

On the First Life Starting Evolution from Chaos

2014 © *Cameron Rebigso*

Since its debut, Darwin's evolution has been incessantly cornered to confront with a challenging question: What had enabled the very first life to show up in nature? Retrospective scrutiny of parental line of living beings must make this question unavoidable. Before this first life appeared, any grouping of materials, simple or complicated, must be lifeless. To answer, all atheistic evolutionists ask people to abide to a faith that life could come to exist by itself and nature could just "breathe" life into some chunks of materials that were complicated enough. The orderly complexity of material combination could just upgrade by itself until life appeared at some point. However, to support this answer, so far, their only argument is "possibly this had happened... possibly that had happened..." As their arguments evolve, they gradually assign more and more inevitability to all these "possibly" but at the absolute independence of approval of any material evidence and nature's law.

Scientists, many of them are also Christians, have long pointed out one mathematical conclusion: with the chaotic distribution of substance found in the wild nature, to have random material particles join together to form highly orderly arrangement as shown by live organisms, the probability is extremely low. It is even easier to expect a brand new dictionary to be the aftermath of the bombardment of a junkyard. Unless planned effort interferes, no organization of material, while depending only on nature's random shuffling, can reach the complexity of arrangement as shown by live organisms, not even to mention how nature has activated the organized material combination with signs of life, such as self-replication, self-motivated consumption of material.

Any live organism can be considered a thermodynamic system. Except independent eggs that take nearly zero mass from the vicinity, most of these systems incessantly receive energy and mass from their external environment. While retaining part of the intake, a live organism also releases some back to the environment, although different content. Overall, the system must enjoy a positive net gain on the energy account to continue its live existence. Gaining energy, such living system is also found reducing the entropy introduced to it along with the mass intake. However, the net gain of energy and reduction of entropy in the same system must contradict the dictation of the second law of thermodynamics (simply called the second law from here on). Circumvention of the dictation is needed so that incoming entropy can be lowered at the presence of additional energy—uncontrollable increasing of entropy must lead to the destruction of the system. So far, no thermodynamic system in the wild nature except live organisms can be

found being able so circumventing. Other than live organisms, anything else that can circumvent the second law's dictation is unexceptionally found being a product of intelligence activity. Innumerable products of no exception together would naturally lead people to establish an induction that live organisms are also products of intelligent design. To argue against, one must answer: why are they not and how can they be not?

Evolutionists against the notion of intelligent design commonly regard the entire earth as one open system to support their argument, instead of regarding each live organism as an individual thermodynamic system. Relying on this preference of regard, they think they found sound reason to reject the argument from their opponents who insist that spontaneous upgrading of complexity of material arrangement in the wild nature must violate the second law. The second law, in the perception of the evolutionists, cannot constitute a reason in an open system to obstruct the happening of such spontaneous upgrading. They argue that certain local entropy of an open system can perfectly lower itself so long as the entropy of somewhere else in the same open system is correspondingly increased for a balance. However, they decline to answer what mechanism has caused the "local" entropy to get lowered and how the corresponding entropy be transferred. They even decline to answer why such local, whatever has been enveloping it, cannot be regarded as one thermodynamic system.

If nature functions as what their preference speculates, every day we must be able to discover in the wild nature the omnipresence of material conglomerations that can behave similar to manmade refrigerators. Such conglomerations can have function of putting its own entropy under control at the expense of certain foreign energy, meanwhile unable yet to self-replicate—self-replication is uniquely a necessary and sufficient sign of life for an organism. Possessing such behaviors, these conglomerations then necessarily occupy the ancestral stage before some future organism can show sign of life. Conversely speaking, the appearance of live organisms requires the preemptive appearance of such material conglomeration, which can consume material and energy but cannot yet reproduce. However, never any such material conglomeration has been found in the wild of the open system called earth.

In refuting the effect of intelligent design, the evolutionists even use circular logic. They say that it has been so natural for a huge cascade of lives to manage the energy from the sun without the concern that the second law should have adverse effect on spontaneous upgrading of orderly complexity of material combination. Thus, according to them, intelligent design has nothing to do with this cascade's appearance and continuous existence. No more plainly and literally, they just say that life's appearance is enabled by life, so is its continuity. Equivalently, this logic says that the appearance and sustenance of the refrigerators is enabled by the refrigerators, having nothing to do with intelligent design. No argument, cloaked as sophisticate academic idea conveying, can appear cruder and more irrational.

It is true that the second law of thermodynamics is quantitatively concluded with some hypothetical isolated system (not exactly closed system as what the evolutionists appear to refer to). However, the same law also allows the co-existence of a qualitative statement saying that heat energy cannot spontaneously transfer itself from a body of lower temperature to a body of higher temperature. The qualitative statement should be more universally and unconditionally applicable in open or closed system, while absolutely isolated system for the quantitative derivation does not exist. If the evolutionists refuse the second law to be applied in scrutinizing the thermodynamic process in non-isolated system, open or closed, they need to prove the following process being independent of the second law's governing: When a system's entropy is lowered as a result of heat being exported out of the system, separate amount of energy must be applied to realize the exportation, and such separate energy must also be isolated from the system. Following this, they must further prove the following is possible: in an open system, materials can spontaneously rally into some group that shows a state of lower entropy but either (1) without heat being generated, or (2) any heat thus generated can stay out of this group and will never reenter. But then they must answer how genuinely open is their open system: is the system including only the materials thus rally or also including the environment absorbing the heat thus released?

People disagreeing on evolution focus their debate on "The Origin of Species", not on the origin of the Earth. The evolutionists' asking people to examine the entire earth as one thermodynamic system obviously only want to divert the focus of discussion. More often than not, they put up something like Miller-Urey experiment as material evidence to support their argument how life initially appeared from a lifeless world. In their conjecture, Miller-Urey experiment is duplicating the chaotic condition of the initial earth. To make their argument hold in refuting intelligent design, they need to (1) explain why an experiment carries no character of intelligent design, (2) prove the condition duplicated by this experiment is indeed faithfully the genuine copy of the same condition of the earth in the remotely old time, (3) explain how the system confined by all the walls of experimental instruments is an open system as what they conceive with the earth. But can they put up any satisfactory answer to these questions?

There are two major mechanisms of life that no evolutionist is able to explain regardless of what known nature's law they would apply. (1) Given a material conglomeration that maximally resembles a live body in material arrangement, must this conglomeration be guaranteed to possess the functions of life? (2) Why must all lives die?

If "yes" is the answer for question (1), we would have no trouble for a corpse to have signs of life restored whenever someone so desires. However, in human's experience, at least in the atheistic evolutionists' experience, no fresh corpse, with its material combination yet highly accurately resembling to that of its previously active body, can ever have signs of life restored. Once the signs of life exit a body that has become a corpse, the signs are gone forever; only

decomposition mandated by nature's randomness awaits the future of this lifeless body. What would compel the evolutionists to believe that materials far more chaotically scattered in nature can have a better chance to establish life than a corpse?

The fact of question (2) annihilates the validity of evolution's absolute dogma "survival of the fittest", because no truly "fittest" can ever appear in nature. All lives must be destroyed in the barn of nature's randomness, sooner or later, one way or the other. Indeed, for example, so many young lives, which are supposed to possess more potential to thrive than some older ones, must die of being a victim of unpredictable attack from the nature, such as disease or infanticide, in even their mother's arms. The inability of rendering proper answers to these two questions by the evolutionists would give so much more room for intelligent design to stay put. An egg is a good example to illustrate the phenomenon involving these two questions together.

An egg is a good closed system, which hardly exchanges mass with the environment but, during incubation, does receive good amount of energy from its vicinity. While being intact, no one can guarantee if a new life would inevitably emerge from it. Even when everything else is the same, the presence or absence of a droplet of semen will lead to a life's thriving or perishing, two opposite worlds. (Sperm here serves as a key of life unlocking. How would a key not bear the finger print of design?) While an egg may stay inactive for a while but still bears life when not incubated, prolonging storage will eventually make it unable to hatch new life—nature's randomness must destroy its life mechanism, one way or the other. Nature's randomness, which never gives excuse to any life, has never showed people that it would lead a new life out of an egg without the interference exerted by other life. Any life out of an egg must be the consequence of some design, no matter how crude and primitive the design may be: A cuckoo strives to lay an egg in the nest of birds of other species; salmon fish and sea turtle must come back to the place of their "childhood" for their eggs to hatch, regardless of the hardship, an adult penguin must make certain its feet can separate the incubated egg from the frigid ground... Violating this, their eggs can only perish. The only other way to rescue is to wait for another design to step in—the modern artificial incubation. Eggs for other species of animals as well as plant seeds carry similar scenario although in much different environments. In short, absent of proper design can never bring in newer generation of life! The view that life can come to existence independent of design and desire is groundless.

There are some more questions that can challenge evolution's idea that life has come from nature's lifeless random environment. If life has established itself on lifeless materials, when the first sign of life showed up on earth, did it show up on only one single individual organism? Did it show up on one batch of multiple individual organisms of the same content? Did it show up on multiple individual organisms of different content? Did it show up on more than one batch but with a distribution spreading in different areas on earth? Wild speculation must arise in

answering these questions with “yes” or “no”, but they must all pivot the validity of evolution, and among these answers some can remove the validity of the others without mercy.

Aside from so many challenging questions concerning the emerging of the first life, the part of evolution concerning primatology and anthropology alone would be hungry enough to exhaust evolution’s answer. Here are a few of these questions.

1. One of the modern sciences that the evolutionists constantly refer to for their support is genetic study, mainly, DNA. They claim that life in higher form possesses more complicated DNA arrangement than life in lower form. It is so because only gene mutation makes it possible for more variety of gene samples to appear in nature’s selection. After the selection, those with more complicated genes survive the selection and thus stay as a higher form of life. (To avoid more complicated argument, at this point, we skip questioning them whether gene mutation in their concept covers only different arrangements of the same gene count or also covers gene addition/elimination.) It has also been commonly accepted by both people agreeing or disagreeing about evolution that *Homo sapiens* represent the highest form of life. If so, isn’t it reasonable for evolutionists’ gene mutation theory to predict that human beings have the most complicated genome among all animals? Surprisingly, we human beings even have one pair less chromosomes in our cells than that of chimpanzees’, which have 24. The evolutionists arbitrate the explanation on such retrogressing with a term called “fusion” but with proof skipped. If their idea “fusion” holds, what term will they use to explain the following finding on chromosome number (shown with haploid number)?

Green monkey, 60

Diana monkey, 60

Brown woolly monkey, 62

Capuchin monkey, 54

Owl monkey, 49 (male) and 50 (female)

In the chronology of evolution, life form development is moving from low to high as primates progress from (monkeys) to (arboreal apes) to (*Homo sapiens*). The complexity of DNA structure must escalate accordingly along this line if the evolutionists’ gene mutation assertion is correct. But the finding is that the chromosome number gradually lessened along this line. How would evolutionists extricate themselves from this theoretic disaster of devolution?

2. Evolutionists have long told people that our ancestors had dwelled in the tree canopies for a long evolution period before they came down to the flat land. Do the evolutionists have a clue about who had placed those ancestors in the treetops to begin their arboreal life and

from where? Or must the first cell leading to future primates and the first cell leading to future plants happen to have clung together inseparably in the long journey of evolution?

3. Evolutionists and those anthropologists taking the atheistic evolution view claim that primates were all originated from Africa, even fossil evidence has suggested monkeys appeared in Europe more than 20 million years ago. Have they found any evidence to support a speculation that no primate can originate from other continents, and that, once dwelling in other continents, any primate must be forbidden from migrating into Africa?
4. Similar to the above claim, the same groups of people claim that all modern men are the descendants of some African origin in this 50 or 100 thousand years. Again, material evidence from them is absolutely absent. Equally dramatic, without material evidence of any kind, they also assert that Caucasians' blue eyes are consequence of cultural selection of these seven or eight thousand years.

In arguments on both topics regarding the appearance of the first life and first human being, all the theory of evolution can show to people is its habit of hiding material evidence. This theory seems desperately destroying itself in many ways, in logic, in natural law application, and in presentation of material evidence. Up to the present time, this theory has been unable to present anything that can soundly remove the idea of intelligent design regarding the appearance of the first life and first *Homo Sapiens*. The most the evolutionists can do is to negate intelligent design as “unnecessary”, but cannot reject it. For a purpose of rejection, they have chosen to rely on another theory in natural science, called the Big Bang theory, which is a theory contriving to deny the existence of any creator that is of deity in nature. Unfortunately to them, the Big Bang theory contains abundant arguments as illogical as the evolution theory itself. Such illogical arguments are fully discussed in Rebigol's another article “*What Has Created the Big Bang?*” in the same website a reader found this article.

Unless a valid theory proving otherwise can be established, the following claim will stand firm: Natural selection is God's intelligent design in processing.