

## **CONTENTS**

Item #1: Textbook Challenge / Petition for Hearing

Item #2: Petitioner's Exhibit 1

Item #3: Petitioner's Exhibit 1a

Item #4: Hearing Officer's Summary

**ITEM #1**

## PETITION FOR ACTION TO THE NASSAU COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

My request to the Nassau County Board of Education is that **we stop promoting this scientifically inadequate theory of evolution as fact to our students**. We should no longer purchase books teaching evolution as proven scientific fact or books that present evolution as proven fact. Until the current books wear out, I propose placing a disclaimer sticker in the front of every textbook that promotes or presents evolution as proven fact. The sticker could read something like the following:

*This book contains references or information about evolution leading the reader to believe that evolution is proven fact. Those who believe in Creation Science would argue that **evolution is impossible because**: (1) evolution cannot explain the chance formation of the first living cell capable of cell division. (2) evolution cannot explain the complexities of life such as the human genome having 3 billion base pairs and the human brain being capable of more than 20 million billion calculations/second. (3) evolution cannot explain the transfer of intelligence to genes. For example, how does a pollen grain know when it is at the right place on the right flower? How does it know what to do next? And (4) evolution cannot explain the lack of transitional forms (missing links) in the fossil record. There is **not one** "so called" missing link agreed upon by all highly qualified evolutionary scientists.*

If the Nassau County Board of Education decides to adopt these measures, there is a strong possibility of a **threatened** lawsuit by groups such as the ACLU. However, if our lawyer along with a highly qualified molecular biologist (who believes in intelligent design) sit down with these groups and explain that they will need to come up with reasonable, scientific, evolutionary explanations for the serious flaws in their theory, I doubt they would dare a court challenge.

The truth is that the extraordinary advances in microbiology and DNA knowledge have really eliminated evolution as a plausible explanation for life on planet earth. As far back as 1953 Francis Crick and James Watson began mapping the human genome. These men immediately became aware that the complexity of DNA far exceeded what evolutionary science could reasonably produce.

Francis Crick, who was an atheist and a believer in evolution, changed his position to accepting that extra-terrestrials brought life to our world. I'm not sure if he later changed his beliefs, but he still needed to address the issue of "where did the alien DNA come from?"

This is a second reason I don't think the Board's decision will actually be challenged in court. The new scenario that life on earth was brought here by extraterrestrials is about ready to be publically promoted. It has been programmed into our literature and our films for many years. UFO sightings and alien encounters have been exploding exponentially for the last few years. Even the Catholic Church has astronomers on Mt. Graham observatories in Arizona searching the skies for the arrival of our "space brothers."

All this is coming, and I don't think organizations who oppose Creation Science will risk a certain defeat in a court of law on the issue of evolution being taught as fact in our schools. More than likely, they will do everything they can to keep the Board's decision from making state or national news.

The Board will probably postpone a final decision on this issue until a future date. Maybe the Board would like to call in experts in the fields of evolution and molecular biology to gather more information. However, I request that the Board set a timeline for whatever future measures it decides to take. I make this request because, as human beings, we tend not to rush into areas which may cause us difficulties. If timelines are not set, decisions may be put off almost indefinitely. This issue is too important to allow unnecessary delays, and I hope the Board will elevate it to a high priority issue. Thank you all for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,  
Jay W. Shutt

**ITEM #2**

Wednesday  
November 1, 2017

**PRESENTATION TO NASSAU COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION  
CONCERNING THE FALSE TEACHING OF "BACTERIA TO MAN  
EVOLUTION" AS BEING CONCLUSIVELY SUPPORTED BY  
SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE**

Florida statute 1006.31 of Title 48 K-20 Education Code states that, "Instructional materials recommended by each reviewer shall be, to the satisfaction of each reviewer, accurate, objective, balanced, noninflammatory, current, free of pornography and material prohibited under s.847.012, and suited to the student needs and their ability to comprehend the material presented."

It is my goal to demonstrate to the Board that the material concerning evolution presented in the 3 textbooks I reviewed are not entirely accurate, objective, balanced, and noninflammatory, nor are they suited to the needs of the students. The 2 high school science textbooks I reviewed were *Biology* and *Environmental Science*; the middle school textbooks reviewed were *Interactive Science, Course 1 and Course 2*.

By way of introduction, my name is Jay Shutt. I'm a 71 year old retired teacher with 40 years of teaching experience in grades K-12. I taught high school English for 2 years, junior high Language Arts for 5 years, 1 week of kindergarten (which is worth 6 months of experience in any other grade), and spent the rest of my time in elementary school, mostly 5<sup>th</sup> grade.

I attended the University of Michigan from 1963-1965. My Biology class convinced me that "bacteria to man evolution" and a 4.5 billion year old earth had been scientifically proven and the Bible, therefore, could not be literally true.

In 1981 I began to question the tenants of evolution. I began to read the research of scientists from many different fields who were Christians, believed in special creation, believed "bacteria to man evolution" was impossible and believed the Biblical timeline of the earth's age to be 6-10 thousand years. They presented scientific evidence supporting these beliefs. Most of my material came from the Institute for Creation Research (ICR at [icr.org](http://icr.org)). Over the last 36 years I have studied enough scientific material on evolution and the age of the earth that, if stacked up, would stand taller than my height of 6 feet.

Before beginning this presentation, let me clearly state that it is **not** my goal to enter into a creation-evolution debate. It is **not** my goal to persuade the Board to include the teaching of creation science in our public school textbooks. And it is certainly **not** my goal to demean anyone who believes in evolution.

The Smithsonian Magazine (May 2006 issue) had an article about then grad student Mary Schweitzer. I quote from the article. "Schweitzer announced she had discovered blood vessels and structures that looked like whole cells inside that T. rex bone—the first observation of its kind. The finding amazed colleagues, who had never imagined that even a trace of still-soft dinosaur tissue could survive. After all, as any textbook will tell you, when an animal dies, soft tissues such as blood vessels, muscle and skin decay and disappear over time, while hard tissues like bone may gradually acquire minerals from the environment and become fossils."

Later the article quotes University of Maryland paleontologist Thomas Holtz Jr. as saying, "The reason it hasn't been discovered before is no right-thinking paleontologist would do what Mary did with her specimens. We don't go to all this effort to dig this stuff out of the ground to then destroy it in acid,..." Schweitzer had to use the acid to get to the bone marrow. The article continues by stating that Mary Schweitzer is a Christian. I have read that Mary is currently teaching at North Carolina State University. She is still an evolutionist and still a Christian. She's been working on finding a naturalistic explanation of how soft tissue was preserved in dinosaur bone supposedly 70 million years old.

I'm sure Mary Schweitzer is a wonderful Christian and a wonderful person. I know many wonderful people, Christian and non-Christian, who believe in "bacteria to man evolution." They are sincere in their beliefs and are certainly entitled to their beliefs. What I want all believers in "bacteria to man evolution" to realize and all Board members to realize is that "bacteria to man evolution" is not supported by science and has no place in a science textbook. This statement seems shocking to most evolutionists, but let me quote from some famous evolutionists who are not shocked by it.

Sir Arthur Keith made this statement in 1959. Sir Arthur Keith was a leading proponent of evolution. In fact, he wrote the forward to the 100<sup>th</sup> edition of Darwin's book, *Origin of Species*. "Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it only because the only alternative is special creation, and that is unthinkable."

Dr. Karl Popper is a leading philosopher of science and an ardent believer in "bacteria to man evolution." He plainly states that his belief is not based

on scientific support. "Evolution is not a fact. Evolution doesn't even qualify as a theory or as a hypothesis. It is a metaphysical research program, and it is not really testable science."

Michael Ruse is also an ardent believer that "bacteria to man evolution" happened, but he knows his belief is not based on scientific evidence. In 2000, he wrote in an article in the "National Post", "Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, as secular religion- a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, ... . Evolution is a religion."

Sir Julian Huxley was the former head of the United Nation's UNESCO. He was a biologist, philosopher, educator, writer and a leading evolutionist of his day. When asked why the scientific community jumped so quickly on board with Darwin's ideas, he did not say because Darwin had provided overwhelming scientific evidence. Instead, he replied, "I suppose the reason we leapt at the *Origin of the Species* was that the idea of God interfered with our sexual mores."

Evolutionists should really not be shocked by such statements made by their own colleagues. First, they need to remember what constitutes true science. *Webster's New World Dictionary, College Edition*, defines science as "systematized knowledge derived from observation, study, and experimentation carried on in order to determine the nature or principles of what is being studied."

Our Nassau County high school textbook, *Environmental Science*, says in state adopted Standard 2 on p.FL23 that, "Scientific knowledge is based on empirical evidence... ."

In our high school textbook, *Biology*, authors Miller and Levine state on p.5, (And I want the Board to remember these statements because key elements of what these 3 books have in their chapters on evolution and a 4.5 billion year old earth violate their own definition of true science.) "First, science deals only with the natural world. Scientific endeavors never concern, in any way, supernatural phenomena of any kind." A few sentences later it is stated, "Third, scientists propose explanations that are based on evidence not belief." And then a summary statement says, "A goal of science is to provide natural explanations for natural events in the world."

If true science only deals with the natural world, then scientists are dealing only with matter and energy. Standard 7 on p.FL25 of *Environmental Science* confirms this: "The scientific theory of evolution of

Earth states that changes in our planet are driven by the flow of energy and the cycling of matter... .”

But where do the matter and energy, which the scientists deal with daily, come from? Another possible way of asking this is asking, “What was going on before the Big Bang to bring about the Big Bang? No scientist can state in naturalistic terms reality before the Big Bang. This means, if scientists will face the fact squarely, that only a supernatural explanation can explain the origin of the matter and energy with which they work. Facing this fact should help evolutionists to accept that supernatural forces are necessary to explain the appearance of that first so called “primitive” cell in the primordial ooze of primitive earth.

The evolutionists’ entire family tree of living things on planet earth rests on this first primitive cell. And they cannot explain the appearance of that cell apart from supernatural forces. Life from non-life, life from matter and energy, violates natural law. Spontaneous generation, called “abiogenesis” in biology, is impossible! (1) I wish I could call on Louis Pasteur for his verification. Therefore, the entire family tree of the evolutionist rests on something supernatural!

This tree of life is pictured in the high school text, *Biology*, on pages 526 and 527. It begins with the bacteria cell. Think of this for a minute. Can you postulate any way the first so called “primitive” cell could form in the primordial ooze complete with cell wall, cell capsule, plasma membrane, cytoplasm, ribosomes, plasmids, pili, RNA, DNA and more and having the ability to take in nutrients, process nutrients into energy, expel wastes, and, on top of everything else, having the ability to reproduce itself- which is a highly complex procedure.

This complex DNA duplication is pictured in an understandable diagram on pages 412 and 413 in our middle school text, *Interactive Science*. However, even in this simplified diagram the complexity of operations is staggering. And most evolutionists want us to believe that the appearance of this first living cell happened because lightning or some other form of energy was applied to the primordial ooze. They ignore the fact that matter and energy cannot produce life. It makes no difference how many lightning strikes hit that ooze; no life would result.

Just a quick side note here. The bacteria pictured in the textbook, *Biology*, is linked to another primitive cell called an archaea cell. The reason, I think the archaea cell is not promoted as the first cell formed is that its cell wall is a different chemical composition from any other living thing. I got that information from a University of California, Berkley article. The Berkley article stated, “Archaeal cell membranes are chemically different

from all other living things, including a "backwards" glycerol molecule and isoprene derivatives in place of fatty acids." (2) I mention this as more evidence that the so called first formed primitive cells are actually extremely complex organisms. These complex organisms could not have been formed by accidents in nature no matter how many billions of years are allowed.

Not only should evolutionists accept the origin of matter and energy is supernatural and the origin of the first living cell is supernatural, but they should also accept that the origin of the information needed to maintain cellular functions is also supernatural.

Dr. Werner Gitt has a very interesting and informational YouTube video about this issue. The access information is listed in the Reference section. Dr. Gitt is an information technology expert. He is the director and professor of the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology and is head of the Department of Information Technology. He states in this video, "There is no known natural law through which matter can give rise to information, neither is any physical process or material phenomenon known that can do this." (3)

Let's consider a human cell. It is more complex than the bacteria and archaea cells mentioned previously. The bacteria and archaea cells are classified as prokaryotic cells and have no organized nucleus. Our human cells are classified as eukaryotic and do have a defined nucleus. They also have other organelles like a nucleolus, ribosomes, vesicles, vacuoles, rough endoplasmic reticulum, smooth endoplasmic reticulum, golgi bodies, cytoskeletons, lysosomes, mitochondria, and centrioles. These organelles are floating in cytoplasm along with enzymes, RNA, DNA and other molecular machines carrying out huge numbers of very precise activities in order to keep the cell alive and functioning.

All of this gets so complex, I would rather consider the humble pollen grain in order to demonstrate the information that is integrated into the workings of all cells. The process of pollen grain fertilization of the egg cell located in the ovary at the bottom of the style of a female flower is pictured and explained in the high school text, *Biology*.

This process is just amazing! A pollen grain has no brain, no eyes, no mouth, no hands and feet. How does it know when it lands on the stigma (which is at the top of the style) of the right species? How does it know how to grow a pollen tube down the style. How does the pollen tube know how to nourish itself with the material in the style as it grows? How does it know where the ovary is and recognize it when it gets there? How does it know to dissolve its own nucleus and release 2 sperm cells into the ovary. How does one sperm nucleus know how to fuse with an egg nucleus to form a seed?

How does the other sperm nucleus know to fuse with the two polar nuclei in the embryo sac to form a triploid cell? This cell divides multiple times to form the fruit which surrounds the seed produced by the first sperm cell and egg.

The complexity of information inherent in these many activities illustrated and described in the text could not possibly result from "bacteria to man evolution." "Bacteria to man evolution" relies on chance positive mutations, natural selection and lots and lots of time. These are natural phenomena relying on matter and energy and could never result in the transfer of any information, let alone the transfer of information of this complexity.

As an illustration, let's take a book. The cover, the pages and the binding represent hardware, just as the pollen grain, itself, represents hardware. The organized letters in the book represent the software, the information that makes a book valuable. Just as the cover, the pages and the binding cannot produce the organized letters, the pollen grain cannot produce the information to carry out its assigned activities. The pollen grain just like the book hardware is useless by itself. It needs the software to be of value. And that software has to come from an outside intelligent source making its presence a supernatural event.

Dr. Gitt very clearly and powerfully explains this in his lecture. He states that, "Any given chain of information can be traced back to an intelligent source." He further states, "Information comprises the non-material foundation for all: technological systems, works of art, biological systems..." etc.

Therefore, the evolutionist needs to face the fact they are dealing with entities, matter and energy, that originated supernaturally; they are dealing with a Family Tree of Life with a supernaturally formed first organism, and they are studying living cells programmed with supernaturally transmitted information. They should realize that the statements quoted above by their 4 famous colleagues are actually true. And they must agree with the authors of the textbook *Biology* quoted above, "Scientific endeavors never concern, in any way, supernatural phenomena of any kind." Therefore "bacteria to man evolutionists" need to accept the fact their beliefs are not scientific and do not belong in a science book.

At the very beginning of this presentation, I quoted from Florida statute 1006.31 of Title 48 K-20 Education Code which stated that the reviewer of curriculum should make sure it is accurate, objective, balanced, non-inflammatory and suited to student needs. It would literally take hours to

make a complete examination of each case of our 3 textbooks violating the first three standards of analysis. I'll just hit highlights in each area. The last 2 standards, being inflammatory and suited to student needs can be addressed in a short space.

All 3 of these books are well written, well organized and provide a wealth of interesting and useful scientific information. I would have no quarrel with their coverage of evolution if they confined their text to micro-evolution. Micro-evolution is variation within a species. We have dogs, cats, birds, and people of different colors, sizes, and shapes. These differences are varieties expressed by gene pools that carry different information. This genetic gene pool can not, can never, produce a higher order species because it has no way of accessing new, higher order information from the intelligent source that provides it.

In spite of this scientific truth, "bacteria to man evolutionists" will insist that beneficial mutations can provide the avenue through which a higher order species can be produced. They have no direct evidence of this ever happening. And remember true science is based on observations not beliefs.

Mutations, in fact, can only rearrange information. (4) Mutations that are expressed don't happen often when compared to rightly transmitted genetic information. Most creation scientists would argue that there is actually **never** a beneficial mutation for a species in a normal environment. That's because a mutation always involves the loss of information (5) Most of the so called beneficial or benign mutations listed in these three books cannot even be proven to be mutations because scientists have not mapped the entire genome of the species in question. This mapping needs to be done to be certain that the code for a certain color of fur or resistance to a certain anti-biotic is not already present in the gene pool of the species. Certainly the "zillions" of fruit flies zapped by radiation in science labs over the last few decades have never expressed a beneficial mutation which would give them an advantage in the real world. They have also not developed into any higher order species. (6)

All 3 books are guilty of subtly and deceitfully combining micro-evolution, variation within a species, with "bacteria to man evolution" which is macro-evolution, progression to a higher order species. The obvious expectation is the student reader will assume that because micro-evolution is true, that macro-evolution is also true. There is no distinction made, and the difference is HUGE! This is not accurate, objective or balanced.

For example, the textbook, *Biology*, concludes its discussion of evolution by stating on p.473, "However, any questions that remain are about how evolution works- not whether evolution occurs. To scientists evolution is

the key to understanding the natural world.” This statement is highly deceitful. It is not stated this directly in the other 2 books, but it is subtly argued in the other 2 books with this same implied conclusion.

Factually, only micro-evolution has been scientifically proven, and factually, not all leading evolutionists consider their theory scientifically provable. And factually, there have been in the past and are in the present hundreds of Bible believing scientists who have significantly improved our understanding of the natural world without the belief in macro-evolution.

Great scientists of the past who dealt with biology like Joseph Lister (antiseptic surgery) Louis Pasteur (Bacteriology) Henri Fabre (entomology of living insects) John Woodward (Paleontology) and George Cuvier (vertebrate paleontology) added enormous volumes to our understanding of the natural world. They were all Bible believers. They did not believe in macro-evolution. Our children do not need to believe in macro-evolution to understand science and even become productive scientists one day.

The bulk of the chapters on evolution in all 3 books are taken up with examples of micro-evolution. Every scientist agrees micro-evolution is scientifically verifiable. Selective breeders of plants and animals have been applying the principles of micro-evolution for thousands of years.

All 3 books quote or refer to the beliefs of famous evolutionists, mostly Darwin. And there is no alternative viewpoint or serious criticism made of their presentations supporting macro-evolution. However, Darwin, himself saw weaknesses in his own theory. He states in *Origin of the Species*, “To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances (which Darwin goes on to innumerate) could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree.” (7)

I’d like to ask Mr. Darwin if he thinks it “absurd in the highest degree” that the human genome has 3 billion base pairs (8) or that the human brain can do calculations faster than 30 trillion per second. (9) I’d like to ask Mr. Darwin if he thinks it “absurd in the highest degree” that our DNA has encoded information billions of times greater than man’s present technology. Northwestern University researchers add to these amazing facts by finding that, “... in reasonable approximation the brain produces the amount of Hubble space data every 30 seconds.” (10) And the evolutionists writing these books expect the reader to believe all this complexity came from natural selection, mutations and lots of time?

The books *Biology* and *Interactive Science* both state that fossil records support evolution. Again, they do not specify macro-evolution as the type of evolution they are referring to. *Biology* goes so far as to say on p.467 that,

"In fact, so many intermediate forms have been found that it is often hard to tell where one group begins and another ends."

In one 3 letter word this statement is a LIE! The truth is that the vast majority of our fossil evidence comes from a period evolutionary geologists call the Cambrian. These fossils are fully formed without any intermediate forms present. (11) Charles Darwin didn't agree with the authors of *Biology*. He stated, "Why is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against this theory." (12)

Stephen Gould, one of the most famous evolutionists of the last 50 years does not agree with the authors of *Biology* either. He wrote on p.140 of his book *Evolution Now* that the fossil record, "... has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution."

The authors of *Biology* on pages 466-467 diagram the progression of an extinct dog-like animal to the modern whale. They have the audacity to put ("walking whale") after the picture of this dog-like animal. Talk about brainwashing the reader! The thought of all the anatomic and biological changes that would have to take place for a dog-like terrestrial dweller to evolve into the aquatic whale, the largest living mammal alive today, staggers the imagination. Their so called "scientific" documentation leaves HUGE gaps and violates professionalism to the highest degree. It offers no evidence for macro-evolution.

The middle school text, *Interactive Science, Course 1* is at least honest in their presentation of the same material. They state on p513, "However, scientists have had difficulty finding fossils that show how this dramatic change occurred. These missing links could reveal how whales lost their legs." One would think, evolutionists would be embarrassed to put such examples in their textbooks, but it doesn't seem to bother them to argue from a lack of evidence!

Both high school texts try to propose that the physical separation of animals of the same species can result in mutations in one or both groups that lead to a different species being formed. They use the Albert's squirrels and the Kaibab squirrels which got separated at some point in the past in our country's southwest. The books **postulate** this separation **could** result in 2 separate species of squirrel. However, this is pure speculation since the squirrels are not, at this time, separate species. The only difference between them proven by the authors is their fur color.

Again, here is a deceitful so called "evidence" of macro-evolution. I'm not going to try to cover other so called evidences presented in these 2 books

except to say that there is no example given of macro-evolution ever actually happening. It is all speculation. They will use words like "may", "likely", "reasonable" "imagine" and "probable" without any concrete evidence to back up their speculations. This is really hypocritical because both textbooks are in agreement **that science only deals with empirical information, not belief.**

*Interactive Science*, the middle school text, uses homologous structures like hand, flipper, and wing and similar fetal development to support evolution. But these could be the result of the same Creator using similar architecture and fetal development in His creation. Of course, this possibility is not mentioned.

Also, it is not mentioned that not all scientists agree with the 4.5 billion year old earth that evolutionists know is necessary for macro-evolution to take place. In my 36 years of studying the evidence for a young and old earth, I would estimate the amount of evidence for a young earth at 90% compared to 10 % supporting an old earth. I know this seems shocking, but remember our science education is controlled at the university level by evolutionists; our scientific publications are controlled by evolutionists, and our science research institutes are controlled by evolutionists. On top of that, almost all of our main stream media are believers in macro-evolution.

Even the 10% of the evidence used by evolutionists for an old earth can be questioned scientifically. One evidence they use is radioactive dating of rock which seems to indicate the rock is multi-millions of years old. However, this evidence would not hold up in a court of law. A University of North Carolina website states, "As proof of the unreliability of the radiometric methods consider the fact that in nearly every case, dates from recent lava flows have come back excessively large. One example is the rocks from the Kaupulehu Flow, Hualalai Volcano in Hawaii which was known to have erupted in 1800-1801. These rocks were dated by a variety of different methods. Of 12 dates reported the youngest was 140 million years and the oldest was 2.96 billion years." (13)

*Interactive Science* (p.157) introduces moon rocks as evidence for an old earth. They say that since moon rock came from the same material that formed the earth and since there would be no contamination of that rock, that radiometric dating of moon rock would provide an accurate dating of planet earth.

However, no scientist has proven that the moon was formed from the same material that formed earth. There are many theories that guess as to the moon's formation, 3 leading ones. (14) Also, Megan Whewell of the National Space Centre contradicts the claim made in *Interactive Science*.

She states, "Overall there are many differences between Moon rock and Earth rock; some were expected but others were great discoveries made by investigating the samples brought back from the Apollo missions." (15) Thus, the authors of *Interactive Science* have stated as fact information that is not fact. It is another example of these textbooks not being accurate.

The authors also state on p.156 of *Interactive Science, Course 2*, "that the absolute ages of rocks can be determined through radioactive dating." Again, another false statement as proved by the University of North Carolina article.

An objective coverage of the age of the earth would have at least stated that not all scientists agree the earth is old. The evidence supporting a young earth is plentiful- like Mary Schweitzer's discovery of soft tissue in dinosaur bone, the presence of Carbon 14 in diamonds and fossils (16), the lack of equilibrium between Carbon 14 and Carbon 12 (17), the distance between the moon and earth (18), too much helium in minerals (19), the strength of our electromagnetic field (20), the volcanic activity present in our solar system (21), the presence of comets in our solar system (22), large quantities of observational evidence of the sun, planets and stars being young creations (23), and the presence of radio plutonium halos in bedrock granite which could only be captured if the rock was formed quick and cold (24). There are actually 101 scientific evidences for a young earth listed on creation.com's website found in reference 21.

The textbook, *Biology*, states on page 484 that, "Recent estimates suggest that each of us is born with roughly 300 mutations that make parts of our DNA different from that of our parents." Scientists have figured out the average rate of mutations in human cell mitochondria. At this rate, the human race could only be thousands of years old not millions. (25)

These textbooks fail to even mention one objection to their old earth theory. That is not objective and certainly not balanced. Every textbook that uses dates of millions and billions of years for the age of the earth should not be allowed to state such dates as proven fact. They are not proven facts, far from it.

In summary, the most serious objection to these textbooks is that they try to blend micro-evolution with macro-evolution. The two are separate and distinct, and an accurate, objective, balanced treatment would present them as such. Secondly macro-evolution is based on the supernatural beliefs that matter and energy miraculously produced life and further, miraculously produced the information necessary for the functioning of life. Finally, evidence from the real world, from fossils, from the incredible complexity of living things, and from the inability of scientists to show, even in the lab,

that so-called positive mutations can result in more highly evolved life forms all combine together to indicate macro-evolution is a scientifically weak theory at best. And remember we see no evidence of it happening in the real world today. All 3 of these books and, indeed, all secular books I've read teaching macro-evolution resort to misrepresentations of the truth to try to convince readers the theory is reasonable and plausible.

I have already pointed out that our students do not need a belief in macro-evolution to have a full understanding of material in a science book. Furthermore, our students should **not** have this material in their science books at all. It violates the writer's own definition of what constitutes true science!

This leads into the final objection- that of the material being inflammatory. To me, this material should be inflammatory to every Christian. Our children from Christian homes are being told that true science supports that they have originated from a bacteria billions of years ago. That means their Bible lies when it plainly states humans came from two parents and were created in the image and likeness of God. A literal rendering of the Bible account interprets the earth and all creation as only thousands not billions of years old. And that age can be substantiated by thousands of research studies. Many students from Christian homes are deceived, like I was, into rejecting the faith of their parents and the God of the Bible.

Christians should be incensed that this evolutionary theory being taught to their children has been used by despots like Adolf Hitler to kill millions of human beings because they were less evolved and were contaminating the human gene pool. Did you know that the full title of Darwin's famous book was *Origin of the Species by Natural Selection or The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*? Darwin's theory of evolution is perfect for justifying genocide of those viewed as undesirables. It is a book that can be used to justify prejudice in its very worst form.

Christians should be incensed that their children are being taught a theory that can radically change a student's worldview and code of ethical conduct. When I was in school, the worst things going on were running in the hall, gum under chairs, and an occasional fight. Now we've got students lying dead on the floor or ground after being shot by other students.

We've got an educational system that was, in my day, one of the top 3 in the world, now we're in the bottom third. In fact, it can be traced from the United States Bureau of Statistics that the exponential increase in destructive societal behaviors like murder, rape, robbery, pornography, divorce, teen pregnancy and such began after 1962 and 63 when prayer and Bible reading

were removed from our schools, removed because they were "religious." Then we turn right around and adopt the religion of secular humanism which is based on the belief in macro-evolution.

Yes, Christians should be incensed that the Supreme Court illegally rejected Christianity as special when one trip to Washington D.C. is proof that this nation was founded by Christians on Biblical principles. I wrote an e-mail to the Board months ago warning about the dangers of teaching an unproven theory that eliminates moral absolutes. We've gone from, "Thou shalt not kill" and "Do unto others as you would have them do to you" to "Might makes right" and "If Hollywood is doing it, then I should be able to do it, too!"

Christians should be incensed that our country has adopted a new religion of secular humanism based on the teaching of macro-evolution, a teaching which is based on supernatural elements. Yes, the Bible is based on supernatural elements. But the Bible can explain the origin of matter and energy, the origin of the living things on planet earth, the origin of that supreme intelligence that transfers information to living cells so they can function, and the Bible can also explain why the natural laws exist and are testable and predictable. Evolutionists know their theory cannot explain that either.

The Bible has hundreds of irrefutable prophecies which have come true with 100% accuracy proving the One who superintended the writing must exist outside our space time domain. The New Testament was written by eyewitnesses to the life of Jesus, two of those eyewitnesses were half brothers of His providing powerful evidence to His life, supernatural miracles, and resurrection. The Bible has more historical, archeological, and manuscript evidence than any book of antiquity. And we've replaced it with belief in "bacteria to man evolution!"

I realize the Nassau County Board of Education is not guilty of this. My generation and my parent's generation are guilty of letting this happen. However, my hope and prayer is the Nassau Board of Education will not only mandate macro-evolution and an old earth not be taught as facts, but will allow Bibles to once again be distributed to our students. And further the Board would use its influence with the state of Florida to bring back legalized corporate prayer and Bible reading to our schools.

A disclaimer statement which could be pasted in the front of all textbooks presenting macro-evolution and/or an old earth as proven fact can be found before the Reference section. I provided a sample in case the Board decides something like this would be helpful. It would, obviously, be very

expensive to get new books, and all the available science books I know of present macro-evolution and an old earth in the same deceitful way.

Thank you for your time and patience in this matter. I realize this presentation has been long. But it takes time to dismantle a theory that has gained widespread acceptance over the last 70 years. However, I trust that the truth will ultimately prevail.

### **SAMPLE DISCLAIMER STICKER**

This book contains material that leads the reader to believe that "bacteria to man" evolution and an old earth of 4.5 billion years are proven scientific facts. Creation scientists would argue that there are dozens and dozens of scientific observations that indicate the earth is young, only several thousand years old.

Additionally, creation scientists would argue that bacteria to man evolution is impossible because (1) living things only come from living things, not from matter and energy. (2) living cells need information to live and function. That information must come from an intelligent source. It cannot come from matter and energy, and (3) life is too complex to be explained by natural selection and chance beneficial mutations. The human genome has 3 billion base pairs, and the human brain operates faster than 30 trillion calculations per second, exponentially faster than any computer.

## REFERENCES

- (1) <https://www.flinnsci.com/api/library/Download/2489f60cd0484cd38a879972979baa30> Experiments were done according to National Science Educational Standards (1996)
- (2) <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/archaea/archaeamm.html>
- (3) YouTube video. Type in "In The Beginning Was Information, Dr. Werner Gitt."
- (4) <https://answersingenesis.org/genetics/mutations/evolution-is-just-mistakes/>
- (5) <https://answersingenesis.org/genetics/mutations/mutations-yes-evolution-no/>
- (6) <https://answersingenesis.org/genetics/mutations/fruit-flies-advantageous-mutations/>
- (7) *Origin of the Species by Natural Selection or The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life* (New York: The Modern Library, 1993) p.22
- (8) <https://www.genome.gov/11006943/human-genome-project-completion-frequently-asked-questions/>
- (9) <http://chrisfwestbury.blogspot.com/2014/06/on-processing-speed-of-human-brain.html> If we multiply all this out we get 100 billion neurons X 200 firings per second X 1000 connections per firing = **20 million billion calculations per second**, which is 20 petaFLOPS.
- (10) [http://klab.smpp.northwestern.edu/wiki/index.php5/Bits\\_per\\_second\\_of\\_human\\_brain](http://klab.smpp.northwestern.edu/wiki/index.php5/Bits_per_second_of_human_brain)
- (11) <http://www.darwinsdilemma.org/cambrian-explosion.php>
- (12) Charles Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, p.413
- (13) <http://www.cs.unc.edu/%Eplaisted/ce/dating.html>
- (14) <http://www.space.com/19275-moon-formation.html>
- (15) <http://www.spaceanswers.com/q-and-a/how-different-is-moon-rock-and-earth-rock/>
- (16) <https://answersingenesis.org/geology/carbon-14/carbon-14-in-fossils-and-diamonds/>
- (17) <http://creationtoday.org/wrong-assumptions-in-c-14-dating-methods/>
- (18) [http://www.earthage.org/youngearthev/evidence\\_for\\_a\\_young\\_earth.htm](http://www.earthage.org/youngearthev/evidence_for_a_young_earth.htm)
- (19) <http://www.icr.org/zircon-helium/>
- (20) <http://www.icr.org/article/evidence-for-young-world/> The main result is that the field's total energy (not surface intensity) has always decayed at least as fast as now. At that rate the field could not be more than **20,000 years old**.<sup>15</sup>

- (21) <https://creation.com/age-of-the-earth> There are 101 evidences for a young earth listed on this website.
- (22) [http://www.earthage.org/youngearth/evidence\\_for\\_a\\_young\\_earth.htm](http://www.earthage.org/youngearth/evidence_for_a_young_earth.htm)
- (23) YouTube video. Type in "What You Aren't Being Told About Astronomy- Vol. II (Our Created Stars and Galaxies)" This video and others like it are presented by Spike Psarris, former engineer in the U.S. military space program. He entered the program as an atheist and evolutionist; **he exited as a creationist and Bible believing Christian. HIS VIDEOS ARE EXCELLENT!**
- (24) <http://www.halos.com/> "...these halos provide unambiguous evidence of both an almost instantaneous creation of granites and the young age of the earth."
- (25) <http://www.icr.org/article/evidence-for-young-world/> Measurements of the mutation rate of mitochondrial DNA recently forced researchers to revise the age of "mitochondrial Eve" from a theorized *200,000 years* down to possibly as low as **6,000 years**.<sup>17</sup> DNA experts insist that DNA cannot exist in natural environments longer than **10,000 years**, yet intact strands of DNA appear to have been recovered from fossils allegedly much older: Neandertal bones, insects in amber, and even from dinosaur fossils.<sup>18</sup> **Bacteria allegedly 250 million years old apparently have been revived with no DNA damage.**<sup>19</sup> Soft tissue and blood cells from a dinosaur have astonished experts.<sup>20</sup>

### **ADVICE TO BOARD MEMBERS IN ANSWERING THOSE WHO WOULD OBJECT TO TAKING OUT MACRO-EVOLUTIONARY TEACHING FROM OUR TEXTBOOKS.**

If someone questions why the teaching of macro-evolution should be taken out of our textbooks, a simple response could be: Macro-evolution is not science for 2 main reasons: (1) Matter and energy do not produce life. Life has never come from non-life; and (2) matter and energy cannot produce the information needed for a living cell to function. Therefore, since macro-evolution needs supernatural elements, it is not true science and should not be included in our science books.

Avoid debating on issues such as the fossil record, DNA similarity between humans and apes (we're also 65% similar to rabbits), homologous structures, similar fetal development, etc. because, ultimately, these issues don't change the fact that evolution involves a belief in supernatural events. As I stated, in the beginning of my presentation, if people choose to believe in evolution, that is their right. They just need to accept the fact that their belief is not based totally on scientific evidence.

**ITEM #3**

Wednesday  
November 1, 2017

**PRESENTATION TO NASSAU COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION  
CONCERNING THE FALSE TEACHING OF "BACTERIA TO MAN  
EVOLUTION" AS BEING CONCLUSIVELY SUPPORTED BY  
SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE**

Florida statute 1006.31 of Title 48 K-20 Education Code states that, "Instructional materials recommended by each reviewer shall be, to the satisfaction of each reviewer, accurate, objective, balanced, noninflammatory, current, free of pornography and material prohibited under s.847.012, and suited to the student needs and their ability to comprehend the material presented."

It is my goal to demonstrate to the Board that the material concerning evolution presented in the 3 textbooks I reviewed are not entirely accurate, objective, balanced, and noninflammatory, nor are they entirely suited to the needs of the students. The 2 high school science textbooks I reviewed were *Biology* and *Environmental Science*; the middle school textbooks reviewed were *Interactive Science, Course 2*.

By way of introduction, my name is Jay Shutt. I'm a 71 year old retired teacher with 40 years of teaching experience in grades K-12. I taught high school English for 2 years, junior high Language Arts for 5 years, 1 week of kindergarten (which is worth 6 months of experience in any other grade), and spent the rest of my time in elementary school, mostly 5<sup>th</sup> grade.

I attended the University of Michigan from 1963-1965. My Biology class convinced me that "bacteria to man evolution" and a 4.5 billion year old earth had been scientifically proven and the Bible, therefore, could not be literally true.

In 1981 I began to question the tenants of evolution. I began to read the research of scientists from many different fields. They were Christians, believed in special creation, believed "bacteria to man evolution" was impossible and believed the Biblical timeline of the earth's age to be supported by scientific evidence. Most of my material came from the Institute for Creation Research (ICR at [icr.org](http://icr.org)). Over the last 36 years I have studied enough scientific material on evolution and the age of the earth that, if stacked up, would stand taller than my height of 6 feet.

Before beginning this presentation, let me clearly state that it is **not** my goal to enter into a creation-evolution debate. It is **not** my goal to persuade the Board to include the teaching of creation science in our public school textbooks. And it is certainly **not** my goal to demean anyone who believes in evolution.

The Smithsonian Magazine (May 2006 issue) had an article about then grad student Mary Schweitzer. I quote from the article. "Schweitzer announced she had discovered blood vessels and structures that looked like whole cells inside that T. rex bone—the first observation of its kind. The finding amazed colleagues, who had never imagined that even a trace of still-soft dinosaur tissue could survive. After all, as any textbook will tell you, when an animal dies, soft tissues such as blood vessels, muscle and skin decay and disappear over time, while hard tissues like bone may gradually acquire minerals from the environment and become fossils."

Later the article quotes University of Maryland paleontologist Thomas Holtz Jr. as saying, "The reason it hasn't been discovered before is no right-thinking paleontologist would do what Mary did with her specimens. We don't go to all this effort to dig this stuff out of the ground to then destroy it in acid,..." Schweitzer had to use the acid to get to the bone marrow. The article continues by stating that Mary Schweitzer is a Christian. I have read that Mary is currently teaching at North Carolina State University. She is still an evolutionist and still a Christian. She's been working on finding a naturalistic explanation of how soft tissue was preserved in dinosaur bone supposedly 70 million years old.

I'm sure Mary Schweitzer is a wonderful Christian and a wonderful person. I know many wonderful people, Christian and non-Christian, who believe in "bacteria to man evolution." They are sincere in their beliefs and are certainly entitled to their beliefs. What I want all believers in "bacteria to man evolution" to realize, and all Board members to realize, is that "bacteria to man evolution" is **not supported by science** and has no place in a science textbook. This statement seems shocking to most evolutionists, but let me quote from some famous evolutionists who are not shocked by it.

Sir Arthur Keith made this statement in 1959. Sir Arthur Keith was a leading proponent of evolution. In fact, he wrote the forward to the 100<sup>th</sup> edition of Darwin's book, *Origin of Species*. He stated, "Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it only because the only alternative is special creation, and that is unthinkable."

Dr. Karl Popper is a leading philosopher of science and an ardent believer in "bacteria to man evolution." He plainly stated that his belief is **not** based on scientific support. He said, "Evolution is not a fact. Evolution doesn't

even qualify as a theory or as a hypothesis. It is a metaphysical research program, and it is not really testable science."

Michael Ruse is also an ardent believer that "bacteria to man evolution" happened, but he knows his belief is not based on scientific evidence. In 2000, he wrote in an article in the "National Post", "Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, as secular religion- a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, ... Evolution is a religion."

Sir Julian Huxley was the former head of the United Nation's UNESCO. He was a biologist, philosopher, educator, writer and a leading evolutionist of his day. When asked why the scientific community jumped so quickly on board with Darwin's ideas, he did not say because Darwin had provided overwhelming scientific evidence. Instead, he replied, "I suppose the reason we leapt at the *Origin of the Species* was that the idea of God interfered with our sexual mores."

Evolutionists should really not be shocked by such statements made by their own colleagues. First, they need to remember what constitutes true science. *Webster's New World Dictionary, College Edition*, defines science as "systematized knowledge derived from observation, study, and experimentation carried on in order to determine the nature or principles of what is being studied."

Our Nassau County high school textbook, *Environmental Science*, says in state adopted Standard 2 on p.FL23 that, "Scientific knowledge is based on empirical evidence..."

In our high school textbook, *Biology*, authors Miller and Levine state on p.5, (And I want the Board to remember these statements because key elements of what these 3 books have in their chapters on evolution and a 4.5 billion year old earth violate their own definition of true science.) "First, science deals **only with the natural world**. Scientific endeavors **never concern, in any way, supernatural phenomena** of any kind." A few sentences later it is stated, "Third, scientists propose explanations that are based **on evidence not belief**." And then a summary statement says, "A goal of science is to provide **natural explanations for natural events** in the world."

If true science only deals with the natural world, then scientists are dealing only with **matter and energy**. Standard 7 on p.FL25 of *Environmental Science* confirms this: "The scientific theory of evolution of

Earth states that changes in our planet are driven by the flow of **energy** and the cycling of **matter**... .”

But where do the matter and energy, which the scientists deal with daily, come from? Another possible way of asking this is asking, “What was going on before the Big Bang to bring about the Big Bang? No scientist can state in naturalistic terms reality before the Big Bang. This means, if scientists will face the fact squarely, that only a supernatural explanation can explain the origin of the matter and energy with which they work. Facing this fact should help evolutionists accept that supernatural forces are necessary to explain the appearance of that first so called “primitive” cell in the primordial ooze of the early earth.

The evolutionists’ **entire family tree** of living things on planet earth **rests** on this first primitive cell. And they cannot explain the appearance of that cell apart from supernatural forces. Life from non-life, life from matter and energy, violates natural law. Spontaneous generation, called “abiogenesis” in biology, is impossible! (1) I wish I could bring back Louis Pasteur for his personal verification. Therefore, the **entire family tree** of the evolutionist **rests on something supernatural!**

This tree of life is pictured in the high school text, *Biology*, on pages 526 and 527. It begins with the bacteria cell. Think of this for a minute. Can you postulate any way the first so called “primitive” cell could form in the primordial ooze complete with cell wall, cell capsule, plasma membrane, cytoplasm, ribosomes, plasmids, pili, RNA, DNA and more and having the ability to take in nutrients, process nutrients into energy, expel wastes, and, on top of everything else, having the ability to reproduce itself- which is a highly complex procedure?

This complex DNA duplication is pictured in an understandable diagram on pages 412 and 413 in our middle school text, *Interactive Science, Course 2*. However, even in this simplified diagram the complexity of operations is staggering. And most evolutionists want us to believe that the appearance of this first living cell happened because lightning or some other form of energy was applied to the primordial ooze. They ignore the fact that matter and energy cannot produce life. It makes no difference how many lightning strikes hit that ooze; **no life would result!**

Just a quick side note here. The bacteria pictured in the textbook, *Biology*, is linked to another primitive cell called an archaea cell. The reason, I think the archaea cell is not promoted as the first cell formed is that its cell wall is a different chemical composition from any other living thing. I got that information from a University of California, Berkley article. The Berkley article stated, “Archaeal cell membranes are chemically different

from all other living things, including a "backwards" glycerol molecule and isoprene derivatives in place of fatty acids." (2) I mention this as more evidence that the so called first formed primitive cells are actually extremely complex organisms. These complex organisms could not have been formed by accidents in nature no matter how many billions of years are allowed.

Not only should evolutionists accept the origin of matter and energy is supernatural and the origin of the first living cell is supernatural, but they should also accept that the **origin of the information** needed to maintain cellular functions is **also supernatural**.

Dr. Werner Gitt has a very interesting and informational YouTube video about this issue. The access information is listed in the Reference section. Dr. Gitt is an information technology expert. He is the director and professor of the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology and is head of the Department of Information Technology. He states in this video, "There is no known natural law through which matter can give rise to information, neither is any physical process or material phenomenon known that can do this." (3)

Let's consider a human cell. It is more complex than the bacteria and archaea cells mentioned previously. The bacteria and archaea cells are classified as prokaryotic cells and have no organized nucleus. Our human cells are classified as eukaryotic and do have a defined nucleus. They also have other organelles like a nucleolus, ribosomes, vesicles, vacuoles, rough endoplasmic reticulum, smooth endoplasmic reticulum, golgi bodies, cytoskeletons, lysosomes, mitochondria, and centrioles. These organelles are floating in cytoplasm along with enzymes, RNA, DNA and other molecular machines carrying out huge numbers of very precise activities in order to keep the cell alive and functioning.

All of this gets so complex, I would rather consider the humble pollen grain in order to demonstrate the information that is integrated into the workings of all cells. The process of pollen grain fertilization of the egg cell located in the ovary at the bottom of the style of a female flower is pictured and explained in the high school text, *Biology*, pgs. 700-701.

This process is just amazing! A pollen grain has no brain, no eyes, no mouth, no hands and feet. How does it know when it lands on the stigma (which is at the top of the style) of the right species? How does it know how to grow a pollen tube down the style? How does the pollen tube know how to nourish itself with the material in the style as it grows? How does it know where the ovary is and recognize it when it gets there? How does it know to dissolve its own nucleus and release 2 sperm cells into the ovary. How does one sperm nucleus know how to fuse with an egg nucleus to form a seed?

How does the other sperm nucleus know to fuse with the two polar nuclei in the embryo sac to form a triploid cell? This cell divides multiple times to form the fruit which surrounds the seed produced by the first sperm cell and egg.

The complexity of information inherent in these many activities illustrated and described in the text could not possibly result from "bacteria to man evolution." "Bacteria to man evolution" relies on chance positive mutations, natural selection and lots and lots of time. These are natural phenomena relying on matter and energy and could **never result** in the transfer of **any** information, let alone the transfer of information of this complexity.

As an illustration, let's take a book. The cover, the pages and the binding represent hardware, just as the pollen grain, itself, represents hardware. The organized letters in the book represent the software, the information that makes a book valuable. Just as the cover, the pages and the binding cannot produce the organized letters, the pollen grain cannot produce the information to carry out its assigned activities. The pollen grain, just like the book hardware, is useless by itself. It needs the software to be of value. And that software has to come from an outside intelligent source making its presence a supernatural event.

Dr. Gitt very clearly and powerfully explains this in his lecture. He states that, "**Any given chain of information** can be traced back to **an intelligent source**." He further states, "Information comprises the non-material foundation for all: technological systems, works of art, **biological systems...**" etc.

Therefore, the evolutionist needs to face the fact they are dealing with entities, matter and energy, that **originated supernaturally**; they are dealing with a Family Tree of Life with a **supernaturally formed** first organism, and they are studying living cells programmed with **supernaturally transmitted** information. They should realize that the statements quoted above by their 4 famous colleagues are actually true. And they must agree with the authors of the textbook *Biology* quoted above, "Scientific endeavors **never concern**, in any way, **supernatural phenomena** of any kind." Therefore, "bacteria to man evolutionists" need to accept the fact their beliefs are **not** scientific and **do not belong in a science book**.

At the very beginning of this presentation, I quoted from Florida statute 1006.31 of Title 48 K-20 Education Code which stated that the reviewer of curriculum should make sure it is accurate, objective, balanced, non-inflammatory and suited to student needs. It would literally take hours to

make a complete examination of each case of our 3 textbooks violating the first three standards of analysis. I'll just hit highlights in each area. The last 2 standards- being inflammatory and suited to student needs can be addressed in a short space.

All 3 of these books are well written, well organized and provide a wealth of interesting and useful scientific information. I would have no quarrel with their coverage of evolution if they confined their text to micro-evolution. **Micro-evolution is variation within a species.** We have dogs, cats, birds, and people of different colors, sizes, and shapes. These differences are varieties expressed by gene pools that carry different information. This **genetic gene pool can not**, can never, produce a higher order species because it **has no way of accessing** new, higher order information from the intelligent source that provides it.

In spite of this scientific truth, "bacteria to man evolutionists" will insist that beneficial mutations can provide the avenue through which a higher order species can be produced. They have no direct evidence of this ever happening. And remember true science is based on observations not beliefs!

Mutations, in fact, can only rearrange information. (4) Mutations that are expressed don't happen often when compared to rightly transmitted genetic information. Most creation scientists would argue that there is actually **never** a beneficial mutation for a species in a normal environment. That's because a mutation always involves the **loss** of information. (5) Most of the so called beneficial or benign mutations listed in these three books cannot even be proven to be mutations because scientists have not mapped the entire genome of the species in question. This mapping needs to be done to be certain, for example, that the code for a certain color of fur or resistance to a certain anti-biotic is not already present in the gene pool of the species. Certainly the "zillions" of fruit flies zapped by radiation in science labs over the last few decades have never expressed a beneficial mutation which would give them an advantage in the real world. They have also not developed into any higher order species. (6)

All 3 books are guilty of subtly and deceitfully combining micro-evolution, variation within a species, with "bacteria to man evolution" which is **macro-evolution**, progression to a higher order species. The obvious expectation is the student reader will assume that because micro-evolution is true, that macro-evolution is also true. There is no distinction made, and the **difference is HUGE!** This is **not** accurate, objective or balanced.

For example, the textbook, *Biology*, concludes its discussion of evolution by stating on p.473, "However, any questions that remain are about **how** evolution works- **not whether** evolution occurs. To scientists evolution is

the key to understanding the natural world.” This statement is **highly deceitful!** It is not stated this directly in the other 2 books, but it is subtly argued in the other 2 books with this same implied conclusion.

Factually, **only micro-evolution** has been scientifically proven, and factually, **not all** leading evolutionists consider their theory scientifically provable. And factually, there have been in the past and are in the present hundreds of Bible believing scientists who have significantly improved our understanding of the natural world without the belief in macro-evolution.

Great scientists of the past who dealt with biology like Joseph Lister (antiseptic surgery) Louis Pasteur (Bacteriology) Henri Fabre (entomology of living insects) John Woodward (Paleontology) and George Cuvier (vertebrate paleontology) added enormous volumes to our understanding of the natural world. They were all Bible believers. They did not believe in macro-evolution. Our children **do not need** to believe in macro-evolution to understand science and even become productive scientists one day.

The bulk of the chapters on evolution in all 3 books are taken up with examples of micro-evolution. Every scientist agrees micro-evolution is scientifically verifiable. Selective breeders of plants and animals have been applying the principles of micro-evolution for thousands of years.

All 3 books quote or refer to the beliefs of famous evolutionists, mostly Darwin. And there is no alternative viewpoint or serious criticism made of their presentations supporting macro-evolution. However, Darwin, himself saw weaknesses in his own theory. He states in *Origin of the Species*, “To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances (which Darwin goes on to innumerate) could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree.” (7)

I’d like to ask Mr. Darwin if he thinks it “absurd in the highest degree” that the human genome has 3 billion base pairs (8) or that the human brain can do calculations faster than 30 trillion per second. (9) I’d like to ask Mr. Darwin if he thinks it “absurd in the highest degree” that our DNA has encoded information billions of times greater than man’s present technology. Northwestern University researchers add to these amazing facts by finding that, “... in reasonable approximation the brain produces the amount of Hubble space data every 30 seconds.” (10) And the evolutionists writing these books expect the reader to believe all this complexity came from natural selection, mutations and lots of time?

The books *Biology* and *Interactive Science* both state that fossil records support evolution. Again, they do not specify macro-evolution as the type of evolution they are referring to. *Biology* goes so far as to say on p.467 that,

"In fact, so many intermediate forms have been found that it is often hard to tell where one group begins and another ends."

In one 3 letter word this statement is a LIE! The truth is that the vast majority of our fossil evidence comes from a period evolutionary geologists call the Cambrian. These fossils are fully formed without any intermediate forms present. (11) Charles Darwin didn't agree with the authors of *Biology*. He stated, "Why is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against this theory." (12)

Stephen Gould, one of the most famous evolutionists of the last 50 years does not agree with the authors of *Biology* either. He wrote on p.140 of his book *Evolution Now* that the fossil record, "... has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution."

The authors of *Biology* on pages 466-467 diagram the progression of an extinct dog-like animal to the modern whale. They have the audacity to put ("walking whale") after the picture of this dog-like animal. Talk about brainwashing the reader! The thought of all the anatomic and biological changes that would have to take place for a dog-like terrestrial dweller to evolve into the aquatic whale, the largest living mammal alive today, staggers the imagination. Their so called "scientific" documentation leaves HUGE gaps and violates professionalism to the highest degree. It offers **no evidence** for macro-evolution.

The middle school text, *Interactive Science Course 2*, is at least honest in their presentation of the same material. They state on p513, "However, scientists have had difficulty finding fossils that show how this dramatic change occurred. These missing links could reveal how whales lost their legs." One would think, evolutionists would be embarrassed to put such examples in their textbooks, but it doesn't seem to bother them to argue from a lack of evidence!

Both high school texts try to propose that the physical separation of animals of the same species can result in mutations in one or both groups that lead to a different species being formed. They use the Albert's squirrels and the Kaibab squirrels which got separated at some point in the past in our country's southwest. The books **postulate** this separation **could** result in 2 separate species of squirrel. However, this is pure speculation since the squirrels are not, at this time, separate species. The only difference between them proven by the authors is their fur color.

Again, here is a deceitful so called "evidence" of macro-evolution. I'm not going to try to cover other so called evidences presented in these 2 books

except to say that there is no example given of macro-evolution ever actually happening. It is all speculation. They will use words like “may”, “likely”, “reasonable” “imagine” and “probable” without any concrete evidence to back up their speculations. This is really hypocritical because both textbooks are in agreement **that science only deals with empirical information, not belief**. And belief in macro-evolution is strictly, **belief!**

*Interactive Science Course 2*, the middle school text, uses homologous structures like hand, flipper, and wing and similar fetal development to support evolution. But these could be the result of the same Creator using similar architecture and fetal development in His creation. Of course, this possibility is not mentioned.

Also, it is not mentioned that not all scientists agree with the 4.5 billion year old earth that evolutionists know **is necessary** for macro-evolution to take place. In my 36 years of studying the evidence for a young and old earth, I would estimate the amount of evidence for a young earth at 90% compared to 10 % supporting an old earth. I know this seems shocking, but remember our science education is controlled at the university level by evolutionists; our scientific publications are controlled by evolutionists, and our science research institutes are controlled by evolutionists. On top of that, almost all of our main stream media are believers in macro-evolution.

Even the 10% of the evidence used by evolutionists for an old earth can be questioned scientifically. One evidence they use is radioactive dating of rock which seems to indicate the rock is multi-millions of years old. However, this evidence would not hold up in a court of law. A University of North Carolina website states, “As proof of the unreliability of the radiometric methods consider the fact that in nearly every case, dates from recent lava flows have come back excessively large. One example is the rocks from the Kaupulehu Flow, Hualalai Volcano in Hawaii which was known to have erupted in 1800-1801. These rocks were dated by a variety of different methods. Of 12 dates reported the youngest was 140 **million** years and the oldest was 2.96 **billion** years!” (13) This difference is **huge!**

*Interactive Science Course 2* (p.157) introduces moon rocks as evidence for an old earth. They say that since moon rock came from the same material that formed the earth and since there would be no contamination of that rock, that radiometric dating of moon rock would provide an accurate dating of planet earth.

However, no scientist has proven that the moon was formed from the same material that formed earth. There are many theories that hypothesize the moon’s formation, 3 leading ones. (14) Also, Megan Whewell of the National Space Centre contradicts the claim made in *Interactive Science*.

She states, "Overall there are many differences between Moon rock and Earth rock; some were expected but others were great discoveries made by investigating the samples brought back from the Apollo missions." (15) Thus, the authors of *Interactive Science* have stated as fact information that is not fact. It is another example of these textbooks not being accurate.

The authors also state on p.156 of *Interactive Science, Course 2*, "... that the absolute ages of rocks can be determined through radioactive dating." Again, **another false statement** as proved by the University of North Carolina study.

An objective coverage of the age of the earth would have at least stated that not all scientists agree the earth is old. The evidence supporting a young earth is plentiful- like Mary Schweitzer's discovery of soft tissue in dinosaur bone, the presence of Carbon 14 in diamonds and fossils (16), the lack of equilibrium between Carbon 14 and Carbon 12 (17), the distance between the moon and earth (18), too much helium in minerals (19), the strength of our electromagnetic field (20), the volcanic activity present in our solar system (21), the presence of comets in our solar system (22), large quantities of observational evidence of the sun, planets and stars being young creations (23), and the presence of radio plutonium halos in bedrock granite which could only be captured if the rock was formed quick and cold (24). There are actually 101 scientific evidences for a young earth listed on creation.com's website cited in reference 21.

The textbook, *Biology*, states on page 484 that, "Recent estimates suggest that each of us is born with roughly 300 mutations that make parts of our DNA different from that of our parents." Scientists have figured out the average rate of mutations in human cell mitochondria. At this rate, the human race could only be thousands of years old not millions. (25)

These textbooks fail to even mention one objection to their old earth theory. That is not objective and certainly not balanced. Every textbook that uses dates of millions and billions of years for the age of the earth should not be allowed to state such dates as proven fact. They are not proven facts, far from it.

In summary, the most serious objection to these textbooks is that they **try to blend** micro-evolution with macro-evolution. The two are separate and distinct, and an accurate, objective, balanced treatment would present them as such. Secondly macro-evolution is **based on the supernatural beliefs** that matter and energy miraculously produced life and further, miraculously produced the information necessary for the functioning of life. Finally, **evidence from the real world**, from fossils, from the incredible complexity of living things, and from the inability of scientists to show, even in the lab,

that so-called positive mutations can result in more highly evolved life forms. all combine together to indicate macro-evolution is **not a scientific theory** at all. And remember we see no evidence of it happening in the real world today. All 3 of these books and, indeed, all secular books I've read teaching macro-evolution resort to misrepresentations of the truth to try to convince readers the theory is reasonable and plausible.

I have already pointed out that our students **do not need** a belief in macro-evolution to have a full understanding of material in a science book. Furthermore, our students **should not have** this material in their science books at all. It violates the textbook writers' own definition of what constitutes true science!

This leads into the final objection- that of the material being inflammatory. To me, this material should be inflammatory to every Christian. Our children and grandchildren from Christian homes are being told that true science supports they originated from a bacteria billions of years ago. That means their Bible lies when it plainly states humans came from two parents and were created in the image and likeness of God. A literal rendering of the Bible account interprets the earth and all creation as only thousands not billions of years old. And that age can be substantiated by thousands of research studies. Many students from Christian homes are deceived, like I was, into rejecting the faith of their parents and the God of the Bible.

Christians should be incensed that this evolutionary theory being taught to their children has been used by despots like Adolf Hitler to kill millions of human beings because they were less evolved and were contaminating the human gene pool. Did you know that the full title of Darwin's famous book was *Origin of the Species by Natural Selection or The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*? Darwin's theory of evolution is perfect for justifying genocide of those viewed as undesirables. It is a book that can be used to justify prejudice in its very worst form.

Christians should be incensed that their children are being taught a theory that can radically change a student's worldview and code of ethical conduct. When I was in school, the worst things going on were running in the hall, gum under chairs, and an occasional fight. Now we've got students lying dead on the floor or ground after being shot by other students.

We've got an educational system that was, in my day, one of the top 3 in the world; now we're in the bottom third. In fact, it can be traced from the United States Bureau of Statistics that the exponential increase in destructive societal behaviors like murder, rape, robbery, pornography, divorce, teen pregnancy and such began after 1962 and 63 when prayer and Bible reading

were removed from our schools, removed because they were "religious." Then, we turn right around and adopt the **religion of secular humanism** which is based on belief in macro-evolution.

Yes, Christians should be incensed that the Supreme Court **illegally** rejected Christianity as special when one trip to Washington D.C. is proof that this nation was founded, by Christians, on Biblical principles. I wrote an e-mail to the Board months ago warning about the dangers of teaching an unproven theory that eliminates moral absolutes. We've gone from, "Thou shalt not kill" and "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" to "Might makes right" and "If Hollywood is doing it, then I can do it, too!" When there is no absolute moral authority, anything goes!

Christians should be incensed that our country has adopted a new religion of secular humanism based on the teaching of macro-evolution, a teaching which is based on supernatural elements. Yes, the Bible is based on supernatural elements. But the Bible can explain the origin of matter and energy, the origin of the living things on planet earth, the origin of that supreme intelligence that transfers information to living cells so they can function; and the Bible can also explain why the natural laws exist and are testable and predictable. Evolutionists know their theory cannot explain any of these things.

The Bible has hundreds of irrefutable prophecies which have come true with 100% accuracy proving the One who superintended the writing **must** exist outside our space time domain. The New Testament was written by eyewitnesses to the life of Jesus, two of those eyewitnesses were half brothers of His, providing powerful evidence to His life, supernatural miracles, and resurrection. The Bible has more historical, archeological, and manuscript evidence than any book of antiquity. And we've replaced it with belief in "bacteria to man evolution!"

I realize the Nassau County Board of Education is not guilty of this. My generation and my parent's generation are guilty of letting this happen. However, my hope and prayer is the Nassau Board of Education will not only mandate macro-evolution and an old earth **not** be taught as facts, but will allow Bibles to once again be distributed to our students. And further, the Board would use its influence with the state of Florida to bring back legalized corporate prayer and Bible reading to our schools.

A disclaimer statement which could be pasted in the front of all textbooks presenting macro-evolution and/or an old earth as proven fact can be found before the Reference section. I provided a sample in case the Board decides something like this would be helpful. It would, obviously, be very

expensive to get new books, and all the available science books I know of present macro-evolution and an old earth in the same deceitful way.

Thank you for your time and patience in this matter. I realize this presentation has been long. But it takes time to dismantle a theory that has gained widespread acceptance over the last 70 years. However, I trust that the truth will ultimately prevail.

### **SAMPLE DISCLAIMER STICKER**

This book contains material that leads the reader to believe that "bacteria to man" evolution and an old earth of 4.5 billion years are proven scientific facts. Creation scientists would argue that there are dozens and dozens of scientific observations that indicate the earth is young, only several thousand years old.

Additionally, creation scientists would argue that bacteria to man evolution is impossible because (1) living things only come from living things, not from matter and energy. (2) living cells need information to live and function. That information must come from an intelligent source. It cannot come from matter and energy, and (3) life is too complex to be explained by natural selection and chance beneficial mutations. The human genome has 3 billion base pairs, and the human brain operates faster than 30 trillion calculations per second, exponentially faster than any computer.

## REFERENCES

- (1) <https://www.flinnsci.com/api/library/Download/2489f60cd0484cd38a879972979baa30> Experiments were done according to National Science Educational Standards (1996)
- (2) <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/archaea/archaeamm.html>
- (3) YouTube video. Type in "In The Beginning Was Information, Dr. Werner Gitt."
- (4) <https://answersingenesis.org/genetics/mutations/evolution-is-just-mistakes/>
- (5) <https://answersingenesis.org/genetics/mutations/mutations-yes-evolution-no/>
- (6) <https://answersingenesis.org/genetics/mutations/fruit-flies-advantageous-mutations/>
- (7) *Origin of the Species by Natural Selection or The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life* (New York: The Modern Library, 1993) p.22
- (8) <https://www.genome.gov/11006943/human-genome-project-completion-frequently-asked-questions/>
- (9) <http://chrisfwestbury.blogspot.com/2014/06/on-processing-speed-of-human-brain.html> If we multiply all this out we get 100 billion neurons X 200 firings per second X 1000 connections per firing = **20 million billion calculations per second**, which is 20 petaFLOPS.
- (10) [http://klab.smp.northwestern.edu/wiki/index.php5/Bits\\_per\\_second\\_of\\_human\\_brain](http://klab.smp.northwestern.edu/wiki/index.php5/Bits_per_second_of_human_brain)
- (11) <http://www.darwinsdilemma.org/cambrian-explosion.php>
- (12) Charles Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, p.413
- (13) <http://www.cs.unc.edu/%Eplaisted/ce/dating.html>
- (14) <http://www.space.com/19275-moon-formation.html>
- (15) <http://www.spaceanswers.com/q-and-a/how-different-is-moon-rock-and-earth-rock/>
- (16) <https://answersingenesis.org/geology/carbon-14/carbon-14-in-fossils-and-diamonds/>
- (17) <http://creationtoday.org/wrong-assumptions-in-c-14-dating-methods/>
- (18) [http://www.earthage.org/youngearth/evidence\\_for\\_a\\_young\\_earth.htm](http://www.earthage.org/youngearth/evidence_for_a_young_earth.htm)
- (19) <http://www.icr.org/zircon-helium/>
- (20) <http://www.icr.org/article/evidence-for-young-world/> The main result is that the field's total energy (not surface intensity) has always decayed at least as fast as now. At that rate the field could not be more than **20,000 years** old.<sup>15</sup>
- (21) <https://creation.com/age-of-the-earth> There are 101 evidences for a young earth listed on this website.

- (22) [http://www.earthage.org/youngearth/evidence\\_for\\_a\\_young\\_earth.htm](http://www.earthage.org/youngearth/evidence_for_a_young_earth.htm)
- (23) YouTube video. Type in "What You Aren't Being Told About Astronomy- Vol. II (Our Created Stars and Galaxies) This video and others like it are presented by Spike Psarris, former engineer in the U.S. military space program. He entered the program as an atheist and evolutionist; **he exited as a creationist and Bible believing Christian. HIS VIDEOS ARE EXCELLENT!**
- (24) <http://www.halos.com/> "...these halos provide unambiguous evidence of both an almost instantaneous creation of granites and the young age of the earth."
- (25) <http://www.icr.org/article/evidence-for-young-world/> Measurements of the mutation rate of mitochondrial DNA recently forced researchers to revise the age of "mitochondrial Eve" from a theorized *200,000 years* down to possibly as low as **6,000 years**.<sup>17</sup> DNA experts insist that DNA cannot exist in natural environments longer than **10,000 years**, yet intact strands of DNA appear to have been recovered from fossils allegedly much older: Neandertal bones, insects in amber, and even from dinosaur fossils.<sup>18</sup> **Bacteria allegedly 250 million years old apparently have been revived with no DNA damage.**<sup>19</sup> Soft tissue and blood cells from a dinosaur have astonished experts.<sup>20</sup>

### **ADVICE TO BOARD MEMBERS IN ANSWERING THOSE WHO WOULD OBJECT TO TAKING OUT MACRO-EVOLUTIONARY TEACHING FROM OUR TEXTBOOKS.**

If someone questions why the teaching of macro-evolution should be taken out of our textbooks, a simple response could be: Macro-evolution is not science for 2 main reasons: (1) Matter and energy do not produce life. Life has never come from non-life; and (2) matter and energy cannot produce the information needed for a living cell to function. Therefore, since macro-evolution needs supernatural elements, it is not true science and should not be included in our science books.

Avoid debating on issues such as the fossil record, DNA similarity between humans and apes (we're also 65% similar to rabbits), homologous structures, similar fetal development, etc. because, ultimately, these issues don't change the fact that evolution involves a belief in supernatural events. As I stated, in the beginning of my presentation, if people choose to believe in evolution, that is their right. They just need to accept the fact that their belief is not based totally on scientific evidence.

**ITEM #4**

**Summary of Evidence Presented During the November 1, 2017**

**Evidence offered by the Petitioner Jay M. Shutt**

The only evidence offered by the Petitioner during the hearing was that of his testimony. Upon being duly sworn and placed under oath, Mr. Shutt's testimony was read verbatim from the Exhibit enclosed herein as Petitioner's Exhibit 1. Subsequent to the hearing, the Petitioner contacted the hearing officer with another draft of Exhibit 1 that corrected various scrivener's errors concerning the page numbers of the subject text books. That corrected version is enclosed herein as Petitioner's Exhibit 1a.

During cross examination by the Nassau County School District's Chief of Legal Services, J. Ray Poole, Mr. Shutt testified that he was not aware of any science textbook available on the market that did not include material on "Bacteria to Man Evolution".

**Evidence offered by the Nassau County School District**

The Nassau County School District offered the testimony of Dr. Cynthia Grooms, Director of Secondary Education. Upon being duly sworn and placed under oath, Dr. Grooms testified concerning the process of how the School Board selects its instructional material. Dr. Grooms testified that all materials used and purchased by the School Board are selected from a pre-approved list from the State of Florida and that the School Board relies, at least in part, on the State to vet the materials. She further testified that the School Board would risk losing funding for instructional materials if it were to select text books not on the State-approved list.

There was no cross examination of Dr. Grooms by the Petitioner.

The undersigned hearing officer acknowledges and affirms that the foregoing is a true and accurate summary of the evidence presented before the undersigned on November 1, 2017.



---

Harrison W. Poole  
Hearing Officer