

ZULF BEGINS TO CHALLENGE CHARLES DARWIN

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

1. WHAT IS WRONG WITH NATURAL SELECTION?

First of all, let me start by saying Charles Darwin was indeed a great scientific genius whose evolutionary theory is very good. Evolutionary theory of Darwin is, on the other hand, a theory, and there is always a gap between theory and the actual truth of Nature. I have no interest in religious stories of God's creation of the world and all animals etc. That is not interesting. What is interesting however, is to accept without any resistance that the state of life on Earth today is indeed the outcome of Natural Processes but wonder of the sort of dramatic story of natural *selection* is actually true.

This is a different sort of challenge than religious challenges. You see, Darwin had to deal with religious orthodoxy where people believed that Creator was real and produced all life on Earth. I think that is not reasonable, like most scientific minds. However, I am rather skeptical that there is a tight decision process of nature of who lives and who dies. To me this is a little too dramatic. I don't think that extinction pressures are all that high in the actual universe. The force of life is just overwhelming, and there is a poverty in thought in feeling that the scientific optimisation problem is that survival is hard. And that is what natural *selection* theory emphasises. I don't believe this emphasis is right in evolutionary theory at all.

For me the most mysterious thing about life is just the wild pressure and force of the living, the abundance, and I am of the opinion that it was a Victorian morality of worthiness that lies behind natural selection as the principle that appealed to Darwin. I would seek the evolutionary principle more in the structure of electromagnetism on a four-sphere, that produces an abundance of wild life forms. I do not believe evolution is driven by a niggardly calculus of survival being difficult; rather it is the pressure of wild amounts of life that is intriguing.

2. INVALID INFERENCE OF NATURAL SELECTION

First of all 'Natural Selection' is such a vague phrase, that we need to clarify that it is a technical term, and I am challenging the technical meaning of the phrase. I do believe that evolution deformed DNA over time. But 'Natural Selection' is not arbitrary. 'Natural Selection' refers to the pressure of survival. Take a look at all the living human beings on Earth today. We are all alive because in our ancestral history, every male found his mate, and produced progeny. It is true. And it is also true that in the past there have been male humans who left no progeny and so their DNA bloodline is gone now. So they did not manage to pass the survival test.

Date: June 11, 2021.

It is however not valid inference that this is sufficient to explain deformation of genes over time. It's not logically necessary. There could be many principles of evolution without an optimality principle based on survival that need be true. And that leaves open the question open of what the secrets of Nature are regarding evolution. It could be completely wrong that an optimality principle of the type 'do or die' which is Natural Selection is actually one being used by Nature. Just for the sake of thought, it could be that there are global universal principles that if you begin with arbitrary electromagnetic matter on a four-sphere, over trillions of years, life must evolve. This is speculative of course, but if a principle of this type is true, then Natural Selection is not the right evolutionary principle of Nature but an artificial explanation to please human minds.