

alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible.” In other words, creation is rejected because of refusal to believe it not because of the evidence.

2. Evolutionists also fail to provide evidence of fossils to show natural origin of species.

The late, **Harvard** paleontologist Dr. Gould wrote, “The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology.... All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms; transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt.”

Francis Hitching: “When you look for links between major groups of animals, they simply aren’t there; at least, not in enough numbers to put their status beyond doubt. Either they don’t exist at all, or they are so rare that endless argument goes on about whether a particular fossil is ... transitional between this group and that.”

Phillip E. Johnson of the Berkeley wrote, “Darwinism is not so much an inference from the facts as a deduction from naturalistic philosophy.”

In fact, many evolutionists are now espousing the theory of Punctuated Equilibrium (P.E.) to explain why the missing links are missing. But P.E. is not evidence for evolution. It is an excuse for not finding evidence needed to support claims of gradual evolution over time. P.E. agrees with the creationist claim that the fossil record shows that populations of organisms resist change. P.E. proponents reason that change occurred too quickly to produce transitional fossils thus giving the appearance of **missing** links. This is not evidence. It is an excuse for missing links.

The creation model correctly predicts that the fossil record shows resistance to unlimited change. The fossil record confirms the creation model prediction and the limited change observed in the laboratory.

Dr. Michael Thomas wrote, “One could argue at this point that such minor changes extrapolated over millions of years could result in macro-evolutionary change. But the evidence will not support this argument.... Those who argue from microevolution to macroevolution may be guilty, then, of employing a false analogy—especially when one considers that microevolution may be a force of stasis, not transformation For those who must describe history of life as a purely natural phenomenon, the winnowing action of natural selection is truly a difficult problem to overcome. For scientists who are content to describe accurately those processes and phenomena which occur in nature (in particular, stasis), natural selection acts to prevent major evolutionary change.”

Conclusion

Laws of science and evidence for limited change overwhelmingly support the supernatural origin of the universe, life, and species. As a scientist, I am convinced by the evidence that, “In the beginning, God created....” Are you?



Patrick Briney, Ph.D.
Former atheist and evolutionist.

Pat Briney, Ph.D.
Creation Insights Founder
www.creationinsights.org

Dr. Briney earned his Ph.D. in microbiology and has presented seminars on creation and evolution for over twenty years, engaged evolutionists in debates, and continues to train students in Biblical apologetics.

Why I rejected Evolution

Patrick Briney, Ph.D.

As an atheist, I believed in evolution as fact. It was the only explanation for existence. But after attending a lecture on creation science, I began to rethink the question of origins. The speaker had pointed out several things that I knew were true, but I never considered the implications. He also said some things I had not been told about in class. Subsequently, I began to doubt evolution, distrust teachers of evolution, and wonder what else I had not been told. Eventually, I became a Christian and a believer in the Genesis account of creation. Let me share with you some of the things that I believe will convince anyone who looks honestly into the subject of origins.

Evidence for Supernatural Origin by Design

Charles Thaxton of Charles University in Prague wrote that evidence for design is reasonable because, “In ordinary life we distinguish natural from intelligent causes all the time—when police officers determine whether a person died of natural causes or was murdered, when archaeologists decide whether a chipped rock is just a rock or a Paleolithic tool.”

Though evolutionists chide creationists for using design arguments, they use the design argument in their search for intelligent life in outer space. NASA’s SETI program (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) is searching for intelligent life in outer space. Isaac Asimov described the purpose for sending signals into space saying that if intelligent life in the universe

detect the signals, they will recognize the obvious design of intelligence in its creation and conclude that intelligent life exists elsewhere. Not only do we send signals into space, we also scan the heavens for signs showing evidence of intelligent creation. Obviously, even the evolutionists recognize the validity of design arguments.

The DNA molecule is a string of information far more complex than radio or optical signals. It is unnaturally complex in size, function, and coded information. Intelligent men have been working on producing life in test tubes for years, and yet they continue to fail even with the code and materials of life all around them. They can create signals to send into outer space, but they cannot create life. From an evolutionary point of view, this makes mindless molecules more clever than brilliant scientists. But from a common sense perspective, this suggests that we have already found the evidence for intelligent design and creation. How is it that intelligent life on this planet are searching for simple design from outer space and missing the obvious evidence of intelligent design in the genetic code?

Evidence for Supernatural Origin of the Universe

1. **The** First Law of Thermodynamics states that Energy is not created by natural means. But, the universe exists as matter and energy. An established, scientific law tells us that it did not create itself by natural means. Therefore, the obvious conclusion is that the universe was created supernaturally.

In contrast, Evolution proposes strictly natural explanations. Therefore, evolution contradicts an established, scientific law. Models that contradict laws of science are unscientific. Therefore, evolution as a model of origins is unscientific and false.

2. The Second Law of Thermodynamics states that

there is no natural means to increase usable energy (reduce entropy) in a closed system. The universe contains all things and is a closed system that is decreasing in usable energy (increasing in entropy). But decreasing in usable energy means that it began in a state of higher energy. An established, scientific law tells us that it could not have increased its state of usable energy by natural means. Therefore, the obvious conclusion is that the initial energy of the universe must have originated supernaturally.

In contrast, evolution proposes only natural explanations. Therefore, evolution contradicts a natural law. Models that contradict laws of science are unscientific. Therefore, evolution as a model of origins is unscientific.

Evidence for Supernatural Origin of Life

1. **The** scientific Law of Biogenesis states that living cells come from pre-existing living cells. Living cells have never been observed to come from lifeless molecules even after thousands of attempts over a hundred years. If living cells cannot arise from nonliving molecules, then the first living cells must have originated supernaturally.

In contrast, evolution proposes that life originated by means of the natural properties of molecules from nonliving matter. Evolutionists say that the chemical nature of life justifies their theory. But this contradicts an established, scientific law. Models that contradict laws of science are unscientific. Therefore, evolution as a model of origins is unscientific.

2. Failure to produce life in the laboratory is consistent with the complexity of life chemistry and the laws of mathematical probabilities. The chemistry of life is neither simple nor likely to evolve by chance events. The properties of matter are against such an event occurring.

Harold Morowitz, distinguished Yale biophysicist and former master of Pierson College, wrote in his book, *Energy Flow in Biology*, that the evolution of the theoretically simplest cell, requiring no less than about 124 proteins, would occur in 1:10 to the 340,000,000 power.

How big is this number, and what is its significance? The mathematical number for impossibility is 10^{50} . The entire universe is estimated to contain "only" 10^{80} sub-atomic particles. 10^{80} is a very big number of unfathomable dimension. In other words, the probability of $1:10^{340,000,000}$ is incomprehensibly impossible.

Evidence for Supernatural Origin of Species

Robert L. Carroll wrote in the *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* journal that, "Large-scale evolutionary phenomena cannot be understood solely on the basis of extrapolation from processes observed at the level of modern populations and species."

Extrapolations are not evidence. Variations that are seen occur within each kind of organism such as is seen in the many breeds of dogs including wolves and coyotes. But the changes that produce these variations are limited within each kind, and dogs never become pigs or cows.

1. **Evidence** for limited change comes from genetic research on fruit flies. For over a hundred years, they have been exposed to conditions to mutate their genetic code, and yet the flies continue to exist as fruit flies. There is no evidence to suggest that organisms can change to become something other than their own kind. Change is limited not unlimited.

In light of such evidence, it is interesting to note the quote by Professor D.M.S. Watson of the University of London who said, "Evolution itself is accepted by zoologists, not because it has been observed to occur or can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true, but because the only