

THE CASE FOR CREATION: 3

LAW OF BIOGENESIS



Genesis 1:21 -- And God created... every living creature that moves... after its kind, and every winged bird after its kind...

Introduction

1. Where the teaching of evolution is concerned, the one-sided indoctrination of students in this materialistic philosophy in the tax-supported public schools in our pluralistic, democratic society is a violation of academic and religious freedoms. It is poor science and poor education.
2. Creationists have an impressive arsenal of evidence to confirm the conclusion that the creation model better fits the available scientific facts than the evolution model. The remedy in the schools is that creation and evolution be presented thoroughly and fairly in public schools.
3. Barring that, the facts for the creation model need to be plainly taught in the church, in the Christian home, and defended wherever possible. These lessons are designed to show where some evolutionists are trying to keep the skeletons in the closet and where others are coming out of the closet themselves.

A. What is Biogenesis?

1. In the field of biology, one of the most commonly accepted and widely used laws of science is the Law of Biogenesis. This law was set forth many years ago to dictate what both theory and experimental evidence showed to be true among living organisms.
2. "By the end of the nineteenth century there was general agreement that life cannot arise from the nonliving under conditions that now exist upon our planet. The dictum 'All life from pre-existing life' became the dogma of modern biology, from which no reasonable man could be expected to dissent." David Kirk, *Biology Today* (1975).
3. Moore and Slusher, in their textbook, *Biology: A Search for Order in Complexity*, wrote; "Historically the point of view that life comes only from life has been so well established through the facts revealed by experiment that it is called the Law of Biogenesis." In a footnote they add, "Some philosophers call this a principle instead of a law, but this is a matter of definition, and definitions are arbitrary. Some scientists call this a super-law, or a law about laws. Regardless of terminology, biogenesis has the highest rank in these levels of generalization."

B. The Evidence for Biogenesis

1. Even Darwin, in his "Introduction" to *The Origin of Species*, wrote: "I am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in this volume on which facts cannot be adduced often apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived. A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question..."
2. Robert Jastrow in his book, *Until the Sun Dies*, has written: "At present, science has no satisfactory answer to the question of the origin of life on the earth. Perhaps the appearance of life on the earth is a miracle. Scientists are reluctant to accept that view, but their choices are limited... The first theory places the question of the origin of life beyond the reach of scientific inquiry. It is a statement of faith in the power of a Supreme Being not subject to the laws of science. The second theory is also an act of faith. The act of faith consists in assuming that the scientific view of the origin of life is correct, without having concrete evidence to support that belief." (1977)

3. He also remarked: "According to this story, every tree, every blade of grass, and every creature in the sea and on the land evolved out of one parent strand of molecular matter drifting lazily in a warm pool. What concrete evidence supports that remarkable theory of the origin of life? There is none."
4. Martin A. Moe, writing in *Science Digest*, expressed it this way: "A century of sensational discoveries in the biological sciences has taught us that life arises only from life, that the nucleus governs the cell through the molecular mechanisms of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) and that the amount of DNA and its structure determine not only the nature of the species but also the characteristics of individuals."
5. In their popular text, *Lifecloud*, Hoyle and Wichramasingh concluded: "It is doubtful that anything like the conditions which were simulated in the laboratory existed at all on a primitive Earth, or occurred for long enough times and over sufficiently extended regions of the Earth's surface to produce large enough local concentrations of the biochemicals required for the start of life."
6. In their text, *The Mystery of Life's Origin*, Thaxton, Bradley, and Olsen stated: "Ideas of chemical evolution have been modified and refined considerably... many of the findings..., however, have not supported the scenario of chemical evolution. In fact, what has emerged over the last three decades, as we have shown in the present critical analysis, is an alternative scenario which is characterized by destruction, and not the synthesis of life."
7. They went on to say: "Even if the primitive atmosphere was reducing or only mildly oxidizing, then degradative processes predominated over synthesis... the prebiotic chemical soup, presumably a worldwide phenomenon, left no known trace in the geological record." And, "...the sharp edge of this critique is not what we do not know, but what we do know."

C. Evolution in spite of the Facts

1. Abiogenesis, or as it is more commonly known, "spontaneous generation", is one of the foundational concepts of evolution. In 1960, when G.A. Kerkut published his famous book, *The Implications of Evolution*, he listed the seven nonprobable assumptions upon which evolution is based. Beginning that list was: "The first assumption is that non-living things gave rise to living material, i.e., spontaneous generation occurred."
2. Nobel laureate George Wald of Harvard said, "...We have now to face a somewhat different problem: how organisms may have arisen spontaneously under different conditions in some former period, granted that they do so no longer... To make an organism demands the right substances in the right proportions and in the right arrangement. We do not think that anything more is needed - but that is problem enough. One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are, as a result, I believe, of spontaneous generation."
3. Richard E. Dickerson, writing in *Scientific American*, remarked that we have "no laboratory models: hence one can speculate endlessly, unfettered by inconvenient facts." (1978)
4. Leslie Orgel (one of the heavyweights in origin of life studies) admitted: "We do not yet understand even the general features of the origin of the genetic code... The origin of the genetic code is the most baffling aspect of the problem of the origins of life, and a major conceptual or experimental breakthrough may be needed before we can make any substantial progress." (1982)
5. J.W.N. Sullivan, a brilliant scientist of the past, penned these words: "...careful experiments, notably those of Pasteur, showed that this conclusion was due to imperfect observation, and it became an accepted doctrine that life never arises except from life. So far as the actual evidence goes, this is still the only possible conclusion. But since it is a conclusion that seems to lead back to some supernatural creative act, it is a conclusion that scientific men find very difficult of acceptance." (1933)