

Sinister Spirit

Tracing the Spirit of Antichrist Through Current Events

By Timothy Zebell

Appendix D.1

Micro-Organisms and the Quest to Create Life in the Laboratory

The following is from Evolution on Trial with Evolutionists At the Witness Stand by Thomas Kindell.

(Kindell, Thomas. Evolution on Trial with Evolutionists at the Witness Stand. Gold Hill, 1996.)

The thoroughgoing evolutionist's position on the origin of life is aptly expressed in the following quote from the public high school biology textbook:

Living creatures on earth are a direct product of the earth. There is every reason to believe that living beings owe their origin entirely to certain physical and chemical properties of the ancient earth. Nothing supernatural appeared to be involved – only time and natural physical and chemical laws operating within the peculiarly suitable earthly environment. Given such an environment, life probably had to happen.¹

The previous quote is all too typical of the “matter of fact” presentation of evolution which is craftily prepared to infiltrate the unsuspecting and often gullible minds of our public school students. However, evolutionists who are experts in this field know full well that the evolutionary origin of life scenario is plagued at every step by horrendous problems—problems so glaringly serious that they should not, and indeed cannot, be glibly ignored the way they so often are in public school textbooks.

THE ASSUMED EARLY ATMOSPHERE

The nature of the primordial atmosphere poses the first of many lethal problems for an evolutionary origin of life. For example, if the primitive earth atmosphere contained a significant amount of free oxygen (as it

does today) an evolutionary origin of life would have been impossible because all substances would have been oxidized to carbon dioxide, water, nitrogen, and other oxidized products. Thus, no amino acids, sugars, pyrimidines or purines could exist to serve as the building blocks for biochemical evolution. Evolutionists are thus forced to assume that the primitive atmosphere was a reducing atmosphere (an atmosphere devoid of free oxygen) which contained methane, ammonia, nitrogen, hydrogen, and water vapor. Evolutionists Harold Urey and Stanley Miller, among others, have presented a paper giving arguments in support of such an atmosphere, but their arguments are replete with so many assumptions that they could have condensed their paper into one sentence: “We assume the primitive earth atmosphere consisted chiefly of methane, ammonia, nitrogen, hydrogen and water vapor.”

Evolutionist Richard E. Dickerson in his *Scientific American* article describes the critical importance of the assumed early oxygen-free atmosphere:

Assuming that terrestrial life did evolve on the earth, what was the planet like when the process began? One thing is certain: the atmosphere contained little or no free oxygen and hence was not strongly oxidizing as it is today. The organic matter that must accumulate as the raw materials from which life could evolve is not stable in an oxidizing atmosphere. One tends to forget that oxygen is a dangerously corrosive and poisonous gas, from which human beings and other organisms are protected by elaborate chemical and physical mechanisms.

...

J.B.S. Haldane, the British biochemist, seems to have been the first to appreciate that a reducing atmosphere, one with no free oxygen, was a requirement for the evolution of life from nonliving organic matter. Without oxygen in the atmosphere there would have been no high-altitude ozone to block most of the ultraviolet radiation from the sun as there is today. The unblocked ultraviolet radiation reaching the surface of the planet could have then provided the energy for the synthesis of a great many organic compounds from molecules such as water, carbon dioxide and ammonia. Without free oxygen in the atmosphere to destroy them again such compounds would have accumulated in the oceans until, in Haldane's words, “the primitive oceans reached the consistency of hot dilute soup.”²

There are, however, a number of authorities who, although they are evolutionists, have pointed out serious contradictions to the assumption of a methane-ammonia atmosphere, the very atmosphere which has been most commonly used for origin of life experiments. For example, P. H. Abelson has pointed out that there is no geochemical evidence that the primitive atmosphere ever contained methane and even if it did, it would have been rapidly converted to higher molecular weight hydrocarbons (i.e. a worthless oil slick) by reaction with ultraviolet light.³ Stanley Miller's response to this difficulty is both stunningly honest and gravely profound:

If it is assumed that amino acids more complex than glycine were required for the origin of life, then these results indicate a need for methane in the atmosphere.⁴

Since glycine is the simplest of the 20 alpha amino acids used in living organisms, Miller is clearly confessing that methane would absolutely *have to be present* in the early atmosphere or the vast majority of biological amino acids could not be produced naturalistically.

Another grave problem is that the breakdown of ammonia to nitrogen and hydrogen by ultraviolet light would have rapidly reduced ammonia to a negligible concentration.⁵ Thus, numerous evolutionist authorities have been forced to conclude that atmospheric ammonia would have been far less than that employed in origin of life experiments. In fact, a growing consensus has developed since the later 1970's that the early earth's atmosphere never contained significant amounts of methane, ammonia or hydrogen.⁶ Instead, a combination of nitrogen, carbon dioxide and water vapor is recognized today as the most likely composition of the early earth's atmosphere. However, as expected in this regard, Stanley Miller's prediction that this kind of methane-free atmosphere would never work has been dramatically confirmed by using such an atmosphere in numerous experiments.⁷

C. F. Davidson, an evolutionist geologist, has argued against a reducing atmosphere at any time during the earth's history. In his contribution to the National Academy of Science symposium on the evolution of the earth's atmosphere, Davidson stated his conviction that there is no legitimate geological evidence that the primitive atmosphere ever differed greatly from that of the present.⁸

Evolutionist John C. Walton has pointed out that vast quantities of magnetite and hematite are present in Precambrian rock formations, and the formation of these mineral would **require** an enormous quantity of oxygen. Walton therefore contends that the evidence indicates that oxygen has always been a prominent constituent of the earth's atmosphere.⁹

Writing in *The Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*, Erich Dimroth and Michael Kimberly said:

The sedimentary distribution of carbon, sulfur, uranium and ferric and ferrous iron depend greatly upon ambient pressure and should reflect any major change in the proportion of oxygen in the atmosphere or hydrosphere. The similar distributions of these elements in sedimentary rocks of all ages are here interpreted to indicate the existence of a Precambrian atmosphere containing much oxygen...we find no evidence...that an oxygen free atmosphere has existed at any time during the span of geological history recorded in well preserved sedimentary rocks.¹⁰

Even if the earth did begin with an oxygen free atmosphere (which is contradicted by the geologic data) there is strong evidence that photolysis of water vapor (breakdown of water vapor by ultraviolet light) would

have produced a significant quantity of free oxygen **very early** in earth history, long before life is supposed to have evolved. R. T. Brinkman has pointed out what he believes are errors in the earlier calculations of Berkner and Marshall¹¹ which indicated that no significant amount of oxygen would be produced by photolysis until relatively late in earth history. Brinkman maintains instead that a correct interpretation of laboratory data on ultraviolet absorption by oxygen indicates that photolysis would have produced as much as 25% of the present atmospheric oxygen content very early in earth history.

Brinkman's mechanism is supported by photographs, taken from the moon of the earth's geocorona, which show substantial amounts of hydrogen exiting the earth's atmosphere. When water vapor is broken down into hydrogen and oxygen by ultraviolet light, the hydrogen escapes into space, but oxygen is too heavy to escape the earth's gravitational field. The end result is a steady production of free oxygen. If the observations of Davidson, Walton, Dimroth, Kimberly, and Brinkman are correct we must stop here, for if the early atmosphere was oxidizing an evolutionary origin of life is absolutely precluded.

Most evolutionists ignore the abundant evidence for an early oxidizing atmosphere and **assume** the early atmosphere was reducing simply because an oxygen free atmosphere is an absolute **necessity** for an evolutionary origin of life. However, by conveniently ignoring the evidence and assuming the existence of an oxygen free early atmosphere, the evolutionists immediately catapult themselves into another problem which is every bit as lethal as the original problem they were trying to evade. This new atmosphere could have no ozone layer and therefore could not provide the earth with an effective shield from solar ultraviolet light. Full strength ultraviolet light would kill any living organism it came in contact with. It would also destroy all the simple organic compounds which are needed for the origin of life as decisively as the presence of oxygen would have. Thus, evolutionists are here caught between the horns of a terrible dilemma. They cannot have the evolutionary origin of life in an atmosphere with oxygen but neither can they have it in an atmosphere without oxygen because that would allow the devastating influx of full intensity ultraviolet light.

EXPERIMENTS PRODUCING SIMPLE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

The ultraviolet/oxygen dilemma is rarely (if ever) adequately discussed in public school textbooks. As with many other lethal problems, this inescapable dilemma is largely ignored. Evolutionists instead point with pride to origin of life experiments such as those which were first performed by Stanley Miller in 1953. Miller's experiment involved circulating a mixture of methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water vapor through an apparatus containing an electrical discharge chamber. Products synthesized by the electrical discharge were collected in a cold trap. Miller analyzed the aqueous solution in the trap and found that it contained several biological amino acids as well as a number of amines, acids and nonbiological amino acids.

Since Miller's experiment, other origin of life chemists have produced a variety of biological compounds under a variety of conditions and using various gases. Evolutionists have, in general, gleefully embraced these

results uncritically, hailing them as providing definite proof that naturalistic processes would have provided the prebiotic “soup” necessary for the origin of life. Some newspaper articles have glamorized these results with sensationalized headlines claiming, “Scientists Create Life in a Test Tube!” Such exaggerated claims may help sell newspapers but in reality they are pure poppycock. Unfortunately, such headlines have succeeded in deceiving surprisingly large portions of the public.

The first thing I must point out is that these results are achieved only because a very artificial mechanism is used which would not have existed on the primitive earth. In all origin of life experiments in which significant quantities of biological compounds have been produced, a trap or some means was used to isolate the product from the raw energy source used for the synthesis. In Miller’s experiment, for example, products synthesized by the electrical discharge were immediately sucked into the trap and isolated so they were no longer exposed to the energy source. Without this quick isolation feature no detectable product would ever have been produced.

Any raw energy source, in the above case the heat and radiant energy produced by the electrical discharge, is far more efficient in the destruction of the biochemical compounds than in their production. Furthermore, the main source of raw energy on the primitive earth would have been solar radiation. The amount of radiation available from the sun at the wave lengths at which these gasses absorb, and therefore available for synthesis, is far less than one-thousandth of the light absorbed by the compounds, and thus available for destruction. The overall result is that destruction is at least **10,000** times more effective than production.

These compounds would have been produced primarily in the upper atmosphere and based on fallout data the time required for them to filter down to the ocean would have been several years.¹² During that time these compounds would have been subjected to the destructive effects of ultraviolet light, cosmic rays, and electrical discharges. Obviously, there were no organic chemists on the primitive earth to trap out and isolate these compounds. Virtually none of the products therefore would have reached the surface of the earth.

Concerning the effect of ultraviolet light, Stanley Miller himself admitted:

Most of the photochemical reactions at these low wavelengths would have taken place in the upper atmosphere. The compounds so formed would have absorbed at longer wavelengths and therefore might have been decomposed by this ultraviolet light before reaching the oceans.¹³

Prominent evolutionist A. I. Oparin conceded:

The significant accumulation of organic substances, sometimes rather complicated one, in such experiments is related to their removal from the sphere of action of the energy source which caused their formation....For instance, in Miller’s experiments, amino acids which have been formed in an

electric discharge, have rapidly moved from the site of their formation and accumulated in an adjoining vessel.¹⁴

Evolutionist D. E. Hull in his critique of the Miller type experiments said:

They have merely used the well-known principle of increasing the yield of a reaction by selectively removing the product from the reaction mixture. The mere fact that a chemist can carry out an organic synthesis in the laboratory does not prove that the same synthesis will occur in the atmosphere or open sea without the chemist.¹⁵

Any minute traces of organic compounds that might have reached the oceans would find no haven of safety there because thermodynamic, kinetic and hydrolytic reactions in the water would cause rates of destruction that would far exceed the rates at which these compounds could have become involved in further synthesis.

The accumulation of adequate quantities of even these simple organic compounds appears to be definitely precluded, then, by the fact that their rates of destruction in the atmosphere and in the ocean would have far exceeded the rates at which they could have accumulated by synthesis.

Concerning this problem the very distinguished evolutionist, A. I. Oparin, confessed:

Numerous calculations of a thermodynamic equilibrium, which would occur when the organic substances dissolved in the primordial hydrosphere, were irradiated with ultraviolet or were provided with some other energy sources, show that no primeval broth could exist there, since under ultraviolet light, decomposition processes prevail over synthetic ones.¹⁶

In this regard I remember well an occasion when I was lecturing on this very subject in a public high school biology class. When I brought up the ultraviolet-oxygen dilemma, the science teacher strongly objected, asserting that heavy cloud-cover shielded early earth environment from ultraviolet light. Beneath this cloud-cover constant lightning discharges provided ample energy for synthesis of the required organic compounds. This idea may sound reasonable but it is based on a misunderstanding concerning the penetration of ultraviolet light through water. Without the effect shield of an ozone blanket, ultraviolet light would easily penetrate not only through the thickest possible cloud cover, but even through 19 meters of the surface of the ocean.¹⁷ Studies have proven that current in both lakes and oceans eventually bring even the deepest water to the surface where any organic compounds would then be destroyed but ultraviolet light. Furthermore, the relatively mild electrical discharges in Miller-type experiments do not reasonably emulate genuine lightning which is known to involve extremely destructive temperatures as high as 50,000 degrees Fahrenheit.

In this regard *Science News* reported that the scientist, Arrhenius,

...contends that if actual lightning struck rather than the fairly mild discharges used by Miller, any organics that happened to be present could not have survived.¹⁸

In his article, "Limitations on Prebiological Synthesis," biochemist H. R. Hulett, after carefully and thoroughly considering all facets of the problem said, "It is in fact hard to reconcile the thermodynamic and kinetic characteristics of these compounds with the postulated pathways for chemical evolution, in the primitive environment."¹⁹

Evolutionists still believe, nonetheless, that life must have evolved at least once, because life does, in fact, exist and to staunch evolutionists who have closed their minds to the possibility of creation, the fact that life exists is proof enough that it must have evolved, regardless of how many lethal problems are associated with the evolutionary theory.

In his article, "Thermodynamics and Kinetics of Spontaneous Generation," physical chemist (and evolutionist) D. E. Hull calculated that only infinitesimally small quantities of these simple chemical compounds could have accumulated in the primitive ocean. His calculations showed, for example, that the simplest biological amino acid, glycine, would have had an equilibrium concentration as low as 1 in 10 to the 12th power molar, which is negligible, and that glucose, a six carbon sugar, would have had a concentration of 1 in 10 to the 134th power molar. This represents such an infinitesimally minute trace that even if the primitive ocean were huge enough to cover the surface of every planet and star in the entire universe to a depth of ten miles, even then the odds would still be essentially nil that you could find even one molecule of glucose in that colossal ocean.

Although an evolutionist, when faced with these fact, D. E. Hull wrote:

The conclusion from these arguments presents the most serious obstacle, if indeed it is not fatal, to the theory of spontaneous generation. First, thermodynamic calculations predict vanishingly small concentrations of even the simplest organic compounds. Secondly, the reactions that are invoked to synthesize such compounds are seen to be much more effective in decomposing them.

The physical chemist, guided by the proved principles of chemical thermodynamics and kinetics, cannot offer any encouragement to the biochemist who needs an ocean full of organic compounds to form even lifeless coacervates.²⁰

Other evolutionists have likewise gone on record agreeing that the amount of organic compounds that could reasonably be expected to accumulate in the primitive ocean would be far less than the minimum amount required for a naturalistic origin of life.

SUMMARY OF MILLER'S FIVE-FOLD FAILURE

The experiment of Stanley Miller and other similar experiments continue to be cited as “impressive” evidence which supposedly forces us to concede that the needed “primordial organic soup” was easily produced by purely naturalistic processes. In reality all such experiments fail abysmally for the following five reasons:

1. ALL SUCH EXPERIMENTS UTILIZED AN UNREALISTIC ATMOSPHERE

As seen before, it is now acknowledged by evolutionist authorities that two crucial gases, methane and ammonia, would not have existed on the early earth in any significant amounts. Furthermore, geologic data indicates that oxygen has always been a prominent component of our atmosphere and photolysis by ultraviolet light would produce it in relatively short order even if it were not present originally.

2. MILLER-TYPE EXPERIMENTS EMPLOY ENTIRELY UNREALISTIC LEVELS OF ULTRAVIOLET AND ELECTRICAL ENERGY

The mild electrical discharges used in Miller type experiments are *much* less destructive than the 50,000 degree Fahrenheit lightning they supposedly simulate. Furthermore, such experiments use only the mild frequencies of ultraviolet light deliberately excluding the known levels of destructive frequencies which would have been present on the early earth. This single fact alone renders *all* origin of life experiments unrealistic. Such deliberate exclusion of known conditions would never be tolerated in any other field of experimental science – yet it is condoned here because it is well known that under realistic levels of ultraviolet light all such experiments would fail miserably.

3. MILLER-TYPE EXPERIMENTS USE A TRAP OR SOME MEANS TO QUICKLY ISOLATE SYNTHESIZED COMPOUNDS FROM THE ENERGY SOURCE

The procedure of rapidly removing products to a protective trap is unrealistic. This is done, of course, because even the mild energy sources used in such experiments are still far more destructive than constructive. Without this artificial “trapping out” procedure no significant quantity of product would be produced by such experiments.

4. EVEN IF QUICK ISOLATION INTO A TRAP WERE POSSIBLE, IT WOULD BE SELF-DEFEATING

Isolation to a trap prevents degradation by raw energy. However, energy is also *required* to cause the compounds to build up into greater complexity. Thus, ironically, trapping out compounds may spare them from destruction by the energy source, but it likewise roadblocks further progress since shielding out the energy also denies access to energy which is needed to cause further build-up of complexity. In water such isolated and energy-deprived products would rapidly hydrolyze (disintegrate by reaction with water) in accordance with the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

5. MILLER-TYPE EXPERIMENTS PRODUCE AN ABUNDANCE OF NONBIOLOGICAL AND DESTRUCTIVE COMPOUNDS

Even if we ignore all the previously cited artificial conditions which are used to guarantee production of some simple organic compounds, the problem remains that never have *all* of the needed compounds been produced and such experiments never produce *only* the desired organic compounds. They also always produce a majority of non-biological and lethal compounds which would disastrously interfere with the needed chemical pathways required for a naturalistic origin of the first cell.

Stanley Miller has had several decades of study and experimentation to help him rethink his initial glowing optimism about the significance of his famous experiment. In light of the facts, it is no wonder that he was quoted in *Scientific American* as saying, “The problem of the origin of life has turned out to be much more difficult than I, and most other people envisioned.”²¹

SUICIDE SOUP – A RECIPE FOR CHEMICAL CATASTROPHE

Even if we ignore the previously discussed problems and assume that the primitive ocean managed to become richly filled with only the correct organic compounds, even then lethal problems would still manifest themselves. Despite such facts, many evolutionists seem to be captivated by the delusion that if only the ocean (or even a lake or pool) were to be filled with the appropriate “building block” molecules of life, natural laws would take over and spontaneous chemical reactions would inevitably produce the first living cell. Such naïve day-dreaming ignores the well established scientific facts of chemistry which dictate that even the correct “building block” molecules will automatically react in destructive ways – thereby annihilating any possibility of a spontaneous origin of life. Of course, within the living cell these chemical compounds are carefully controlled and regulated to help prevent such destructive reactions. However, before the cell existed neither would any complex chemical control mechanisms exist. Without such controls the soup would have to react according to natural chemical laws – inescapably assuring self-destruction rather than cellular evolution.

STOP IN THE NAME OF THE LAW!

Again the evolutionist's constant appeal to the law (or laws) of nature as the driving force of prebiotic evolution is bewildering and fatally ironic. If the evolutionists really listened to the message given by proven natural laws they would immediately, "Stop in the name of the law!" – for they would realize that natural chemical laws and processes decisively prohibit rather than promote the possibility of correct bio-molecular evolution.

One of the most obvious laws of chemical reactions is that bases and acids react in a dramatic way. If you have ever used soda (a base) to clean acid from an automobile battery (or mixed soda and vinegar together) you are familiar with the violent "fizz and foam" reaction of acids and bases. Since bases and acids react so readily, and since DNA and proteins are composed of bases and acids the common chemical law of base-acid reactions must be one of the central driving forces that caused DNA and protein to have evolved into the first living cell – right? Dead wrong!

The problem is that violent base-acid reactions would "scramble up" DNA and protein units into all sorts of non-biological and lethal combinations.²² In fact, the cell must constantly employ complex control and repair mechanisms to prevent, or at least repair, the damage done by this most "natural" of all chemical reactions. Clearly, before the cell existed there would be no way to arrest or repair the lethal chemistry produced by base-acid reactions.

DOUBLE-CROSSED BY CROSS-REACTIONS

Once again evolutionists find themselves "double-crossed" by the natural chemical laws that they have placed their faith in.

DNA and RNA (partially composed of sugars) and proteins (composed of amino acids) cooperate quite beautifully – but only within the elaborately controlled arena of the living cell! In the primitive ocean, on the other hand, their sub-units (sugars and amino acids) would destroy each other through natural cross-reactions. This means that sugars and amino acids spontaneously cross-react (combine) to form insoluble, non-biological compounds which can no longer perform the functions of sugars or amino acids. Thus, by natural chemical law they annihilate each other. In this regard evolutionist P. H. Ableson admits:

In addition, carbohydrates such as glucose combine readily with amino acids to form non-biological products. This reaction proceeds at room temperature, and even at 0 degrees C there is a noticeable reaction in a week. At Ph 8-9, amino acids and free carbohydrates are simply incompatible...Thus it is unlikely that the primitive ocean ever contained more than traces of free glucose, free ribose, or deoxyribose,...[T]here are serious chemical incompatibilities among the constituents of living matter, and some of the components of the soup would react to form non-biological substances.²³

Prominent evolutionists Nissenbaum and Oro conclude:

We suggest that a similar set of reactions between abiotically formed amino acids and sugars, and more generally between aldehydes and amines occurred on a large scale in the prebiotic hydrosphere. The rapid formation of this insoluble polymeric material would have removed the bulk of the dissolved organic carbon from the primitive oceans and would thus have prevented the formation of an “organic soup.”²⁴

SCUTTLED BY SCAVENGERS

Many evolutionists speculate that the organic compounds in the “prebiotic soup” could remain for long periods of time unmolested by scavengers since living microbes would not be around to “eat the soup” until ages later. What many evolutionists fail to realize however, is that non-biological natural processes would effectively scavenge the “soup” anyhow. As evolutionist Nissenbaum attests:

The existence of hot or cold “nutrient broth” or “primeval soup” is challenged on the basis of the recent geochemistry of soluble organic carbon in the oceans. Most of the dissolved organic carbon is recycled quickly by organisms. But the residual, biologically retractive, organic matter is efficiently scavenged from the oceans (residence time of **1000 to 3500** years) by non-biologically mediated chemical and physical processes, such as adsorption on sinking minerals, polymerization and aggregation to humic type polymers or by aggregation to particulate matter through bubbling and sinking of this material to the ocean bottom. Since there is no reason to believe that such non-biological scavenging was not operative in the prebiotic oceans as well, then the prolonged existence of organic soup is very doubtful...²⁵

WATER – CRADLE OF LIFE? ... OR ELIXIR OF DEATH?

Even something as necessary and seemingly benign as ordinary water induces chemical disaster for the theory of organic molecular evolution.

All organic compounds degrade spontaneously in accordance with the Second Law of Thermodynamics. However, if you want to greatly accelerate this natural disintegration process, just put the organic compound in water! Numerous evolutionist authorities have conceded that the natural chemical law of hydrolysis (destruction by interaction with water molecules) will guarantee relatively rapid decomposition. Again, of course, within living cells the hydrolytic effect of water is carefully controlled and regulated. However, in the open sea before life existed no complex chemical control mechanisms would exist to inhibit or repair the

devastating effects of hydrolysis! Thus, evolutionary origin-of-life theories find themselves abruptly “buried at sea” for the well proven law of hydrolysis has inescapably sentenced them to an early watery grave.

Evolutionist P. H. Abelson concludes:

At least five major factors limit the kinds of compounds that might have accumulated in the primitive ocean. First, there are limitations of what can be made by inorganic means; second, all organic matter degrades spontaneously with time; third, some substances are readily destroyed by [ultraviolet] radiation; fourth, many compounds would have been removed from the ocean by precipitation or adsorption; fifth, there are serious chemical incompatibilities among the constituents of living matter, and some of the components of the soup would react to form non-biologic substances. In view of these limitations, one is challenged to seek a series of steps toward life that are compatible with the environment.²⁶

This challenge has remained unmet despite decades of intense experimentation!

Considering all the aforementioned lethal roadblocks, it is little wonder that evolutionists Nissenbaum, Kenyon and Oro have admitted:

It is difficult to see how, under such conditions, the “primordial soup” could have existed at all.

...[I]t is now generally accepted that the concentration of the “soup” was probably too small for efficient synthesis, particularly of bio-polymers.²⁷

NO SOUP – BUT PLENTY OF FOOD FOR THOUGHT

From Darwin’s time to the present, evolutionists have speculated about an early organic “soup” which provided the necessary medium for the spontaneous origin of the first living cell. Darwin spoke of this “prebiotic soup” as a “warm little pond”:

But if (and oh! What a big if!) we could conceive in some warm little pond, with all sorts of ammonia and phosphoric salts, light, heat, electricity etc., present, that a protein compound was chemically formed ready to undergo still more complex changes...²⁸

Today the idea of a “primordial oceanic soup” is often discussed as if it were a proven fact. Yet, as we have seen, the real facts speak forcefully that no such “soup” ever could or did exist.

We have already examined the evidence that ultraviolet light and counter-productive chemical reactions would prohibit the formation of such a “soup” in the primitive ocean. However, the real “clincher” is the blatant lack of physical geologic evidence which should be observable if such a soup ever existed. As non-creationist molecular biologist, Michael Denton attests:

The Existence of a prebiotic soup is crucial to the whole scheme. Without an abiotic accumulation of the building blocks of the cell no life could ever evolve. If the traditional story is true, therefore, there must have existed for many millions of years a rich mixture of organic compounds in the ancient oceans and some of this material would very likely have been trapped in the sedimentary rocks lain down in the seas of those remote times.

Yet rocks of great antiquity have been examined over the past two decades and in none of them has any trace of abiotically produced organic compounds been found....As on so many occasions, paleontology has again failed to substantiate evolutionary presumptions. Considering the way the prebiotic soup is referred to in so many discussions of the origin of life as an already established reality, it comes as something of a shock to realize that there is absolutely no positive evidence for its existence.²⁹

Likewise evolutionists Brooks and Shaw conclude:

If ever was a primitive soup, then we would expect to find at least somewhere on this planet either massive sediments containing enormous amounts of the various nitrogenous organic compounds, amino acids purines, pyrimidines, and the like, or alternatively in much metamorphosed sediments we should find vast amounts of nitrogenous cokes (graphite-like nitrogen-containing materials). In fact, no such materials have been found anywhere on earth....There is, in other words, pretty good negative evidence that there ever was a primitive organic soup on this planet that could have lasted but a brief moment.³⁰

Dose, a notable evolutionist, likewise points out that there is no geological evidence of the “evaporating pools” postulated by some evolutionists.³¹

Because of the intractable problems already discussed, Shapiro, Sillen and other prominent evolutionists now have openly proclaimed “the myth of the prebiotic soup”.³²

If the much-touted “pre-biotic soup” is a fantasy, and the evidence argues that it is, then the evolutionary origin of the first living cell must also be a fantasy. Accordingly, this lack of soup provides us with serious food for thought, indeed!