

# #002 What to do to understand life?

Jan Kubań, Warsaw 2019.04.21

Article from the series "What is life – step-by-step".

Well, this is probably the fundamental question that everyone who wishes to understand the essence of life should ask themselves. Medical students study the longest, and afterwards they get the right to practice medicine after undergoing a several-year internship and passing a state medical examination. But even then no one considers themselves as a specialist in everything. Doctors choose their specialization and continue to learn over the years. Everyone knows that this is a lot of knowledge from various scientific disciplines. The enormity of knowledge and still the humility that they still do not know everything yet.

Everyone is aware that to treat effectively a vast knowledge is necessary. However, when it comes to the issues of understanding life, I have the impression that people try to resolve this problem with a very narrow perspective. Two attitudes dominate: blind faith in Darwin or blind disbelief in Darwin.

"Blind faith in Darwin!?" - someone may ask - "But Darwinism is logical and explains everything clearly!" I am not saying that the theory of evolution is untrue, but I know, for sure, that many issues it leaves unexplained, unsaid or even misinterpreted, and a lot of uncomfortable topics are swept under the proverbial "carpet". And because, unfortunately, this is true, everyone who reliably deals with life deflects from these types of topics. "And what topics are these?" - someone may ask again.

First, there is no definition of evolution. If you do not believe me try to find one which convincingly explains how life came to be. Next, if you state that life originated on the principle of the self-organization of matter, then you have to precisely define all the processes and all of their characteristics that organized matter into cells, and then cells into multicellular organisms. And if this process is consistently described, then you have to think about what to do with the Second Law of Thermodynamics. For if life arose on the principle of the self-organization of matter, it will be obvious that this principle cannot be true. In order not to be groundless, it is enough to say that Darwinist icons claim that life originated from "a happy chemical accident" (R. Dawkins) or "somehow" (J. Szostak). Someone who has become familiar with the theory of stability – and there are not many of them, because it is practically taught nowhere – will realize that life could not have arisen by accident, it had to have been created by "a system that performs the process of creating living objects in an asymptotically stable manner".

Other avoided topics include:

1. Does the Darwinian Tree of Life contradict phenomena of symbiogenesis and endosymbiosis;
2. Why the so-called genetic algorithms have nothing to do with the mechanism of biological evolution, and yet evolutionists use them as one of their crowning arguments?
3. How groundbreaking information could arise "out of nothing"?

4. How did a group of billions of cells working together in such a perfect and highly reliable way become us?
5. What factors caused that, in multicellular living objects, that cells have specialized and differentiated over generations?
6. What is the final answer: is evolution based on "conflict" or "cooperation"?
7. What is the purpose of life?
8. How does biological evolution introduce "novelties"?
9. What did Darwin mean when he wrote that evolution could lead to a "reversion to a less perfect state"?
10. How was evolution naturally triggered?
11. Why do life sciences not mention economics, when absorption and expulsion of resources is carried out by every living object with practically no interruption?
12. What is evolution and what mechanisms cause it to create such complex objects as ourselves?

Without unambiguous and logical answers to the above questions, they can be discussed forever. And the essence of such discussions was perfectly captured by the father of Polish cybernetics, Marian Mazur: *The publication on, say, intelligence, begins with the question: "What is intelligence?" followed by quoting and discussing the statements of twenty previous authors and adding their own. The next author will already have twenty-one statements to quote and the opportunity to add twenty-two, and so is the "development of literature" on this subject. It can be seen that the word "intelligence" is a permanent element here, but what reality corresponds to it remains a fluid matter. This is putting the matter on your mind - instead of exploring the fragment of reality in which you see the problem to be solved, the choice of the subject of the study depends on the supposed meanings of the words. It seems that if certain words did not exist, then such authors would have nothing to study. Meanwhile, the progress of science consists primarily in the detection and investigation of phenomena not previously known, and thus not named by anyone.*

When I started looking for a definition of evolution a dozen or so years ago - I couldn't see the wood for the trees. What's worse, none of the ones I found convinced me. I don't mean to say that I reject the theory of evolution, quite the opposite. But as long as there is no unambiguous, consistent and logical definition of it, able to precisely answer the above questions, the Darwinists (including Neodarwinists) will continue to argue with Creationists, and vice versa.

One has to admit that Darwinists swept the discoveries of Konstantin Mieriezkowski (1855-1921), Lynn Margulis (1938-2011) and Barbara McClintock (1902-1992) under the carpet, all of which are essential to understand biological evolution. So in order to understand life we have to find logical answers to the most basic of questions, namely "How did life start?".

In the next episode: we will face the Creationists' main argument - "F. Hoyle's Impossibility Thesis".