



r/compsci

Posts

Posted by u/kiwi0fruit 17 hours ago

On natural selection of the laws of nature, Artificial life and Open-ended evolution, Universal Darwinism, Occam's razor

Greetings,

I seek advice or any other help available regarding creating a specific mathematical model. It's origin is at the intersection of the following areas:

- fundamental physics (a bit),
- the theory of evolution (a lot),
- metaphysics (a lot),
- foundations of mathematics and computability (should be a lot).

The problem I'm trying to solve can be described as to ***create the simplest model possible in which the evolution of the laws of nature arises from the natural selection of structures***. This approach implies indeterminism and postulates random and spontaneous nature of some events. It is also assumed that the universe had the beginning (the first moment of existence). This task is meant to provide the tychism doctrine by Charles Peirce with a mathematically accurate dynamic model.

The mathematical model is intended to describe the process of changing of a discrete structure (like graph, consisting of interconnected atomic parts). Moreover, it should be the process of development and complication of the structure (it should be capable of producing even complex "intelligent" agents after some presumably great time). And this discrete structure is a medium on which the natural selection works on (there can be selected individuals and environment, natural selection postulates hold).

The idea is attractive because it assumes that the beginning of the Universe was simple and self-justifying and can be described by the mathematical model that is obvious in the retrospective: just like Darwin's idea of evolution and natural selection: they are obvious, but until they were formulated it was really hard to assume them. This research program is a special case of the *Artificial life / Open-ended evolution* problem (OEE) that has extra constraints that come from metaphysics (I also hope they may help to solve OEE problem).

P.S. (on computability)

The only connection to computability is that individuals in the model to build presumably should incorporate recursive algorithms that change the environment (that is presumably the other individuals). I tried to imagine lambda functions or primitive recursive functions as basic ontological atoms (to incorporate to graph-like space) but failed miserably.

UPD

The whole article is a description of the research program aimed to create an artificial universe in which we can answer any questions like "why is the present is this way not another?" (it's a better formulated ancient question "Why is there something rather than nothing?"). And this universe

formulation should be enough simple and self-justifying to be a candidate for model of the our real universe.

And there are two main intuitions-constraints for this universe: 1) the start from the simple enough state (the beggining of time), 2) the complexity capable of producing sentient beings (after enormous simulation time of course) comes from natural selection. And natural selection postulates hold in the universe formulation.

Both these intuitions give hope that the model to build would be simple and obvious in retrospect like postulates of natural selection are simple and obvious in **retrospect**. So there is a hope that it's feasible task.

The "only" thing is left is to precisely define what are individuals and environment in the model (environment should be other individuals presumably - again from simplicity considerations) and how the process of their replication and death takes place. At the moment I'm not even sure if the individuals should be bult-in or to be emergent... (but I lean to the first option).

And sadly I have not moved far to this goal. I'm still in the situation of "I feel like the answer the this grand question can be obtained this particular way".

...

There is the article with complete description of the research problem: <https://kiwi0fruit.github.io/ultimate-question>

GitHub repository of the article: <https://github.com/kiwi0fruit/ultimate-question>

 26 Comments  Share  Edit Post ...

6.2k Views · 78% Upvoted

Comment as [kiwi0fruit](#)


What are your thoughts?

 [Switch to Fancy Pants Editor](#)

COMMENT

SORT BY BEST ▼

 [sagaciux](#) 7 points · 14 hours ago


 I think your problem as currently stated is too open ended. Since your goal is to build a specific mathematical model, you're going to need a precise definition of what you want to achieve. Right now, the phrase "create the simplest model possible in which the evolution of the laws of nature arises from the natural selection of structures" is too ambiguous for me to unpack: what laws of nature are you looking to express? What structures are you selecting from? How do you define the process of evolution/natural selection? How would you know if your model was simpler or more complex?

The problem may become more clear if it is separated into smaller parts. I think philosophy can be open-ended and contradictory, but a model needs precise definitions. At minimum, a model needs rules and an initial state. Before trying to figure out these things, I would

want to know: what do I want my model to demonstrate? Given a particular state, what should the next state look like? If the model should be simple, then I would want to include only the most relevant behaviors and states. What information does my model at minimum to function, and how much of it?

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#) [Give gold](#)

 [kiwi0fruit](#)  1 point · 13 hours ago

 The most of problems you mention (if not all) I tried to address or at least mention in the [section 0 of the article](#). And in particular in the [0.1 subsection](#). I'm aware that I'm still far from understanding...

| what do I want my model to demonstrate?

It should be the model of open ended evolution (artificial life) (OEE). OEE means that individuals in the model with natural selection don't stop on some fixed level of complexity but keep evolving (like life kept evolving from unicellular life to homo sapiens). But at the same time the model should be simple enough to be (like) self-justifying from philosophical reasoning (that was addressed in the mentioned section 0.1).


| Given a particular state, what should the next state look like?


If I'm to know the answer to this question then I've already had understood the model workings and I simply need to write them down in some language. That's clearly not the case now as I still lack understanding of how it should work in details.

As about "separating into smaller parts"... I have problems with that.

The name of the article is not mentioned here but it's "The Ultimate Question of Life, the Universe, and Everything". And there is a reason for it. Well enough justified (from philosophical point of view) model of open ended evolution would be a very good candidate to answer The Question. And I have no hope that such a question can be solved by splitting to smaller parts. I also can tell that all that I know about this problem suggests that it cannot be split to smaller components. But it's only my intuition so it's not an argument...

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Save](#) [Edit](#) ...

 [sagaciux](#) 3 points · 11 hours ago



 Reading through section 0, I still feel there is too much ambiguity to approach the problems in section 0.1. For example, what is an individual? You postulate that natural selection begins with individuals and their environment, then later you describe natural selection as the change of the model's structure over time. I'm not entirely sure how you define structure, but I'm going to guess that it's the state of the model at a given time - a bunch of numbers, presumably. As time advances, you apply some rules and get a new state/structure. How can you identify individuals within this state/structure? Are there multiple individuals, or just one? How are individuals created/destroyed? I understand you're not sure about this either, but I think before you can even begin to answer your later questions, you need to solve the smaller problem of how to define individuals and their environment. Presumably, both are separate entities, yet they exist in a common state/structure.


I think it's impossible to answer a big general question without breaking it down into easier to manage parts. It's a bit like asking, "what is love?" There are multiple and

even contradicting answers to such a question because it is too vague, and so we have to ask, what kind of assumptions can we make before answering? I may have an intuition about love which guides my answer towards a certain direction, but I can't just appeal just to intuition to generate and communicate my answer. If I want others to understand what my answer, or even my question, is, I need to precisely explain what I mean, and why I choose to make certain assumptions.

In your article, you assume for example, that a) the complexity of the universe is a result of evolution, and b) evolution is a product of natural selection, heredity, and variation. I'm not saying your assumptions are right or wrong, but you have to admit that if they are true, there must be individuals who can undergo evolution in your universe. Thus, "what is an individual?" is not merely speculative for your model - it is a mandatory question that is required for your model to work. On the other hand, if you change your assumptions and say that the state/structure as a whole can undergo "evolution" (how would you even define evolution in this case?), then you don't need a definition of individuals at all! And what if there's some mechanism other than evolution which can increase the complexity of the universe? These are some of the questions which come to my mind when reading your ideas.

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#) [Give gold](#)

 **kiwi0fruit**  1 point · 3 hours ago

 And what if there's some mechanism other than evolution which can increase the complexity of the universe?



I would be curious to learn about such mechanism. I guess there can be imagined some. But I guess they would fall somewhere between natural selection postulates (plus something yet unknown that would allow to precisely define what is an individual) and between sentient god that created the universe this morning with me unshaven.


The more complex structures we introduce as axioms to generate open ended dynamic universe the more we would feel the need to answer "Why these particular structures?" question.

By the way, if we ever to create the general artificial intelligence then it could be possible to make an assumption that the Universe started with a such an AI precisely defined (plus something to drive process).

But still I feel like starting with something as simple as possible is much preferable.

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Save](#) [Edit](#) [...](#)

 **kiwi0fruit**  1 point · 2 hours ago

 but I think before you can even begin to answer your later questions, you need to solve the smaller problem of how to define individuals and their environment

I guess I failed to say it properly. And it's a good point to note **but** the all metaphysical considerations, all guesses and other questions are there for only one purpose: to help find out what should be the individuals (environment should be other individuals presumably - again from simplicity considerations) so that


their dynamic would lead to natural selection with open ended evolution that does not stop on fixed level of complexity.

I/we should answer this only question and then make a research if open ended evolution is the case in a formulated model (how to do it is another question).

So again. The most of the assumptions I made are for philosophical self-justification that take form of choosing the simplest structures. I guess I choose them also because it's easier to work with them :)

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Save](#) [Edit](#) ...

 [kiwiOfruit](#)  1 point · 1 minute ago

 The whole article is a description of the research program aimed to create an artificial universe in which we can answer any questions like "why is the present is this way not another?" (it's a better formulated ancient question "Why is there something rather than nothing?"). And this universe formulation should be enough simple and self-justifying to be a candidate for model of the our real universe.

And there are two main intuitions-constraints for this universe: 1) the start from the simple enough state (the beginning of time), 2) the complexity capable of producing sentient beings (after enormous simulation time of course) comes from natural selection. And natural selection postulates hold in the universe formulation.


Both these intuitions give hope that the model to build would be simple and obvious in retrospect like postulates of natural selection are simple and obvious in **retrospect**. So there is a hope that it's feasible task.

The "only" thing is left is to precisely define what are individuals and environment in the model (environment should be other individuals presumably - again from simplicity considerations) and how the process of their replication and death takes place. At the moment I'm not even sure if the individuals should be built-in or to be emergent... (but I lean to the first option).

And sadly I have not moved far to this goal. I'm still in the situation of "I feel like the answer to this grand question can be obtained this particular way".

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Save](#) [Edit](#) ...

 [WeirdEidolon](#) 4 points · 15 hours ago

 NEAT might check a lot of the boxes you're looking for (I haven't browsed through your link yet)

https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neuroevolution_of_augmenting_topologies

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#) [Give gold](#)

 [HelperBot_](#) 1 point · 15 hours ago

 Non-Mobile link:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neuroevolution_of_augmenting_topologies

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

⬆ WikiTextBot 1 point · 15 hours ago

⬇ Neuroevolution of augmenting topologies

NeuroEvolution of Augmenting Topologies (NEAT) is a genetic algorithm (GA) for the generation of evolving artificial neural networks (a neuroevolution technique) developed by Ken Stanley in 2002 while at The University of Texas at Austin. It alters both the weighting parameters and structures of networks, attempting to find a balance between the fitness of evolved solutions and their diversity. It is based on applying three key techniques: tracking genes with history markers to allow crossover among topologies, applying speciation (the evolution of species) to preserve innovations, and developing topologies incrementally from simple initial structures ("complexifying").

[[^PM](#) | [Exclude ^me](#) | [Exclude from ^subreddit](#) | [FAQ / ^Information](#) | [^Source](#)] [Downvote to remove](#) | v0.28

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

⬆ Rococoon 3 points · 16 hours ago

⬇ When do you want to start working on it? I think it is super interesting and I would like to help you think about it, however I am super busy right now... I do think that I might be able to help though given my background.

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

⬆ [kiwi0fruit](#) 1 point · 16 hours ago · *edited 15 hours ago*

⬇ Actually I worked on it till summer of 2016. The article by link is a compilation of what I was able to figure out (mostly guesses and questions with details) - I've recently added final bits to the 2016 article and started to search for help once again - I feel like I've reached my limit or burnt out.

If you feel like you have thoughts or anything useful please do not hesitate to [comment here](#) or even make a pull request to [the repo](#) (or communicate any other way you like).

I'm also going to be busy from now on but "It does not matter how slowly you go as long as you do not stop" :)

🗨 Reply Share Save Edit ...

⬆ [noam_compsci](#) 2 points · 16 hours ago

⬇ Page not found on the kiwi link

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

⬆ [kiwi0fruit](#) 2 points · 16 hours ago

⬇ thanks! fixed.

🗨 Reply Share Save Edit ...

⬆ [noam_compsci](#) 1 point · 16 hours ago

⬇ Thanks! Looking forward to reading.

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

↑ Voidwarped 2 points · 16 hours ago

↓ The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution.

🗨️ Reply Share Report Save Give gold

↑ kiwi0fruit -2 points · 16 hours ago · edited 1 hour ago

↓ After few years of research (2014-2016 mostly) I think about all **books** on the topic with a **great** scepticism. May be you know if there is an article on the topic? But still thank you!

UPD

Shame on me: I've forgot that such books in most cases have associated article(s) - for example books by Lee Smolin about time have a nice short article on the same topic: "Temporal naturalism".

🗨️ Reply Share Save Edit ...

↑ daermonn 6 points · 14 hours ago

↓ Hey! I think some of my readings in recent years are relevant to what you're trying to do. It's a really fascinating space.

Generally, agency is a thermodynamic engine that consumes resources to produce work that's invested in the agent's future productive capabilities, with the side-effect of entropy production. From the perspective of the universe, entropy production hastens time and renders the universe a simpler computational object, so entropy-maximizing paths - including abiogenesis - are more likely to be realized. There's deep math in information theory, thermodynamics, and (quantum) physics that I don't understand well enough yet, but that's the overall picture.

Here are some links to authors/concept that might be valuable to you:

- [Causal Entropic Forces - Wisner-Freer & Gross](#): a formal model of agency roughly along the lines sketched above, where an agent produces/disperses entropy to maximize future freedom of action
- [Friston's free energy model of agency](#): another formal model of agency from a neuroscientific perspective, with a focus on free energy in the system
- [Empowerment: An agent-centric model of control](#) - Klyubin et al.: another model of agency, with a focus on the throughput velocity of information through an agent's sensor-actuator circuit
- [Jeremy England's work](#) on the entropic gradient that incentivizes abiogenesis

Some other folks writing in the space that I'm much less familiar with:

- Ilya Prigogine, of course, who won the Nobel for his work on the nature of time, irreversibility in thermodynamic systems, far-from-equilibrium dynamics, and dissipative structures
- Alfred Lotka, a 20thC physicist who wrote extensively on the relationship between evolution and physics
- [Rod Swenson](#), who is apparently regarded as a bit of a crackpot, but whose ideas seem very interesting
- Chaisson's [Energy Rate Density as a Complexity Metric & Evolutionary Driver](#) is another work in this space I'm not terribly familiar with

- Philosophers like Bataille, Deleuze & Guattari, contemporary accelerationists, etc have interesting ideas around this from the perspective of continental philosophy, which is just as hard to parse as the math but along a different dimension

Check out also, e.g., the [quantum source of spacetime](#), which casts space as quantum entanglement networks and time as the breaking of entanglement, which is apparently a big improvement in the complexity of the math we use to represent spacetime, and which provides a path forward for quantum gravity as the density of entanglements. This is important because entropy is in some sense a measure of entanglement or causal relationships; think about entropy as information-theoretic uncertainty within a causal model of epistemology for an intuition pump here.


It sounds like you're less interested in, e.g., specific models of agency,

At the end of the day, I don't really know. I wish I could be more helpful. Most generally, there's some super-deep, super-important underlying unity between thermodynamics, information theory, physics and cosmology, evolutionary processes, machine learning and optimization, linear algebra and topology, markets and efficiency, etc etc etc, but I don't have the mathematical maturity of conceptual clarity to really explicate it.

Godspeed, let me know what you find!

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#) [Give gold](#)


 [kiwi0fruit](#)  1 point · 14 hours ago

 Oh my macaroni! That would be a hard read through (when I get free time and motivation). Thanks a lot as it seems like there can be something very useful.

If not my metaphysical hopes I would have dropped this task long ago. And hopes are about that the desired model should be simple enough to imagine and create (even for me): start from the simplest state of finite and discrete space (presumably that consist of atomic agents that can influence/change each other), laws that govern change of the space are immanent to agents and not much more complex than natural selection postulates, and etc.


 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Save](#) [Edit](#) [...](#)


 [daermonn](#) 1 point · 11 hours ago

 Haha yeah, it's a lot, I sympathize as I never do the readings I should.



And yeah, sounds like you will be most interested in the underlying thermodynamics/information theory/statistical mechanics.

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#) [Give gold](#)

 [Voidwarped](#) 2 points · 16 hours ago

 I'm not aware of too many articles, but you could try [this one](#) co-authored by Kaufmann a few years before the book was published.

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Report](#) [Save](#) [Give gold](#)

 [kiwi0fruit](#)  1 point · 16 hours ago

 Thanks!

 [Reply](#) [Share](#) [Save](#) [Edit](#) [...](#)

↑ [GayMakeAndModel](#) 2 points · 7 hours ago · *edited 7 hours ago*

↓ Divide a Universal Search algorithm that utilizes a select set of modern programming techniques.

Then devise a Universal Search (US) algorithm for Universal Searches.

Edit: clarity and to add that bonus points are awarded for using a finite, partially-ordered set of Hermitian operators to move from time(0) to time time(N)

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

↑ [pdxdabel](#) 2 points · 6 hours ago · *edited 6 hours ago*

↓ I'd suggest taking a look at [Les Valiant's paper on Evolvability](#) -- it investigates questions relevant to your agenda about the relationship between computation and evolution, grounded in Valiant's early framework for understanding machine learning from a theoretical perspective, [PAC Learning](#).

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

↑ [UnderTruth](#) 2 points · 5 hours ago

↓ Sounds like you should talk with [/u/userdna46](#) -- see if you two can come to consensus.

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

↑ [criticalcontext](#) 1 point · 1 hour ago

↓ So you want to make a theory of everything. Good luck...

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold

↑ [SnowceanJay](#) 1 point · 16 hours ago

↓ This is a really interesting problem!

Regarding the compsci side of this project, the most obvious things to look into are, imho: evolutionary algorithms (of course), multi-agent systems, emergence and self-organization.

🗨 Reply Share Report Save Give gold