well, it would appear that "natural selection" is not at all effective on these moths.

It is said that black moths of other kinds do prefer a dark resting-place. Again though, the fact that they "know" what is to their advantage by no means proves that they have evolved from something else. Indeed, it may be that this whole matter of colour is a "red herring;" it may be that their worst problem is not hiding at all, but something quite different.

References

Hart, J. S. April, 1969. Science dimension. The National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, p. 28.

²Private Communication.

³Proverbs 30; 18 and 19.

⁴Pollack, J. B. and C. Sagan. 1969. Space Science Review, 9:243.

⁵Whitcomb, J. C. and H. M. Morris. 1961. The Genesis flood. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pa., p. 428.

⁶Strong, C. L. and R. Sassen. June, 1969. *Scientific American*, 220:131.

New Scientist, 10 April 1969, p. 54.

*Michael, C. R. May, 1969. Scientific American, 220: 105.

⁹Applewhite, P. B., E. A. Lapan, and F. T. Gardner. 3 May 1969. *Nature*, 222:491.

Fehsenfeld, F. E. and E. E. Ferguson. 1 May 1969. Journal of Geophysical Research, 74:2217.

"Sargent, T. D. 1969. Nature, 222:585.

SPECULATION VS. TRUTH

WILLARD L. HENNING*

Familiar to many people is the background of the anti-evolution law passed by the Tennessee legislature in early 1925 prohibiting the teaching of the origin of man by a process of evolution in contrast to the account clearly stated in the Book of Genesis. The law was challenged and upheld in the rather controversial William Jennings Bryan—John T. Scopes Trial in Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925 and has since been the subject of continual controversy.

Most of the controversy, no doubt, stems from difficulties in interpreting the law correctly, its intention, whether or not it deprives school teachers of academic freedom, and also whether a school teacher has the right to complete authority in his or her classroom. These questions, obviously, are not easily answered and their answers differ widely among various people.

In spite of all the controversy the anti-evolution law (code section, 49-1922) stood on the statute books of the State of Tennessee for 42 years and was a testimony to the people of America, along with a similar law in two other states, that the general sentiment of the people is opposed to the atheistic theories of man's origin from lower beasts, and the effects such would have in drawing the minds of young people away from the Holy Word of God. The word "atheistic" is used by the author to refer to those who do not believe in a personal, miracle-working God.

The Bible a Myth?

During the spring semester of 1967 Gary Scott was teaching general science at Jacksboro (Tennessee) High School in Campbell County when one of his students asked him, "Do you believe in evolution?" He replied that he could not answer this in a few minutes but if the class agreed they would make a study of evolution "for a few weeks" (according to the account given in "An Interview with Gary Scott" by Charlene Sanders, published in *Phoenix*, Spring, 1967, Vol. 8, No. 5, The University of Tennessee Publishing Association.)

Scott's lectures began with "the evolution of evolution theories," starting with the Bible, presumably as the most primitive account, and then going to Aristotle and Darwin. However, "the class got fixated on the Genesis account" and "did not want to accept much else." Scott pointed out "that there was no need for the scientific account to conflict with the Biblical account, but that they would have to admit a non-literal interpretation of the Bible to avoid conflict with factual evidence." He apparently used the word "mythical" in reference to the Bible. All of the above quotations are from the *Phoenix*.

Like a Fairy Tale

It is obvious that he used the word *evidence* to support evolution with the implication that he favors this in contrast to the Biblical account. According to the testimony of one of his students Gary Scott labeled the Biblical account as "allegorical" or like a fairy tale, and this stirred up considerable controversy which grew worse.

^{*}Willard L. Henning, Ph.D., is Professor of Biology and Chairman of the Division of Natural Science at Bryan College, Dayton, Tennessee 37321. This article is reprinted with permission from the *Bryan Blueprint*, 3(2), March, 1969.

DECEMBER, 1969 141

Probably this explains why "the class got fixated on the Genesis account" as stated in the *Phoenix*. It is not clear whether or not he claimed as factual the origin of man from a lower form of animals, but complaints indicate that he was teaching Darwin's theory of evolution in his class.

The controversy over his teaching continued; details of all that happened will not be included in this paper since they are quite lengthy. Some high points, according to *Phoenix*, are as follows: Students discussed the controversy of science and Genesis with their ministers; ministers formed a committee to deal with the situation; parents complained to the principal who in turn told Gary Scott, "go back to the text." Scott replied that he "would think about it." He was later given a copy of the Tennessee antievolution law.

Some time later Scott claimed that he was not informed that his job was in jeopardy until the day prior to the night meeting of the Board of Education when he was fired. He was officially notified of this action the next day at 3 p.m., according to the *Phoenix*. Accounts of the meeting indicate that it was a quickie-type, when, under emotional stress, Scott was fired without discussion of the case, nor was he given an opportunity for a hearing.

Avoid Another Trial

After being fired, Scott filed a lawsuit in Federal District Court in Nashville in which he "sought to have the anti-evolution code section declared unconstitutional," The suit was against the Board of Education and was backed by rather strong groups as the American Civil Liberties Union, NEA, and National Service Foundation. Realizing the tremendous costs and involvements in what would amount to another "Scopes Trial" in 1967, the Board of Education considered it the wiser decision to reinstate Gary Scott.

During this time the anti-evolution law had been before the Tennessee legislature and was repealed the day following the filing of the suit. Possibly the growing strength of sentiment favoring Gary Scott and against the anti-evolution law may have been factors.

Organized Opposition

It is obvious that public sentiment was much more strongly in favor of both the anti-evolution law and prohibition in Tennessee in the 1920's than in the 1960's. Has the influence of the Bible and genuine Christianity diminished because of lack of cooperation on the part of Bible-believing, God-fearing Christians? Or are the opposing forces better organized, more influential, and more strongly supported?

The real truth regarding the origin of all things, the Creator and Designer of all, the limits of change that are possible within any of the Genesis kinds (Chapter 1) cannot be changed by teachers, philosophers, or discoveries of scientists. The Bible speaks with authority. It only needs to be properly understood, interpreted and accepted.

An editorial in the Chattanooga News-Free Press (Nov. 13, 1968) says:

The overruling of the anti-evolution statute is considered by some to be a defeat for Christian fundamentalists. But that reasoning is strange, to say the least. Faith that "In the beginning God created the heaven and earthand all that is within them—does not rest upon a court ruling or require the passage of a law and is not dependent upon any so-called scientific theory or upon the posturing personal debate of two brilliant windbags at a county courthouse.

Sad to say, man's statutes favoring both the spread of atheistic theories, as well as consumption of alcoholic beverages, have been adopted because of groups having much wealth as well as propaganda influence.

* * *

The author of the above article wrote a booklet entitled "How Valid is the Theory of Evolution" several years ago, which was published by William Jennings Bryan College, and has been widely circulated. The booklet points out many serious flaws in the theory of evolution and defends the Bible and the viewpoint of "Special Creation."

A copy of this booklet was mailed personally, to John T. Scopes in Louisiana, to Susan Epperson who fought to overthrow the anti-evolution law in Arkansas, and the same publication was given to Gary Scott who was instrumental in the repeal of the same type of law in Tennessee. No reply of any type or rebuttal has been received from any of them.