

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE: BY CHANCE OR BY CHOICE?

by Brian Thomas, M.S.

“So God created the great creatures of the sea and every living and moving thing with which the water teems, according to their kinds, and every winged bird according to its kind.” – Gen. 1:21

The answer to the question, “Where did life come from?” is important to everyone because it is related to how we view the world and how we think and behave. How life came to be is a question that empirical science cannot answer directly because the event is not repeatable. The question can be answered using a different form of science called ‘origin science’, which is similar to historical analysis. To use origin science, we must weigh circumstantial evidence, then interpret that according to a model or worldview. The model which best explains the evidence is superior, because it accurately represents reality. We contend that the Biblical creation worldview is a far superior model than the alternative (atheistic evolution) because the creation model predicts what we observe in the laboratory and in the field.

Comparing The Models:

The Biblical creation model says that, from nothing, the omnipotent and omniscient Creator God spoke life into being. The materials were created on Day 1, then precisely organized into specific molecules with intricately interacting systems. These systems are found in living things which were created over a six day period by His powerful spoken word (Gen. 1:21).

The atheistic evolutionary model posits that from nothing, life spontaneously came into being, over vast time spans. (1) Conditions on the early Earth became ideal for life to evolve (create itself) from a primordial chemical soup. (2) Amino acids may have been formed by lightning in the presence of certain specific atmospheric gases. Perhaps by heat and dessication, (3) these amino acids catalyzed into proteins. (4) Bases and sugars spontaneously formed, then were catalyzed into nucleic acids in the presence of certain clays. Proteins and nucleic acids were fortuitously and simultaneously (5) encapsulated within lipid bubbles called coacervates. Given enough time and enough small steps, the first living cell became viable, (6) complete with the abilities of digestion, metabolism, structural maintenance, locomotion, reproduction, and sensitivity.

A logical interpretation of the evidence garnered through observations and experiments will conclude decisively in favor of the Biblical creation model. If any of the above steps in the evolutionary process of the formation of life can be shown false, then the whole paradigm should be discarded and replaced with a superior model, which we suggest is Biblical creation. Negative evidence for evolution is simultaneously positive evidence for creation.

(1) The early earth atmosphere was supposed to be free of oxygen (for oxygen readily reacts with amino acids and nucleic acid bases which are the building blocks of life) and full of ammonia, hydrogen, and methane, for these substances would provide the necessary atoms to form the building blocks. It must be considered that in the absence of oxygen, there is an absence of ozone in the upper atmosphere. In our present oxygenated atmosphere, the ozone reflects harmful UV radiation, but in the oxygen-free atmosphere that they postulate, that radiation would have been free (penetrating through ten feet of water) to destroy amino acids, bases, and sugars, as well as ammonia and methane! Further, geological evidence shows that even the ‘earliest’ rocks were deposited in the presence of oxygen. “The existence of early red beds, sea and groundwater sulphate, oxidized terrestrial and sea-floor weathering crusts, and the distribution of ferric iron in sedimentary rocks are

geological observations and inferences compatible with the biological and planetary predictions. It is suggested that from the time of the earliest dated rocks at 3.7 b.y. ago, Earth had an oxygenic atmosphere.”¹ Just the building blocks of life, let alone the complex biomolecules they comprise, let further alone the fully coordinated biomolecular systems, do not exist today apart from a fully functioning cell, complete with structural repair and protective mechanisms.

(2) In the Encyclopedia of Evolution, p.274, Richard Milner states, “Decades of persistent failure to create life by the ‘spark in the soup’ method (or to find such productions in nature) have caused some researchers to seek other approaches to the great enigma.” The origin of life is only an enigma for the evolutionist. All amino acids and sugars can have the same chemical composition, but different ‘handedness’. Of the hundreds of amino acids that could be formed, only 20 are used in all living things. Of these 20, **only** left-handed are used (a single right handed amino acid in a protein of 500 renders the protein useless). Attempts to demonstrate the probability of the spontaneous formation of the 20 left handed amino acids (and therefore the probability of an evolutionary origin of life) yield mixtures of some simple amino acids, **all** in 50:50 right and left handed forms.

(3) To link amino acids together and form proteins requires many different specifically shaped enzymes in living cells today. Experiments to demonstrate the spontaneous linkage of amino acids cannot use water, for water pushes the reaction the wrong way; it tends to pull amino acids apart. Further, without enzymes mediating the reactions, any amino acids that have been polymerized tend toward an equal mixture of right and left handed, even when starting from concentrated pure left handed materials. The more time given, the more 50:50 the mixture becomes.

(4) Of the five bases used in nucleic acids of all living things (cytosine, guanine, thymine, adenine, and uracil), cytosine does not form spontaneously at all. Given highly concentrated amounts of these bases mixed with concentrated ribose sugars, in the absence of the proper complex enzymatic machinery used by living cells to catalyze the junction of a base to a ribose, the junction always occurs on the wrong carbon atom of the ribose. As with amino acids, given more time the concentration of these precious building blocks diminishes, so that it is very unlikely that they would even interact at all in a random primordial soup. The formation of nucleic acids cannot form in spontaneous solutions, but that’s only the beginning of the problems for an evolutionary origin of these immense biomolecules. The evolution model must account for not only the origin of the physical structures discussed here, but also of the vast amounts of information they contain. Evolutionists have calculated the smallest amount of information a bacterium would have to contain to be alive to be 580,000 base pairs of DNA, or bits of information. (though it would be degenerate and parasitic)² All of this information would have had to arise all at once for the organism to operate. “O LORD, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all:...” –Ps.104:24

(5) Coacervates are supposed to be the primeval progenitor of cell membranes, but they are vastly different. Cell membranes allow only certain chemicals in or out at certain times, are maintained constantly, hold their shape while remaining fluid, and are composed of specifically sized phospholipids and specially shaped proteins. Coacervates are simple blobs of oil that fall apart easily. They absorb any enzyme at random, including ones that may be harmful to any ‘developing’ proteins.

(6) Without all of the basic functions and essential abilities of a living cell already in place at one time, it cannot function at all. Molecular biologist (and non-creationist) Michael Denton wrote, “Is it really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality, the smallest element of which – a functional protein or gene – is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality which is the very antithesis of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man?”³ If life could not have created itself naturally, it must have been created supernaturally!

¹ H. Clemney and N. Badham, *Geology*, vol.10 (1982), p. 141.

² C.M. Fraser et. al., “The Minimal gene complement of *Mycoplasma Genitalium*”, *Science* 270 (5235): p. 397.

³ Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory In Crisis* (Adler and Adler) 1986, p.328