Can science create life?

That depends on what we mean by "creating" life. If you take a living cell, certainly today no scientist could produce anything that resembles it, but as science progresses and knowledge and techniques improve, I see no reason why one day a scientist couldn't - if he wants to go through such useless labor - produce an exact copy of that cell. But if this is what is meant by "science creating life" then this is certainly not a very interesting proposition. But have been significant sense.

"Cogito ergo sum" said Descartes, which somewhat freely translated means
"I think and therefore I live." Why should science not one day construct a
machine that can think? Our present-day calculating machines do, of course,
nothing of the sort. The mathematician thinks, the machine merely calculates.

A calculating machine has never an idea, whereas a mathematician occasionally has
one. No one knows today how such a thinking machine could be built. In many
respects its functions would have to resemble some of the functions of the brain,
even though the machine would be constructed of technical materials and not for
longanic compounds. That such a machine might be very large and expensive matters
little. As technical advances proceed, the machine might be smaller than we
might suppose. But difficulties of technique and financing are not relative refunction.

for the purpose of discussions in any case.

Suppose such a machine could be built and could communicate using some sign language? Suppose it were taught as children are taught today until they are ready to take over and are capable of thinking productively, would we not have to regard such a machine as living? And if a scientist were to converse with such a machine and learn from it new ideas that had not occured to him before, wouldn't he gradually come to regard the machine affectionately as a fellow scientist? If science is going to create life, my guess is this is the kind of life science with first attempt to create.