

# Patterns of Intelligence

## CHAPTER 26

### THE FIRST LIVING CELL

Let's start at the beginning of evolution and talk about the "first living cell." If there is one thing that is evolving in the theory of evolution, it is how the "first living cell" came to exist.

Evolution must claim that life on this earth started with a single cell which had entirely randomly generated DNA or RNA.

When creating a new species from an old species, the new species will start out with some intelligence on their DNA which was inherited from the DNA of its parent species (according to the theory of evolution).

But the "first living cell" was claimed to be the first life on the planet earth and thus **it did not inherit any intelligence from a parent species** - by definition.

Thus, the *entire* sequence of DNA or RNA of the "first living cell" must have been totally put together randomly (i.e. the flat chart in a prior chapter)!!!! This is because it could not inherit any intelligence from a parent species!! But randomness can never create intelligence, randomness can only **reduce** intelligence (i.e. randomize it)!!

Randomness cannot create life because life requires vast intelligence to create it, even for "simple" cells.

There could never have been a "first living cell" which was alive!! It could not have passed on any intelligence to its descendant species because it did not have any intelligence to pass on!!

When you hear scientists talk about the "first living cell" you won't need a dictionary because they are constantly inventing new terminology as they go along.

But the lack of intelligence is only the tip of the iceberg with regards to the problems of the "first living cell" for evolutionists. For example, every known type of "living cell" today is incredibly complex.

Looking inside of a single cell today is like looking at a perpetual motion machine in a complex society on a different and distant planet!!

I strongly recommend the reader Google the videos: "Inner Life of a Cell" and "Powering the Cell: Mitochondria." Both videos were designed at Harvard University and made by BioVisions. These two videos are a very, very small peak inside the complexity of a living cell.

Also inside of cells are very complex molecules. For example, ribosomes are very, very complex molecules which are involved in the conversion from nucleotides to amino acids. How were ribosomes created by evolution for the first living cell?

I have two college textbooks in my library which are about cell biology. They are both books for [introductory](#) courses in the field of cell biology. Both are large books in terms of how much they weigh.

The World of the Cell by Becker, Kleinsmith and Hardin, Fourth Edition, is 11 inches tall and 8 1/2 inches wide. It is [878 pages long](#), including the index.

Essential Cell Biology - An Introduction to the Molecular Biology of the Cell (Note the word "Introduction") is about the same size, but only has [630 pages](#) (excluding the Glossary and other sections).

Looking at these books, you would not believe how many complex chemical chain reactions; complex signaling, etc. that exist inside of a single cell!!

These two books are introductory textbooks to what is going on inside of every known cell.

I also have a newer version of the book: Essential Cell Biology (3rd Edition - [731 pages](#)). You would not believe how many times the word "evolution" is used in this book.

Why do they use the term "evolution" in a cellular biology book? There must be a living cell before it can "evolve" into a more complex cell and eventually into humans. But they don't explain how a cell can form from the dust of the earth by totally accidental events.

(Note: I will talk about "self-replicating RNA" later in this book.)

Also consider that every year scores of scientists are awarded PhDs in "cell biology," meaning they get PhDs for making advances in understanding the complexity of what goes on: on the surface, inside (such as chemical reactions) and outside of cells!!

This means my textbooks are only an introduction to what is going on inside of cells!!

What goes on inside of a cell is so complex it has taken thousands of scientists to unravel our current understanding of its complexity.

I have an entire book which talks about nothing but calcium and much of the book is about how important calcium is to cells. This book mentions the existence of thousands of scientific papers which are primarily about calcium and cells!!

I also have a dictionary called: A Dictionary of Genetics, Seventh Edition, by King, Stansfield and Mulligan. This book has about 400 pages of definitions related to genetics, biology and related fields. In this book there are 10 pages devoted to **listing** scientific periodicals (i.e. journals) related to genetics, cell biology, etc.

Do you get the idea that cell biology and DNA are very, very, very complex subjects!!! And scientist don't have a clue as to many of the things that DNA is capable of doing!!

How could something as complex as a cell, with highly complex RNA or DNA, form from the dust of the earth from nothing except sand, lightning and chemicals randomly mixed together!!

Where did the first DNA or RNA come from? Where did the first cell membrane come from? How was it enclosed so it didn't leak? How were its ports made so it could breathe?

Where did the first mitochondria, which would have provided the ATP molecules inside the cells, come from? Every cell has from one to thousands of mitochondria to provide energy and to keep the cell from falling apart.

Even devout evolutionists admit that the cells of today could not have come to exist from a pile of dirt and chemicals and a lot of fortuitous accidents.

To avoid such an inane claim, evolutionists claim that the "first living cell" was a "simple cell" or was nothing but a "self-replicating molecule" or a "self-replicating RNA" strand. This "simple cell" would have had simple metabolism and simple RNA.

The problem is that there are no "simple cells" on this planet and that is why the story of evolutionists has to keep changing!! Even a "self-replicating RNA" would need a cell membrane and hundreds of other complex mechanisms to survive. The DNA or RNA inside a cell is only a small part of what is going on inside the cell.

In addition, no one has demonstrated that RNA replication could itself be self-replicating (i.e. new copies of RNA cannot copy themselves) in nature. While

this can be done in a lab, doing this actually involves two RNA enzymes and a steady supply of subunits. This combination is not likely to happen in nature a single time, much less enough times to create a living cell.

When you deal with RNA the statistics are bad enough, but to deal with two RNA, plus a supply of subunits, that work together, the probabilities of doing this accidentally are even more absurd.

But one of the biggest issues is the cell membrane and the many, many complex things that go on inside of a cell.

Evolutionists will continue to try to figure out how life began. But they are trying to do it in highly controlled laboratories!!

They need to do it on the beach, not in a laboratory!! They need to start with a sandy beach and end up with a living cell which can reproduce. And they are not allowed to touch anything or add anything to the beach. That will never happen!!

Yet, "life" on this earth had to start with a single cell if evolution is true!!

Thus, evolutionists must claim that the "simple cells" are all extinct. How convenient, all of their evidence is dead and missing!!

But you cannot jump directly from a "simple cell" (the term "simple cell" is an oxymoron, all cells are highly complex) to any of the types of cells on the earth today. Thus, if the theory of evolution were true, there would have had to have been an "evolution" or "progression" of many different types of simple cells (each slightly more complex than the former) to get from the first simple cell to a complex cell of today.

But all of these intermediate semi-simple cells are also extinct, leaving only complex cells on this planet. How convenient.

What the reader needs to do is go to a library and look up a college textbook on cellular biology. Flip through the pages and on every page ask yourself: "how did this feature of the cell come to exist by a series of accidents to dirt and chemicals?" Then, and only then, will you begin to comprehend the absurdity of the theory of evolution.

For example, find a copy of the Third Edition of Essential Cell Biology and look at pages 442-447. And they claim all of these 500 chemical reactions were created by a series of accidents??!!

How could a cell have existed with only 40 of these chemical reactions?? And how did 40 chemical reactions all occur accidentally in the "first" cell.

The more scientists learn about cells, the more ridiculous the theory of evolution becomes. But scientists ignore the absurdities of evolution and continue to push forward with their "theories," deceptions and creative thinking.

But here is the question the reader needs to ask themselves: "If evolutionists cannot create life from non-life using carefully designed experiments, why do they claim they have 'proven' that evolution is true and that the 'first living cell,' and succeeding semi-simple cells, which are now extinct, were all formed by a series of random accidents?"

All of their "evidence" is gone, so why do they claim they have "proven" anything??

Now you know one more reason why evolutionists have to lie so much to get converts.

Evolutionists have never proven that randomness can create intelligence or even a "simple" living cell. This is the very origin of life on this earth and *the very foundation* of the theory of evolution.

They have no viable answers as to how random, natural events could have created the first life on this earth. They cannot prove any single aspect of the "first living cell" on the beach, watching through a telescope, so why do they continue to tout that they have "proven" that evolution is true and that creation scientists are gullible?

In his book, The Greatest Show on Earth, atheist Richard Dawkins states: "Evolution is a fact. Beyond reasonable doubt, beyond serious doubt, beyond sane, informed, intelligent doubt, beyond doubt evolution is a fact." (page 8)

This is interesting because in his entire book he does not mention one proven example of *macro*evolution in action. Nor does he explain where the morphing of the embryo algorithms of all of our ancestor species came from. Nor does he explain how a single cell can be created by accidents (though he does try to explain this). He has zero evidence, yet he claims that scientists have "proven" that evolution is a fact!!

Evolutionists cannot even remotely get evolution to the point of the "first living cell." They literally cannot get evolution "off the ground" or even on the ground.

Dawkins implicates creation scientists as being "a baying pack of ignoramuses" (page 3) and many other things, but yet he cannot intelligently explain where the "first living cell" came from, which is the very *foundation* of evolution!!

Dawkins (from England) is stunned that so many Americans are creationists. Why is he stunned? Maybe we have done our homework better than he has.

And maybe some of us aren't deceived by his use (and that of many others) of examples of **micro**evolution to claim that **macro**evolution is a proven fact.

But the "first living cell" issue is barely a drop in the bucket of the problems for the theory of evolution.