

Life and Evolution



Charles B. Samuels

Life and Evolution

After a lifetime of agnosticism, I have changed my mind and decided that the universe is an intelligently designed construction in which the designer defined the physical laws of the universe. Then the designer sat back and watched to see what would happen. It is evident that if the omnipotent designer wanted a particular outcome, he/she/it would have created it that way, and it could not have included evolution, which is primarily driven by chance.

I recently read the article "7 theories on the origin of life" by Charles Q. Choi. None of the seven theories are compelling. Scientists have been unsuccessfully trying to create life for a very long time. The belief underlying the search is that a chance combination of forces created the beginning of life, and all life on earth flowed from that.

A more plausible view is, *"The cell is the most complex and most elegantly designed system man has ever witnessed. ... The reason is that organic molecules are so complex that their formation cannot possibly be explained as being coincidental, and it is manifestly impossible for an organic cell to have been formed by chance."*

What is life? All life, including bacteria, is composed of cells. Viruses are not cells, but are semi alive and can only replicate inside of cells. Something is alive when it has the property of creating a copy of itself, uses energy, and has a limited life span. It is intuitively obvious (I love that phrase) that life is a fundamental part of nature. It is also evident that life will be found throughout the universe wherever conditions permit.

There are four forces in nature; gravity, electromagnetic, strong force, and weak force. The strong force holds protons and neutrons together, and the weak force controls the decay of atoms. Is life a fifth force? If so, it is very different than the other four. The idea of a life force is not new; the concept has been around for centuries. But the idea was relegated to the scientific trash bin along with alchemy.

When a living cell splits, each cell has half the amount of material as the original cell, but the life force of each daughter cell is the same as the mother cell, which indicates the life force is an integral part of the cell. Life gives cells the ability to replicate, use energy, and defines the cell's life span. The question arises: are those attributes one function, or are they separate functions? Logic will show that these attributes are distinct functions, e.g.,

- if the ability to replicate is turned off, the cell will die with no side effects.
- If the ability to use energy is turned off, the cell will die with no side effects.
- If the ability to die is turned off, the cell will not die, and the result is cancer. However, cancer will eventually kill the host.
- A side note about cancer: because the cells do not die, any errors accumulate, and the cells morph into a different thing.

Doctors try to cure cancer by killing the cancer cells, but a better way is to turn the ability to die back on. How do we do that? I have no idea, but if someone sends me a few million, I'll give it a shot. Evolution needs all three of these attributes, random changes or damage to the cell will almost always be detrimental, but occasionally changes are positive.

Physics is the study of natural phenomena, and biophysics is the study of life forms. Physics has two parts, Quantum Mechanics and Classical Mechanics. Quantum deals with the atomic scale and uses probabilities to describe phenomena, and Classical physics deals with the larger or macro scale. In a sense, biophysics is more akin to quantum physics than to classical physics because probabilities also describe it.

Life on earth consists of many species of insects, plants, and animals. Most life forms are mobile to seek food, aka energy, and find mates. Plants are not mobile. However, they have other means to spread into new territories. I looked on the internet for a list of biophysical laws and found none. Biology is not my strong suit, but science seems to treat life studies as a red-headed stepchild.

Some laws that could be considered are:

- Reaction time is dependent on the size of the organism; a mosquito's reaction time is faster than an elephant's. And the distance from the brain to the eye determines the reaction time.
- Life span is also dependent on size
- Intelligence and technological ability are separate things. One can be highly intelligent, but unable to create technology, whales, apes, and dolphins are examples. On the other hand, one must be intelligent to create technology.
- To have technology, one must be able to manipulate materials, humans use hands, the octopus uses their arms, and birds use their beaks.
- Technology requires the use of fire to work metals.
- The life span of cells varies depending on location in the body and ranges from a few days to your entire life.

What an alien would look like:

- They would walk upright to free the hands for work.
- Their senses would be the same as ours; smell, taste, touch, sound, and sight.
- Their eyes and ears would be close to the brain.
- Their size and shape would depend on the gravity of their home planet, high gravity would dictate a short frame, and low gravity would allow a tall frame.
- Their shape and size of their eyes would depend on the type of sun on their home planet.
- They would not be carnivorous, nor would they be strictly vegetarian. A carnivore does not need intelligence, and a vegetarian is too focused on eating a low energy diet.

- They would have language and communicate with each other. There are a lot of ways to communicate: sound, motion, and light are possible, but sound is the most probable. Telepathy? I don't think so; it would require an unknown type of energy.