The Argument From the Logically Prior Superselection

&

An Analysis of the Darwinist/Materialist Theoretical Composite.

©2004 William Brookfield

Abstract:

Derived from standard computational models, "**The Brookfield Argument From the Logically Prior Superselection**" is a logical-syntactic argument, that examines the discrete functional components of the Darwinian/materialist theoretical syntactical composite (Rvar, RandM, NSelection, Reproduction & Environment). Each component is assessed, both in isolation and in combination, with regard to logical sequential priority and functional adequacy/inadequacy (as generators of bio-complexity). In its simplest form, the LPSS argument maintains that Random Mutation(RM) and Natural Selection (NS) -- the neo-Darwinian mechanism -- is <u>not</u> causally adequate as a bio-complexity generator and that the words "Random" and "Natural" in "RM&NS" effectively defer all legitimate causality to a <u>second</u>, system state level of order -- that is, to an <u>assumed</u> "Logically Prior Superselection."

The neo-Darwinian concepts of "micro-evolution" and "macro-evolution" are subsequently re-assessed in the light of both the LPSS and the full Darwinian/materialist complex (Rvar, RM, NS, Rpr & Env).

Introduction:

As an avid supporter of computer <u>science</u> and Intelligent Design (ID) <u>science</u> (but not religion) I remain mystified at the Darwinist use of computer simulations ("evolutionary algorithms") to allegedly defeat ID. How could computers (cyber-space shuttles, intelligently designed and hideously <u>unnatural</u>) be used to "prove" RM& <u>Natural</u> selection? To me this is the logical equivalent of using space shuttles to "prove" a theory of spontaneously orbiting cattle (say, RM&<u>Natural</u> Bovine Orbital Projections). In order to clarify my point, I recently coined the phrase, "Coddled Platonic Idealizations" (or CPI's) and began writing an article. "Coddled Platonic Idealizations and the Emergence of 'Fact-Free Science' -- Typing Monkeys, Mandelbrot sets and Evolutionary Algorithms." While preparing this article, a related argument arose "**The Argument From the Logically Prior Superselection**" that expressed the CPI in terms of an expanded Darwinian/materialist composite. I have since concentrated on my LPSS argument due to the clarity that it brings to some long-standing Darwinian questions.

In order to get some preliminary feedback, I initiated a thread at Access Research Network.[1] One thing that struck me about the general feedback was that almost everyone, regardless of their persuasion, ID or anti-ID seemed to believe, to one extent or another,

that order can come from randomness -- or that "randomness is sometimes creative" or novelty-inducing. It also occurred to me that, while I am certainly supportive and grateful to William Dembski for his ID science, there are times when he also seems to believe (to a small extent) in the creative power of randomness. While I do consider his specified complexity arguments to be valid (as of this writing), I am convinced that much stronger unifying arguments for ID are to come from both logic and cosmology.

Cosmic ID or "God" from my perspective, is empirically detectable because the universe is empirically detectable and without "God" there would be no universe to detect -- only an eternally stable black hole. As I alluded to earlier, however, I see no necessary connection between the iterating God-function of my science and any religion of any kind. The ID debate is not about religion versus science (I have no religion) but about whether or not a new structure-inducing force (and function) is required in science to explain the existence of the universe and the nature of its contents. I maintain such a force is needed and that there exist much deeper problems with Darwinism and the materialist model than mere irreducible complexity.

William Dembski -- From "Why Natural Selection Can't Design Anything"[2]

"As Davies rightly notes, *laws* (that is, necessities of nature) can explain specification but not complexity. For instance, the formation of a salt crystal follows well-defined laws, produces an independently given repetitive pattern, and is therefore specified; but that pattern will also be simple, not complex"

I disagree here because I see this process as order neutral. The pattern already exists in salt at the molecular level. The fundamental physical laws of nature cannot explain the emergence of any level of specified complexity (order). The cosmic laws of thermo/black hole dynamics can certainly explain the complete destruction or loss of these features. Any real explanation of the emergence of complexity or specification at any level requires a new force of nature to (at very least) de-stabilize an otherwise eternally stable cosmic singularity.

"On the other hand, as Davies also rightly notes, *contingency* (that is, chance or accidental processes of nature) can explain complexity but not specification. For instance, the exact time sequence of radioactive emissions from a piece of uranium will be contingent, complex, but not specified.

Once again, I disagree with both William Dembski and Paul Davies here. Complexity is not explained by randomness or "accidental processes of nature." Complexity is imposed upon randomness by the physical camouflage structure (discrete particles) through which randomness is forced to appear. The decay time sequence is complex, not because randomness is complex or because it causes complexity, but because the particlulated physical medium is complex. Physical contingency results from the inability of the physical medium to fully express randomness and the lack of timing instructions within that function (leading to a lack of any repetitive pattern). The reality of randomness, however is not "chunky"-- not complex -- and indeed "black holes have no hair"-- (a

popular phrase in black hole physics). Due to the necessary absorption of the long range fields into the hole, a <u>cosmic</u> black hole (initial or final singularity) does not even have the typical three remaining "hairs"-- mass, charge and angular momentum. A cosmic black hole is the ultimate in randomness (high entropy).

Randomness is not "chunky." Randomness is a purée. Randomness is an equilibrious, static probability distribution devoid of novelty, creativity or complexity. Randomness is <u>always</u> destructive in its active form. Within CPI's (Coddled Platonic Idealizations - EA's), however, randomness is <u>forced</u> to assume the <u>pre-existing</u> camouflage patterns (structure/order) of the <u>pre-established</u> system. In the case of "monkey shakespeare," randomness (a <u>pure</u> function) is forced to dress up in a (humiliating :-) "alphabet suit" -- one member of a finite set of available letter combinations. This "letter suit" represents neither the product nor the nature of randomness but instead the product and the nature of the LPSS. It is the creative LPSS act, that establishes the (CPI) system and its typically large but (finite) set of all possible "outfits." The "order from randomness" error thus results from confusion over the discrete functions performed by randomness, on the one hand and <u>pre-established</u> system structure on the other.

Coddled Platonic Idealizations

The following are two examples of CPI's (Coddled Platonic Idealizations). I categorize their functionality with regard to both intelligent design and natural selection. I attempt to examine biology (System #3) in the same light...

System #1.

Intelligent Design Phase: (LPSS)

#1. Hire Monkey (LPSS)
#2. Rent Typewriter(LPSS)
#3. Establish Filter that "naturally selects" for shakespeare sonnets (LPSS).
Sonnet pattern = viable "organism," non-sonnet pattern = non-viable "organism"
-
Subsequent Questions:

#1. Can "Natural (for this system) Selection" generate superselections?

Can NS produce or hire new monkeys?
Can NS produce or rent new typewriters?
Can NS establish new selection parameters?
Can NS establish that which is logically prior to NS?
Can NS establish real Shakespearean meanings, intentionality and syntax or just meaningless letter patterns that we interpret as Shakespearean meanings, intentionality and syntax?

Can NS transcend the "hypervolume" established by superselections 1,2 and 3?

#2. What can the system as a whole produce? Can it produce Shakespeare patterns? YES
#3. What can NS produce? Can NS produce Shakespeare Patterns?
#4. What can NS produce <u>without</u> the ID phase (the Logically Prior Superselections)?

System #2.

Intelligent Design Phase: (LPSS)

#1. Design and build a computer (LPSS).
#2. Pay electrical bill. (LPSS).
#3. Design evolutionary algorithm software such as AVIDA to mimic RM&NS+Rpd in an environment (LPSS)

Subsequent Questions:

#1. Can "Natural (for this system) Selection" generate superselections?

Can NS (within this system) produce new computers?
Can NS produce new EA's?
Can NS establish new selection parameters?
Can NS de-frag its own hard drive in order to survive?
Can NS pay the electrical bill in order to survive? Computers require electricity.
Can NS produce real organisms (monkeys, bacteria, redwood trees, etc.)?
Can NS establish that which is logically prior to NS?
Can NS, in any way, transcend the hypervolume established by superselections 1, 2 &3?

#2. What can the system as a whole produce? Can it produce all configurations existing inside the established hypervolume? YES
#3. What can NS produce? Can it produce all configurations existing inside the established hypervolume?
#4. What can NS produce <u>without</u> the ID phase and its Logically Prior Superselections?

Notices that "pay electrical bill" could be replaced with "build solar panels, place them on roof and then run wires to battery and power conditioner and then to the computer." This would be analogous to plant photosynthesis that draws power from the sun, conditions and stores it for subsequent biological use as glucose.

System #3 -- Biological LPSS's

#1. Energy translation engines such as Photosynthesis (or functional precursor) --(LPSS)
#2. Reproduction engine: (LPSS)
#3. Information storage device -- DNA (or functional precursor) -- (LPSS)

Photosynthesis(globally) -- digestive system (locally) -- is logically prior to natural selection -- organisms cannot survive without energy.

Reproduction is logically prior to natural selection -- a sterile organism is an evolutionary dead end.

DNA is logically prior to a natural selection -- Without DNA, (de)selection information is lost.

Natural selection cannot work without energy (photosynthesis).
Natural selection cannot work without reproduction - without any variant copies to select from.
Natural selection cannot work without DNA (information storage and its subsequent availability for forward transmission)

Note: System #1 - LPSS #3 is not analogous to biology. NS does not select (positive) for Shakespeare sonnets but instead de-selects (negative) non-sonnets.

Preliminary Conclusions:

A. The case for a biological LPSS is very strong and seems undeniable.
B. Physical systems cannot act creatively to transcend their established "hypervolumes."[3]
C. The "natural" output of such probabilistic-deferent systems is entirely dependent upon a LPSS.

What I failed to mention directly, however, is the need for a fundamental <u>ongoing</u> LP superselection that constantly ensures system <u>stability</u>. It is this function to which the word "coddled" primarily refers and it is this very function that Darwinism seems to ignore.

I am thus maintaining that;

D. There exists yet another crucial LPSS component that Darwinism has failed to address.

Along with the LPSS, a System Stabilizing Agent or mechanism (SSA) is required. This agent or mechanism is crucial to the maintenance of the overall system and to any system output over time. I thus include the LPSS and the SSA in the Darwinian/materialist theoretical composite (*LPSS{SSA}*, Rpr, Rvar, RM, NS, Env). Given that Darwinism is a theory of structural assembly over deep time, it is amazing that no agent of ongoing structural stability is present in the orthodox Darwinian formulation (RM&NS). Without system stability there would be no time to evolve anything (and no constraint to render the selection probability non-zero).

The physical environment (being bound by the Second Law of Thermodynamics) offers no stability (with regard to macroscopic bio-complexity). While it is indeed possible (from my ID perspective) that billions of organisms are working day and night to

intelligently design a future in which they survive - thereby stabilizing the system. Such an ID hypothesis is not valid for a material theory of origins. A material theory of origins must draw from its logically prior material and not from consciousness, with its intelligence and its intentionality.

In the case of the space shuttle, we know of the source of its structural, functional and ongoing stability -- an enormous amount of funding, intelligent design and ongoing supervisory maintenance.

In the case of a cyber/platonic-space shuttle (the computer and software) we know of the source of its structural, functional and ongoing stability -- an enormous amount of funding, intelligent design and ongoing supervisory maintenance.

In the case of Darwinian biology however, we have no material source for its structural, functional and ongoing stability and it is here that Darwinism seems the weakest. Darwin seems to have borrowed an ID based, conscious "struggle to survive" in order to make his theory appear reasonable.

"Coddling" produces constraint and constraint is just another word for order. The form of any space shuttle must be constrained and not scattered at random over the countryside. A randomized space shuttle is a destroyed space shuttle. Due to confusion regarding randomness and its prominence in the Darwinian formulation, I feel that we should examine it a little more closely;

William Brookfield (from the ARN thread)

"Random mutation" is a garburation function applied to the genome. Randomization functions are destruction functions. Randomness is not a biological novelty producer. Randomness is a structure attenuator/destroyer. Randomness is not biological period ("full stop" in formal English). Randomness is a mathematical function devoid of any biological meaning or syntax. Randomness is, by definition, insensitive to macroscopic order. Biological order is macroscopic. Randomness is therefore bio-complexity negative.

The Deuce: (from the ARN thread)
quote:

I think you may be coming down a bit too strong on randomness. I, too, am skeptical of Darwinism as the explanation for biological complexity, but I think you may be overreaching here ... When you already have a system of syntax in place, as with biology, there is, or could be depending on the circumstance, a possibility that a random change will happen to have some meaning within that system, and within that possibility, there is a possibility that the meaning could have an immediate benefit.

Yes, but I see a couple of problems here. It is the job of reductionist scientists (such as myself [4]) to isolate components to reveal their pure functions within systems. If my ruthless reductionism is "too hard" on randomness, I would just say "too bad and welcome to science." Without strict definitions science cannot be done. To the extent that randomness is not strictly defined, it is not scientific.[5]

Also, the "possibilities" and "meanings" here are produced by the combined system and environment or "supersystem" that is "already in place," not by randomness (the pure function). To use an analogy, "Swiss cheese" is produced by the "cheese factory" and not by the "holes." Both the possibility and the nature of the possibility are a function of the system, not randomness. Any "random" possibility, occurring within the confines of such an orderly system, is necessarily order at the system level.

Confusion also occurs when one "component" of a random distribution (say a mutation) is isolated within a system and treated as if it were causal and deterministic (non-random), instead of random and probabilistic. This confusion results from the fact that randomness has no internal isolated components -- by definition of "random." In the neo-Darwinian case, any putative "Cinderella" mutation is inexorably attached to its compensating "ugly step sisters."

The two components of a probabilistic CPI:

#1. The causally adequate structure that establishes "meaning" and "possibility"
(Cheese factory ---> Swiss cheese).
#2. A random component that attenuates "structure, meaning and possibility" (makes holes in cheese) -- or is merely a lack of structure -- "a lack of cheese" (holes in cheese).

So if you "already have a system of syntax in place," then you have a source of residual order -- the system, the order that is in place. Logically speaking, order (constraint) cannot come from randomness (the absence of constraint) just as light (photons) cannot come from darkness (the absence of photons). If a probabilistic-deferent system is in place however then it is ordered by definition -- by its defining parameters -- by its LPSS. It is therefore "naturally" adulterated (rendered impure) by its indigenous order. The possible "meanings" and "benefit" are subsequently "already in place" for they already exist in the permanent probability distribution as determined by the pre-established system parameters. The system can then "naturally select" order at its system level, for it is completely natural for it to do so.

If randomness (the destruction function) has access to the whole system, it will destroy the whole system. For the orderly continuation of the system, randomness must be held in check at the system level. The ongoing maintenance of any physical system requires a constant infusion of new order (against the thermodynamic gradient). What is the source of this constant infusion of order? Darwinism just ignores this question, assumes the system(LPSS) and its stability(SSA) and then in circular fashion invokes biological order at the system level. This Darwinian deferring of order ("natural" selection) to the system-

state (or "natural") level of order does <u>nothing</u> to answer the question as to the <u>source</u> of biological order. Any invocation of such <u>system level</u> order or biological "monkey shakespeare" requires an explanation of the source of the <u>system</u>. Merely <u>deferring</u> causality to a second level of order does not constitute an explanation.

A Brief Conversation with a Skeptic.

Darwinist: "The species was produced by RM and Natural Selection"

Skeptic: "Oh really? Is it "natural" for insentient carbon to get up and dance Busby Berkley style?

Darwinist: "But I am not talking about the origin of life."

Skeptic: "Actually you are. Slot machines only produce jackpots and <u>all</u> the other configurations because they have been originated, are stable and are designed with sufficient complexity, features and residual constraint to produce these things. The very definition of what is and is not 'natural' is dependent upon the system's set up parameters. Within a slot machine, jackpots (along with all of the other available configurations from its solution space) are <u>natural</u>.

Is it "natural," however, for insentient carbon to get up and dance in a physical universe governed by the Second Law? No.
Is it "natural" for <u>life</u> to appear in a solution space of <u>dead</u> matter? No.
Is it "natural" for consciousness and intentionality to appear in a solution space of unconscious unintentional dead matter? No.
It is "natural" for dead matter to differentiate "self" from "non-self." No.
Is it "natural" for macroscopically ordered, stable reproduction engines to appear in a solution space of unstable/unconstrained dead matter. No
Is it "natural" for complex energy conversion systems (photo synthesis, digestive systems, respiratory systems) to appear in a solution space of dead matter? No.
Is it "natural" for macroscopic stability, constraint, coddling and binding to appear in solution space of unstable/unconstrained dead matter bereft of any of these things? No.
Is it "natural" for biological order or any kind of order to arise in a solution space of dead matter -- governed by the <u>natural</u> second law? No

In order for life or "lemons" to be selected they must already be -- "naturally" be -- in the solution space. Any successful RM&NS "fishing trip" requires a solution space, pre-stocked with "fish."

Is the slot machine's solution space stocked with "naturally" selectable lemons or jackpots. Yes.

Is the dead matter solution space stocked with "naturally" selectable life? No.

Darwinian use of the word "natural" therefore, is scientifically indefensible. Life scientists are required to <u>explain</u> the emergence of life (and its characteristics) not just <u>assume</u> its existence in an imaginary and yet-to-be-defined (RM&NS searchable) solution space. It is not scientifically defensible to place the origin of life (the origin of the system and its parameters) off limits and then constantly refer/defer to it and its assumed mythical fecundity through the use of word "natural." The establishment of a <u>deferred</u> payment plan does not constitute payment. Establishment of a deferred Darwinian "explainment" plan does not constitute an explanation.

Selection (S)

"<u>Selection,</u>" as used in Darwinism, is a non-sequiter. The "origination" or "addition"(positive) of new species does not logically follow from Natural Selective Destruction (negative). No amount of killing (negative) of light peppered moths can produce (positive) dark colored moths. Killing and creating are logically and functionally distinct. Without the pre-existing genetic material for dark colored moths, NS would just kill them all. The active -- change inducing -- component of NS (and of any physical filter) is its blocking (negative) function. "Selection" is therefore bio-complexity <u>negative</u>.

As an explanation of bio-complexity, therefore, the RM&NS formulation is <u>not</u> causally adequate. The "random" in "RM" merely garburates genetic information and the "selection" in "NS" merely takes out the garbage. What is required is an order producing agent or mechanism, not an irrelevant tale of genetic garbage generation and disposal.

Thus:

#1 R(M) is <u>not</u> a causally adequate explanation for order generation. Randomness merely garburates. Randomness and order are <u>opposites</u>.
#2 CPI system-state order however, <u>is</u> a causally adequate explanation for the commonly misunderstood "order by chance" or "monkey shakespeare." This however is true, if and only if, the CPI in question possess all of the features, complexity and residual constraints necessary to render such an output "natural."
#3. The "Natural" in NS simply <u>defers</u> causality to the system (CPI) level of order.
#4. The "Selection" in NS merely destroys and is therefore the opposite <u>de</u>-selection function.

Thus we have in the neo-Darwinian formulation -- Rand(-)M & N(0) S(-) -- two negatives and a neutral, but <u>no</u> bio-complexity generator(+).

Reproduction (Rpr)

"Reproduction," is logically prior to RM&NS. "Reproduction" as used in Darwinism, is an assumed physical copying function. In a platonic idealization, copying functions can be perfect (bio-complexity neutral). In the real world (Env), however, no copying

function is perfect and random copying errors are inescapable. Randomness is, by definition, insensitive (destructive) to macroscopic order. Biological order is macroscopic. In the physical world therefore, reproduction would be bio-complexity negative. Putting thermodynamic (Env) considerations aside, however, the discrete function of "reproduction," is bio-complexity neutral. While "reproduction" might amplify a mutation or configuration, such action merely targets and hones pre-existing (old) bio-complexity. Also, by definition of the words "reproduce" or "copy," "Reproduction" would not produce new bio-complexity.

It is important here to keep in mind here that I am referring to the actual reproductive mechanism, as distinct from any secondary variational (var) features that might enhance mating chances and thereby increase reproduction. A human male could perhaps increase his reproductive chances by using a new after-shave or by becoming a rock star. Any such changes are superficial, however. If ones reproductive machinery does not work then no amount of fame, after-shave or available women, will make any reproductive difference.

Reproduction therefore, represents both a structure and a critical tunnel that when open, gives living organisms the ability to extend their bio-complexity into the future. This tunneling however, does not produce new order (+) but merely copies and recapitulates the old (0) -- at the end of the tunnel.

Random Variation (Rvar)

As usual, the "randomness" function in "random variation" does no creative work and only randomizes (destroys) the timing sequence of appearances by spreading probabilities evenly over the available solution space. For example, the "randomness" in a slot machine only randomizes the timing of the appearance of the internal configurations (such as the pre-established three-lemon configuration) established at system setup. Randomness does not establish the three lemon set or any other configuration. The prior establishment of the system and its finite hypervolume, establishes the fixed set of all available configurations and their attendant occurrence probabilities.

The "three-lemon" jackpot is the result of the repeatedly pulled handle (a motion production function) plus the residual order of the system. The probability of hitting the three-lemon target (for any given pull) is determined by the ratio of the target size to that of the total hypervolume. Three lemons are therefore bound to appear -- not by randomness -- but by the residual order (binding/constraint) inherent in a finite (constrained) probability space. Randomness and its seeming productive capacity is dependent upon each selection having already been made -- along with all the other combinations -- in the initial establishment of the system. That is to say, the three lemons are already in the "library" -- already in the "hypervolume," waiting to be withdrawn.

Such a randomization therefore applies only to the temporal order in which those pre-existing "books" are selected. Randomness subsequently cannot explain how the system

itself "the library" and all its of its various combinations or "books" came to be. Randomness in such systems can only explain why jackpots occur at random intervals and <u>not</u> why jackpots actually exist and occur. Variational randomness in biological systems can only explain why species must occur at random intervals (barring any other factors) and <u>not</u> why species actually exist and occur.

At the risk of repeating myself, I will provide another example. A doughnut making machine <u>causes</u> done doughnuts to appear. "Randomness" or "play" in the machinery does <u>not</u> cause doughnuts. It causes damaged (-) or perhaps nonexistent (-) doughnuts. Unless damage or equilibrium (<u>negation</u>(-), with regard to structure) is what you are seeking, "randomness" is of no value. (In the case of the slot machine <u>equilibrious</u> probability is exactly what is sought). Doughnut machines cause doughnuts. Slot machines cause jackpots. "Randomness," while a component of both machines, causes neither doughnuts nor jackpots.

#1. Randomness in doughnut factories does not cause doughnuts. The structure is in the <u>system</u> and not in randomness. Randomness is insensitive to "doughnut-ian" order.

#2. Randomness in slot machine does not cause slot machine outputs (jackpots, etc.) The structure is in the <u>system</u> and not in randomness. Randomness is insensitive to "jackpot-ian" order. (In terms of this system, <u>every</u> combination of three is a "doughnut"-- a functional <u>success</u>.)

#3. Randomness in biological systems cannot cause new species. The "species-ian" structure must be in the <u>system</u> and not in randomness. Randomness is insensitive to biological order.

#4. Randomness (-) is insensitive to order(+).

The "random" in "Rvar" is <u>negative</u> (with regard to any specifically helpful variations). Within a <u>sustained</u> probabilistic-deferent system however, any given variation is necessarily <u>ordered</u> (constrained) at the system state level, so "variation" itself is bio-complexity <u>neutral.</u>

Environment (Env)

"Environment"(Env). represents the physical and chemical background in which all biology necessarily exists. With regard to the question of biological structure, this physical background is bound by the Second Laws of thermodynamics and black hole dynamics. These are structure <u>reducing</u> laws that ultimately lead to the loss of the space-time-mass structure inside black holes. Included in the Env. category are environmental changes such as the sooting of the English environment that led to the peppered moth case (considered below). While this change was indeed caused by complex organisms (humans) such environmental impacts are not complex and can also be caused by natural events such as volcanoes or asteroid impacts. As long as the chain of causality must pass

through the physical environment unguided, its effects are bound by the laws of the physical environment. I consider the Env. component to be bio-complexity <u>negative</u>.

The Darwinist Materialist Theoretical Composite
(*LPSS{SSA}*, Rpr, Rvar, RM, NS, Env)

I have added plus(+) minus(-) and neutral(0) signs to each component to represent their capacity for bio-complexity generation/degradation.

LPSS(+)*{SSA}*(+)*,* Rpr(0), Rand(-)Var(0), Rand(-)M, Nat(0)Sel(-), Env.(-)

Evolution in Action (?)
The Case of the Peppered Moth

Whether or not the peppered moth case is strictly true (perhaps there are other factors that effect moth coloration) this example does serve to describe the Darwinian "mechanism" in action.

In my some of my earlier writings I referred to the peppered moth case as <u>a</u>volution (neutral). This is because there exists no increase in macroscopic syntactical bio-complexity in this example. Similarly, RM&NS(+Rpr) do <u>not</u> provide "evolutionary" movement here. My reasoning is as follows;

"Randomness" does not provide a lateral (light to ---> dark moth) vector because any putative "Cinderella" mutation is inexorably attached to its compensating "ugly step sisters"-- by definition of "random." "Random Mutation" thus represents a <u>static</u> probability distribution. That is to say, it is dead and non-creative.

"Natural" <u>de</u>-selection is a deterministic (gravity-like) mechanism that grants passage to the optimum models by destroying that which is not optimum (and letting reproduction foot the bill). <u>De</u>-selection <u>de</u>-stroys anything outside the ecological niche and permits that which is inside the niche to live. This makes it an outside to---> inside (of the niche) <u>de</u>structive vector and not the lateral (light to ---> dark moth) vector needed to produce lateral movement or "micro-evolution."

Nor does "reproduction" provide a lateral vector for it merely replenishes (if it can) what matches any given niche.

The lateral (light to ---> dark moth) movement occurs, not because of RM&NS&Rpr, but because the niche has been bumped -- bumped and moved in this case by humans who changed (darkened) the environment. Once moved, RM&NS&Rpr merely follows, de-selecting for the new niche location -- for a subsequent new optimum, relative to the new niche. If the organism has sufficient stability and variational resources (inboard {RVar} and outboard probabilistic {RMut}) plus sufficient reproductive power, it can recover from having its niche bumped and dislocated. If not, it goes extinct.

Thus;

#4. RM&NS&Rpr is <u>not</u> a causally adequate explanation for "micro-evolution."
#5. Environmental motion however, <u>is</u> a causally adequate explanation for "micro-evolutionary" motion.

So the cause of lateral motion ("micro-evolution") is not RM&NS&Rpr but is instead <u>environmental change</u>. Putting the question of what produced the <u>initial</u> change aside, we can now ask -- is it possible that environmental change could suitably bump a bacteria without a flagella, thereby transforming it into one with a flagella? Could <u>any</u> amount of blind environmental forces <u>bump</u> a new species or a new structure into existence? Can the physical environment do what RM&NS&Rpr by definition cannot? Such questions merely restate the problem of the origin of life. While physical events can indeed bring <u>change</u> ("micro-evolution") how do they produce life and its complex structures ("macro-evolution")?

As any scientist or mathematician knows, the repeated multiplication (or addition) of a "micro" will lead to a "macro." Repeated multiplication of a small positive will lead to a large positive. Evolutionary logic however, depends entirely upon the "micro" in question actually being positive. If the "micro" is a small negative then its multiplication will lead, not to evolution, but to <u>de</u>volution and the <u>de</u>struction of all life on earth.

In this regard I have perhaps been too kind with the word "<u>a</u>volution" (neutral) and should have used the word micro-<u>de</u>volution (negative). The "bumping" of an organism's niche is like a game of Russian roulette. While there is a chance the essential random mutation or variation will appear in the population (assuming it is actually in the probability distribution) there is also a chance that it (being random with regard to timing) will not appear at the "correct" time. With a sufficient amount of bumping, a species is certain to be dead. An even more effective bumping (of niches) -- and subsequent devolutionary change -- could be accomplished by hitting the planet with a huge asteroid or throwing it down a black hole.

As we can see, in "micro-evolution," the internal complexity and characteristics of life are being ignored. Species and their environments are being treated superficially, as the logical equivalent of Newtonian, bouncing balls. This may be one reason why "micro-evolution" is so well accepted generally. "Micro-evolution" (and the evidence for it) simply does not touch the problems of the <u>origin</u> of life and the <u>origin</u> of species -- which I maintain are one and the same problem.

The typical Darwinian response to the "micro" to "macro-evolutionary" problem, on the other hand, is to blithely maintain that "micro-evolution" is a <u>positive</u> and that all species actually inhabit the same constrained hypervolume (in spite of the apparently <u>different</u> engineering challenges involved). This however just turns the "miracle" of life's origin into an utterly stupendous hyper-miracle. Just how big is this hypervolume?

DJ mullen. (from The ARN thread)

"I think that it's hypervolume includes every species that has ever existed on this earth and an almost infinite variety that haven't yet been "found"."

Apparently its size is "almost infinite" and this is not even counting the 99.99.. percentage of DNA configurations that are de-selected duds. In order for any internal configuration to be "naturally selected," this stupendous but <u>finite</u> hypervolume must be both generated and constantly maintained and fully constrained. This means that this must be a <u>real</u> counter-thermodynamic <u>structure</u> -- for if it is not <u>real</u> and subsequently not <u>constrained</u>, then the system hypervolume automatically goes to <u>infinity</u> and the selection-probability of <u>any</u> internal (finite) target goes to <u>zero</u>. And furthermore, the structure's counter-thermodynicity must be transferable to the target organism. Organisms exhibit autonomous counter-thermodynamic <u>stability</u>. "Monkey shakespeare" and "three lemons" do not.

This analysis explains my disbelief in both <u>physical</u> "macro-evolution" and <u>physical</u> "micro-evolution" and my present belief in both <u>physical</u> micro- and <u>physical</u> macro-"<u>de</u>volution" consistent with the physical Second Law.

To summarize;

#1. RM&NS(+Rpd&Env) are <u>not</u> causally adequate with regard to "macro-evolution."
#2. RM&NS(+Rpd) are <u>not</u> causally adequate with regard to "micro-evolution."
#3. A changing Env. <u>is</u> causally adequate with regard to "micro-evolution," but "micro-<u>de</u>volution" is the correct scientific term.

Conclusion:

The use of randomness (order negative) in a theory of origins (order positive) is an error. With the use of the word "natural," Darwin merely shifted the question of "what originated the species?" to "what originated the CPI(s) or LPSS?...that in turn originated the species."

Darwinists have two choices with regard to <u>origins</u>.

Either;

#1. Explain the origin (production) of the species

or

#2. Explain the origin of the background system that (over time) generates the species (in deferred, probabilistic Darwinian fashion).

Either way it is order production (+) that needs an explanation, not its RM&NS

destruction (-) which needs no explanation (in a universe governed by the Second Law).

Due to the mathematical relationship between any CPI's parameters and its output, the problem of the "origin of the Darwinian LPSS" is the same the "origin of species" problem, but in a different form. Any answer to the question of origin requires, at very least, a mechanism for the production (LPSS) and maintenance (SSA) of new order (new LPSS order, biological order, cosmic order. With regard to the gradual Darwinian "explainment" plan, Darwinists have no mechanism [6] with which to make their first payment.

Notes:

#1. The ARN thread can be found at..
(http://www.arn.org/boards/ubb-get_topic-f-13-t-001190.html)

#2. See -- (http://www.iscid.org/papers/Dembski_WhyNatural_112901.pdf)

#3. For a discussion of computer programs and their attendant "hypervolumes" see the John Bracht article, "Inventions Algorithms and Biological Design"--
(http://www.iscid.org/papers/Bracht_InventionsAlgorithms_112601.pdf). See also -- ISCID "Brainstorms" thread by "Francis" -- Evolving Algorithms -- (http://www.iscid.org/boards/ubb-get_topic-f-6-t-000287.html)

#4. As a scientist I am a "reductionist" by nature. With regard to people and consciousness, however, I am an "exaltationist." I "reduce" people and all existence to God.

#5. One could avoid pure randomness here by claiming that randomness is not pure because what we have is the collision of two languages (cosmic and biological) and where they have a syntactical component in common (change) there can exist a reprieve from the usual collisional randomness.

This however would also change the Darwinian formulation from...R-->M&NS
to...CPR(Collisional Pseudo Randomness)--->M&NS

While this (Brookfield -- ID) model definitely has value in other respects, it unfortunately does not get us anywhere from a Darwinian standpoint. In such a collision model, the abrasiveness would simply reduce all non-cosmic (biological) order to cosmic order (leaving only "change") while also, to some extent, reducing cosmic order. When an asteroid hits the earth, collisional pseudo randomness is for all intents and (biological) purposes, just as nasty. The concept of "language" also presupposes a "speaker" (ID).

#6. Given that I have spent significant time with these issues and that my name is "Brookfield" I am recommending the Brookfield Psycho-Physical Anti-Friction (BAF) mechanism as a replacement for the RM&NS "mechanism." The explanation of this however, requires another article.