

Forgive my arrogance but I sometimes think I might have better insight into my thoughts than you do. I'm also a little surprised you would want to engage in this discussion given you already know with such confidence what we atheists all believe. Your humility is inspiring! That you would explain all this to us. If a god exists I'm sure it would be proud of your good will. Please explain how this works. You claim this is what we believe, yet I am telling you that is not the case. If I tell you that "*X is not what we believe*", *why do you still claim "X is what you believe"*? Now let's get into it.

> "*If you believe something that is faith.*"

Demonstrably not true at all. For example, I cannot say with certainty that my wife will be home when i arrive in the morning. I believe it to be true because i have a reasonable expectation based on a pattern of behavior that lies outside of "faith". I cannot say with certainty that my neighbor owns his home. I believe it to be true because i have a reasonable expectation based on demonstrable evidence that lies outside of "faith". You dishonest (*yes, you are dishonest*) theists like to conflate what you call "*faith*" (*belief in something without evidence*) with "*reasonable expectation*" that is based in either patterns of behavior or evidence-backed assumptions.

Belief is a conviction that a proposition of fact is true or false, regardless of the reason for that belief. Faith is belief in spite of, even perhaps because of, the lack of evidence. Faith is belief in a god that is not based on evidence. Faith is the surrender of reason and skepticism. If you have substantial evidence, you don't need faith. Can't help but think I have already explained this before. Faith starts at the conclusion and justifies it working backward, science starts from now and works backs justified by repeatable testing in real world situations. I suggest you look at a few of my first tweets that explain this. Here is some of it:

Your argument shows a complete lack of understanding about what an atheist actually is. Nowadays, the lazy, the uneducated, or those seeking to deliberately mislead, use the term "*atheist*" to mean something like "*someone who believes there is no such being as God.*" Obviously, this is why they think atheism is a belief system, but that definition is incorrect. This argument is also used by those who think it takes faith to believe in certain scientific theories, which simply shows a lack of understanding in the scientific method. Every scientific theory, result, or law has mountains of evidence to back it up. In a way, a scientific theory is stronger than a fact, because a "*theory*" ties in more than one observable fact.

When there is not sufficient evidence to support a claim, the default position should be rational skepticism if the goal is to minimize the number of false beliefs and maximize the number of true beliefs one holds. Atheists maintain that there is no strong evidence for the presence of a higher power, which is why theists

need faith -- to replace evidence. Not believing in fairies or Santa Claus is not an act of faith, because those who are making these claims have the burden of proof, and must provide evidence to support the acceptance of such propositions. Technically, disbelief of a claim, when evidence is lacking, requires less a statement of faith, in the same sense that 0 is less than 1. Definitionally, it doesn't make sense to say that disbelieving *"takes more faith,"* as it doesn't require any faith not to place one's belief in unsubstantiated truth claims.

Anyway, I always find it funny whenever a believer (*I assume you are per your very own false dichotomy*) claims that atheism is also a belief system like religion because it is a tacit admission that taking claims on faith is a silly thing to do. That they are indirectly admitting that what they believe in is just plain B.S. When you have succumbed to arguing that the opposition is just as misguided as you are, maybe it is time to rethink your position.

> *"unwavering BLIND faith atheist have"*

Incorrect. As per post above, instead we follow the evidence, and admit when we don't know. No faith involved. We don't believe in something (*a positive claim*), we reject the hypothesis that life was created (*a negative hypothesis*). We don't know, but we have evidence to support the Big Bang, evolution, abiogenesis etc. (*some more than others obviously*), so I personally have come to the conclusion that those are the most likely foundations of life. But I don't claim it as true. Rather than *"blind faith"* I see it as the qualified acceptance of a concept, best we have until a better idea comes along. Any person who holds to a definite belief in any *"creation"* process that far back, theist or atheist, is lacking somewhat in the rationality department.

> "Read this slowly I am not debating with you and will not debate with you how life was created. I don't know, you don't know."

Yet you keep asserting it had to be either created by magic or originated by pure chance from nothing, those sound like claims to knowledge to me. Demonstrate them.

> *"There are really only 2 choices, I am arguing neither." ... "Either way, this is irrelevant. I made no attempt to give any explanation, or provide any theory as to where or how life began."*

*As usual the atheists are too busy attacking to recognize their own hypocrisy."*

You very clearly are doing exactly that. Your entire false premise is constructed in order to mock one position based on an incorrect explanation of it while promoting the other. It is expressly designed to take sides. You certainly have repeatedly made claims about this, the most obvious ones being that we are limited to two choices, and that nothing can come from nothing, you have simply assert these of course with no evidence. I'm guessing the irony of your last sentence is wasted on you.

> *"There are really only 2 choices, I am arguing neither. 1) Either life was created Or 2) it spontaneously sprang from nothing."*

That's a false dichotomy, just how exactly would you evidence your claim we're limited to two choices? That's assuming you can even be bothered to stop simply asserting it as if it is a fact of course.

There are other options... Such as it took millions and billions of years of small changes accumulating to add up to big changes. That would be a third option. The only people who say that one day there was no life and the next day there are theists. That's what their book says anyway. But still, almost no-one says that.

Another option, one of which is that the concept of *"life"* as a separate category of beings is incorrect, meaning proposition you propose doesn't make sense. That said, I think you might avoid that concern by asking about the universe rather than asking about life specifically, but even then I think there are questions about what *"nothing"* means here and how creation by an unexplained creator differs from spontaneous existence in any meaningful sense that need to be answered before I'm completely on board with what you're saying here.

And the above options are not the only options, either. What if we're just in a computer simulation? What if aliens seeded life on Earth? You can speculate as to any number of conceivable options.

Anyway it takes no faith to not believe. I guess if you look at it like... No. Still no. Not believing A does not mean you believe in not A. It doesn't even mean that you believe in B or X or anything. It just means you don't accept A.

Besides, your options 1 and 2 are essentially the same: Life being created from nothing is the same thing as it springing from nothing. You also forgot the actual option backed up by scientific evidence: That life is the result of billions of years of natural forces acting on matter.

You seem to want to create a dichotomy but have failed to do so. Let me help. Using your formula: There are actually 3 choices:

1) Either life was created

Or

2) it spontaneously sprang from nothing.

Or

3) I don't know, so i'm not gonna pretend that i do and make something up because it makes me feel better, and anyway, there *still* is no evidence for the existence of gods.

Although if you want to go deeper, more options available:

- 4) Life spontaneously sprang from something.
- 5) Life spontaneously sprang from some things.

I could also raise similar objections to your use of "*spontaneously*" and "*sprang*" resulting in dozens of possible options that aren't 1 or 2.

Your false dichotomy is as cliché as it is wrong. We know how organic molecules began to move on their own and reproduce, we just don't fully understand the process yet. We do know it didn't come from "*nothing*". From what I said above, faith is belief without evidence. So taking this, using Occam's Razor, one can conclude the most likely and logical explanation without positing unnecessary assumptions would be, abiogenesis, which is not "*life springing from nothing*". It's life slowly emerging from a very specific environment over a long period of time. There is evidence that abiogenesis occurred. There is no proof yet, but there is *evidence*. [The Miller-Urey experiments](#), and subsequent research based on them, shows that complex organic compounds such as amino acids can arise naturally from nonliving environments. Specifically, from our best understanding of what the early-Earth environment was like. And [NASA's Stardust probe](#) has found some of those amino acids in the tails of comets. So clearly Earth is not alone in being able to produce the basic components of life. And once we had those basic building blocks? [Turns out they're more versatile than we thought](#). None of this is definitive proof. But compared to other explanations, with less evidence (or no evidence at all), abiogenesis has got the most empirical support so far. There is no such supporting evidence for Creation. If there are two possible explanations, and one of them has some supporting evidence, and the other doesn't, isn't it reasonable to believe the one that has evidence supporting it? That which can be asserted without evidence can also be dismissed without evidence. No more assumption should be taken than necessary. Does this mean I have 'faith' in it? No. I go with the evidence and the most reasonable hypothesis, and I am humble enough to say I don't know. What I mean is There is a lot of evidence that shows what kind of ways non-living matter can form living matter. But for the sake of this argument and make things easier, let's assume we have no evidence of those methods. I would say, "*I don't know how life got started*". Saying "*I don't know*" is the opposite of having faith. Saying I don't know is saying life could have come about by natural or supernatural methods.

> *"If atheists are adamant that life was not "created" there is only one other possibility And that is that life just started all by itself. -And despite the complete lack of any explanation for this, they will absolutely lambaste you if you don't -except this as fact. My statement isn't about God it's about atheists only."*

This is your false dilemma in another form but now you have muddied the waters and shifted from "*spontaneously sprang from nothing*" to "*started all by itself*". Those are not the same thing. Since when is "*all by itself*" the same as "*spontaneously sprang from nothing*"? You're equivocating. This is intellectually

dishonest if you know what you are doing or if you don't, it's ignorance of who and not only what atheism means and what it means to be an atheist but also intellectual discourse.

If I leave bread out, mold will start growing all by itself. But that mold is not *"spontaneously springing from nothing"*. Life *"spontaneously springing from nothing"* is absurd, you know it is, but you are trying to force this description to what we believe. That is intellectual dishonesty once again.. The basic building blocks of life arising naturally from a very specific chemical environment is not. We already have ample evidence that that occurred. Have you heard the *"is the number of marbles in the jar even or odd"*? You're basically saying 'if you don't believe that the number is odd, then you HAVE FAITH that the answer is even!' (*putting aside that in this case, there are more answers than the two you offered*).

> *"And despite the complete lack of any explanation for this, they will absolutely lambaste you if you don't except this as fact."*

My lack of an explanation does nothing for your case. Rational skepticism of claims not provided by onus probandi does not mean I have to explain a thing. The lambasting you're currently receiving is earned by your constant dishonest misrepresentations, your blatant gullibility and the cack-handed lazy way you went about it. Besides, you are wrong. There is vast good evidence for this conjecture here. I for one would not lambaste anyone without reason. I don't believe anything came from nothing nor do I think abiogenesis is fact. We, being the atheist also don't think of *"life came out of nothing"* and should not be expected as fact. Actually, I think one should criticise and consider everything first before they claim anything as fact. The lambasting you're currently receiving is earned by your constant misrepresentations.

> *"I'm not forcing the position on atheists but rather I'm merely observing that they've taken it" ... "If atheists are adamant that life was not "created" there is only one other possibility And that is that life just started all by itself."*

You are indeed putting that position on us. Telling us our positions instead of asking. Another thing, atheists are not adamant that life was not created by a creator. They merely haven't accepted the claim because it hasn't met its burden of proof. Furthermore, you are making a false dichotomy. Intellectual dishonesty.

What I mean by false dichotomy is that you are providing only two choices when there are more. It's like asking what the best colour is, red or orange?, you must prefer one! That's how silly your question seems. Maybe instead of accusing people of being pompous without even proof-reading your own posts you could look some of these terms up? Or do a little research first? There is a great series by potholer54 in YouTube called *"our origins made easy"* or something like that. Check it out and then come back. I will be waiting.

> *"life spontaneously sprang from nothing."*

Strawman once again. This is incorrect. I think you misspelled *"gradually arose through chemical processes from previously-existing basic building blocks."* Spontaneously sprang from nothing is a horrible misrepresentation of the science. It sprang from various compounds in a high energy environment, not *"nothing"*. Formation of amino acids and more complex xxx organic molecules by natural processes has been demonstrated time and again. The step from that to life is not a huge one; just an unusual one. But with a huge planet and hundreds of millions of years the rarity becomes far less of an obstacle to the odds.

You said (*illogically*) that *"all of the atheists are just absolutely positive that life began out of nothing"*. I merely pointed out an error in your terminology. The prevailing scientific and atheist view is that life somehow arose spontaneously on the primeval Earth. That's not the same as *"from nothing"*.

> *"life spontaneously sprang from nothing. That one day there was no life and the next day there was and that just happened. Just some random out of no where random miraculous occurrence, and bam all life sprang forth."*

Matter is not nothing. You illustrated only your own dishonesty. Well, if a huge universe full of organic chemical compounds is *'nothing'* then I don't think we'll see eye to eye. This basically destroys the dichotomy that your entire argument relied on.

> *"Just some random out of no where random miraculous occurrence"*

There's a difference between something happening by *chance*, and happening *completely at random*. Pick two people at random in the world, and the odds of them knowing each other is very very slim. Yet there's a good chance of running into your neighbor when you go grocery shopping at the local store. The difference is that in the second example there are various factors that affect the odds of it happening. Additionally maybe you won't run into them today, but if you go to the grocery store a thousand times a day over billions of years eventually you'll run into them.

> *"and bam all life sprang forth"*

This is incorrect. All life didn't spring forth suddenly. It most likely started out as a single type of very simple microorganism that could barely even be considered life, and over *billions* of years evolved to the species we have today. Understanding the basics of abiogenesis and thinking *"This might be possible but*

*there's a lot of details that need to be worked out*" isn't the same thing as saying *"In literal days, a magic man in the sky made literally everything including life itself out of literally nothing."* Trying to equate entertaining a scientific hypothesis with religious belief, and calling both of them faith, is disingenuous and equivocating.

> *"since you and the rest of the atheists absolutely positively do not know how it began you can't possibly know that the people of faith are wrong."*

True, I don't know if the people of faith are 100% wrong. I do know I have not seen sufficient evidence to suggest you are right however. I agree that any who claim to know specific facts about the origin of life are mistaken. On the other hand, the available evidence doesn't support any of the various myths about the origin of life. The burden of proof is on the theist claiming there IS a supernatural deity... It's not simply a black and white scenario. There is equivocation between this and when *"people of faith"* posit demonstrably untrue assertions, yes we most certainly can know that they are wrong.

Yeah, we don't know 100% how life started. That doesn't mean we *"can't possibly know that people of faith are wrong"*. We know many religious people are wrong because they believe things that can't possibly have happened. We know many religious people are wrong because they believe in things that have mutually exclusive properties. We know many religious people are wrong because they have an almost incredibly small understanding of some things that make it clear that they are simply ignorant.

Do we know anything 100%? No, but it is folly to take that and tell people that they aren't allowed to know \*anything at all, or that they can't say something is more likely than any other.

> *"but you get all defensive and say things like "don't dare question it or Else".*

It's quite the opposite, science questions everything, it never stops questioning everything, questioning things is the very nature of science. I say question everything. It's interesting how you theists keep mistaking atheism for a religion. It's not a religion. It's the opposite of a religion. It has no creed. Most atheists don't have more than one thing in common: a lack of belief in a god.

> *"My point is the demonization of people of faith by atheists is hypocritical and frankly offensive."*

So says the person who made up a false position for his opponents and continues to criticize people for holding that position even after me pointed out they don't actually hold that position. The hypocritical one here is you. The undercurrent to your post and comments is your objection to the rhetoric of the atheists. You used words/phrases like *"mocking"*, *"attacking"*, *"condescending"*, *"pompous ass"* and *"fancy language"*, etc. I get the impression that you think people are often deliberately trying to make you feel stupid. And you're particularly defensive about it. But honestly, I don't think the atheists are trying to make you feel stupid. Granted, they're not trying to make you feel smart either. Many do, however, have a bias

toward expressing their positions with as much precision as possible. And precision often requires specialized vocabulary.

I agree that some atheists are overconfident and overbearing when discussing this topic with those who believe in unfalsifiable, untestable myths about the origin of life. They adopt a condescending tone and use terms like *"amusing hypocrisy"*, *"pompous ass"*, *"typical [insert group you dislike]"*, *"As usual the [insert group you dislike] are too busy attacking to recognize their own hypocrisy"* or *create a false definition of people who are not you and apply it on all of them. etc.* in discussions. It doesn't do anything to advance the discussion, and only shows that they're ill-mannered and full of themselves.

I don't think majority of us don't demonizing anyone, some do I admit. We fight stupid creationists who teach impressionable kids that evolutionary science is wrong without understanding it the slightest. Some may take this as *"demonizing"* but no as Daniel Dennett says *"There's no polite way to say that you've devoted your life to a folly"* In other words, the mildest form of criticism of religion is also the biggest. If someone is offended, it's their problem. if they are so willing to be offended by the most mundane things, there is nothing I can do about that. But here, I will meet people halfway and say, someone can say something abusive about me, I welcome it in fact, but be prepared to do it at your own risk. I hope that sums up my position without going off on a tangent on another topic.

So, not only is this strawman and tu quoque but also, but also based on illogical thinking that inferring that something is true of the *whole* from the fact that it is true of some *part* of the whole.

> "Intentionally and unnecessarily using long words, to try to make your statement seem more intelligent just makes you look like a pompous ass."

Personal incredulity. Which unnecessary long words are you referring to? And could it not be said you are also doing the same thing? You have used some not so common words too that could have been taken out and put in more relatable word, have you not?

Let me make it simpler for you: You are lying. You are lying about what we believe. We simply do not believe what you say we believe. Period, end of story. You are not a mind reader, so if someone says *"I don't believe that"* and you say *"yes you do"*, you are lying aka intellectual dishonesty and strawmanning. I simply don't know what happened. I don't believe an all powerful sky-fairy did it, as there is ZERO evidence to support that, however based on scientific study, we're edging closer to finding out what did in fact happen. The findings are definitely steering towards the likelihood that the Universe did in fact *"begin"* without a *"creator"*. I don't have faith, I have good reason to believe, based on evidence for this. There no big long words for you to cherry-pick.

> “You can concoct an argument wrapped in all sorts of fancy language & unprovable theories”

If it is unprovable it isn't a theory. A [scientific theory](#) is an explanation of an aspect of the natural world that can be repeatedly tested, in accordance with the scientific method, using a predefined protocol of observation and experiment. Established scientific theories have withstood rigorous scrutiny and embody scientific knowledge. There are no proposals/hypotheses for abiogenesis which attain this standard.

Dexter, paraphrasing all your tweets into one sentence > “Just admit you atheist people have faith and stop mocking people who do, which is being a hypocrite. And your hypocritical for demonizing people of faith because they have faith.”

This is really the root of this whole matter, isn't it? Well, how about this. Faith comes with many definitions. Some use it to mean “*trust*”, others mean “*Expect*”, and others yet use it as “*believe without evidence*”. Well, It's a bad thing to believe without evidence. Yet, we all do it all of the time about one thing or another. There is just too much out there, too much content. It isn't pragmatic to personally evaluate all evidence on every subject. This is why the courts use the testimony of experts, for example. The court itself cannot be counted to know everything, so it uses specialists to help understand the stuff, as a witness to the knowledge.

Yet you mean faith in the origin of life. There is no scientific claim that the process via which life came about has been worked out. There are a number of possibilities consistent with known chemistry and biology, but to outline and flesh out a possibility is not to make the claim that it necessarily happened that way. To propose a possibility without claiming that this is necessarily what actually did happen is not a statement of faith. However, on the other hand, religious people believe without evidence regarding their religion, and their understanding of how life came about. There is a scientific understanding for where life came from that doesn't require magic, miracles, deities or demigods. IT just requires the natural workings of the universe and enough time and enough space for it to occur. It happens “*on it's own*”. (Note: “*Sprang from nothing*” is so far away from the mark, I urge you to stop using that description).

The theory of abiogenesis isn't yet perfect, but it is *close enough* to warrant belief without faith. Science gets stuff wrong, but it error-corrects itself. When we learn something new about a subject in science, we update our understanding of how things work. The same can't be said for faith.

So the reason why people who hold faith that life was created is mocked is because they are doing so despite very rational evidence and argument that life is possible without a creator, yet they seem to reject this because their trust in their own religion (*probably because it was taught to them by people they respect, and their whole life has been affected by it*) outweighs their interest in following the specialists understanding of the scientific answers to these questions.

We don't want to have faith, even though we all do. We must try to be better than belief-without-evidence, and theists seem to have no interest in doing so. They literally treat faith as a virtue, which many atheists find absurd. No, theists are proud of their faith so much so that they don't even want to trust the specialists. I'll mock that, shamelessly.

### To your latest comments:

> *"It is intellectually dishonest to pretend by rejecting creation atheists are not staking out the position that life began on its own. It's one or the other, if had a third choice you'd have offered up by now. But there simply isn't one. It's A or B no highway option"*

You're kidding, right? Move the goalposts, much? Firstly, you're doing it again. *"Began on its own"* is not the same as *"spontaneously sprang from nothing"*. Life didn't *"spontaneously come from nothing"*. That was your second choice. Life arose from natural processes that have more to do with the way proteins fold than any anthropomorphic gods with elaborate plans that require billions of years to unfold. I don't need faith to know that, I just need to pay attention to the evidence. [The evidence doesn't require your gods.](#)

> *"It is intellectually dishonest to pretend by rejecting creation atheists are not staking out the position that life began on its own"*

False. By saying *"i do not believe you"* we are not saying *"you are wrong"*. We are saying *"we do not believe you, pending evidence"*. This has been explained to you numerous times in more polite ways than you deserve. I choose to ignore your false dilemma. Instead, I choose the third option, one that you keep avoiding - *"I don't know"*. Address that and maybe we can have an honest discussion. What you are doing is . Atheism is a lack of belief in any god or gods. It is not a position on how life started. One can be an atheist (i.e. lack a belief in any god) without being adamant or absolutely positive about anything. Your post is therefore a complete strawman argument - you are attacking a position that people do not in fact adopt, even if some people do you would be appealing to what is known as fallacy of composition. I would say that the majority of atheists are do not subscribe to creatio ex nihilo as you suggest and have better arguments for their side than you propose.

> *"It's one or the other, if had a third choice you'd have offered up by now."*

The third choice has been told to you numerous times both here and on twitter in many forms. They are *"We do not know"*. You do understand that us saying "I don't know" does not automatically make you right? Don't you? You do not get to jam in your unproven myth to fill that space. That would be intellectual dishonesty of the serious kind and Abiogenesis, which is not *'spontaneously sprang from nothing'*. How

did you rule out life arising from something as a result of natural chemical processes? You basically rejected these by saying we should not discuss the *"particulars"*. And that they are not relevant. They most certainly are for this very reason and that your argument still applies even if we don't know. I have explained why this cannot be the case. This is another way of asking *"What are the other possibilities then?"* This would be, is, illogical, by displaying argumentum ad ignorantiam.

If you're going to force a false dichotomy, please at least stay consistent: do you think all atheists believe life *"spontaneously sprang from nothing"*, or that all atheists believe life *"starts all by itself"*, or that all atheists believe that life *"began on its own"*? You are using these terms interchangeably, but they all mean different things. If intentionally done, you are undergoing tasks such as moving the goalposts and special pleading.

> *"But there simply isn't one. It's A or B no highway option"*

I see your argument from ignorance and while I can ignore it, I have addressed it. You can either prove your assertion, which you are implying, or join us in the *"we do not know"* camp, which you say you do but what you argue tells me otherwise. Either way this has nothing to do with atheism. Nothing. If you were really curious, you would go ask a damned scientist, and if you have done that, ask many scientists, once you have done that see if it has passed the muster of peer review research of the current state of the claim.

#### **Addendum:**

Keeping in mind, I am not obliged to give you any evidence for abiogenesis for many reasons, for simplifying saying *"I don't know"* is sufficient enough to refute your false dichotomy. But nonetheless here is an extra tid bit of evidence for abiogenesis and thus being the most likely out of the two options you have presented me with. Again keeping in mind, the hypothesis of abiogenesis proposes that life arose from pre-life self-replicating chemicals, is not from nothing. Another thing to keep in that brain of yours is that there are a number of possibilities consistent with known chemistry and biology, but to outline and flesh out a possibility is not to make the claim that it necessarily happened that way. To propose a possibility without claiming that this is necessarily what actually did happen is **not** a statement of faith. In other words while I propose abiogenesis as a viable and most reliable option to how life originated, I in know way claiming it to be true, I am saying with the evidence we have, it is most likely, I am still saying *"I don't know"*.

[Here is some information on abiogenesis:](#)

Evidence points towards abiogenesis through [chemical evolution](#)

Here are two very informative videos and a bunch of research for you.

[Video 1](#)

[Video 2](#)

[Nucleotides can naturally form in nature.](#)

[Amino acids can naturally form in nature , we've even found amino acids in space.](#)

[That protocells can spontaneously form in solutions.](#)

[That these spontaneously forming protocells can replicate and grow naturally.](#)

[Abiogenesis & Evolution](#)

[The Origins of Life: Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology](#)

[RNA Worlds: Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology](#)

[Exploring Life's Origins](#)

A potential question you may be wondering when I said *"life from nonlife"* (which isn't as farfetched as it sounds - refer to the Urey-Miller experiment It also coincides with everything we know about evolution and the mechanism involved).. It might go something like this:

> *"What's the difference between life starting on its own or life springing from nothing?"*

The difference is something vs. nothing. If I leave bread out long enough, mold will start to grow on its own. But that mold is not springing from *'nothing'* - there's bread, there's the chemical composition of its environment, there's temperature, and there's the spores that attach to the bread and eventually form the mold. *"Life sprang from nothing"* is not a position that many, if any, serious scientists or atheists take. We've never observed *'nothing'*. We've never tested *'nothing'*. We have no idea what the properties of *'nothing'* are. We don't even know if it's possible for *'nothing'* to exist. So suggesting that life can spontaneously spring from it would be a ludicrous proposition. Maybe it can. Maybe it can't. We don't know. But ultimately it's irrelevant to this discussion, because we know roughly when life appeared on Earth, and we know that at the time, there wasn't *'nothing'* - there was something. There was the Earth, its atmosphere, the chemical composition of its air and the primordial soup, and so on. That's not *'nothing'*. That's something. Rain starts on its own. But it doesn't spring from *'nothing'* - it springs from clouds. It's the result of an entirely natural process based on *'something'* being there, not *'nothing'*. All evidence suggests that life is no different.

> "*miraculous occurrence*"

Now, I am only going to reference one word "*miraculous*" to give you a quick lesson in semantics and language whilst keeping to the topic of what you mean.

Depends on how you define "*miraculous*". If you think magic or supernatural or some other variant like this. Then no. Others here have shown you that abiogenesis is not what you imply "*spontaneously sprang from nothing*" but rather gradually arose through chemical processes from previously-existing basic building blocks.

Miraculous in the sense that it was an amazing event that occurred within the Cosmos. Yea, it could be thought of if like that. That the right conditions were perfect for life to occurs. This in no way suggests life "*spontaneously sprang from nothing*" but rather a set of natural occurrences as hypothesised by the scientific community. Creatio ex materia if you will.

Saying that prominent scientists do say that Life occurred as soon as it could have on earth.. so one could say it was inevitably going to happen. This could still be miraculous that it occurs and that "*we are a chance the universe can know itself*" as Sagan would say but not in the sense that it defied the odds and occurred.

You see it all matters how one defines words like "*miraculous*".