TRIANGLE ASSOCIATION for the SCIENCE of CREATION
P.O. Box 12051 • Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2051 • tasc@tasc-creationscience.org
Website: www.tasc-creationscience.org

TASC

TASC's mission is to rebuild and strengthen the foundation of the Christian faith by increasing awareness of the scientific evidence supporting the literal biblical account of creation and refuting evolution.

October 2024

Evolutionary Indoctrination, *Not Education*, of Kids: From the Courtroom to the Classroom

The Case of JENNIFER REINOEHL et al. v. PENN-HARRIS-MADISON SCHOOLS

By Jerry Bergman

Introduction

The court in the case of Reinoehl et al. v. Penn-Harris-Madison Schools ruled that evolution is not a religion, but rather is science. Therefore, it can be taught in public schools. Creation was defined as a religion; therefore, it cannot be taught in public schools. Evolution is not a peripheral topic, and Penn-Harris-Madison schools teach evolution "at every level from Kindergarten to [twelfth] grade."[1] Reinoehl et al. averred that "teaching of evolutionary theory in public schools violates the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution as well as Article 1, Section 3 of the Indiana Constitution."[2] They added that plaintiffs further assert that evolution embodies

> positions taken by advocates of Atheism. Because the atheistic Theory of Evolution specifically attacks the Judeo-Christian origin story…it has the purpose and effect of advancing the atheist religion…, result[ing] in the entanglement of the state with religion…the inclusion of evolution in public school curriculum violates the Establishment Clause of the United States Constitution as well as Article 1, Section 3 of the Indiana Constitution. Plaintiffs assert that discussions about the origins of the universe "must be limited to classes on religion and philosophy—in which all creation stories from all religions should be presented as equal.[3]

The court rejected this claim, writing that "Plaintiffs have failed to allege an Establishment Clause violation here because it is clearly established in the case law, and perhaps also in common sense, that evolution is not a religion and that teaching evolution does not violate the Establishment Clause."[4]

The Courts Claim Is Naive and Wrong but Politically Correct

It may be "clearly established in the case law, and perhaps also in common sense, that evolution is not a religion" but, in fact, teaching one side of a worldview is indoctrination, not education. A main problem with public education is that on many issues it indoctrinates and does not educate, a major problem that this ruling reinforces. This indoctrination began aggressively with the Scopes Trial in 1925.[5]

Evolution and creation are both worldviews that, at their core, explain where we came from, why we are here, and where we are going. Evolution teaches us from where we came, that we evolved and are here to survive, and that, when we die, that is the end of our life. Creation, conversely, teaches mankind was created and we have descended from the first couple. Why we are here is to serve God and our fellow humans. Where we are going in the afterlife is dependent on this life.

The first step in evaluating the decision in *Reinoehl et al.* is to define religion. Importantly, the court decision never even attempted to define religion. It is irresponsible to determine that evolution is not religion without defining religion. The word religion is from the Latin *religio* (referring to what is sacred, worthy of value and respect) and *religare* (to bind, in the sense of an obligation). One of the leading non-Christian sociologists of religion, French scholar Émile Durkheim was the Chair of Education and

---

1 United States District Court, Southern District of Indiana (2024 Aug 30) Jennifer Reinoehl, Jason Reinoehl, Sarah Reinoehl, Plaintiffs, v. Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation, Katie Jenner in her official and individual capacity, Indiana State Board of Education, Defendants. No. 1:23-cv-00889-SEB-MG, 8. Hereafter Reinoehl et al.

2 Reinoehl et al., 1

3 Reinoehl et al., 3

4 Reinoehl et al., 10

5 Bergman J (2023) *The Other Side of the Scopes Trial: At Its Heart the Trial Was About Racism*, Wipf & Stock Publishers, Eugene, OR

Full Professor of the Science of Education at the Sorbonne, France's leading university. In his major work, the 464-page book, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, Durkheim defines religion as "a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and valued—beliefs and practices which unite people into a single moral community.[6] A summary of the book is here:

> [S]ociologist Émile Durkheim described it with the ethereal statement that it consists of "things that surpass the limits of our knowledge." …Some people associate religion with places of worship (a synagogue or church), others with a practice (confession or meditation), and still others with a concept that guides their daily lives (like dharma or sin). All of these people can agree that **religion** is a system of beliefs, values, and practices concerning what a person holds sacred or considers to be spiritually significant.[7]

Furthermore, religion provides the "social cement" that has "held societies and cultures together. Faith provided the justification for society to exist beyond the mundane and partial explanations of existence as provided in science, even to consider an intentional future: 'for faith is before all else an impetus to action.'[6]"[7] Most non-Western religions and belief systems do not revolve around a deity or supernatural being: "While many approaches to religion exclude nontheism by definition, some inclusive definitions of religion show how religious practice and belief do not depend on the presence of a god or gods."[8]

The question "Is evolution a religion?" has been answered in the negative primarily because this definition fits the dominant secular worldview and allows them to suppress the views that contradict the dominant secular worldview. Conversely, many leading scientists have carefully documented the fact that evolution is religion, such as evolutionist professor Michael Ruse in his 267-page book published by Oxford University Press.[9] Michael Ruse's Ph.D. is from the University of Bristol (1970), and he taught at the University of Guelph in Ontario, Canada for 35 years. He is a prolific writer and has 116 books on Goodreads with 18,454 ratings. In 2014, Ruse was named the Bertrand Russell Society's award winner for his dedication to science and reason. A fellow of both the Royal Society of Canada and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Ruse is director of Florida State's History and Philosophy of Science program. He wrote:

> Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion—a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, but I must admit that in this one complaint—and Mr. Gish [Duane T. Gish the Creation Scientist] is but one of many to make it [such]—the literalists are absolutely right. Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today.[10]

Another example is Mary Midgley (1919–2018) who authored the classic 224-page book *Evolution as a Religion*. She was one of the most renowned moral philosophers of her generation and the author of many important books on religion.[11] She observed that she had been very concerned for some time by certain prophetic and metaphysical passages that appeared in science books about evolution. She wrote that although "these passages were detached from the official reasoning of the books, they seemed still to be presented as science. But they made startling suggestions about vast themes such as immortality, human destiny, and the meaning of life."[12] One review of her work made the following observation:

> Midgley is concerned with the clearly dogmatic views that some scientists hold, often resulting in worldviews that are compelling, but do not have the force of data behind them and should not be presented as science. Midgley deftly points out these failings, and along the way she brings up many philosophical implications of evolution. [13]

Both Ruse and Midgley stress that, in recognizing religion, they are not referring to well-documented facts, such as water consists of a ratio of two hydrogen atoms to one

---

[6] Durkheim E (1995) *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (New York: Oxford World's Classics), First Edition. Translated by Karen Fields. The Free Press, New York, NY, 431.

[7] McGivern R (2014) Religion. *Introduction to Sociology*. New York: Pressbooks. https://opentextbc.ca/introductiontosociology/chapter/chapter-15-religion/ Accessed 2024 Oct 01

[8] Nontheistic religion (Last edited 2024 Sep 26) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nontheistic_religion -:~:text=Nontheism Accessed 2024 Oct 05

[9] Ruse M (2017) *Darwinism as Religion*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

[10] Ruse M (2000 May 13) How evolution became a religion: Creationists correct? *National Post*, B1,B3, B7.

[11] Midgley M (2002) *Evolution as a Religion*, Second Edition. Routledge, New York, NY

[12] Midgley (2002) viii

[13] A Scotty (2024 Jan 12) Dense but in a good way. https://www.amazon.ca/Evolution-Religion-Strange-Hopes-Stranger/dp/0415278333 Accessed 2024 Oct 02

oxygen atom, but to the application of facts to society such as eugenics, racism, and evolutionism, to cite the most obvious examples. After a long discussion supporting his conclusion, Egan summarized his conclusion that Darwinism replaced Christianity as follows:

> The Darwinists approach seemed logical and appropriate at a time when many Euro-Americans became dissatisfied with…Christian dogma. Rational Humanism, with Darwinism as its linchpin, became accepted as an alternative concept of creation and existence. Science [of Darwinism] emerged as a new religion, one that offered an understanding of the universe based upon logic and facts, rather than myth. …Modern atheism, of which Darwinism is an integral part, may have philosophical shortcomings, but for many it's better than illogic and superstitious threats of hellfire and brimstone.[14]

These evaluations were summarized by biochemist Michael Denton who correctly observed:

> The twentieth century would be incomprehensible without the Darwinian revolution. The social and political currents which have swept the world in the past eighty years would have been impossible without its intellectual sanction. It is ironic to recall that it was the increasingly secular outlook in the nineteenth century which initially eased the way for the acceptance of evolution, while today it is perhaps the Darwinian view of nature more than any other that is responsible for the agnostic and skeptical outlook of the twentieth century. What was once a destruction from materialism has today become its foundation.[15]

What is most ironic is that the

> influence of evolutionary theory on fields far removed from biology is one of the most specular examples in history of how a highly speculative idea for which there really is no hard evidence can come to fashion the thinking of a whole society and dominate the outlook of an age…one might have hoped that Darwinian theory was capable of a complete, comprehensive and entirely plausible explanation for all biological phenomena from the origin of life on through all its diverse manifestations up to, and including, the intellect of man. That it is neither fully plausible, nor comprehensive, is deeply troubling. One might have expected that a theory of such cardinal importance, a theory that literally changed the world, would have been something more than metaphysics, something more than a myth.[15]

Darwin's Goal Was the Murder of God

Darwin made it very clear that his goal for developing his theory of evolution by natural selection was to devise another "creator" to account for the existence of life. That creator was evolution. In a letter to Joseph Hooker dated 11 January 1844, Darwin wrote, in contrast to his original belief, that he now believed "species are not immutable (it's like confessing a murder)."[16] In a *Scientific American* paper titled "Darwin on a Godless Creation: 'It's like confessing to a murder,'" Marty explained in detail the background of Darwin's statement:

> "Before marriage, Charles Darwin had confessed everything to her [Emma]. That he was in the process of rewriting the history of life. That, according to his convictions, all living things descended from a common ancestor. And that species were not to be attributed to God's endless creativity, but were the product of a blind, mechanical process that altered them over the course of millions of years."[17]

Darwin knew that the main reason people believed in God in his day (and in ours as well) was the fact that evidence of creation requires a creator.[18]

If Darwin could come up with another theory that satisfactorily explained at least the origin of the biological creation, he realized that the main reason people gave for believing in God would no longer exist. The common belief then was that species never change, although they could vary within clear limits. Darwin acknowledged that admitting to having departed from the belief that species were fixed was like confessing a murder. This would result in many giving up belief in God, which history has confirmed is exactly what has happened.[19]

---

[14] Egan JH (2009) *6 Million and Counting: Darwin, Hitler and Genocide: The Darwinian Crisis in America.* Third Millennium Press, Baton Rouge, LA, 74

[15] Denton M (1985) *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Adler and Adler, Bethesda, MD, 358

[16] Darwin Correspondence Project, "Letter no. 729," https://www.darwinproject.ac.uk/letter/?docId=letters/DCP-LETT-729.xml Accessed 2024 Oct 03

[17] Marty C (2009) Darwin on a godless creation: It's like confessing to a murder, *Sci. Am.* 2009 Feb 12 https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/charles-darwin-confessions/ Accessed 2024 Oct 03

[18] Shermer M (2000) *How We Believe: The Search for God in an Age of Science*, W.H. Freeman and Company, New York, NY, xiv

[19] Fuller R (2017) *The Book That Changed America: How Darwin's Theory of Evolution Ignited a Nation*, Viking Press, New York, NY

Evidence for Evolution

As I will document, it is a scientific fact that *evolution never occurred and could never have occurred*. Evolution (i.e., from molecules to man) is often called Darwinism after the man, Charles Darwin, who converted the scientific world to his worldview. Darwinism is here defined as the progression from molecules to cells, to bacteria-like life-forms, to amphibians, to reptiles, to mammals, to primates, and, lastly, to humans purely by the accumulation of *mutations*, which are relied upon to produce genetic variety. The theory then claims that this genetic variety provided by mutations is then culled by "natural selection," a process often called "survival of the fittest." Carl Sagan wrote that "evolution works through mutation and selection," adding that the source of mutations is:

> radioactivity or ultraviolet light from the sun or cosmic rays or chemicals in the environment. If the mutation rate is too high, we lose the inheritance of four billion years of painstaking evolution. If it is too low, new varieties will not be able to adapt to some future change in the environment. The evolution of life requires a more or less precise balance between mutation and selection. When that balance is achieved, remarkable adaptations occur.[20]

In short, modern Darwinism (aka "Neo-Darwinism") teaches that we, and all life, are the product of billions of damage events to the genome called genetic mutations which are selected by natural selection. The result is due to the "survival-of-the-fittest" law, that the fitter life-forms are more likely to survive. These genetic damage events are caused by toxins, including dangerous radiation, such as gamma rays, along with cosmic rays and mutagenic chemicals.

The Lethal Problem With Darwinism

The major problem with this idea is that close to 99 percent of all mutations are *near-neutral*, deleterious (very harmful), or lethal. The evidence is clear: each new generation of humans contains many thousands of new mutations. Near-neutral means they only cause slight damage, but the slight damage adds up in time, eventually causing *genetic catastrophe*, i.e., death and possibly species extinction. Each child has about 100 new mutations compared to his or her parents, and this child's children have close to an additional 100 new mutations.[21] Furthermore, "If the deleterious mutation rate is too high, the species will go extinct… It should be no higher than 1 or 2 deleterious mutations per generation."[22] The fact is, quoting from the publisher's description of Kondrashov's work:

> Despite all of the elaborate mechanisms that a cell employs to handle its DNA with the utmost care, a newborn human carries about 100 new mutations, originating from their parents, about 10 of which are deleterious. A mutation replacing just one of the more than three billion nucleotides in the human genome may lead to synthesis of a dysfunctional protein, and this can be inconsistent with life or cause a tragic disease. Several percent of even young people suffer from diseases that are caused, exclusively or primarily, by pre-existing and new mutations in their genomes, including both a wide variety of genetically simple Mendelian diseases and diverse complex diseases such as birth anomalies, diabetes, and schizophrenia.[23]

The Main Problems With Great-Age Claims

The problem with these claims of great age in the "millions of years" is the fact that the omnipresent background radiation damages the DNA. The main reason is because "ionizing radiation damages the genetic material in reproductive cells and results in mutations that are transmitted from generation to generation…. [R]adiation has been found to be mutagenic in all organisms studied so far."[24]

The annual average effective dose from natural background ionizing radiation is approximately 2.4 millisieverts worldwide. Although this is a relatively small amount of radiation, after 50 or 60 years it can cause cancer and other damage to DNA and to cell organelles. After millions of years we would expect that the DNA

---

[20] Sagan C (1980) *Cosmos*, Random House, New York, NY, 35

[21] Meisenberg G, Simmons WH (2006) *Principles of Medical Biochemistry*, Mosby, Philadelphia, PA, 153

[22] Moran L (2014 April 01) A creationist tries to understand genetic load. *Sandwalk* (blog). https://sandwalk.blogspot.com/search?q=a+creationist+tries+to+understand+genetic+load Accessed on 2024 Oct 03

[23] Kondrashov AS (2017) *Crumbling Genome: The Impact of Deleterious Mutations on Humans*, First Edition. Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, MA. Publisher description: https://www.wiley.com/en-au/Crumbling+Genome%3A+The+Impact+of+Deleterious+Mutations+on+Humans-p-9781118952139

[24] National Research Council (US) Committee on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR V) (1990) Chapter 2: "Health Effects of Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation," National Academies Press (US), Washington, DC

would have largely deteriorated. The major sources of ionizing radiation include cosmic rays (alpha, beta, gamma, neutron radiation, and x-rays) and radioisotopes, including polonium-210, carbon-14, iodine-131, and potassium-40. Ionizing radiation knocks electrons out of their orbit, damaging the molecules in cells.

DNA is especially susceptible to ionizing damage from radiation. Ionizing radiation directly affects the DNA structure by causing DNA breaks, particularly double-strand breaks, which are the most lethal damage to cells.[25] Radiation also causes the formation of reactive oxygen species that are involved in DNA damage. Knocking electrons out of their orbit around atoms alters the electron/proton balance, potentially damaging the cell structure, often killing the cell.

The major damage to DNA caused by mutations was recognized decades ago. Leading geneticist Theodosius Dobzhansky wrote in 1951:

> A majority of mutations, both those arising in the laboratories and those stored in natural populations, produce deteriorations of viability, hereditary disease, and monstrosities. Such changes it would seem, can hardly serve as evolutionary building blocks.[26]

For this reason, Dobzhansky adds, "Natural selection will, therefore, favor the genotype in which the mutability is kept to a minimum." If this can be observed in the laboratory in a few years or less, then after eons it would be expected to have produced major DNA damage, causing extinxtion to the species. Egan adds, "Mutations are almost never beneficial to a species, and most of the time mutations are dealt with harshly by nature: That is to say; natural selection weeds them out."[27]

The mutation load in humans accumulates, eventually leading to mutational meltdown and extinction. The medical profession is very aware of this, and one of the main focuses today is to medically counteract this problem. These same mutational events cause aging. Thus, entire species age, as do all life-forms. The aging of species (e.g., dogs, humans, etc.) eventually causes species extinction.

Despite this reality, most leading scientists favor the view that mutations are our creator, not God. This view is not only irresponsible, it is contrary to fact. This view is believed partly because the lower courts have, without exception, ruled that evolution must be taught in all public schools *as fact*. Furthermore, information contrary to this worldview must not be taught because, the courts have ruled, doing so is teaching "back-door religion," and thus is unconstitutional. The only judicial exception to this ruling has been the Supreme Court, which, so far, all lower courts have ignored. Opposition to Darwinism is widespread in the churches because, as has been well-documented, Darwinism is the doorway to atheism.[28]

Only Darwinism can be taught in government schools, and secular scientists control most of the media and science book/journal publishing. As a result, most people in the Western world, even many people who call themselves Christians, accept evolution as fact. They often attempt to meld the two worldviews together into a position called *theistic evolution*, which actually consists of a very thin coat of theism pasted on a solid body of Darwinism. This is all obvious, so why cannot evolutionists, both those who call themselves Christians and non-Christian evolutionists, see this? The main reason many accept this evolution as fact is that they see the world through evolutionary glasses and cannot see it for what it really is.

Nothing Created Everything

Evolution tells us not only where we allegedly came from, but where we are supposedly going. The so-called *Big Bang* teaches that the entire universe came from an extremely compact something called "the primordial egg." This view, held by leading astrophysics scientists such as the late Steven Hawking, teaches that, in short, for some unknown and unexplainable reason, this primordial egg "exploded." From this point, for the first time ever in history, matter, energy, time, and space were somehow created. In short, the "scientific" view is literally that nothing created the "primordial egg," which produced everything, or from nothing came everything.

The Big Bang is described as the "leading theory behind the birth of everything: atoms, light, gravity, gasses, stars, planets, galaxies and even time itself. …Scientists have found plenty of evidence to back up the big bang theory."[29] Furthermore, Boyer adds that before the Big Bang there was "nothingness … nada, zip" and, somehow, somewhere was "a supremely hot spot crammed with all of the raw ingredients of the universe scrunched into a point thousands of times smaller than

---

[25] Borrego-Soto G, Ortiz-López R, Rojas-Martínez A (2015) Ionizing radiation-induced DNA injury and damage detection in patients with breast cancer. *Genet Mol Biol.* 38(4):420–432

[26] Dobzhansky T (1951) *Genetics and the Origin of Species*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY, 73

[27] Egan JH (2009) 46

[28] Bergman J (2019) *Darwinism Is the Doorway to Atheism*. Leafcutter Press, Southworth, WA

[29] Boyer C (2015) *Why?: Over 1,111 Answers to Everything,* National Geographic Society, Washington, DC, 82

the period at the end of this sentence."[29] Fully 13.8 billion years later, here we are, the universe and all life, thanks to the Big Bang. However, this date has just been revised from 13.8 to 27 billion years ago.[30] The book concludes everything somehow popped into existence from nothing.

A now disproven theory called the Oscillating Universe Theory postulated that this Big Bang expansion will gradually slow down and begin to contract, producing the *Big Crunch*, which in time will blow up again, producing an endless series of Big Bang explosions and contractions. Thus, this endless series of events existed in the infinite past and will continue into the infinite future. However, the evidence that the universe's expansion rate is not slowing, but rather increasing, argues that the expansion will continue forever.

Eventually, according to the secularist view, the stars will burn out, destroying the planets and their moons. The entire universe will then consist of dust spread out to the extent that the universe will forever consist of a state very close to a vacuum near or at absolute zero in temperature. This state (of "heat death") will exist forever, and never again will life or anything else exist anywhere in the universe. In short, evolution is not only scientifically false but is a pessimistic, depressing worldview devoid of hope and a future.

Creation, conversely, tells us a very different story. It is an account of purpose, meaning one of everlasting life with an eternal God who, in the beginning, created everything and cares about us. This God will not allow the pessimistic state of affairs envisioned by secular, atheistic scientists to occur. The evidence for this Creator God is found everywhere in the natural world, both in the inorganic and organic worlds.[31]

What Is Taught in Secular Education?

To make evaluations on the topic of teaching evolution, I selected several of the most popular books used in public schools published by leading publishers and then reviewed how they cover the topic of evolution.[32] In all the cases that I examined, they teach evolution as an unequivocal fact and never once discussed the many, well-documented controversies in the academic evolutionary field. This is especially problematic because most young people are rarely exposed to the many major problems with the claims presented in the children's books reviewed below.

Most noncreationist parents are not prepared to respond to the evolutionary claims made in the books evaluated in this review. Furthermore, most of the nonevolution-related material in these books was well-documented, factual information that is not debated by experts in the fields discussed. Once exposed to unsubstantiated claims about evolution alongside well-known facts, a mindset is produced which will likely be reinforced as the child reads further in the area of science and the origins issue.

The first set of books reviewed is a lavishly illustrated set of five books, three of which I reviewed, published by the highly respected publisher, National Geographic Society. As evidence of their popularity, these books have over 38,000 ratings on Amazon. Positive features of the books include that they are very well-written and well-illustrated in color on engaging topics that are often of interest to young people. The downside is that they contain evolution from cover to cover, much of it having been refuted decades ago. An example is under the subheading What Is Evolution?, which defines evolution as the following:

> The theory of evolution explains how all plants and animals—including humans—slowly change over time to improve their chances of survival. All life-forms are subject to the forces of "natural selection" in which nature favors changes (tougher beaks, sharper teeth, keener eyesight, etc.) that help a species survive and reproduce. …Eventually, all of these adaptations add up until one species evolves into a new one. If you go back far enough in Earth's history, all life-forms—from great white sharks to cherry trees—evolved from a common ancestor.[33]

On page 60 is pictured the now ubiquitous icon depicting the fictional progression from ape to Neanderthal Man and ending with modern man. In an attempt to persuade the reader of the truth of evolution, the author noted that those who disagree with evolution ask, "If humans evolved from apes, then why do chimpanzees and other

---

[30] Lagatta E (2023 Jul 14) How old is our universe? New study says Big Bang might have happened 27 billion years ago. *USA Today*. https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2023/07/14/universe-may-older-than-thought-study-shows/70411343007/ Accessed 2024 Oct 04

[31] Bergman J (2019) *Science is the Doorway to Creation: Nobel Laureates and Other Eminent Scientists Who Reject Orthodox Darwinism,* Leafcutter Press, Southworth, WA

[32] Baker L (2024 May 27) The best children's books about human evolution for your curious little ones. *AZ Animals*. https://a-z-animals.com/reviews/best-childrens-books-about-human-evolution-for-your-curious-little-ones/ Accessed 2024 Oct 04

[33] Boyer C (2015) 60

apes still exist?"[34] The reason given is that apes and humans both evolved from a common ancestor which, they fail to mention, was a hypothetical ape.

In the section on the origin of languages, the book admits that "researchers can only guess when humans first began forming sounds into words to communicate thoughts."[35] The text adds that "ancestors of the human species possessed the mouth and throat parts necessary to pronounce words nearly two million years ago, but they likely didn't have much to talk about until they started creating complex tools and building fires more than a million years later."[35] The author assumed that *Australopithecus afarensis* evolved into *Homo erectus* over two million years ago, and little evidence exists that *Australopithecus afarensis* could use language. For one, no hyoid bone was found. Yet the author stated, without evidence, that the beginning of humans was "200 thousand years ago."[36]

Evolution is repeatedly personalized. For example, in answer to the question, "Why do humans have ten fingers," Boyer answered: "The process of evolution determined that the most beneficial number of fingers and toes for our survival [was five]. …[E]volution determined that five fingers per hand are just right for humans."[37]

Vestigial Organ Arguments

In answer to the question, "Why are some body parts pointless?," the book answered these "'vestigial' organs are useless body parts that are "leftovers from our evolutionary ancestors, who actually needed them."[38] Among those "vestigial" organs listed was the coccyx, which the author claimed "is a leftover from animals that needed tails for balance or grasping tree branches."[38] However, in actuality, the coccyx functions as an attachment point for various muscles, tendons, and ligaments. Posteriorly, the lateral edges function as insertion sites for the coccygeal muscles, the sacrospinous ligament, the sacrotuberous ligament, and the fibers of the gluteus maximus muscle. Although these muscles have other attachment points, this redundancy provides additional required support and thus is a critical function of the coccyx. A coccygectomy (surgical removal of the coccyx) creates the risks of losing bowel control and of nerve damage. The surgery is often done to relieve pain, but its removal does not always stop the pain.

Also listed were wisdom teeth which, as is true of all other teeth, are pulled only if they cause a problem, usually if they become impacted. There are no proven health benefits of pulling problem-free wisdom teeth. Removing them is usually unpleasant, and their removal may cause unwanted health side effects.

Boyer's book teaches human evolution as an unassailable fact: "Humans have evolved to become less hairy in the past six million years or so, but we still have these clumps of fur above our eyes."[38] Then, after claiming that goose bumps serve no purpose, the author listed several important purposes that they do serve."[39] In answer to the question, "Why do we think baby animals are cute?," the book explains that "we have evolved to think that any creature with a big head, large eyes, and a button nose—features that most human babies share—is cute. …Evolution has wired our brains to think babies are cute."[40]

Besides personifying evolution, this response does not answer *why* we perceive baby animals as cute any more than explaining that we have eyes because we need to be able to see. To claim that we evolved eyes to see is not an answer. The answer to the question "Why am I here?" was given two full pages to show how some chemical soup 3.8 billion years ago created life which, after millions of years, evolved into humans.[36] Boyer added that our species began evolving 200,000 years ago *after* natural selection wiped out our less-fit ape relatives.

Not a word was about the many controversies related to human evolution—nor does the author mention the fact that almost half of all Americans have concluded that humans did not evolve but rather were created by God.[41,42] The books openly teach a secular *worldview* to answer the questions of where we came from, why we are here, and where we are going. Evolution teaches that we evolved from simpler forms of life; that we are here to survive and reproduce; and that when we die, we are gone forever. This is a secular *religion*. On the other hand, Christianity teaches that God created all life, that our purpose is to serve our Creator God and our fellow

---

[34] Boyer C (2015) 61
[35] Boyer C (2015) 118
[36] Boyer C (2015) 59
[37] Boyer C (2015) 28
[38] Boyer C (2015) 14
[39] Boyer C (2015) 15
[40] Boyer C (2015) 187
[41] Moyers B (2013 Mar 01) Richard Dawkins on the truth of evolution. https://billmoyers.com/2013/03/01/moyers-moment-2004-richard-dawkins-on-the-truth-of-evolution/ Accessed 2024 Oct 04
[42] Newport F (2004 Nov 19) Third of Americans say evidence has supported Darwin's evolution theory. *Gallup*. https://news.gallup.com/poll/14107/third-americans-say-evidence-has-supported-darwins-evolution-theory.aspx Accessed 2024 Oct 04

humans, perhaps to raise a family, and that our afterlife depends on whether we have asked Christ to save us from our sin. These religious questions should be taught by the parents, not by some secular book for children.

It is the responsibility of authors to do their homework, which in this case was not done, at least in the area of evolution. One review of the book noted, "If you do not believe in evolution, then do not get this book. It would have been great if it had just been a book answering interesting facts without bias, but sadly it is not. I even would have tolerated one section about evolution, however this book makes mention of evolution all throughout the book."[43] Another reviewer wrote regarding his purchase of the book:

> purchased this book to give as a gift but reviewed a little of it first and I am glad I did. I returned the book to Amazon due to the fact that a question was asked about how humans got on Earth and the book discussed evolution and not the Biblical view. I believe in GOD and I believe GOD created men and women, not Evolution.[44]

In the book *Why? Animals: 99+ Awesome Answers for Curious Kids*, the author covers a favorite kids topic, dinosaurs.[45] After stating, "Prepare to get your mind blown," Beer announces that "birds are dinosaurs," adding that birds are descendants of dinosaurs, specifically theropods, and that they evolved from one of the fiercest dinosaurs that ever lived, *T. rex*.[46] She explains that although dinosaurs died off, some survived to evolve into birds. She cites that some dinosaurs had evidence of feathers, giving the impression that the belief that dinosaurs evolved into birds was a hard fact. An actual fact not mentioned is that some leading evolutionary bird experts even dispute this claim. Thus, Beer writes that, as dinosaurs evolved into birds, they are "anything but extinct. They live on every continent on the planet, and come in hundreds of shapes and sizes."[46]

The author does not avoid teaching human evolution, writing that our closest relatives are chimps and bonobos, which "share 98.7 percent of humans' genes. And that 98.7 percent makes us alike in a lot of ways,"[47] (although the percentage has been greatly reduced by other analyses of the same data). She then explains how we (i.e., apes and humans) are alike, including that we both use tools, are both smart, and can effectively communicate. She ignores the fact that chimp tool use is limited to a crude use of sticks and rocks, and their communication involves mostly grunts and squeals. In contrast, the average human can articulate over 1,000 words.

Instead of using the word *design*, Beer often uses the word *evolution* when *design* would work just as well. For example, in answer to the question "Why can't penguins fly?" she answered, they "have evolved wings that work more like flippers, helping them swim and steer in the ocean. In fact, their wing bones are straight and unable to fold like most birds' wings. And their body resembles a sea animal more than a bird's."[48] More accurate would be the following: Their barrel-shaped bird's wings were designed to function like flippers to enable them to swim and steer in the ocean. Their body is designed for the sea environment, and not flight, as are other birds' bodies.

Another popular book, *How Come? Every Kid's Science Questions Explained,* claims that it answers kids' common science questions. Asked "If human beings evolved from apes, why don't apes in jungles or zoos turn into humans?," the answer the book provides is that "we and apes descended from a common ancestor," which the author then ignored explaining that this common ancestor was an ape.[49] The "evidence" given for our evolution from apes was the long-ago disproved claim that "chimpanzees are our closest relatives: We share 98.4 percent of our genes with them."[50] In fact, the similarity is probably closer to 85 percent, or a difference of close to 500 million genes.[51]

All the other examples of evolution listed in this book have been refuted. They include the claim that the giraffe has a long neck because some shorter-necked giraffes that "by chance were born with somewhat longer necks could forage from the ground all the way up the treetops, and find more food…. So over generations, the longer-necked giraffes crowded out the short-necked ones."[52] This story sounds reasonable, except that the evidence is overwhelmingly against it. No evidence exists in the fossil

---

[43] Mondry MH (2018 Nov 25) All about evolution. Amazon-posted review of *Why?: Over 1,111 Answers to Everything* by Crispin Boyer.

[44] Linville J (2017 Nov 10) Reviewed a little of it first and I am glad I did. Amazon-posted review of *Why?: Over 1,111 Answers to Everything* by Crispin Boyer.

[45] Beer J (2022) *Why? Animals: 99+ Awesome Answers for Curious Kids*. National Geographic Society, Washington, DC

[46] Beer J (2022) 152

[47] Beer J (2022) 122–123

[48] Beer J (2022) 167

[49] Wollard K (1993) *How Come? Every Kid's Science Questions Explained*. Workman Publishing, New York, NY, 250–251

[50] Wollard K (1993) 250

[51] Tomkins J (2021) *Chimps and Humans: A Geneticist Discovers DNA Evidence That Challenges Evolution*, Institute for Creation Research, Dallas, TX, 40–45

[52] Wollard K (1993) 220–221

record of short-necked giraffes, even though neck bones preserve very well compared to soft tissue.

Other difficulties for giraffe evolution include the circulatory system and heart that must pump blood all the way up against gravity to supply blood to the brain and other structures. This feat requires a major redesign to evolve a short-necked animal into the giraffe's 6-foot- (1.8-meter-) long neck that weighs about 600 pounds (272 kilograms).[53] Extensive breeding experience has well-documented the fact that growth limits are reached fairly rapidly and that crossing those limits is not possible. Although breeding can move us close to those limits, it often produces major health problems.

Another example used to "prove" evolution is the peppered moth *Biston betularia*,[54] which is actually not evolution but merely a change in certain population traits due to environmental changes. As Wollard explained, in the early 1800s most peppered moths were light gray. Occasionally, a black moth was born, but as their color contrasted with the trees they rested upon (actually they rest on the underside of the canopy leaves), they were more apt to be noticed and then eaten by the birds. As factories were built, the black pollution they produced darkened the tree trunks. As a result, the light gray moths were more visible, and the number of black moths increased in the areas where black soot blackened the tree bark. Later, when pollution was regulated, the trees' bark color went back to their original light-gray color. Then the gray moths again became dominant, and the black ones became rare. This is not an example of evolution. Only the color ratio changed, then it changed again back to the original color ratio. Though no evolution occurred, readers are left with the impression that, in fact, this change is evidence of evolution (via "industrial melanism"), not merely adaptation.

Three pages were dedicated to evolutionists' claims of evidence for human evolution.[55] Gradually, Darwinian evolution was taught as fact: "If you could see a speeded-up movie of [human] evolution, you would see one line that looked more and more like chimpanzees as time went on and another line that looked more and more human as time passed."[56] This lineal (aka "orthogenic") human-evolution concept has been rejected by evolutionists long ago for several reasons, including the fact that no fossil evidence exists for it.[57]

Summary

All of the claimed evidence for evolution, as defined in this paper, has been disproved by the peer-reviewed literature, including the fossil record[58] and the useless organs,[59] and poor design claims.[60] The three pillars—abiogenesis, natural selection, and mutations—have likewise been refuted[61] as have the other major pillars used to support evolution, including the taxonomy, homology claims, plus the evolutionary convergent evolution argument, the claims for evolutionary naturalism, and the arguments evolutionists make against irreducible complexity. Also, the evolutionary co-option claim and the pseudogenes argument for evolution were refuted. Last, the antibiotic resistance, entropy, and endosymbiosis arguments made by evolutionists were also refuted.[62]

The books noted above are typical of the books on science for young people that irresponsibly indoctrinate young people to accept the secular worldview of atheistic evolution. All the evolutionary examples used in the books reviewed above are very problematic: the claims made have long ago been rejected by research, even by many evolutionists. The problem is that very few young people will learn about the problems with evolution and/or that much of the information is outdated or even deceptive. The sections on evolution reviewed above are not education but indoctrination of the worst kind.

The above-mentioned, pro-evolution court decision and numerous others like it have not encouraged open discussion of the important topic of worldviews presented in the schools, but rather have narrowed curricula to the extent that the "teaching" results in indoctrination, not

---

[53] Bergman J (2002) The giraffe's neck: Another icon of evolution falls. *J Creation* 16(1):120–127, https://dl0.creation.com/articles/p026/c02620/j16_1_120-127.pdf

[54] Wollard K (1993) 222

[55] Wollard K (1993) 250–251

[56] Wollard K (1993) 252

[57] Bergman J, Line P, Tomkins J, Biddle (2021) *Apes as Ancestors: Examining the Claims About Human Evolution*, Bartlett Publishing, Tulsa, OK

[58] Bergman J (2019) *Fossil Forensics: Separating Fact From Fantasy in Paleontology*, Bartlett Publishing, Tulsa, OK

[59] Bergman J (2024) *Useless Organs: The Rise and Fall of a Central Claim of Evolution*, revised edition, Bartlett Publishing, Tulsa, OK

[60] Bergman J (2024) *Poor Design. An Invalid Argument Against Intelligent Design*, revised edition, Bartlett Publishing, Tulsa, OK

[61] Bergman J (2022) *The Three Pillars of Evolution Demolished: Why Darwin Was Wrong*, WestBow Division of Thomas Nelson and Zondervan, Bloomington, IN

[62] Bergman J (2002) *The Last Pillars of Evolution Falsified: Further Evidence Proving Darwinian Evolution Wrong*, WestBow Division of Thomas Nelson and Zondervan, Bloomington, IN

education. Due to court decisions such as the one reviewed in this paper, the Big Bang "creation" theory is the only worldview told in secular schools and by the secular media. The only way some people will hear the other side is in church. Understandably, however, most ministers are not trained in science at the graduate level, nor do they have a background in science, so their congregations will probably never hear from the pulpit the scientific evidence that renders the Big Bang bogus. The belief in evolution is very powerful and guarded by both the courts and academia which results in censorship,[63] and discrimination against those who challenge this worldview,[64] including career termination.[65]

[63] Bergman J (2024) *Censoring the Darwin Skeptics. How Belief in Evolution is Enforced by Eliminating Dissidents*, revised 3rd edition, Leafcutter Press, Southworth, WA

[64] Bergman J (2023) *Silencing the Darwin Skeptics*, revised edition, Leafcutter Press Southworth, WA

[65] Bergman J (2023) *Slaughter of the Dissidents: The Shocking Truth About Killing the Careers of Darwin Doubters*, revised version, Leafcutter Press, Southworth, WA