

Abiogenesis: The Great Delusion

Addressing the blind spot in the 'beginning of life' narrative

Leo Greenwood

Did life itself *emerge*? If so, from what? Primordial soup? Sounds tasty but it also sounds a bit.. Aristotelean. Don't get me wrong, Aristotle had a lot of great ideas, but he often had ideas that 'haven't aged well,' we'll say.

"*Like what?*" you ask: Earth has been here for all eternity is one; men have more teeth than women; there are seven heavenly bodies that never change; some animals spontaneously come into being from mud; heavy objects fall faster than light objects—wait, go back one?

some animals spontaneously come into being from mud

Spontaneous Generation

This is the notion that life can arise from non-living matter. It's called spontaneous generation, or, if you like, abiogenesis.

a- 'without' or 'not'

bio—'life'

genesis—'origin' or 'birth' [\[1\]](#)

In modern day English, 'Birth without [prior] life'.

Now of course, someone having a load of bad ideas doesn't mean they can't also have really good ideas. For example, it's possible that someone could believe the Earth is flat and still have exceptional parenting techniques for emotion regulation.

But, the bad ideas don't have to come bundled with the good, and as you might have gathered from the rather dramatic title, I am currently persuaded by my logical reasoning that abiogenesis is a bad idea that has come free with the purchase of some good ones.

Building Blocks of Life

After some dedicated time spent working out various chemical compositions of the Earth billions of years ago, Alexander Oparin and J. B. S. Haldane (to name a few) arrived at the same idea as Aristotle—only much more refined. They proposed that life itself began spontaneously from a complex combination of organic molecules that in turn came about due to the chemical melting pot of Earth's surface and atmosphere. (Then evolution and reproduction took place.)

As the chemicals interacted they became more complex and at some point, *life began*. These chemicals, molecules, hydrocarbons and so forth, were then dubbed the 'building blocks of life'.

The Split

My issue here isn't the science, nor is it the accuracy of the composition of Earth's atmosphere or surface. It isn't the idea that molecules can combine to create chemicals that create patterns that create organisms. It isn't even that Aristotle thought adult frogs spontaneously appeared from mud without egg or parent.

My issue is with the idea that 'life' is somehow a distinct and separate reality from the environment it is said to 'come from'.

Nowhere among the scientific data is there an indication of a line between the entirely fabricated categories of life and non-life. **That split is down to a narrative we project, not a reality we observe.**

What Is Life?

That which is 'non-life' isn't considered 'dead' because only life can die. This inert 'matter' cannot and does not live at any time. And yet, the paradox—and so the frustration and mystery—of abiogenesis persists: non-living matter produced living, breathing, life. So this question is put forward in an attempt to bridge the gap between life and non-life: What actually *is* life as distinct from non-life?

In trying to answer this question, we find no way in which we can delineate life and non-life. Every living thing is made of this supposed inert matter, ostensibly simple unconscious molecules. **Life is, according to the science stripped of ideological narrative, simply the environment organising itself in a particular way.**

It isn't that life *emerged from* the (perhaps delicious) Primordial Soup, it's clearly that the Primordial Soup was itself a form of life, born from the parent Earth. Earth in turn having been born from the celestial womb of the solar system.

Life as ordinarily conceived, cannot exist without a living womb to support it—metaphorically and literally. The planet is the womb for all life on Earth, and so Earth itself is alive and its womb is the solar system. Without the Sun, the moon and the other planets Earth would be a frozen world in cryostasis rather than a thriving, breathing organism.

The solar system can then be realised as a *living* reality, a holistic life-system. And so the milky way is *its* womb and on and on until we realise that the split between womb (environment) and life (organism) is in fact meaningless. Everything that exists is, as all the science will tell you, one unified continuous reality. Life is the nature of all of it.

In the Beginning

We may, with this mode of thinking, even go back to before the 'Big Bang,' if we are to believe that's the way it happened. Whatever was before that event was conducive to the birth of universes, and so that too was the living reality, giving birth to birth-giving environments.

There is, as far as I can comprehend this infinite reality, absolutely no separation between life and non-life because **there is no such thing as 'non-life'**.

In the End

Seeing the entire experience of this world as a living reality, we are not some strange germ that mutated itself into being through mechanical cogs of non-living material. We are instead known as the living nature of reality itself. Our breath is the expanding and contracting universe, our heartbeat is the rhythm of time, consciousness is the cosmic awareness of Self.

We are the totality, in self-awareness.
