# There Is No Such Thing as the "First Selfreproducing Molecule That Gave Rise to Life"

There Is No Such Thing as the "First Self-reproducing Molecule That Gave Rise to Life"

The scenario regarding life that Darwinists have been rehearsing ever since Darwin's time begins with a mythical "first cell" that supposedly came into being spontaneously. This mythical first cell;

- Was described in Darwin's day as "a small balloon filled with water," because under the primitive conditions of the time, nobody even knew what the cell really looked like.
- It was irrationally suggested that this alleged first cell came into being spontaneously in water.
- It was claimed that all the varieties of life developed from this first cell that came into being by chance.

Enormous scientific progress was subsequently made in the 20th Century and the structure of the cell was fully revealed. It was realized that;

- A single cell has a more complex structure than the city of New York.
- That it was impossible for even a single protein inside the cell, let alone a cell itself, to come about spontaneously.
- The idea that the cell came into being in muddy water is therefore scientifically illogical and impossible.

These facts caused a terrible panic among Darwinists. The fact that the theory of evolution had collapsed RIGHT AT THE BEGINNING OF LIFE totally demoralized them. They wanted to conceal this fact. They set about using the press and universities. "We can probably manufacture protein in laboratories and are conducting experiments," they said. "There are hypotheses that life began from a single cell," they said. "We will prove our claims eventually," they said. But nothing changed over the next 150 years and no evolutionary claim was ever proved. On the contrary, every new scientific advance has proven that no protein can ever come into being by chance.

## <u>Why Do Evolutionists in Turkey Still Espouse Claims That Darwinists Elsewhere Have Abandoned?</u>

Stunned by a succession of scientific defeats, Darwinists recently, under the leadership of Richard Dawkins, began speaking of a supposed "self-reproducing molecule." But even this did not rescue the position, and even Dawkins had to publicly admit the illogical nature of the claim, and thus that such a creation could only be brought into being by a sublime intelligence.

Yes despite all these facts and scientific advances, evolutionists in Turkey insist on repeating the idea. They reiterate such illogical and unscientific ideas as, "We cannot speak of an advanced life form, but we speak of an organization progressing toward life," "...the first self-replicating molecule created life," or "...life emerging from inanimate matter is the result of the laws of nature, and there is nothing to discuss about it." The reason for this is that these people are unable to divorce themselves from the old, fraudulent evolutionist conception of science.

#### There Is No Such Thing as a First Self-reproducing Molecule

Since Darwinists are unable to account for how a protein might have formed spontaneously, they claim that the beginning of life was "a first molecule capable of self-reproducing." First of all, there is no such

thing as a "self-reproducing molecule." If this molecule was a protein, the smallest units inside the living cell, then it must be borne in mind that proteins themselves have no "self-reproductive" property. In order for a protein to be able to self-replicate, IT NEEDS

- Other proteins
- DNA
- Ribosomes
- Endoplasmic reticulum
- Cytoplasm
- Energy manufacturing mitochondria
- And the cell membrane.

#### IN SHORT,

### A FULLY EQUIPPED CELL.

Therefore, the idea of a "self-reproducing molecule" is totally fraudulent. It is impossible for a molecule not inside a living cell to be able to take in energy from the outside and use it to replicate itself. To refer to this as "an organization progressing toward life" is demagoguery and a deliberate distraction. "Organization progressing toward life" is a totally illogical term. The smallest living thing is "a CELL." Only a cell and the structures inside it can self-reproduce. Only a cell can take in energy from the outside and use it. Only a cell can maintain its own existence through its own organelles and the energy it takes in from the outside.

To put it another way, there can be no supposed stages progressing <u>from the inanimate toward life</u>. LIFE CAN NEVER COME FROM SOMETHING INANIMATE. THAT IS ABSOLUTELY IMPOSSIBLE. IT IS SCIENCE THAT SAYS THIS, PROVEN, CONCLUSIVE, SCIENTIFIC EXPERIMENTS. When Darwinists say, "....there is scientific evidence that life formed from inanimate matter," they are not speaking the truth. All research at the molecular level has proved in the 20th Century that life cannot come from what is inanimate; and this has been confirmed by science in the 21st Century. Not even the presence of a protein is enough for a living thing to form. In order to be able to explain life, Darwinists have to account for the formation of a SINGLE CELL. BUT THEY ARE STILL UNABLE TO ACCOUNT FOR HOW A SINGLE PROTEIN MIGHT HAVE EMERGED SPONTANEOUSLY. A tiny protein inside the cell totally demolishes Darwinism.

https://www.harunyahya.info/en/articles/there-is-no-such-thing-as-the-8220first-self-reproducing-molecule-that-gave-rise-to-life8221