

#001 The state of knowledge regarding life today

Jan Kubań, Warszawa 2019.04.14

I have been intrigued with the subject of life almost from childhood. Is a man good or bad? How did life arise? Why did the October Revolution in Russia begin? Why did the Soviet Union dismantle, and yet it was ruled by people who were supposedly benevolent to others? What was Christ's {Krajst} deal with that other cheek? I often asked myself these kinds of questions. Besides, the problem of life intrigues not only me, one of the most frequently asked phrases in Google's search engine is "What is life".

There has been a lot written about this subject, however, it seems that there is a lull in this area. And on fundamental issues, this stagnation continues even from Darwin's time. The title of his work "On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life" suggested that at the core of life lies the struggle for existence. Russian scientists did not agree with this almost immediately. They claimed that life is not based on competition but on cooperation. To this day we can meet such muddled expressions as: "Cooperation, Not Survival of the Fittest" or "Evolution does not have to be competitive; it can be cooperative". Both of these quotes come from a {ej} very interesting book, "Evolution 2.0{to point zero}" by Perry Marshall.

I started my adventure with finding the essence of life, like many enthusiasts, from reading "What is Life" by Erwin Schroedinger, "Sociobiology" by Edward O. Wilson and "Selfish Gene" by Richard Dawkins. All of these books have discovered new things, but many issues have remained unexplained. I read {red} on. The next were: Robert Wright's "Nonzero: The Logic of Human Destiny", Marian Mazur's "Cybernetics and character" and Tibor Ganti's "Principles of Life" which I bought by chance for half the price of a can of beer.

Each of these books looked at life from a separate point of view, which unfortunately meant that none of them gave a full and consistent explanation. The first thing that caught my eye was the lack of an unambiguous, logical and understandable definition of evolution. The fact that Creationists neglected to provide such a definition is obvious, but why could the Darwinists not do it?

In the book Evolution 2.0 {to point zero}, published in 2015, the author wrote that he is a very well educated man [according to Wikipedia he has a degree in electrical engineering] and, because no one can explain to him how this complex code of DNA was created, it means that this code had to be created by someone. The author claims that he tried to contact many respected Darwinists so they could explain to him some of the fundamental issues related to life, but they generally avoided him.

Of course, the explanation from Creationists is very simple and can be encapsulated by the statement: "If we do not understand something, it means that God created it". Before it was lightning, then earthquakes, St. Elmo's fire, then it became {bikejm} life and now, as you can see, is seeing DNA as a code. Perry Marschall understands this as a computer programme that creates a living object. I wonder what the ancient Greeks would say about this, because they thought that thunder came from an angry Zeus. Would they have understood what Marschall was talking about?

When it comes to scientific knowledge, we know and understand more and more every year. However, Perry Marshall is absolutely right on one point - Darwinists, like fire, avoid certain topics. According to him, they did not explain how information (ie DNA) could emerge, nor did they explain how biological mechanisms change DNA, because, according to him, "random mutations" cannot stand scrutiny, nor did they explain how biology introduces profitable novelty. If someone wants to explore this subject, I encourage you to read "Evolution 2.0". The book is written in accessible English.

I also came across very similar problems while conducting my own research. I have already mentioned the absence of a definition of evolution. If you have any doubts about this try to find or create your own definition using all available resources. When I was looking for an answer how life might have emerged I found two. One from the icon of the Darwinian movement, Richard Dawkins, who said that it occurred by a "happy chemical accident". The second, from Nobel Prize winner Jack Szostak, stated that it happened "somehow".

Darwinism seems to be more logical out of the two, using science rather than belief. Yet neither of the two top Darwinists explanations of the emergence of life remain absolutely unconvincing.

As I have already mentioned, I have been searching for the origin of life for decades. I approach every issue very critically, just as I was taught at University. I try to analyze everything thoroughly, and if I do not understand something, I do not hide it. Although I do not say whether God exists or not, I am far from the idea of Creationism but Darwinists have left a lot of important thing unsaid as well

The paths of my education were very different, there were many of them and they were uncommon. They helped me develop a kind of worldview in me. On the one hand very critical and on the other very pragmatic. And it was thanks to this worldview that I was able to develop something that one of my reviewers described as "the first successful attempt to build a full, strict model of life". I might say it a little more modestly, it seems to me that I have developed a more probable model of life, including the model of life creation than Dawkins and Shostak, quoted just now. But maybe the next great breakthrough in science will not be made by a scientist.

Perry Marshall claims too that the breakthrough will be made by a person from outside the scientific industry. He gives examples of "newcomers / outsiders" who, not being professionals in the field, have made revolutionary changes. He mentions: Bill Gates, Larry and Siergiej, the creators of Google, Fred Smith, who revolutionized the supply market and a few others. Similar stories are known throughout history: Leonardo da Vinci, Jean le Rond d'Alembert, Auguste Comte, Gustave Eiffel, Gustave Le Bon, George Orwell and many others.

My first and probably the most important observation in relation to life was that no one, absolutely nobody talks about a certain aspect of building cells. Mitosis, meiosis, budding, building on the basis of DNA, we read about it in our school textbooks. But even the world-famous monograph "Biology" does not mention one word about the economic aspect. Where do the cells take elements to build themselves? Of course, we know from the school that animals eat, plants are watered and nutrients reach the dividing cells with water, but nobody says that the active absorption of external resources is one of the fundamental features of all organisms. In my opinion, life cannot be understood without knowledge about resources, their absorption, their processing and methods of acquiring them. Biology should discuss issues related to resources to the same extent as it discusses cell division issues, DNA structure, transcription and translation.

The second fundamental feature of every living object is that it multiplies. Or, to be more precise, because there are many people without children, and mules are not even able to reproduce, we can say that every organism has one or two parents. Knowledge about economics and these two fundamental features of each organism allow the analysis of life processes from a completely different perspective.

One of the biggest neo-Darwinist deceptions was described by Perry Marshall in the following way:

*Some years ago, Dawkins wrote a famous GA software program to demonstrate how Darwinian evolution might successfully work. He entered the following random string of letters into the program.
WDLTMNLT DTJBKWIRZREZLMQCO P*

One letter at a time, his program evolved this string of letters. After only 43 iterations, by randomly changing letters and deleting results it didn't want, the program reached its preprogrammed goal of the following sentence:

METHINKS IT IS LIKE A WEASEL

This was heralded as a success. However, Dawkins' software was programmed to compare each new sentence to the goal sentence and either select it for continued "mutation" or reject it based on whether it more closely resembled the goal than the previous mutation. But his very own "1.0" {an point zero} Darwinian evolution explicitly forbids preprogrammed goals! So Dawkins' "Weasel" {fize} experiment had nothing to do with true Neo-Darwinism.

It's hard to believe, but Marshall is absolutely right! This is confirmed by Pedro Domingos on page 123 of his book "The master algorithm":

The key input to a genetic algorithm, as Holland's creation came to be known, is a fitness function. Given a candidate program and some purpose it is meant to fill, the fitness function assigns the program and some purpose it is meant to fill, the fitness function assigns the program a numeric score reflecting how well it fits the purpose. In natural selection, it's questionable whether fitness can be interpreted this way: while the fitness of wing for flight makes intuitive sense, evolution as a whole has no known purpose.

Is it worth getting interested in this topic? The Darwinists providing the contradictory explanations argue with the Creationists. Creationists also do not convince, because as science develops, the argument about external intervention goes to further levels of complexity. It used to be lightning, and now DNA, as a computer programme.

Or maybe there is something that they all do not know yet? In my opinion, yes, and worse, there are many such things. Therefore, I invite you to the next episodes of the series "The Physics of Life".