

The Gradual Emergence of Life? – A Myth

Paper II

The most profound indications of flaws in our methodology are in the Subjects into which we divide Science. Why do we have Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Physiology, Psychology and the rest?

Most people say that these are just convenient divisions to focus our studies into understandable local areas. But, that is NOT the reason. For if they were they would all easily and smoothly concatenate across the boundaries, and Reductionist explanations would also traverse these so called arbitrary divisions with ease.

But, they don't, and you can't!

They should, according to that approach, ultimately condense into a single Science, with arbitrary specialisms within it, but that is very far from the case. They appear to be *intrinsically separate*! The across-boundary links actually seem to be unobtainable.

Nothing has been exposed, not even in the tiniest degree.

The separate Sciences quite clearly deliver **explicable** areas separated by *inexplicable* gaps.

Why is this?

Such important questions cannot be continually shelved. They are much too important.

Let us consider what might be behind the gap between Physics and Biology.

Clearly, before Life appeared for the first time, there could be NO Biology. The process of creating the first Life, **must** also be behind the inexplicable gap. Technically, such an Event is an Emergence, and it is characterised by a whole New Level of Reality, never before in existence, in which there are new entities, new properties, new qualities, new relations and even new Laws. Where on Earth do all these come from? The obvious answer is that they must have “emerged” from the underlying Level, and the usual “guess” is that the difference is mere complication.

Isn't! It turns out that we can never explain Biology in terms of Physics. The reason is that an Emergence is NOT purely Formal. It involves Creation!

And this Creation is as marvellous as any toted in religion, but totally without any external, non-material agency. Matter pulls itself up by its own bootlaces to new, never before in existence Levels. It is not planned or designed. It is “based on” such lower processes, but transcends them. It is driven by something akin to Natural Selection *but for non living matter*.

Scientists have dedicatedly tried to deliver some of the essential features of life directly from physical components, and have never succeeded. To those who protest that many contributions have already been made, I reply that NOT ONE actual transition has ever been carried through.

Now, this does NOT mean that those areas are not intrinsically linked. They indeed are so linked. But it does mean that our methods of analysis and study are incapable of delivering – are incapable of dealing with what actually happens in such transitions.

NOTE: Not one equation produced by the whole history of science delivers what is in Biology from what is in Physics. Not one! Obviously, our methods can take us so far, and no further, or to be more exact are incapable of dealing with Emergences.

The basic assumptions and premises of our Sciences are fine for all phenomena **within a Level**, but they show their inadequacies when the Emergence of a wholly New Level is involved.

It reminds me of the weaknesses of Formal Logic. That method is fine within a fixed area, with immutable assumptions, premises and entities: an area where the actual content doesn't mutate into something else. But it is useless when “all is change”. It falls to the ground and can deliver NOTHING of consequence. Hegel, 200 years ago was aware of these failings and commenced to tackle the building of a Logic of Change, but his remarkable start was NOT continued to hopefully deliver this necessary method.

Only the Marxists, and then mainly in Social Action, attempted the task. And a measure of their partial success must have been proved by the carrying through of the Social Revolution in Russia in 1917.

But, even these efforts did not continue, and widen as was then, and still is now, necessary. Modern day “Marxists” don’t tackle the Main Issues any more.

So, the problems are STILL unanswered, and there for US to contribute to solving, and some beginnings have been made in the handful of serious contributions to the study of Emergence.

So, after the above essential, though obviously inadequate, diversion to establish what we are really talking about, we must return to our initial purpose with this paper.

As the form of gradualism which involves Chance is NOT the explanation of the Origin of Life on Earth, we have to try to re-orientate into a more accurate direction. Of course, I do not by any means think that the crucial questions are solved . They aren’t! But, the direction to look, I believe, can be discerned.

We must return to real Emergences to explain the Origin of Life. All “short cuts”, clever arguments and rationalisations must be rejected. We must approach the Transition between Emergent Levels as clearly inexplicable using our usual within-Level methods. We have to constantly address Change as unavoidable. We have indeed to embrace it, be familiar with it, and begin to recognise its forms.

How else can we deal with the entirely New features as they clearly do appear in Life?

Otherwise, we try to explain things in a mechanist way. No wonder the idealists were unimpressed with early Science. In spite of its remarkable achievements, it was clearly inadequate to answer many questions even if it was paramount in others.

To be continued

(925 words)