

Did Life Spontaneously Arise from Non-Life **Or Was Life Created?**

TAKE OUT THE GARBAGE – MOM

Sixteen year old Johnny came down from his bedroom and stumbled into the kitchen to get a bowl of his favorite cereal – Alpha-Bits. When he got to the table, he was surprised to see that the cereal box was knocked over and the Alpha-Bit letters spelled out “TAKE OUT THE GARBAGE – MOM” on the placemat.

Recalling a recent high school biology lesson, Johnny didn’t attribute this message to his mom. After all, he had just been taught that life itself is merely a product of mindless, natural laws. If that’s the case, Johnny thought, why wouldn’t a simple message like “Take out the garbage – Mom” be the product of mindless natural laws as well? Maybe the cat knocked the box over, or an earthquake shook the house. No sense jumping to conclusions. Johnny didn’t want to take out the garbage anyway.

Comforted by the fact that principles learned in his biology class could help him avoid conclusions he didn’t like, Johnny decided to take a walk. As he looked up, he noticed a message in the sky: “Drink Coke”, the white puffy letters revealed on the sky-blue background. “Unusual cloud formation?” Johnny thought. “Swirling wind, perhaps?”

No, Johnny couldn’t play the game of denial any longer. A message like that was a sure sign of intelligence. It couldn’t be the result of natural forces because **natural forces have never been observed to create messages**. Even though he never saw a plane, Johnny knew there must have been a skywriter up there recently. **Why? Messages point to intelligence.**

One would need to be willfully blind to suggest that messages like “Take out the garbage – Mom” is the work of natural laws. Yet these conclusions are perfectly consistent with the principles taught in most biology classes today! That’s where naturalistic biologists dogmatically assert that messages infinitely more complicated are the mindless products of natural laws! They make this claim in trying to explain the origin of life.

“God’s eternal power and character cannot be seen. But from the beginning of creation, God has shown what these are like by all he has made. That’s why those people don’t have any excuse.” - Romans 1:20 – Contemporary English Version

The Bible claims that the evidence for a Designer certainly is clear in creation. **In fact, one of the most glaring evidences of God’s design is found in the origin and complexity of life.** Did you know the very simplest life forms contain the information-equivalent of 1,000 sets of encyclopedias? Christians believe only an intelligent being could create life. Atheists believe random, non-intelligent natural forces can do it. **Given the complexity of life, is it probable that life came into being spontaneously from non-life, or is it more probable that the complexity of life must be attributed to a designer, the God of the Bible?**

Since life exists, there can be only 2 possibilities for its existence. Either:

- 1. Life generated spontaneously from nonliving chemicals by natural laws without any intelligent intervention (life came from non-life) or**
- 2. Life generated from the intervention of an intelligent being (life was created)**

Which is more plausible? **If an honest person without preconceived biases examines the evidence, which conclusion would they be more likely to accept?**

The supreme problem for the Darwinist is explaining the origin of the very first life. Naturalistic biologists assert that life generated spontaneously from nonliving chemicals by natural laws without any intelligent intervention (life from non-life). This may have seemed plausible to a 19th century scientist who didn’t have the technology to adequately investigate the cell. However, our current technology now enables scientists to examine the tiny world of intricate design and amazing complexity within the cell.

Unfortunately for Darwinists, the first life – indeed any form of life – is by no means “simple”. When Charles Darwin wrote *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, man’s knowledge of the complexity of the cell was very limited. Darwin understood that the complexity of the cell could be a potential fatal flaw in his theory of evolution. He wrote, “If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formulated by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.” With our advancing ability to look within the contents of the cell, has this happened? “The question then becomes, are there any irreducibly complex systems in the cell? Yes, there are many.” – Michael Behe, *Irreducible Complexity*.

In fact, this became abundantly clear in 1953 with the discovery of DNA, the chemical that encodes instructions for building and replicating all living things. DNA’s helical structure looks like a twisted ladder, the rungs of which consists of 4 possible nitrogen bases (adenine, thymine, cytosine, and guanine, commonly represented by the letters A, T, C, and G). These letters comprise a four-letter genetic alphabet. This alphabet is identical to our alphabet in terms of its ability to communicate unique messages, except the genetic alphabet has only 4 letters, instead of 26. Just as the specific order of the letters in the alphabet communicates a unique message, the specific order of A, T, C, and G within a living cell determines the unique genetic makeup of that living entity. Another name for that message of information, whether it’s in a sentence or in DNA, is “specified complexity”. Not only is it complex – but it also contains a specific message.

The incredible specified complexity of life becomes obvious when we consider the message found in the DNA of a one-celled amoeba. **The message found in the DNA of this tiny amoeba has as much information as 1,000 complete sets of the Encyclopedia Britannica!** In other words, if you were to spell out all of the A, T, C, and G in an amoeba, the letters would fill 1,000 complete encyclopedia sets! Further, these 1,000 encyclopedia sets would consist of letters in a very specific order – just like real encyclopedias. In fact, they must be in a specific sequence in order to encode the proteins that make life possible. So, here’s the key question for evolutionists: **If simple messages such as “Take out the garbage – Mom” require an intelligent being, then shouldn’t a message 1,000 encyclopedia sets long also require one?**

Evolutionists cannot answer this question by showing how natural laws could do the job. They claim that this one-celled amoeba (or something like it) came into existence by spontaneous generation (i.e. without intelligent intervention) in a warm little pond somewhere on the very early earth. According to their theory, all biological life, after spontaneously coming into existence, somehow survived, and has evolved from that first amoeba to what we see today, without any intelligent design/guidance at all. Thus, their theory of evolution!

But besides the required complexity of DNA that is necessary for life, what are some of the other issues with this theory?

1. **No human observed the origin of the first life.** The emergence of the first life on earth was a one-time, unrepeatable historical event. No one was present to see whether the first life was created or instead arose by natural laws from nonliving material.
2. **Spontaneous generation of life from nonliving chemicals has never been observed or recreated.** Scientists have never been able to combine chemicals in a test tube and arrive at a DNA molecule, much less life. Why should we believe that mindless, random processes in an uncontrolled environment can do what brilliant scientists cannot do in a controlled environment?
3. **Not only is the complexity of DNA a problem for evolutionists, but so is the origin of DNA.** DNA relies on proteins for its production, but proteins rely on DNA for their production. So, which came first, proteins or DNA? One must already be in existence for the other to be made.
4. **Even Darwinists who insist on the spontaneous generation of life clearly recognize the evidence for design!** Richard Dawkins, an ardent atheist and evolutionist, in his book, *The Blind Watchmaker*, writes, “Biology is the study of complicated things that give the appearance of having been designed for a purpose.” In the same book, he acknowledges “the intricate architecture and precision-engineering” of human life and in each of the trillion of cells within the human body, yet, strangely, flatly denies that life has been designed. Francis Crick, co-discoverer of DNA and

another ardent Darwinist, also acknowledges the appearance of design and he warns that “biologists must constantly keep in mind that what they see was not designed, but rather evolved.” These comments seem strange indeed coming from men who believe in the supremacy of science, which is supposed to rely on observation!

5. Evolutionists provide no evidence to support spontaneous generation of life.

Biochemist Klaus Dose admits that 30 years of research into the origin of life has led to “a better perception of the immensity of the problem of the origin of life on Earth rather than to its solution.” C. Wickramasinghe observes, “*the emergence of life from a primordial soup on the Earth is merely an article of faith ... There is no experimental evidence to support this at the present time. Indeed all attempts to create life from non-life, starting from Pasteur, have been unsuccessful.*” Microbiologist Michael Denton, though himself an atheist, adds, “*The complexity of the simplest known type of cell is so great that it is impossible to accept that such an object could have been thrown together suddenly by some kind of freakish, vastly improbable event. Such an occurrence would be indistinguishable from a miracle.*”

So, by blind allegiance to this naturalistic, reductionist ideology – which is against all observation and reason – Darwinists dogmatically assert that life arose spontaneously from its nonliving chemical components. Ironically, this is exactly what Darwinists have long accused creationists of doing – allowing their faith to overrule observation and reason. **Creationists are simply making a rational inference from the evidence concerning the origin of life. We are simply following the evidence exactly where it leads – back to an intelligent cause – back to God!**

Reference: *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*, by Norman Geisler & Frank Turek.

On February 25th we had corresponding lessons on this topic. Check our website for sermons titled “Help My Unbelief (Mark 9:14-29)” from the AM service and “Don't Rush Me (Exodus 20:1-17)” from the PM service. Also, you can find our worship services on our Facebook page.