

Meteorite Life Form not Alien!

By Babu G. Ranganathan

10.03.2011

http://english.pravda.ru/science/earth/10-03-2011/117140-meteorite_life_form-0/



NASA will do anything for money. Recently NASA [actually Dr. Richard Hoover from NASA] claimed aliens exist and that there is now proof from a meteorite containing fossils of bacteria.

NASA claims that

meteors and meteorites originated from other planets. Why couldn't they have originated from Earth?

In the Earth's past there was powerful volcanic activity which could have easily spewed dirt and rocks containing microbes into outer space which not only could have eventually reached Mars but also ended up traveling in orbit through space that we now know as meteors.. A *Newsweek* article of September 21, 1998, p.12 mentions exactly this possibility. "We think there's about 7 million tons of earth soil sitting on Mars", says scientist and evolutionist Kenneth Nealson. "You have to consider the possibility that if we find life on Mars, it could have come from the Earth" [Weingarten, T., *Newsweek*, September 21, 1998, p.12].

MIT scientist Dr. Walt Brown (a creationist) in his book In "The Beginning" points out that during the great Genesis flood, as recorded in the Bible, the fountains of the deep that were let loose could have easily spewed out meteors and meteorites into space that very well may have contained micro-organisms such as bacteria. One thing for sure is that life requires intelligent creation and doesn't come by chance. NASA knows all this but looking for life on other planets is a powerful way to motivate people to want their government to give more and more money to NASA. NASA, after all, is a business with hefty salaries at stake.

All the scientific evidence only supports the possibility of life coming from previously existing life. It is not scientific to believe that life can arise from non-living matter, at least not spontaneously (by chance). It was once thought by evolutionists that life arose spontaneously from garbage until it was shown that the reason for this is because of insects having previously laid their eggs in the garbage. Thus, the belief that life arose by chance (spontaneously) from chemicals in garbage was successfully refuted. But, evolutionists didn't give up. They just got more sophisticated.

Note from Pastor Kevin Lea: *This week, NASA scientist Dr. Richard Hoover published a paper in Journal of Cosmology (<http://journalofcosmology.com/Life100.html>) claiming that he has discovered bacteria on meteorites, some of which are very similar to bacteria found on earth. He muses whether this is proof that life came to earth from space.*

Those who follow Dr. Walt Brown's work on the origin of comets and asteroids are aware that Dr. Brown predicts that evidence of life will be (and has) found on meteors that return to earth after having been jettisoned into space during the time of Noah's flood. (See www.creation-science.com.)

As this article from Pravda (a Russian news source) points out, spontaneous formation of proteins, which are necessary for life, is scientifically impossible – on earth or in space. All evidence points to an all-knowing, intelligent God Who created life on earth. Therefore, the most logical explanation for life on a meteorite is that during the flood of Noah, the "fountains of the great deep" burst up and jettisoned rock, debris, water, and biological material into space. Now, some of this jettisoned material is falling back to earth, with vestiges of the same life forms that left with it.

The author of this article also mentions Dr. Brown's work and makes some very good points about this hotly contested issue.

Stanley Miller, in his famous experiment in 1953, showed that individual amino acids (the building blocks of life) could come into existence by chance. But, it's not enough just to have amino acids. The various amino acids that make-up life must link together in a precise sequence, just like the letters in a sentence, to form functioning protein molecules. If they're not in the right sequence the protein molecules won't work. It has never been shown that various amino acids can bind together into a sequence by chance to form protein molecules. Even the simplest cell is made up of many millions of various protein molecules.

Also, what many don't realize is that Miller had a laboratory apparatus that shielded and protected the individual amino acids the moment they were formed, otherwise the amino acids would have quickly disintegrated and been destroyed in the mix of random energy and forces involved in Miller's experiment.

In Nature there are what scientists call right-handed and left-handed amino acids. However, life requires that all proteins be left-handed. So, not only do millions of amino acids have to be in the correct sequence, they also all have to be left-handed. If a right-handed amino acid gets mixed in then the protein molecules won't function. There won't be any life!

Similarly, the nucleic acids in DNA and RNA must be in a precise sequence. The sugar molecules that make-up the various nucleic acids in DNA and RNA must be right-handed. If a nucleic acid with a left-handed sugar molecule gets into the mix then nothing will work.

In the midst of all the arguments over evolution and intelligent design, it is amazing how many in society, including the very educated, believe that scientists had already created life in the laboratory. No such thing has ever happened.

All that scientists have done is genetically engineer already existing forms of life in the laboratory, and by doing this scientists have been able to produce new forms of life, but they did not produce these new life forms from non-living matter. Even if scientists ever do produce life from non-living matter it will only be through intelligent design or planning so it still wouldn't help support any theory of life originating by chance or evolution.

Even in the case involving synthetic (artificial) life, scientists don't actually create or produce life itself from non-living matter. What scientists do in this case is create (by intelligent design) artificial DNA (genetic instructions and code) which is then implanted into an already existing living cell and, thereby, changing that cell into a new form of life. And, again, even if scientists ever do create a whole living cell from scratch (and not just its DNA) it still would not be by chance but by intelligent design. Synthetic life is just another form of genetic engineering. But God was the first genetic engineer. Remember that always!

If the cell had evolved it would have had to be all at once. A partially evolved cell cannot wait millions of years to become complete because it would be highly unstable and quickly disintegrate in the open environment, especially without the protection of a complete and fully functioning cell membrane.

The cell seems to be irreducibly complex. For example, without DNA there can be no RNA, and without RNA there can be no DNA. And without either DNA or RNA there can be no proteins, and without proteins there can be no DNA or RNA. They're all mutually dependent upon each other for existence! It could not have gradually evolved! Evolutionists generally believe that it took one billion years for the

first life form or cell to have evolved. That belief, although still taught as gospel in many elementary and secondary schools, cannot be sustained by modern science.

Of course, once there is a complete and living cell then the genetic program and biological mechanisms exist to direct the formation of more cells. The question is, how did life come about naturally when there was no directing mechanism in nature?

If humans must use intelligence to perform genetic engineering, to meaningfully manipulate the genetic code, then what does that say about the origin of the genetic code itself!

The great British scientist Sir Frederick Hoyle has said that the probability of the sequence of molecules in the simplest cell coming into existence by chance is equivalent to a tornado going through a junk yard of airplane parts and assembling a 747 Jumbo Jet!

We tend to judge something as being simple or complex by its size. So many of us assume that because the cell is microscopic in size that it must be simple. Not so! Size is relative, but not complexity. If you were as big as the Empire State building you would probably think that the tiny cars and automobiles on the street were simple and could easily happen by a chance combination of parts. However, we know that is not so.

Natural laws are adequate to explain how the order in life, the universe, and even a microwave oven operates, but mere undirected natural laws cannot fully explain the origin of such order.

Science cannot prove how life originated since no human observed the origin of life by either chance or design. Observation and detection by the human senses, either directly or indirectly through scientific instruments, is the basis of science and for establishing proof. The issue is which position has better scientific support. Both sides should have the opportunity to present their case.

If some astronauts from Earth discovered figures of persons similar to Mt. Rushmore on an uninhabited planet there would be no way to scientifically prove the carved figures originated by design or by chance processes of erosion. Neither position is science, but scientific arguments may be made to support one or the other.

Many think that natural selection in nature is proof that we had evolved. Natural selection does occur in nature. However, natural selection itself does not produce biological variations. Natural selection can only “select” from biological variations that are possible and which have survival value. Natural selection is a passive process in nature.

Natural selection is simply another way of saying that if a biological variation occurs which is helpful to an animal or plant’s survival then that that variation will be preserved and be passed on. Of course, nature does not do any active or conscious selecting. The term “natural selection” is simply a figure of speech. Also, natural selection can only apply once there is life and reproduction and not before. In other words, natural selection could not have been involved in any pre-biotic, non-living interactions of chemicals.

Evolutionists believe that random or chance mutations in the genetic code (caused by random environmental forces such as radiation) will produce the favorable evolutionary changes necessary for natural selection to act upon.

However, there is no evidence that random or chance mutations in the genetic code are capable of producing greater biological complexity (vertical evolution) among species. Most biological variations are the result of new combinations of already existing genes and not because of mutations which are almost always harmful precisely because they are accidents in the genetic code.

Considering the enormous complexity of life, it is much more logical to believe that the genetic and biological similarities between all species are due to a common Designer rather than common evolutionary ancestry. It is only logical that the great Designer would design similar functions for similar purposes and different functions for different purposes in all of the various forms of life.

All of this simply means that real science supports faith in God. Science cannot prove that we are here by chance (evolution) or by design (creation). However, the scientific evidence can be used to support one or the other. It is only fair that evidence supporting intelligent design be presented to students alongside of evolutionary theory, especially in public schools which receive funding from taxpayers who are on both sides of the issue. Also, no one is being forced to believe in God or adopt a particular religion so there is no true violation of separation of church and state. As a religion and science writer, I encourage all to read my Internet article "The Natural Limits of Evolution" at my website www.religionscience.com for more in-depth study of the issue.

The Institute for Creation Research at www.icr.org offers excellent articles, books, and resources from Master's or Ph.D degreed scientists showing how true science supports creation.

The author, Babu G. Ranganathan, has his bachelor's degree with concentrations in theology and biology and has been recognized for his writings on religion and science in the 24th edition of Marquis "Who's Who in The East." The author's articles may be accessed at www.religionscience.com.