In our encounters with these brothers, the Urantia revelators tell us not to fear to assert our certainty about God. When confronting the cleverness of those who

argue against God and a divine plan behind evolution, faith is our greatest technique for dealing with them. If our faith is challenged on the ground that it is unproven, then we can "resort to the dogmatic challenge of the facts of science and philosophy on the grounds that they are also unproved; they are likewise experiences in the consciousness of the scientist or philosopher."(p.1127:3)

As we encounter athiestic brothers, we should keep in mind that a Melchizadek from Nebadon told us:

"If you truly believe in God-by faith know him and love him-do not permit the reality of such an experience to be in any way lessened or detracted from by the doubting insinuations of science, the caviling of logic, the postulates of philosophy or the clever suggestions of well-meaning souls...(p.1140:4) The certainty of the God-knowing religionist should not be disturbed by the uncertainty of the doubting materialist; rather should the uncertainty of the unbeliever be mightily challenged by the profound faith and unshakeable certainty of the experiential believer."(p.1140:5)

REFERENCES

- Barbour, Ian G. 1966. Issues in Science and Religion.
Harper & Roe, New York
- Darwin, Charles. 1859. Origin of Species.
Hurst & Co. New York
- _____.1871. The Descent of Man.
John Murray, London
- Gardner, Eldon J.1972. History of Biology.
Burgess Publishing Co. Minneapolis, Minn.
- Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre.1969. How I Believe. (Trans. by
Rene Hague) Harper & Roe. New York
- _____.The Phenomenon of man. (Trans.
by Bernard Wall) Harper & Roe. New York
- The URANTIA BOOK. 1955. Urantia Foundation, Chicago, Ill.