

There have been a few scientists not afraid to admit the lack of evidence for the spontaneous generation of life. Professor Gerald A. Kerkut, a noted British zoologist and physiologist and a professing evolutionist, wrote a book pointing out the many assumptions that are necessary to the integrity of the current theory. In dealing with the origin of life he says :

“The first assumption was that non-living things gave rise to living material. This is still just an assumption. It is conceivable that living material might have suddenly appeared on the world in some peculiar manner, but this raises the question, “where did life originate on that planet?” We could say that life has always existed, but such an explanation is not a very satisfactory one. Instead, the explanation that nonliving things could have given rise to complex systems having the properties of living things is generally more acceptable to most scientists. There is, however, little evidence in favour of biogenesis and as yet we have no indication that it can be performed It is therefore a matter of faith on the part of the biologist that biogenesis did occur” - G. E Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution* p. 150.

But what evidence is there for the creation of life? In our review of the structure and function of the cell we saw how intricate and complex it is. Every component has an indispensable part to play. Its complexity is all directed towards a purpose - the maintenance of the cell as a living unit- the design of the cell is perfectly suited to its functions. It is this combination of complexity and purposefulness that is one of the main arguments for creation as the origin of life. Chance does not produce design, and is by definition purposeless. No one would seriously suggest that brass, steel, gold, jewels, and glass would come together by chance and form a watch, and that having done so it would have quite accidentally achieved a method of telling the time. We recognize here that design suggests a designer, and that there is a purpose behind the design.

Yet living material is infinitely more complex than a watch. To believe in a designer of life, and a purpose in its creation, is more rational than to believe, contrary to established laws and accepted methods of reasoning, that life occurred as a result of blind chance.

Evolutionists claim to find a lot of support in the fossil record. It is suggested that the layers of rock which surround the earth have been laid down gradually over millions of years. The deepest layers, or strata, are therefore supposedly the oldest. In these various layers of rock are entombed fossils which are reputed to be arranged in an evolutionary sequence, with the simplest forms of life in the lowest, oldest, rocks and more highly developed forms in the upper layers. It is clear that if life began as the result of a unique accident and then gradually developed, one would expect to see this gradual development in the fossils of the early rocks.

In the Cambrian stratum of the earth there are lots of fossils. They are of highly developed creatures - e.g., shellfish, sea urchins, etc. These Cambrian fossils cover a wide range of different animals. Fourteen of the twenty-six currently existing phyla of animals are represented in the Cambrian fossils, in all at least 5,000 species of animals. Mammals, reptiles, starfishes, sponges, spiders, are examples of different phyla. But in the next stratum evidence for any of these twenty-six is virtually non-existent. So the rocks deny a gradual development of life, and teach instead its sudden appearance, fully developed, completely consistent with a belief in special creation. The relative sterility of the pre-Cambrian strata and the evidence of teeming highly-developed life in the very next strata is an insuperable problem to the evolutionists.