



*R*EASONS
TO
*R*EJECT
*E*VOOLUTION

Paul G. Humber, *Editor*

REASONS TO REJECT EVOLUTION

Paul G. Humber, *Editor*

Contributors¹

Roger Assman

Jerry Bergman, Ph.D.

Biology

Karen Bodner

David Bump

Karl Crawford

Danny R. Faulkner, Ph.D.

Astronomy

Paul Gosselin

Teno Groppi

Jack Kennedy

Kirk Kimball

Jean Lightner, D.V.M.

Steve Miller

Stewart R. Reeve

Andrew Rodenbeck

David Sack

Dan Schobert

Doug Sharp

Theodore J. Siek, Ph.D.

Biochemistry

Joseph A. Strada, Ph.D.

Aeronautical Engineering/Math

Bob Zuvich

INTRODUCTION

Members of the media and evolutionists (whether theistic or atheistic) affirm that evolution, as defined below, is a fact of science and that anyone who would oppose it is either uneducated or an obscurantist. True science, however, should be self-correcting.

This booklet is presented as an incomplete summary of our search for reasoned answers to questions that of necessity are not entirely scientifically based. Common descent evolution, for example, is heavily dependent on the philosophy of materialistic naturalism. No finite scientist was present at the beginning, and pre-history can not be repeated. Any scientist who claims to have reached conclusions in these matters has gone beyond science into metaphysics. The claim that the physical world alone can account for itself is a worldview – even a religious tenet. Many educated people oppose the broad parameters of evolution, however, and here are some reasons why.



This “living fossil” (Wollemi Pine) was purchased by one of our contributors, Creationist Teno Groppi, from *National Geographic* recently.

Cover Photo: Contributor Steve Miller graciously provided the photo on the front and back covers. In fact, it is he standing near the telescope. Creator Christ, however, is the One deserving of all the glory in the stars, sky, and Steve.

REASON #1

The setting for biological evolution is very shaky. Evolutionists have two “explanations” for the cosmos – Steady State (SS) and Big Bang (BB). The first is excluded due to the Law of Entropy. If the universe had no beginning, then it would have dissipated due to “heat death” long ago. This is why the SS concept has for the most part been abandoned. The more popular BB concept also needs to be abandoned. Why? Even evolutionists acknowledge the lack of evidence for the earliest (i.e. Pop. III) stars – essential for BB to have any credibility.² Despite an increasing desire in the scientific community for a serious review of the integrity and prominence of the BB model,³ it has not been abandoned because the only reasonable alternative models imply Special Creation (an abhorrent notion for many).

Biological evolution cannot get off the ground – even onto “square one.”

REASON #2

Abiogenesis (spontaneous generation) has not been observed; though evolutionists have faith that it must have happened at least once. Neil A. Campbell's textbook, *Biology*, (2nd ed.) affirmed “that life developed on earth from nonliving materials.” *Life: The Science of Biology* by Purves, Orians, and Heller was more guarded: “The initial energy source for life's evolution is not known, but volcanic vents were probably important sites for the evolution of proto life.” In short, belief that life could generate from nonliving materials is a matter of faith (a religious tenet) – not science.

REASON #3

It is impossible for life to develop through natural causes. Evolutionists will argue that billions of years and billions of planets provide the basis for the assumption that life has been created through natural

causes. To evolutionists, the origin of life is like a lottery. Someone has to win, and since we are here on Earth, that means that Earth won the life lottery. The truth is that a living organism is so complex that it is impossible for life to be created by natural causes. Only He who is “the Life” (John 14:6) can create life.

REASON #4

Common-descent evolution is impossible. First, the statistical probability of evolving by chance-mutations a new functional protein is much too low for it to have a realistic chance of happening.⁴

Second, mutations are overall harmful to the genome. Many of these mutations are not efficiently removed by natural selection. Evolution cannot move things upward when the changes brought about by mutations are in reality pulling those things downward.⁵

Third, for a mutation to be fixed in a population, those who have it need to pay a cost, consisting of a higher reproduction rate. This cost is so high that it cannot be paid in one generation. Therefore this higher reproduction rate needs to be maintained (by those having the mutation) for many generations in order for the cost to be paid and the mutation to become fixed in the population – so many generations, in fact, that evolution cannot occur in the time-span stated by evolutionists.⁶

REASON #5

Mark Twain said of science: “One gets such wholesale returns of conjectures out of such a trifling investment of fact.” The “trifling” (to use Twain’s word) Miller-Urey experiment, one that uses a trap, is so far removed from explaining the origin of first life that any representation of its being the first stage is extremely misleading and anti-science. Again, there is a failure to show abiogenesis even possible.

REASON #6

Only God can make a living cell. So-called “simple” cells are not simple. Former atheist Anthony Flew

has become a theist due to unbelievably complex DNA. "It seems to me that Richard Dawkins constantly overlooks the fact that Darwin himself, in the fourteenth chapter of *The Origin of Species*, pointed out that his whole argument began with a being which already possessed reproductive powers. This is the creature the evolution of which a truly comprehensive theory of evolution must give some account. Darwin himself was well aware that he had not produced such an account. It now seems to me that the findings of more than fifty years of DNA research have provided materials for a new and enormously powerful argument to design" (<http://www.biola.edu/antonyflew/>).

REASON #7

Evolution is at a loss how to account for genetic information coming into being. Why? They rule out Information (Word = Logos = Jesus) from the beginning. Natural selection cannot produce new information. Computer simulations of supposed evolution allow selection to occur in a guiding way so that "nucleotides" fall into place when they would not naturally. They also hijack a pre-existing, complete information system to make its demonstrations; this is an invalid experiment, as the onus is on evolutionary demonstrations to originate an arbitrary, but complete information system of its own (syntax, semantics, sender-receiver, etc); only from there can it then produce information of internal significance and, thus, a successful demonstration of evolution producing new information.

Evolution has been and still is supported by hoaxes and flawed information.

REASON #8

Can evolutionary scientists like Ernst Haeckel, who was a German proponent of evolution, be trusted? He produced fraudulent drawings of embryos in various stages that supposedly proved evolutionary

relationships. This lie continues to prop the mirage of evolution. Wilhelm His, a German scientist, “accused Haeckel of shocking dishonesty in repeating the same picture several times to show the similarity among vertebrates at early embryonic stages in several plates . . .” Stephen Jay Gould, *Ontogeny and Phylogeny* (1977), p. 430. “When critics brought charges of extensive retouching and outrageous ‘fudging’ in his famous embryo illustrations, Haeckel replied he was only trying to make them more accurate than the faulty specimens on which they were based” (R. Mlner, *Encyclopedia of Evolution* (1990, p. 206).⁷ It is better to trust the Lord than to put confidence in man.

REASON #9

Related to the above, Carl Sagan encouraged the fiction that life in the womb traces out an evolutionary history. We “must decide,” he wrote, “what distinguishes a human being from other animals and when, during gestation, the uniquely human qualities – whatever they are – emerge.” He compared the appearance of the developing embryo to “a segmented worm” and added that “something like the gill arches of a fish or an amphibian . . . become conspicuous, and there is a pronounced tail.” The face becomes “reptilian. . . (then) somewhat pig-like.” Eventually, it “resembles a primate’s but is still not quite human.”⁸

REASON #10

Can Charles Darwin himself be trusted? In his *Descent of Man*, Vol. I, pp. 168-169, he opposed vaccination against smallpox! Note the reason why: “Vaccination has preserved thousands, who from a weak constitution would formerly have succumbed to smallpox. Thus the weak members of civilized society propagate their kind . . . this must be highly injurious to the race of man. It is surprising how soon a want of care, or care wrongly directed, leads to the degeneration of the domestic race . . . we must bear without complaining the undoubtedly bad effects of the weak surviving and propagating their kind . . .”

REASON #11

Over 100 so-called “vestigial” organs are not vestigial. The appendix was once thought to be an evolutionary left-over, but several very sensible reasons exist for each of us having one. One reason is that the appendix helps protect the small intestine, which is normally sterile, against bacteria from the large intestine, which has billions of bacteria.⁹

REASON #12

“Junk” DNA may not be totally junk. Just because we may be ignorant about the exact function of so-called “junk” DNA does not mean that it has none. See, for example,

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/4940654.stm>—*Salvage prospect for ‘junk’ DNA*, by Paul Rincon, BBC News science reporter: “A mathematical analysis of the human genome suggests that so-called ‘junk DNA’ might not be so useless after all.” It may be, however, that some DNA is “junk” in the sense that it is (degenerative).

REASON #13

Evolutionists play a shell game with the unwary. There are two distinct definitions for evolution in biology. One is that it is a change in the genetic make up of a population over time. This, indeed, can be observed. Differences in size, shape, and color can be seen within different breeds of both domestic and wild animals. Selection, natural or artificial, can indeed change the ratios of various characteristic of such groups of animals. The second definition of evolution is common descent, or molecules-to-man evolution. This requires that new information be added to produce new organs and complex biochemical pathways. Using examples of change to support this second definition when these changes do not build the type of complex biochemical pathways seen in living things betrays an irresponsibly vague and deceptive use of terminology. A change in a finch beak (a structure which already exists) does not explain the origin of the beak.¹⁰

REASON #14

Variation within a kind (dark/light moths, finch beaks, etc.) is called evolution even though the pattern of change does not result in a new kind of animal. The peppered moths were hailed as the “most spectacular evolutionary change ever witnessed and recorded by man . . .” (Sheppard PM, 1975, *Natural Selection and Heredity*, 4th ed. London: Hutchinson University Library, p. 70).¹¹ Yet it remains the same species of moth with the same two color patterns represented in the population. The work was poorly done and it was later revealed that moths had been glued to tree trunks to make it appear they were resting there.¹² Apparently, they do not normally rest on tree trunks for birds to find them.

***Some human evolution proposals
have been especially bad.***

REASON #15

We should not live our lives on puffs of wind. For forty years, the Piltdown Man hoax provided the mirage of evolution with seeming support, but it was a deliberate fraud. It is featured on pp. 10-13 of The American Museum of Natural History’s *The Hall of the Age of Man* by Henry F. Osborn, Honorary Curator of Vertebrate Paleontology.¹³ Like the empty shell of a departed cicada, evolution still makes feeble motions with puffs of wind, but all that is inside is air.

REASON #16

We should not trust our origins to a pig’s tooth. Nebraska Man also became part of scientific literature, but it was a colossal, scientific blunder--based on a single, pig tooth. Sir Grafton Elliot, an anatomist, commissioned a painting of this “creature” which appeared in the *Illustrated London News*.

REASON #17

Nutcracker Man (*Zinjanthropus boisei*), found by Louis Leakey in 1959, was once used to promote

the so-called missing-link concept; however, even evolutionists now admit that this extinct creature should not be viewed as ancestral to man.

REASON #18

The Bible teaches that we all come from One Man, Adam. We are therefore all brothers; we have the same blood; there is only one race – the human one. On the front cover of the August 1972 issue of the *National Geographic*, was pictured a “primitive” Tasaday child climbing a vine – reminiscent of monkey-climbing. This article, however, was and is another hoax. The implicit racism on the cover becomes explicit on page 225 of the issue: “Young Lubu . . . scampers through the forest, climbing vines . . . with the ease of a monkey.” Monkey language is again repeated on page 242.

*The “dates” of evolution
are skewed by bias.*

REASON #19

Evolutionists are in denial about historical dates. If man is supposed to have been around for 1-2 million years, why do historical dates only go back to a mere fraction (less than 1%) of that time? Evolutionists expect creation scientists (CS) to believe incredible things, but CS are not so gullible.

REASON #20

Based on evolutionary assumptions, one would think that there would be at least some simple-language holdouts among peoples who continued to live simple hunter/gatherer lives, but the assumptions do not agree with reality.

“The so-called primitive languages can throw no light on language origins, since most of them are actually more complicated in grammar than the tongues spoken by civilized peoples.”¹⁴ “The evolution of language, at least within the historical period, is a story of progressive simplification.”¹⁵

REASON #21

Evolutionary chronology is under suspicion. *National Geographic* is selling living Wollemi Pines. According to the magazine, this tree is a “miraculous time traveler” and “survivor from the age of the dinosaurs.” Its absence from the fossil record for supposedly millions of years, however, calls into question the entire evolutionary, chronological paradigm. Other living fossils do the same thing. The millions of years that evolution requires is challenged by an ever increasing number of “living fossils.”

REASON #22

The latest advances in dating technology do not seem to be utilized. The use of an accelerator mass spectrometer is an improved method for dating animal fossils. Why is this method not used to date so-called hominid bones? Is it because there is fear that this relatively new carbon-14 dating technique will reveal that fossils believed to be millions of years old will be shown to be mere thousands of years old? “An astonishing discovery made over the past twenty years is that, almost without exception, when tested by highly sensitive accelerator mass spectrometer (AMS) methods, organic samples from every portion of the Phanerozoic record display $^{14}\text{C}/\text{C}$ ratios far above the AMS detection threshold of 0.001 percent modern carbon (pmc)” (<http://icr.org/article/117> or contact the editor paulhumber@verizon.net).

REASON #23

The Bible speaks of those who suppress the truth in unrighteousness. Dinosaur tissue has been extracted from bone fossils and has been found to be both soft and flexible. This was a surprise to the evolutionary scientists studying the fossils; they seem unwilling to admit that this evidence, at least on the surface, seems to support biblical chronology and clashes with evolutionary faith that dinosaurs are millions of years old. If some affirm that it is merely soft, pliable polymer, why do they not go the next step and submit it

to AMS testing for C14? See Reason immediately above.

REASON #24

Evolutionists tend to have a religious bias toward atheistic naturalism. Many will not allow God to gain a foothold inside the door of scientific dialogue. Helium and lead are both by-products of uranium radioactive decay, but helium-diffusion chronology clashes with the lead-formation chronology.¹⁶ Both measures cannot be correct. At least one is wrong. Is there any evidence that evolutionists are trying to reconcile this discrepancy?

REASON #25

The Grand Canyon is a testament to the fact that a tremendous amount of water once covered the American Southwest to a height of more than 6000 ft above current sea level. Contrary to evolutionary claims, the major flow morphology of the Grand Canyon proves it was carved in a short time by water that filled the Grand Canyon to overflowing. Only a worldwide flood can account for this monolithic structure. Some evolutionary geologists have begun to consider that the Grand Canyon may be the result of a catastrophic event rather than feeble erosion processes over a very long time-scale. A Nova PBS special on the scablands of Washington State, called "Mystery of the Megaflood," is one example of such a change in perspective(cf.

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/megaflood/>).

Examples of bias in other areas of evolutionism.

REASON #26

Do not trust *National Geographic's* evolutionary faith. The November 1999 issue of *National Geographic* displayed a fake fossil ("archaeoraptor") supposedly connecting birds with dinosaurs – a "true missing link." Then, three months later, *USA Today* published an article, *The 'missing link' that wasn't* (2/1/2000). Finally,

near the end of its October 2000 issue, *National Geographic* finally admitted that they had published “a fraud,” but there is a significant gap in time between *USA Today*’s report and *National Geographic*’s admission. Why did it take so long? Also, why did *National Geographic* publish two double-page images, two single-page images, two medium sized images, and six smaller images (for a total of twelve) in the issue promoting the fraud, but only a single, smaller image in the issue admitting it was a fake?

REASON #27

Evolutionary art has an evolutionary and even racist bias at times. *National Geographic*’s racist hominid sequence (from dark pigmentation to light) was justified because the last three were from Europe. The fourth in the sequence, however, also artistically drawn with light pigmentation (like the first three), was based on fossil evidence from Kenya, Africa. Their justification, therefore, falls flat.

REASON #28

Evolutionary hostility toward competing theories shows ice cracking under Darwin’s feet. U.S. House of Representatives’ Committee on Governmental Reform published findings in December of 2006: “Smithsonian’s top officials permit the demotion and harassment of scientists skeptical of Darwinian evolution.” . . . “The staff investigation has uncovered compelling evidence that Dr. Sternberg’s civil and constitutional rights were violated by Smithsonian officials. Moreover, the agency’s top officials – Secretary Lawrence Small and Deputy Secretary Sheila Burke – have shown themselves completely unwilling to rectify the wrongs that were done or even to genuinely investigate the wrongdoing.”

REASON #29

Various evolutionists seem to be in denial about the heritage of modern science. Why? They think it impos-

sible to be both a scientist and one who also affirms God in creation. Many “Founding Fathers” of modern science, however, were people who bowed before the God of creation. Sir Isaac Newton, perhaps the greatest of so-called modern scientists (gravitation, laws of motion, calculus), had no problem with the concept of God. In his *Principia*, he wrote of the “Lord over all.” Many other scientists – including Robert Boyle (the father of modern chemistry), George Cuvier (founder of comparative anatomy), Michael E. DeBakey, (famed heart surgeon on front cover of the May 28, 1965 issue of *Time* said, “I still have almost a religious sense when I work on the heart. It is something God makes.”), John Ambrose Fleming (the father of modern electronics and first president of the Evolution Protest Movement), Johann Kepler (the founder of physical astronomy and the one who thought “God’s thoughts after Him”), Carolus Linnaeus (the father of biological taxonomy), Joseph Maxwell, Gregory Mendel (the father of genetics), Samuel F. B. Morse (telegraphed, “What hath God wrought!”), and Louis Pasteur (one who disproved spontaneous generation) – did not see science and belief in the supernatural as antithetical.

Miscellaneous

REASON #30

The evolution of sex is hard to conceive. Reality and simple intuition join in casting doubt on evolutionary theories. Why do fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals (including humans) not divide like amoebas? A lot of energy and risk seems to be “wasted” (courtship, gestation, birth, etc.). Would it not be easier for a single fish to split, for example, into two fish – than to wait for a member of the opposite sex to evolve? Jesus’ words fit reality: “He who created them from the beginning made them male and female” (Matthew 19:4).

More Information?

Some, reading the above, may be curious where to get more information. Most of the contributors are members of the Creation Research Society, which may be contacted online (<http://www.creationresearch.org/>) or by writing to Creation Research Society, P.O. Box 8263, St. Joseph, MO 64508-8263, USA. Another option is to contact the editor of this paper (paulhumber@verizon.net, 215-483-9846, or CR Ministries, 327 Green Lane, Philadelphia, PA 19128).

**Note: This document may be freely distributed.
Our only request is that it be distributed
as a whole unit. Thank you.**

NOTES

¹Master and baccalaureate degrees are not listed.

²There is also the presence of bafflingly mature galaxies and other macro-objects in deep (presumably “early”) space. The introduction of the “dark matter fudge factor,” to account for failed predictions of the distribution of matter in the universe, is also of serious concern. See, for example, <http://metaresearch.org/cosmology/BB-top-30.asp>.

³See www.cosmologystatement.org and “Secular Scientists Blast the Big Bang,” www.creationontheweb.com/content/view/2019/.

⁴It is very clear that evolution simply cannot happen, no matter how long one is prepared to wait. Evolution is statistically impossible. Nobel Laureate, co-discoverer of DNA and atheist, Sir Francis Crick, computed the probability of the random “evolution” of a single protein: 1 chance in 10 to the 260th power! (*Life Itself*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1981, p. 51). To put this staggeringly small number in perspective, there are “only” 10 to the 80th power atoms in the universe! The chance of two human beings having the same fingerprints is “only” one in 10 to the 41st power, and of having the same DNA is “only” one in 10 to the 15th power – and both of these are considered ZERO by the FBI and our legal system.

⁵Sanford, John. (2005), *Genetic Entropy and the Mystery of the Genome*. Ivan Press.

ReMine, Walter J. (2005), "Cost theory and the cost of substitution – a clarification." *Technical Journal*, Vol. 19(1), pp. 113-125 and (2006), "More Precise Calculations of the Cost of Substitution," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 43(2), pp. 111-120.

⁷"For example, the human embryo at one point seems to have gill slits in the neck, thought by Haeckel to signify a fishlike stage in development. However, gill slits are not gills, and the similarity is not an actuality. In reality, the 'gill slit' develops into the lower jaw in mammals."

(http://www.iscid.org/encyclopedia/The_Biogenetic_Law_of_Ernst_Haeckel). Also, see

[http://medicalsciences.med.unsw.edu.au/SOMSWeb.nsf/resources/freeman01/\\$file/haeckel.pdf](http://medicalsciences.med.unsw.edu.au/SOMSWeb.nsf/resources/freeman01/$file/haeckel.pdf): Presented: Australian Birth Defects Society Annual Scientific Meeting, Royal Hospital for Women, Sydney, December 2000, HUMAN "BRANCHIAL" WHATEVERS: PERPETUATING HAECKEL'S FORGERIES. Brian Freeman, School of Anatomy, UNSW, Sydney, NSW 2052 (b.freeman@unsw.edu.au): "Haeckel's biogenetic 'law' (essentially, that ontogeny is a condensed recapitulation of phylogeny) is based on forged illustrations, or scientific fraud, as Haeckel himself admitted in a letter to the *Berliner Volkszeitung* on 29 December 1908 . . . Nevertheless, textbooks in Anatomy, Embryology, and Molecular Biology still continue to describe structures in the human head and neck using the adjective branchial (i.e., of gills), and to reproduce the forged illustrations."

⁸Carl Sagan and Ann Druyan, "Is It Possible To Be Pro-Life And Pro-Choice?" *Parade Magazine*, April 22, 1990, pp. 5-7.

⁹See Jerry Bergman and George Howe, 1990, "*Vestigial Organs Are Fully Functional*." CRS Monograph Series No. 4, Creation Research Society, 97 pages. "Coccyx - tonsils - appendix - cecum - goose bumps - etc. Evolutionists still assert that many structures in the bodies of animals and people (and even in plants) are useless remnants, i.e., 'vestigial,' of organs which functioned only in evolutionary ancestors. Bergman and Howe have produced a review of those arguments and a reply in which they show that these supposed 'remnants of evolution' play important roles and should not be considered as useless vestiges. This book is a must for medical doctors and students who have been exposed to the vestigial organ argument in support of evolution."

¹⁰In the article, "Evolutionary Theory Under Fire" by Roger Lewin (*Science* magazine, Volume 210, 21 November 1980, pp 883-887), the author was reporting on the 1980 Chicago Conference on Macroevolution. In the 5th paragraph, these words are found: "The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution. At the risk of doing violence to the positions of some of the people at the meeting, the answer can be given as a clear, No. What is not so clear, however, is whether microevolution is totally decoupled from macro-evolution. The two can more probably be seen as a continuum with a notable overlap." // The phrases, "not so clear" and "more probably" (near the end of the quotation) are suspicious. How can molecules-to-man evolution be both demonstrably true and a proven fact if the key requirement (micro changes supposedly fabricate to

macro changes) is built on the foundation stones of “no so clear” and “probably”?

¹¹See also “the clearest case in which a conspicuous evolutionary process has actually been observed” (Wright S. 1978, *Evolution and the Genetics of Populations*, Volume 4: Variability Within and Among Natural Populations, p. 186, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

¹²http://www.arn.org/docs/wells/jw_pepmothshort.htm

¹³Guide Leaflet Series No. 52, October, 1929 (in Editor Paul Humber's collection)

¹⁴Ralph Linton, *The Tree of Culture* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1957), p. 9. “Many other attempts have been made to determine the evolutionary origin of language, and all have failed. . . . Even the peoples with least complex cultures have highly sophisticated languages, with complex grammar and large vocabularies, capable of naming and discussing anything that occurs in the sphere occupied by their speakers. . . . The oldest language that can reasonably be reconstructed is already modern, sophisticated, complete from an evolutionary point of view.” George Gaylord Simpson, “The Biological Nature of Man,” *Science*, Vol. 152, 22 April 1966, p. 477

¹⁵Albert C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language*, 2nd edition (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), p. 10

¹⁶See <http://www.icr.org/pdf/research/rate-all.pdf>.



Published by

CR MINISTRIES