

Life From Non-Life: An Impossible Chemical Journey



Article By: Jeffrey D. Mason. C.Ht., M.A. and M.H.

Though it is true many people uncritically accept the views of evolution as though it were a scientific certainty; the actual science that can be observed, tested and repeated, strongly demand we re-examine the claim evolution makes of itself, as supposedly legitimate science. In reality there are serious problems with the whole idea of evolution and its assertion that it is the best means to explain the observable facts.

To begin with, we know based on the actual testable science, evolution couldn't have gotten started in the first place. In the 1970's it was firmly established that in the primordial atmospheric gases amino acid formation would not have been possible. This fact was not only established, but has failed to be overturned to the present day. These scientific findings have left the possibility of life springing spontaneously from non-living chemistry in serious doubt.

At the present time the "theory" of evolutionary molecular chemistry is really not faring any better than when these discoveries were made almost 30 years ago. We have discovered amino acids have a type of handedness, in simple terms they are known as either left or right handed. The curious thing about these left/right handed amino acids is that ALL biologically living things are composed of only the left-handed type. Why would this be a problem for theoretical molecular evolution?

Well because left handed amino acids WILL NOT bond in the presence of right handed types, and in nature left and right handed amino acids are found in equal numbers!

You might say... “So what. Perhaps the left handed amino acids somehow got isolated from the right handed kind in the early primordial atmosphere and developed from there.” The problem with this idea is the fact that we have discovered, left handed amino acids left to themselves actually reverse to form right handed types until there are an equal number of both left and right handed types. So even when isolated it has been scientifically demonstrated they will not come together to form more complex proteins which are so necessary to the development of biological life.

Another discovery we have made is the fact the early primordial environment had nearly 1 million times more oxygen than any evolutionary theorist originally even estimated. We know this as a fact by looking at the internal isotopes of pre-Cambrian Rocks, revealing signs of oxidation within them. The internal oxidations of these rocks are powerful geophysical pieces of evidence testifying strongly to the presences of large amounts of oxygen in the early atmospheric conditions of our planet. It is a catch 22 where oxygen is concerned, because oxygen is absolutely necessary to the development of life so without it, life could not develop and yet, in its presence, because of oxidation, life producing chemicals would have been torn apart before being able to come together and form more complex proteins, which serve as a major building block in all forms of life. You see, even with anaerobic life (or bacteria that require NO oxygen to live) atmospheric oxygen would have been crucial in providing enough of a protective atmosphere to shield the developing life from solar radiation from our sun and space itself, and without it, any developing life would have literally been fried by the influx of such radiation. So from the standpoint of abiogenesis it is a no win situation. Without oxygen, solar radiation will fry all developing life before it even starts, and yet, in the presents of oxygen at levels necessary to provide a shielding atmosphere from radiation, oxidation will act upon these compounds to arrest and tear apart any possibility of producing further complexity.

To overcome the problem of radiation many evolutionary theorists’ hypothesized life began in the oceans, puddles, and small lakes or pools of water. This was based on the idea that in water these delicate amino acid bonds would be shielded from the onslaught of radiation’s lethal effects. However, since all life including the DNA is composed of proteins, and proteins are built from less complex amino-acids which are further composed of even simpler polymers and so on, life could NOT have evolved or begun in the oceans either. Water is composed of 2 hydrogen

and 1 oxygen atom. If amino acids bound together in water, the oxygen atoms in the water would have gotten right in between these amino acid bonds and literally ripped them apart. Science fully understands this fact by the processes of hydrolysis. Therefore, in spite of all the theory, opinion, conjecture and unproven speculation of evolutionary theorists', life springing from non-living chemicals even under the most ideal scenarios seem to be a physical impossibility based upon the observable, testable and repeatable science; either on land or in water.

These facts have been fully established scientifically. Many evolutionists' then speculated that life must have come in from outer space on asteroids. They claim that on asteroids amino acids occur only in left-handedness. However, this claim is false. Even on asteroids there are equal numbers of left and right handed amino acids. Yet, let's just give the evolutionist the benefit of the doubt and ignore the equal numbers of amino acids on asteroids, even though this is to deny known scientific facts; and say their claim was valid. Upon entering the earth's atmosphere the intense heat of entry would literally act to destroy these amino acids, and purify the asteroid from any useable stuff. To argue this wouldn't happen because the early earth had little to no atmosphere would simply mean the amino acids were destroyed by solar radiation as they began to develop toward life. So this argument only shifts the source of destruction. Now, if the evolutionist claim's there was a protective atmosphere, then the source of destruction of these amino acids becomes oxygen rather than entry heat or solar radiation acting on the simple organisms developing, resulting in their death. In addition to this, even if the asteroid in space had harbored only left handed amino acids, once it touched down to earth, these left handed types would have quickly begun to reverse to a natural balance of right and left handedness and abiogenesis is still arrested. Given all these known scientifically verified "FACTS" the evolutionist is forced, like it or not, to admit, if they are going to go with the known science, that Stanley Miller's primitive atmosphere experiments, as well as those conducted by every researcher since his time, including Ponnampertuma, Fox and Cyril are all invalid, in terms of providing anything viable in relation to abiogenesis.

EVOLUTIONISTS' CHAMPION A NEW "THEORY" The "RNA World"

As a result of the insurmountable hurdles for amino acid bonding to realistically occur and thus the development of life-giving more complex proteins to come about; evolutionists' advance a new "theory" the RNA World. It was in 1986 when Dr. Walter Gilbert, a chemist from Harvard University introduced the concept to the scientific community. This theory suggests that it wasn't protein that came first but instead it was the RNA molecules that harbor the information for protein. In short, the theory goes, billions of years ago an RNA molecule somehow randomly developed by mere accidental chemical bonding with the ability to reproduce itself. Then, this RNA molecule began to create proteins through activation of some unknown outside influences. Therefore, the theory says, it became necessary to store this information in a secondary molecule and, by unknown means the DNA molecule came into being to fulfill this role.

This is what the evolutionists have been reduced to, in spite of the fact that RNA molecules would still be subject to much of the same problems as the formation of simple amino acids. The whole RNA theory is simply a desperate attempt to rescue an already highly conjectured theory from ultimate extinction. It is dependant on one impossibility after another. The accidental formation of so much as a single nucleotide composing the RNA is scientifically utterly devoid of reason and the whole idea is completely preposterous. Leslie Orgel and Gerald Joyce, eminent evolutionary microbiologists revealed the absurd nature of the theory in their book, "In the RNA World":

" This discussion...has, in a sense, focused on a straw man: the myth of a self-replicating RNA molecule that arose de novo from a soup of random polynucleotides. Not only is such a notion unrealistic in light of our current understanding of prebiotic chemistry, but it would strain the credulity of even an optimist's view of RNA's catalytic potential."

Dr. John Horgan, an evolutionist also went on record regarding the concept of the RNA world.

"As researchers continue to examine the RNA-World concept closely, more problems emerge. How did RNA initially arise? RNA and its components are difficult to synthesize in a laboratory"

under the best of conditions, much less under really plausible ones.”

The RNA World theory leads us to suppose a self-reproducing RNA in a primordial environment, with available amino acids of every kind, ready for use, and that all of these impossible sequences somehow, through unknown means took place. Even under such scenario this process still fails to lead to the formation of a one single protein. RNA by itself will only contain information about the structure of proteins. On the other hand amino acids are the crude building blocks for the proteins. In this concept there is still NO mechanism for the construction of the more complex proteins with the simpler amino acids. To view the RNA as somehow possessing the ability in times past, to produce complex proteins is about as nonsensical as expecting a house will build itself by throwing the blue prints for the house onto a pile of lumber, nails and similar materials. It just is impossible and everyone with common sense knows it. A blue print by itself cannot produce a house without skilled carpenters, lumber, a lumber mill, nails, nail factories, and specialized tools used by the carpenters, any more than RNA could produce proteins without the benefit and cooperation of other vital cell components which carry out the instructions contained in the RNA.

Proteins themselves are produced in the ribosome of the cell and require highly specialized enzymes and highly complex processes within the cell to cause their formation to come about in the first place. The ribosome is a very complex cellular organ that is composed of proteins. This leads to another inescapable further presupposition that ribosome's also must have come into existence by a process of some unknown "Self-producing" mechanism at the exact same time as the RNA in order to get the whole process to work in the first place. The entire idea, especially in the light of known chemistry laws is beyond ridiculous. Even the eminent Noble Prize winner and atheist/evolutionist Jacques Monod explains that protein synthesis could by no means be considered merely dependent on the information in the nucleic acid.

*“The code is meaningless unless translated. The modern cell's translating machinery consists of at least 50 macromolecular components, which are themselves coded in the DNA: the code CANNOT be translated otherwise than by products of translation themselves. It is the modern expression of omne vivum ex ovo. **When and how did this circle become closed? It is exceedingly difficult to imagine.”***

The question begs asking, HOW an RNA chain in the primordial earth could have possessed methods that resulted in protein production by doing the work of 50 or more highly specialized particles all by itself? Neither atheists nor evolutionists have any answers to these

complexities. In the scientific Journal, “*Nature*” one article clearly states the idea of a self-reproducing RNA chain is nothing more than mere conjecture and fanciful imagination, as there has never been so much as a single incident in which this kind of RNA has ever been produced in any experiment.

“DNA replication is so error-prone that it needs the prior existence of protein enzymes to improve the copying fidelity of a gene-size piece of DNA. “Catch 22” says Maynard Smith and Szathmary. So, wheel on RNA with its now recognized properties of carrying both informational and enzymatic activity, leading the authors to state: “In essence, the first RNA molecules did not need a protein polymerase to replicate them; they replicated themselves.” Is this a fact or a hope? I would have thought it relevant to point out for ‘biologists in general’ that not one self-replicating RNA has emerged to date from quadrillions of artificially synthesized, random RNA sequences.”

As should be glaringly obvious by now, to any thinking person possessed of common sense, it is a foolish notion to expect such complex functions to arise from RNA. Dr. Orgel, one of the associate researchers with Stanley Miller and Frances Crick of California University in San Diego, employed the term “scenario” for the likelihood of life coming into being through the RNA World. Dr. Orgel defines the qualities such an RNA would have to possess and how totally impossible these would have been in an article published in *Scientific American* in October of 1994:

“This scenario could have occurred, we noted, if prebiotic RNA had two properties NOT evident today: A capacity to replicate without the help of proteins and an ability to catalyze every step of protein synthesis.”

It is clearly evident by the actual, observable and concrete science, the chance formation of life through the RNA world idea so popular today, is a mere fable and completely goes against the known established facts of science and molecular chemistry.

Further, the information systems coded in the DNA/RNA networks only add insult to injury to ANY model set forth for abiogenesis, or “life springing from non-life.” Evolutionists and atheists often claim the universe created itself or has eternally existed. They claim the nature of rational thought is in the recognition of the reality that there is no God and that nothing exists except energy and matter, which compose all things both living and non-living. However, information systems such as are found in the DNA/RNA complex totally overturn this naïve and grossly oversimplified explanation of the nature of reality.

Because all biologically living things are composed of genes and genes are written in a four-protein type alphabet known as DNA, the nature of reality is not just that of energy and matter but of information. Indeed, the DNA code is a literal language composed of a type of biological alphabet, forming words, sentences, paragraphs and eventually an entire recipe book on how to make a cell. The proteins on the DNA are not the information; they are only the matter or carrying case of the information. Just as we can store information on the matter of a computer hard-drive or a strip of video or audiotape, so too, biological information is stored on these unique proteins. These proteins serve as a four-letter alphabet and like letters of an alphabet they come together to express and convey information. Information of itself is neither matter nor energy. It can be transmitted by energy and stored on matter...however, information is neither of these but rather it is concept or idea.

This fact alone shows the nature of reality is really composed of energy, matter and concept. Concept or "IDEA" is by its very nature intelligence, and anywhere we have ever looked we have found intelligence can ONLY COME from mind. And mind requires by its very presence, awareness of self and presence of person. There is NO way around this, for neither energy nor matter has the ability for thought, idea and development or transfer of intelligible information; this ability as everyone knows instinctively can only proceed from a mind. Now, ideas, thought and information can be passed by energy and stored in physical matter, just as the information in this article is stored in the physical symbols of letters coming together to form intelligible words; and are related and stored on and through servers, and hard-drives and transferred from one computer to another; via electronic circuits and the energy running through them...the information itself is from the mind of the writer. Because it is written intelligibly, it can be understood as proceeding from a mind capable of conveying ideas and thoughts through the medium to the reader. Logic dictates then by sheer reason, we must draw the same conclusion regarding the DNA code, since one small strand of DNA stores intelligible information equivalent to approximately 100 million pages of the Encyclopedia Britannica. No rational person would find even a single word written in sand and believe it to be the result of a random chance or freak accident of natural happenings from the elements. What are we to deduce from 100 million pages worth of discernable information? If to believe a single word written in the sand that was understandable, coming about by accident would stretch the credulity of reason; then how unreasonable and illogical it should be to any thinking man or woman, that somehow 100 million pages of intelligence came about by mere accident and random processes by the molecular elements of nature!

Given all the know science it is inconceivable life could ever spring from non-life. Scientifically therefore, reason dictates abiogenesis is nothing more than mere delusional fantasy. A wishful hope for men of reprobate minds who would rather cling to fairy tales than to admit the overwhelming evidence loudly proclaiming the existence of a GOD!

Many atheists and evolutionists may attempt to side step these solid scientific facts, by insisting abiogenesis has nothing to do with evolution; since evolution is the process of what happens after the simplest life has formed. However, this again is simply one more logic error on the part of the evolutionist. Intelligent men have been trying and failing to create the simplest life for years. Now, our knowledge of prebiotic chemistry has advanced to the point where the odds of being able to do so realistically, even under the most ideal of conditions, has all but disappeared, in spite of what evolutionists may like to claim. To say abiogenesis has nothing to do with evolution is absurd and utterly false. For if even the simplest life cannot come about based on the known scientific facts and established laws of molecular chemistry from non living elements, then life purely by naturalistic means never gets started in the first place. If by mere naturalistic means life cannot even begin, then common sense and reason leads us to reject the whole premise of evolution. Common sense knows there could be no simple life to evolve. The truth is, Life does NOT spring from non-life.

Which is more plausible? Impossible things happen through time and chance against the laws of probability and science; or impossible things happen by the will of God and through the laws of science. The evolutionary atheists often like to ask what is more plausible by applying the idea of "Alchem's Razor" which states: ***"All things being equal the simplest answer is usually the correct one."*** Now, atheists claim, the Christian God is merely a delusion and is in reality the "God of the Gaps." That is to say, they claim, wherever science has gaps in its knowledge, the religious faithful will use God in place of reason to explain these gaps. However, given all we currently know based upon the observable and actually knowable science, evolutionary theory is one huge gap after another from the very beginning of how the universe came into existence, to how life could spring into life from non living particles, against known molecular chemistry principles, to exactly how one kind of creature could turn into an entirely different kind of creature, and leave no evidence of such progression in the fossil record; to how mutation fails at any point to add information to make such a change even viable. It's just one huge gap after another. Evolution is more than just a gap it is a giant hole! Applying Alchem's Razor then...what really is the simplest answer? Evolution is the cause for the product of life and nature, and that what we see is the result of one impossible random chance accident

after another? Though NO physical evidence supports it, and the very processes of the mechanism flies in the face of ALL observable facts...or that, an ALL-powerful mind willfully and deliberately created everything we see for a specific reason and purpose? Which does the evidence support? Which actually leaves us logically and intellectually with the least unanswered questions or gaps? Based on all the known facts observed in science which really IS the simplest explanation and the most likely cause of what we see... all things being equal and ALL things considered? Obviously, given all the facts, the simplest and most likely answer is...in the beginning God...

Life can ONLY spring from life. That is what we actually witness and observe. Life produces life. Abiogenesis and evolution are simply ways men cling to in an attempt to run from God. The evidence for His existence is undeniable if one will admit all the facts. All life came from the Spirit of Life, for the creation is ALIVE. Only a living mind could produce a creation with the order, complexity, livingness and information systems we see. This mind is the mind of the one and only Living God. He is the God WHO IS God, the true God; In HIM ALL THINGS CONSIST...and in Him we LIVE and move and have or being!

REFERENCES and NOTES:

Behe, Michael J.: Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution, 2006

Orgel, Leslie: The Origins of Life: Scientific American, Oct. 1994

Orgel, Leslie -Joyce, Gerald: In the RNA World

Knight, Jonathan: Top Translator, New Science, 158 April 18, 1998

Dose, Klaus: The origin of Life: More Questions than Answers, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, 13, no. 4 1988

Pigliucci, Massimo: "Where Did We Come From?" Skeptical Inquirer, 23 Sept-Oct 1999

Collins, Francis S.: The Language of God, 2005

Morris, Henry M.: The Biblical Basis for Modern Science, 2002