

Beginnings – ORIGIN *(Where did we come from?)*

- **Only Two Choices**
- **Realize the Significance**
- **Is it Faith or Science?**
 - LAB - Lookable, Accessible, Breakable
- **Guess at the Evidence**
- **Inspect the Evidence**
 - Universe = "Decay"
 - Age of the Earth = "Can't Say"
 - Origin of Life by Chance = "No Way"
 - Evolution of Species and Man = "Lacks Genes and Tweens"
- **No Compromise**

DON'T - Death, Orders of Creation, Names in genealogies, Ten Commandments refer to seven-day week

Intent of Life – LIFE *(Why are we here?)*

- **Love - GOD and MAN**
- **Increase - GROW**
- **Faithfulness - Time, Talent, Treasure**
- **Eternity – Past, Present, Future**

Authority – POWER *(Who's in charge?)* A God Who is:

- **Personal and Loving**
- **Omnipotent**
- **Wise and All-Knowing**
- **Everywhere and Eternal**
- **Righteous and Reliable**

Standards – RULES *(What are the rules?)* God's rules are:

- **Revealed supernaturally, not derived by reason**
- **Universal and apply to everyone, everywhere, all the time**
- **Loving**
- **Enforced**
- **Steadfast**

Life from non-living matter

This is a critical question. Where did life come from? Some evolutionists will argue that this is not part of the theory of evolution, but I think that evolution at least strongly implies that there is a natural explanation for the origin of life. Here are the expectations:

Creationist Expectation	Evolutionist Expectation
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Life was supernaturally created by God2. Life comes only from other life and cannot spontaneously spring into being from non-living materials	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Life was created by an accident of nature2. Life originally came from non-living matter and under the right conditions could be formed from non-living matter today

Evidence

After massive efforts in scientific research there is still no known natural explanation for the formation of life. I'll leave the details to folks like Answers In Genesis and other creation scientists and organizations, but I'll give a few examples (you can skip to the last one if you're in a hurry):

- All observations about living creatures support the idea that **life only comes from other life**. No one has ever observed life coming into existence from non-living matter.
- **Science has not succeeded in creating life from non-living matter *even under unnatural conditions***. Many years, dollars, and brilliant minds have been expended in this pursuit under the most ideal laboratory conditions, but these efforts have all failed. The ones still currently mentioned in textbooks (such as the Stanley Miller experiment to create amino acids in 1953) are no longer considered viable explanations by scientists, but no one has removed them from public "references".
- *(Warning – this is a little technical)*

The formation of a living system from non-living matter is statistically in the realm of "impossible". Life is incredibly complex. The following steps would be necessary for the chemical production of a first living cell:

- a. Random atoms must be formed into amino acids
- b. These amino acids must link together to form chains (polypeptides)
- c. These chains must become long (hundreds of amino acids) and they must form in an ordered sequence, since there are 20 kinds of amino acids. This produces a simple protein molecule.
- d. More complex proteins must be produced.
- e. Very long and highly ordered molecular chains known as DNA must be formed and maintained

- f. An enormously complex chemical factory must be produced, complete with special protein formations, enzymes, DNA, RNA, ribosomes, a cell wall, etc. This single cell must be able to reproduce itself and carry on all the functions of life.

To examine the odds that these steps occurred let's generously assume an ideal environment with amino acids already formed, catalysts, and the right temperature and moisture:

- Walter Bradley, PhD, materials science, and Charles Thaxton, PhD, chemistry, calculated that the probability of amino acids forming into a protein is: 4.9×10^{-191} . This is well beyond the laws of probability (1×10^{-50}), and a protein is not even close to becoming a complete living cell.
- All living proteins are built of amino acids that are exclusively "left-handed" in their molecular orientation. The chances of forming left or right handed amino acids are about the same, so the odds that a chain of 400 left-handed-only amino acids would form is the same as the odds of flipping a coin and getting tails 400 times in a row. This is a probability of 1 in 10 to the 120th power (a 10 followed by 120 zeroes). This would form **one** protein molecule, and hundreds of such molecules would be needed in the first living system.
- The amino acids in the above example must be linked in a meaningful sequence. There are 20 kinds of amino acids and they must be linked in particular sequences.
- A cell contains a chain of about three billion pairs of molecules, and the sequence of these molecules is crucial. The odds of this happening by chance are essentially zero.
- It is estimated that the amount of time required to form even one gene by chance might be compared to the amount of time it would take to wear away a stone the size of the solar system if one atom was removed every billion years!

Sir Fred Hoyle, PhD, astronomy, and Chandra Wickramasinghe, professor of applied math and astronomy, calculated that the odds of amino acids forming together in the proper sequence for life was 1 in 10 to the 40,000th power. All of these statistics point to a probability of zero.

If this is not enough, there is also the fact that every chemical reaction along the way is reversible. A molecule that came together by chance is unstable and could easily break back down.

- If the above examples were a little complicated, this last one is pretty simple. **One of the best evidences that there is no viable natural explanation for the origin of life is the testimony of the evolutionists themselves.** When some of the most well-known evolutionists such as Richard Dawkins and Isaac Asimov state that perhaps life was brought to earth from other planets, you know they recognize the lack of any natural explanation. They are grasping at any straw that allows them to deny that life requires a supernatural Creator.

What Does the Evidence Indicate?

As far as the development of life from non-living matter, the answer from the evidence is very clear:
“NO WAY”.

Creationist Interpretation

A creationist would say that all of this is simply proof that God created life by purposeful design. We cannot even come up with another feasible theory, so certainly there is nothing "blind" about having faith in the Bible's account of the origin of life.

Evolutionist Interpretation

Evolutionary scientists have clearly taken a leap of faith when they assert that life began from non-living chemicals. The origin of the first life form is just assumed to be an accident of nature because the most obvious alternative explanation is God. Evolutionists find it easier to accept the miracle of a statistically impossible event than to accept a miracle from God.