

Re: There Was No Grace Period (copy)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004-10/0236.html>

From: TomHendricks474 (tomhendricks474_at_cs.com)

Date: 10/16/04

Date: Sat, 16 Oct 2004 20:54:57 +0000 (UTC)

>> TH

>> *Yes and this is a new paradigm. I suggest that
>> every aspect of life before the replicator, the replicator
>> and every evolved aspect of life is that it better
>> survives or is more stable in its environment.
>> Life is an energy moderator with modification through descent.
>> Life did not emerge and then evolve ways of surviving
>> (there was no grace period for metabolism or replication) – it was that
>that
>> best survived that day and the next.*

>>

>*This is what I mean by the idea of having a sentence from the
>beginning that makes sense even when there are (certain) changes in
>the environment. But notice that there must be *some* regularity in
>the environment,*

The sun/heat cycle is the ONLY consistent cyclical energy cycle that lasts long enough for anything to adapt to it. It is so inherent in all life and how life reacts to the sun/heat, night/cold and summer/winter cycles that perhaps we miss the 500 pound gorilla that stares us in the face. Life of course is a blatant and obvious adaptation to the heat cycle – what other power source could it adapt to?

(snipped)

>*I meant spontaneous for the assembly of subcomponents into a well
>formed replicator in the sense that they autoassembled. Unless there
>was some kind of template (not implying a *directed*, conscious
>template), hence the idea of cribages and the possibility of clays as
>the first (immediate) environment for life.*

I think you are missing my point. Life does not emerge. chemicals do not emerge out of nothing. What survives the heat cycle does so at a similar temp.

If chemicals A survive and activated at 70 C on Sunday, and chemicals B

survive and activated at 70 C on Monday, then tuesday you have chemicals A and B both at the same place at the same time and activated. Soon you have a pre-symbiosis effect or a temperature symbiosis where all things surviving at 70–80C together at the same time.

We must get the order correct – we must determine the order of events.

FIRST comes surviving the sun. Then later life (which is just an evolved form of surviving the sun) came about.

Worry first about chemicals surviving – then when they're safe – worry about the ones that are replicating.

First things first – horse before the cart.

>

>*But that that is most stable was created by `chance`*,

I don't think so. Chemical reactions at the same temperature do not vary. There is little chance in

outcome. They are reasonably predictable.

Put a match to straw and there are not many outcomes other than fire that are open to you.

>> *But let's say the environment tests two molecules*

>> *1. is a replicator that is in no way adapted to its environment.*

>> *2. is a molecule already tough enough to survive that environment.*

>>

>> *Which of the two will survive according to all reasonable arguments?*

>>

>> *(snipped)*

>*2 the molecule. I understand where you are getting at. We need first to create a basic vocabulary of stable molecules before assembling them into a successful replicator. The molecule(s) will survive until a reaction destroys it. Then the (auto)assembly maybe easy, with stable components.*

Yes exactly. And every step of the way the sun has the final word on what survives. I think once the new sun starts to cool, then and only then was prebiotic life forced to find a energy substitute – that substitute was chemical energy – which we have now.

>*But if an unadapted replicator replicates quickly enough it can start changing (adapting) and that particular life line will survive.*

why challenge the odds with fluke events to describe

the origin. If so I suppose magic wands could have done it to – right?

I can't rule out anything in this less than exact scenario for the origin – but I can depend on the most likely as being that that was most likely to have happened.

But

>*how simple can be a replicator?*

Would you consider replicator in a new sense?

What if it hadn't anything to do with replicating –
but instead just had to do with surviving temperature cycle.

Ex. – in the PCR reaction – doublestranded DNA is heated up, the strand
separate, and mixed with bases.

Then its cooled – annealing begins and two exact copies are there instead of
one.

Now did life do this because it wanted to replicate?

OR did the heat cycle do this and the chemicals followed the heating cooling
process?

Cells – when they get too large they can no longer take in enough energy to
survive. IF that cell can dump half of itself as WASTE OUT – it can live again.

Is that cell replicating?

Is that cell dumping waste to survive