



A Critical Issue Revisited

It can be successfully shown that virtually all Darwinian proofs of evolution have been refuted and new mechanisms offered in their place; but the real Achilles hill of Darwinism is the issue of life's origin. Darwin, living in a day when it had not yet been successfully demonstrated that life does not arise from non-living matter, imagined that "in some warm little pond....a protein compound was chemically formed ready to undergo still more complex changes" (Life and Letters of Charles Darwin). Now over a hundred years later, scientist have come to realize that the odds of the spontaneous emergence of life on earth is virtually zero!

But Didn't Someone Make Life in a Test Tube?

In the decades following Darwin the common presumption was that life originated in a "prebiotic" soup. Simply put, all the chemicals necessary for life were thought to exist in the earth early atmosphere and through the chance combination of them life arose. This assumption was the basis of Stanley Miller's famous "test tube" experiment in which he passed electricity through a chemical mix of methane, ammonium, and hydrogen and witnessed the formation of a few amino acids.

However since 1980, NASA scientists have shown that the primitive earth did not have these elements in any large quantity and that the atmosphere of the early earth was composed of nitrogen, carbon dioxide, and water. What this does is practically blow the earlier theories of life's formation out of the water (no pun intended).

More Recent Research

In more recent years other theories have been tested with a similar outcome causing biochemist Klaus Dose, an expert in this field to say, "More than thirty

year of experimentation on the origin of life in the fields of chemical and molecular evolution have led to a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on Earth rather than to its solution. At present all discussion on principle theories and experiments in the field either end in stalemate or in a confession of ignorance."

Implications for Evolution

The implications for evolution are immense. It was easy for scientists to presume an atmospheric mix that would produce the outcome they wanted and now those presumptions are seriously questioned. Even so, nothing remotely kin to a living cell was ever formed in Miller's or anyone else's experiments. What scientists now understand is that the formation of the building blocks of life involve processes that are so complex that Nobel prize winner, Francis Crick, discoverer of DNA, has said, "The origin of life appears to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to be satisfied to get it going".

What Are the Odds?

Michael Behe points out that the odds of linking up 100 hundred amino acids to create just one protein molecule by chance (and that's a long way from a living cell) would be the same as a blindfolded man finding one marked grain of sand somewhere in the vastness of the Sahara Desert— and doing it not just once, but three different times"? Yes, the creation of life on earth is not, in Crick's words, "almost a miracle"; it is a miracle that calls for the existence of a brilliant and powerful miracle worker! Today's scientific evidence still points to the truthfulness of the book of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (Genesis 1:1).

—Johnny Felker (www.truthchasers.com)

(Quotations from Lee Stobel's "The Case for Faith")