

The Case Against Chemical Evolution (Spontaneous Generation)

Illustration:

Let's say I wanted to build a house that did the following things:

- protect itself – from the elements (leaks, wind, fire), from thieves, etc.
- reproduce itself – add additions, upgrades, neighboring houses, etc.
- repair itself
- perform basic operational functions – open doors, welcome guests, clean and sort dishes, file mail, etc.

What would be required? What steps would we take? First, we would collect materials:

- Wood, stone, masonry, tar (asphalt shingles), fiberglass (insulation), glass
- Parts for circuit boards – various metals and plastics
- Stainless steel – chemically treated

Since the house is self-repairing it would also need to be able to harvest these materials and refine them. Just assembling a house like this – even one the size of a doll house (or any structure for that matter) – would be far beyond our present day technology. I cannot think of any product that mankind has produced that can reproduce itself, or repair itself. The closest would be a car factory, but the structure we're talking about would be like a car having a car factory inside of it that can make another car with a similar car factory inside of it.

But let's assume that we could design such a structure. How could this structure come about by natural means? If all the right products were brought together to create such a structure, could this structure form on its own? Even a simple form of it, that would allow it to reproduce itself – because once it gets to this point, it's basically trial and error until something happens – would that be possible? What if we added energy? What if we brought all the right materials together and a tornado went through, could this thing be assembled by natural means? By chance? No I don't think so. It would be like a tornado going through a junkyard and assembling some sort of functioning aircraft. It just wouldn't happen. What's worse, a tornado would probably damage most of the materials. After many tornadoes the materials would be even more unlikely of coming together. Adding time to this process would not solve anything.

If it could not have come together all at once, could it have come together piecemeal? Adding to itself gradually until it could reproduce itself? How could anything come together piecemeal without protecting itself from the elements? Or without repairing itself? Or without any mechanism or reproducing itself before falling apart?

Isn't it amazing that our cells do all of these things and more – protect themselves, reproduce themselves, function as part of a greater whole, repair themselves and perform all sorts of operational functions. These could not have formed piecemeal either – they would have died off before reproducing and the whole process would have to start over. Not only that, but we observe that many of the basic parts of the cell do not naturally come together, but fall apart.

See Movie Clip: Chemical Evolution

(This clip is part 4 of "A Question of Origins" found free at:

http://www.eternal-productions.org/question_video/question_video.html)

Details of clip:

- Spontaneous Generation – the theory that life arose from non-living chemicals
- **Problem 1** – Law of Biogenesis – life comes only from preexisting life.
- **Problem 2** – Miller Experiment – Stanley Miller's famous experiment has been used to demonstrate that life could have potentially come from non-life millions of years ago on planet earth. We know that cells are made of proteins which are made of long strings of amino acids, so the Miller experiment showed that amino acids could have formed on this early earth. This experiment has three problems:
 - **Wrong Materials** – The Miller experiment assumes an atmosphere with no oxygen – amino acids would never form in such an atmosphere. But as deep as we dig we find oxidized rock, showing that earth always had an oxygen rich atmosphere. It also assumes an atmosphere with ammonia and methane gas, which is also problematic.
 - **Wrong Procedure** – The Miller experiment uses energy (a spark) to form the amino acids – this is

supposed to simulate lightning. However in nature, this energy is much better at tearing amino acids apart than putting them together. So the experiment used a procedure that does not naturally occur to prevent this.

- **Wrong Results** – The experiment produced a result that was 2% amino acids, and 98% materials that are toxic to life. Not only that, the amino acids that were formed were both left and right handed amino acids. Only left handed amino acids make up proteins, and the presence of even one right handed amino acid prevents their formation.
- **Problem 3** – Even if you could get left handed amino acids to form by natural means without toxins in an oxygen rich atmosphere, there are even greater problems getting those amino acids to form a cell.
 - Even the simplest proteins have upwards of 75 amino acids. They act very much like a computer program – they must be arranged in a very specific order – one amino acid off and the whole thing is garbage. The other problem is that they do not naturally form on their own, so there's no room for trial and error to eventually form a working protein.
 - After much experimentation and research, it has been calculated that the probability of a simple 100 amino acid protein forming spontaneously is 1 in 100 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 (or 10^{65}).
 - Even if one protein formed, we are still miles away from forming a living cell. The simplest living cells require thousands of **specialized** proteins – meaning that that chance of 1 in 10^{65} has to be done thousands of times before putting together a cell.
 - A scientist calculated that the chance of the proteins of an amoeba arising by chance is $10^{40,000}$. Consider that there are only 10^{80} atoms in the visible universe.
 - Only if all pieces of a cell came together simultaneously, could a cell function.
- Spontaneous Generation is probably the greatest problem for the theory of evolution.

Chance illustrated

Every time you watch TV, the picture is made up of tiny dots. Those dots are put together in a particular order to form a meaningful picture. Every second you watch TV, you see 30 unique pictures!

If we were to select a random image, shouldn't a meaningful picture occasionally come up, given all the different meaningful pictures we see on TV? It's a lot less likely than you think. Consider, meaningful pictures have a lot more order than we realize - the pixels around each other usually have similar colors. Consider that lining up two pixels side by side with the same color is extremely rare, as a TV has 16 million colors to chose from.



Go to http://www.garsidechurch.com/study/apologetics/creation_evolution_4b.php to randomly generate a 720x480 picture - DVD resolution. Then try again. And again. It's always scrambled, random and meaningless. Order just does not come from non-order.

Note: A chance of there being a meaningful picture does not mean that after you click the button many times, you will eventually see a meaningful screen. Each click is 100% randomized, so it's not going through a sequence. Consider the chance of randomly lining up 15 cards and having them come out in the right sequence. The chance of doing this simple task randomly is 1 in 1307674368000 (1.30×10^{12}). Download a simple program at http://www.garsidechurch.com/study/apologetics/creation_evolution_4c.php to see how long it would take for this to randomly occur.

The Elephant in the Living Room

Writer George V. Caylor interviewed Sam, a molecular biologist. George asked Sam about his work. Sam said he and his team were scientific “detectives,” working with DNA and tracking down the cause of disease. Here is their published conversation.

G: “Sounds like pretty complicated work.”

S: “You can't imagine how complicated!”

G: "Try me."

S: "I'm a bit like an editor, trying to find a spelling mistake inside a document larger than four complete sets of *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Seventy volumes, thousands and thousands of pages of small print words."

G: "With the computer power, you can just use 'spell check!'"

S: "There is no 'spell check' because we don't know yet how the words are supposed to be spelled. We don't even know for sure which language. And it's not just the 'spelling error' we're looking for. If any of the punctuation is out of place, or a space out of place, or a grammatical error, we have a mutation that will cause disease."

G: "So how do you do it?"

S: "We are learning as we go. We have already 'read' over two articles in that encyclopedia, and located some 'typo's'. It should get easier as time goes by."

G: "How did all that information happen to get there?"

S: "Do you mean, did it just happen? Did it evolve?"

G: "Bingo. Do you believe that the information evolved?"

S: "George, nobody I know in my profession truly believes it evolved. It was engineered by 'genius beyond genius,' and such information could not have been written any other way. The paper and ink did not write the book. Knowing what we know, it is ridiculous to think otherwise. A bit like Neil Armstrong believing the moon is made of green cheese. He's been there!"

G: "Have you ever stated that in a public lecture, or in any public writings?"

S: "No. It all just evolved."

G: "What? You just told me –?"

S: "Just stop right there. To be a molecular biologist requires one to hold on to two insanities at all times. One, it would be insane to believe in evolution when you can see the truth for yourself. Two, it would be insane to say you don't believe in evolution. All government work, research grants, papers, big college lectures – everything would stop. I'd be out of a job, or relegated to the outer fringes where I couldn't earn a decent living."

G: "I hate to say it, Sam, but that sounds intellectually dishonest."

S: "The work I do in genetic research is honorable. We will find the cures to many of mankind's worst diseases. But in the meantime, we have to live with the 'elephant in the living room'."

G: "What elephant?"

S: "Design. It's like the elephant in the living room. It moves around, takes up an enormous amount of space, loudly trumpets, bumps into us, knocks things over, eats a ton of hay, and smells like an elephant. And yet we have to swear it isn't there!"¹

1 George V. Caylor, "The Biologist," *The Ledger*, Vol. 2, Issue 48, No. 92, 1 December 2000, p. 2. (www.ontherightside.com), As quoted by Walt Brown, In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood.