

# Evolution Cannot Explain Biogenesis

---

John Baumgardner

9 May 1997

*The Los Alamos Monitor*

[globalflood.org/origins-debate.html](http://globalflood.org/origins-debate.html)

Editor:

Headline: "New Mexicans for Science and Reason Become Creationists". I admit such news is outrageously premature. Nevertheless, I was pleasantly surprised to find two members of this militantly anti-creationist organization, David Thomas and Marvin Mueller, admit in recent Monitor letters that evolutionists have no explanation for biogenesis. Mueller (4/18/97) wistfully reflects, "the complexity is so great that achieving a theory compelling enough to exclude other possibilities reasonably could well lie a century or more in the future." Thomas (4/9/97) states, "while traditional evolution (origin of species) is thoroughly documented, the origin of the first self-reproducing snippets of life is not." Although evolutionists themselves dispute the first part of Thomas' claim, I find such candid statements concerning the biogenesis issue by some of the most ardent members of NMSR a truly amazing turn of events.

Despite such admissions, however, there seems to be considerable ongoing confusion concerning how the first living organisms might have arisen. In attacking my 4/3/97 probability arguments, Thomas states, "But no biologist contends that life comes about from a big bowl of amino acids, which suddenly goes POOF! and generates detailed genes or proteins." While it is true that no competent biologist or biochemist would make such a foolish claim, this indeed is the impression given in public school textbooks and in the popular media, typically in the guise of the notion of a 'primordial soup' or of Darwin's 'small warm pond' or in connection with Stanley Miller's 1953 experiment of passing 50,000 volt sparks through a mixture of gases to yield some amino acids in the water at the bottom of his apparatus.

If life did not come about in such a fashion, just how does Mr. Thomas conceive it could happen? If there is more than random interactions of the chemical constituents, just what extra is involved? From the tone of his letter, one could assume he has an answer. I respectfully call his bluff. Mr. Thomas has not a clue how it might have happened by naturalistic means, and he should be forthright enough to say so.

Thomas quickly proceeds to confuse the biogenesis question with the issue of how new species arise, which he claims is "thoroughly documented." But if this is so, why does Lynn Margulis, a Distinguished University Professor of Biology at the University of Massachusetts and highly respected for her ideas on the origin of mitochondria, regularly ask her scientific audiences to give a single, unambiguous example of the formation of a new species by the accumulation of mutations, and her challenge is met with utter silence?!

If macroevolution really happens, just how does the innovation occur? What is the genetic mechanism that adds new genes to transform, say, a mycoplasma with 500 genes into a mammal with some 100,000 genes? If Mr. Thomas were honest about this question, he would also admit he has not a clue. The required mechanism must generate immense coded language structures. There is no hint in the laws of chemistry and physics of any natural process capable of such feats.

I repeat what I have said on previous occasions that molecules-to-man evolution, as routinely presented in the popular media and in our public school classrooms, is intellectual fraud. The persistent inability of the ardent advocates of evolution in the pages of the Monitor to present any plausible naturalistic scenario for biogenesis or macroevolution or the origin of genetic information or account for the glaring lack of Darwinian intermediates in the fossil record should serve dramatically to underscore this reality. Yet the recent letters offer a bit of encouragement that science and reason may ultimately prevail after all.

John Baumgardner