

THE NEW MILLER-UREY EXPERIMENT

Seventy years after the infamous lab tests which were pumped up to suggest that life had been created in a test tube, the same thing is happening again, only this time it is in a petri dish and the conclusions reached are outrageous.

Increasingly we will be seeing terms such as prebiotic and protocells, suggesting that great strides have been made in teasing out the riddle of abiogenesis. Don't believe it. It's posturing and puffery by the Materialists. In a rerun of the 1952 experiments by Stanley Miller and his assistant, Geologist Juan Manuel Garcia Ruiz and team placed water, methane, nitrogen, and ammonia into a transparent container and added electric charges to simulate conditions of a primitive Earth. Just like in Miller's test, some amino acids formed. Ruiz's experiment also generated the five nucleobases that are in DNA. You might think that is a profound advancement, but the excitement was for supposed "protocells" that formed, described in the reporting article as, "structures considered to be the precursor to life itself."

The Darwinian fantasy began when the yellowish-brown layer seen through the microscope appeared like curved structures that at first glance looked like life. Even though they were not living, they were called "self-organized" molecules. Note that they didn't just organize, they were prompted, facilitated by a lab with specific conditions. Keep that in mind, because breathless stories of abiogenesis conveniently downplay the hand of man in the process. Even these dead clumps did not self-organize! They were chemicals agitated by electrical sparks that caused them to form. The collection of them is being called "proto-worlds". When evolutionary origin of life researchers want to load their work with supposedly world-class importance, to allude to their dead materials as though living, they give it names with words like "world", which elicits a notion of living things. Remember what I have been teaching you in this book, that lab work by molecular biologists is showing that molecules, amino acids, and proteins do not self-assemble! The story being trotted out by Ruiz flies in the face of high confidence lab work showing the process of abiogenesis is bankrupt!

For Ruiz, it is not enough that non-living structures are called protocells or the like. Sweeping declarations must be made, "We have always approached the [origin of life](#) following the biblical text, as though there were a divine breath, a singular moment where everything becomes irreversible. What our study suggests is that it wasn't like that, but that it is a [chemical evolution of millions of years](#), absolutely random, like subsequent biological evolution, and that it increases in complexity over time. It can

lead to self-organized structures and, in some cases, to self-assembled structures, like life," García Ruiz explains. Then he goes in for the big denial, the overreach, ""These types of proto-worlds must exist on billions of planets throughout the universe. And these proto-worlds may lead to something as complex as life, or to nothing at all. There's no intelligent design, no divine breath of life, and no fundamental reaction either."

If the man had made life, he might have a point. He did nothing of the sort and budged the movement toward demonstrating the potential of chemicals to randomly form life perhaps a centimeter on a million-mile-long road. The total progress of the evolutionary camp over 70 years has progressed a smidge over one centimeter. If you want to have the hard scientific proof backing my comment, read a book that I have recommended, [The Stairway to Life](#) by Change Laura Tan and Rob Stadter. Then you will understand why I take such umbrage with loose claims!

So much for the humility of science in saying, "We don't know." In seventy years, the advancements of lab work have allowed a test that produced non-living structures to advance to the point of creating... non-living structures! What has advanced in terms of showing that non-life can produce life? Basically, nothing. But a new outcome has surfaced, a bold declaration that God's breath of life was not involved. One thing has advanced mightily in the intervening 70 years, man's pride! This marginally important result is supporting a claim that God's direct involvement in life has been disproven. As we take a closer look at Ruiz's work, we will see his bias at work, using his questionable results to bash the Christian account of creation.

Importantly, Ruiz notes, "These protocells must have also appeared in Miller's experiment and in subsequent ones, but no one had looked for them until now." Wait! He is saying that these non-living structures were likely produced by Miller's tests 70 years ago, but no one looked for them. Now, they are being seen, and that is being offered as a major advancement in demonstrating that life comes from chemicals and randomness. Part of the humans-pretending-we're-showing-nature-making-life results 70 years ago are given new legs by claiming that there were practically cell walls found!

Mexican biologist Antonia Lazcano felt the study advanced the cause of abiogenesis, but suggested caution, "I would not call them protocells, because that suggests an evolutionary continuity that is far from being demonstrated, and that *does not correspond to their chemical composition*, (italics mine)" he notes. "They are right to write that they may have been microreactors that allowed other reactions, but we are still far from constructing a detailed and realistic sequence of evolution that led from the

inorganic components and molecules of the prebiotic Earth to the first organisms, among other reasons because *we still do not agree on what would be a good definition of 'first forms of life.'* "(italics mine). Why don't they have a good definition of the first forms of life? Because no one can conceive of a step-by-step process for chemicals to make the leap to become a molecule, much less a cell! Scientists have tried valiantly to conjecture the simplest form of life, but it is so complex that when the numbers are run, the odds of it forming are prohibitive. That's being generous; the odds are so against it that there would be more likelihood of pink cotton candy T-Rex dinosaurs living at the bottom of the ocean.

Here is how Kepa Ruiz Mirazo, "a philosopher of biology and expert in the origin of life and protocellular models," reacted in part, "From my perspective, the encapsulation of biomolecular precursors, although necessary (as the authors of the article argue), is not in itself a sufficient condition for a compartment to be considered a protocell."

In other words, Ruiz is exaggerating the results, saying the non-living structures were a part of chemical evolution, one step in the chain of accidental changes that must have led to life. When you call a dead structure a protocell and a bunch of them a proto-world, you are fantasizing, stretching the results. That kind of fantasizing and stretching the results in support of evolutionary theory is about the best evidence that has arisen in 70 years. What fantastic strides have been made, to see little dead shells that were in Miller's experiments and now call them prebiotic! At this rate, in another 70 years, repeated experiments will be seeing dead structures and calling them advanced prebiotic protocells! Nothing will be living as an outcome of the test, and there is no chance that dead chemicals would self-assemble because it has already been shown that molecules don't self-assemble and randomly change configurations. Proteins don't form randomly because the molecular machinery to make them requires that DNA, RNA, and transcription all be functioning simultaneously, none could have evolved. Organelles and cell walls don't form randomly but according to mind-blowingly complex systems of construction by proteins and enzymes. Everywhere we look biologically, we see deeper and deeper layers of interdependent systems. The Kinect toy Darwinian thought process is the equivalent of the worst fast food you have ever eaten. It contains little intellectual nourishment.

In other words, Ruiz's experiment is being hailed as important by evolutionists, when it's inconsequential. It's play time for fantasy stories which bear no resemblance to reality, which is a good description of Darwinian theory.

[Protocells emerge in experiment simulating lifeless world: 'There is no divine breath of life'](#)