

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

FITNESS OF THE COSMOS FOR LIFE

Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

This highly interdisciplinary book highlights many of the ways in which chemistry plays a crucial role in making life an evolutionary possibility in the universe. Cosmologists and particle physicists have often explored how the observed laws and constants of nature lie within a narrow range that allows complexity and life to evolve and adapt. Here, these anthropic considerations are diversified in a host of new ways to identify the most sensitive features of biochemistry and astrobiology. Celebrating the classic 1913 work of Lawrence J. Henderson, *The Fitness of the Environment*, this book looks at the delicate balance between chemistry and the ambient conditions in the universe that permit complex chemical networks and structures to exist. It will appeal to scientists, academics, and others working in a range of disciplines.

JOHN D. BARROW is Professor of Mathematical Sciences in the Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics at the University of Cambridge and Director of the Millennium Mathematics Project. He is the author of *The Artful Universe Expanded* (Oxford University Press, 2005) and *The Infinite Book: A Short Guide to the Boundless, Timeless and Endless* (Cape, 2005), as well as co-editor of *Science and Ultimate Reality: Quantum Theory, Cosmology and Complexity* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).

SIMON CONWAY MORRIS is Professor of Evolutionary Palaeobiology at the Earth Sciences Department, University of Cambridge. He is the author of *Life's Solution: Inevitable Humans in a Lonely Universe* (Cambridge University Press, 2003).

STEPHEN J. FREELAND is Associate Professor of Biological Sciences at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. His research focuses on the evolution of the genetic code.

CHARLES L. HARPER, JR. is an astrophysicist and planetary scientist and serves as Senior Vice President of the John Templeton Foundation. He is co-editor of *Science and Ultimate Reality: Quantum Theory, Cosmology and Complexity* (Cambridge University Press, 2004); *Visions of Discovery: New Light on Physics, Cosmology, and Consciousness* (forthcoming from Cambridge University Press).

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning
Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge Astrobiology

Series Editors

Bruce Jakosky, Alan Boss, Frances Westall, Daniel Prieur and Charles Cockell

Books in the series

1. Planet Formation: Theory, Observations, and Experiments
Edited by Hubert Klahr and Wolfgang Brandner
ISBN 978-0-521-86015-4
2. Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning
Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper, Jr.
ISBN 978-0-521-87102-0
3. Planetary Systems and the Origins of Life
Edited by Ralph Pudritz, Paul Higgs and Jonathon Stone
ISBN 978-0-521-87548-6

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning
Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

FITNESS OF THE COSMOS FOR LIFE
Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by

JOHN D. BARROW
University of Cambridge

SIMON CONWAY MORRIS
University of Cambridge

STEPHEN J. FREELAND
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

CHARLES L. HARPER, JR.
John Templeton Foundation



Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning
Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo
Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK
Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York
www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521871020

© Cambridge University Press 2008

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2008

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge
A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-87102-0 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>List of contributors</i>	page vii
<i>Foreword: The improbability of life</i>	
<i>George M. Whitesides</i>	xi
<i>Preface</i>	xxi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxiii
Part I The fitness of “fitness”: Henderson in context	
1 Locating “fitness” and L. J. Henderson	3
<i>Everett Mendelsohn</i>	
2 Revisiting <i>The Fitness of the Environment</i>	20
<i>Owen Gingerich</i>	
3 Is fine-tuning remarkable?	31
<i>John F. Haught</i>	
4 Complexity in context: the metaphysical implications of evolutionary theory	49
<i>Edward T. Oakes</i>	
5 Tuning fine-tuning	70
<i>Ernan McMullin</i>	
Part II The fitness of the cosmic environment	
6 Fitness and the cosmic environment	97
<i>Paul C. W. Davies</i>	
7 The interconnections between cosmology and life	114
<i>Mario Livio</i>	
8 Chemistry and sensitivity	132
<i>John D. Barrow</i>	
9 Fitness of the cosmos for the origin and evolution of life: from biochemical fine-tuning to the Anthropic Principle	151
<i>Julian Chela-Flores</i>	

vi	<i>Contents</i>	
Part III The fitness of the terrestrial environment		
10	How biofriendly is the universe? <i>Christian de Duve</i>	169
11	Tuning into the frequencies of life: a roar of static or a precise signal? <i>Simon Conway Morris</i>	197
12	Life on earth: the role of proteins <i>Jayanth R. Banavar and Amos Maritan</i>	225
13	Protein-based life as an emergent property of matter: the nature and biological fitness of the protein folds <i>Michael J. Denton</i>	256
14	Could an intelligent alien predict earth’s biochemistry? <i>Stephen J. Freeland</i>	280
15	Would Venus evolve on Mars? Bioenergetic constraints, allometric trends, and the evolution of life-history invariants <i>Jeffrey P. Schloss</i>	318
Part IV The fitness of the chemical environment		
16	Creating a perspective for comparing <i>Albert Eschenmoser</i>	349
17	Fine-tuning and interstellar chemistry <i>William Klemperer</i>	366
18	Framing the question of fine-tuning for intermediary metabolism <i>Eric Smith and Harold J. Morowitz</i>	384
19	Coarse-tuning in the origin of life? <i>Guy Ourisson</i>	421
20	Plausible lipid-like peptides: prebiotic molecular self-assembly in water <i>Shuguang Zhang</i>	440
21	Evolution revisited by inorganic chemists <i>R. J. P. Williams and J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva</i>	456
	<i>Index</i>	491

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Contributors

Jayanth R. Banavar

Box 262, 104 Davey Laboratory, Pennsylvania State University, University Park,
PA 16802-6300, USA

John D. Barrow

Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce
Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK

Julian Chela-Flores

The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Strada Costiera
11, 34104 Trieste, Italy

Instituto de Estudios Avanzados, Apartado Postal 17606, Parque Central,
Caracas 1015-A, Venezuela

School of Theoretical Physics, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies,
10 Burlington Road, Dublin 4, Ireland

Simon Conway Morris

Department of Earth Sciences, University of Cambridge, Downing Street,
Cambridge CB2 3EQ, UK

Paul C. W. Davies

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Arizona State University, 300 E.
University/PO Box 876505, Foundation Bldg, Suite 2470, Tempe, AZ
85287-6505, USA

Christian de Duve

de Duve Institute and Louvain Medical School, Catholic University of Louvain,
Avenue Hippocrate 75-B. 7550, B-1200 Brussels, Belgium

The Rockefeller University, 1230 York Avenue, Box 282, New York, NY
10021, USA

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper
Frontmatter

[More information](#)

viii

List of contributors

Michael J. Denton

Department of Zoology, University of Sindh, Jamshoro, Sindh, Pakistan

Albert Eschenmoser

Laboratorium für Organische Chemie, ETH Hönggerberg, HCI H309, CH-8093
Zürich, Switzerland

J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva

Fundação Oriente, Rua do Salitre, 66/68, 1269-065 Lisboa, Portugal
Centro de Química Estrutural, Instituto Superior Técnico, Av. Rovisco Pais,
1049-01, Lisboa, Portugal

Stephen J. Freeland

Department of Biological Sciences, University of Maryland, Baltimore County,
1000 Hilltop Circle, Room 115, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA

Owen Gingerich

Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, 60 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA
02138, USA

John F. Haught

Department of Theology, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057, USA

William Klemperer

Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University, 12 Oxford
Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

Mario Livio

Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218,
USA

Amos Maritan

Istituto Nazionale per la Fisica della Materia, Dipartimento di Fisica G. Galilei,
Università di Padova, Via Marzolo 8, 35131 Padova, Italy

Ernan McMullin

Program in History and Philosophy of Science, University of Notre Dame,
Box 1066, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

Everett Mendelsohn

Harvard University, Science Center 371, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

Harold J. Morowitz

Krasnow Institute for Advanced Study, East Building 207 (MS 1D6), George
Mason University, Fairfax, VA 22030, USA

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

List of contributors

ix

Edward T. Oakes

University of St. Mary of the Lake/Mundelein Seminary, 1000 East Maple
Avenue, Mundelein, IL 60060, USA

Guy Ourisson

Centre de Neurochimie, Université Louis Pasteur, 5 rue Blaise Pascal, F-67084
Strasbourg Cedex 9, France*

Jeffrey P. Schloss

Department of Biology, Westmont College, 955 La Paz Road, Santa Barbara, CA
93108, USA

D. Eric Smith

Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe, NM 87501, USA

George M. Whitesides

Department of Chemistry, Harvard University, 12 Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA
02138, USA

R. J. P. Williams

Inorganic Chemistry Laboratory, University of Oxford, South Parks Road,
Oxford OX1 3QR, UK

Shuguang Zhang

Center for Biomedical Engineering and the Center for Bits and Atoms,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 500 Technology Square, NE47-379,
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307, USA

* Professor Ourisson passed away while this book was in production.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Foreword: The improbability of life

George M. Whitesides

How did life begin?

I (and most scientists) would answer, “By accident.” But what an absolutely unlikely accident it must have been! The earth on which life first appeared – prebiotic earth – was most inhospitable: a violent place, wracked by storms and volcanoes, wrenched by the pull of a moon that was much closer than the one we know now, still battered by cosmic impacts. On its surface and in its oceans were myriads of organic compounds, some formed in processes occurring on earth, some imported by infalls from space. Out of this universe of tumult and molecules, somehow a small subset of chemical processes emerged and accidentally replicated, thus stumbling toward what became the first cells. How could such a chaotic mixture of molecules have generated cells? Order usually decays toward disorder: *Why do the tracks that led to life point in the opposite direction?*

The origin of life is one of the biggest of the big questions about the nature of existence. *Origin* tends to occur frequently in these big questions: the *origin* of the universe, the *origin* of matter, the *origin* of life, the *origin* of sentience. We, scientists and non-scientists alike, have troubles with such “origins” – we were not there watching when the first events happened, we can never replicate them, and, when those first events happened, there was, in fact, no “we.” I believe that one day we will be able to describe life in physical terms – that is, we will rationalize life satisfactorily in molecular detail based on accepted scientific law and scientific theory using the scientific method. But we certainly do not know yet how to do it.

Understanding how organized living cells emerged from disorganized mixtures of molecules is an entrancingly, seductively difficult problem – so difficult, as we now understand it, that science does not even have well-formulated, testable hypotheses about how it might have happened, only guesses and intuitions. This

problem deserves our most careful thought. Its solution will tell us about our origins and describe how disorder can spontaneously become order. It will also test the capability of current science to understand systems comprising many interacting parts.

Before trying to answer the question *How did life begin?*, we must first think about what the question really is that we are trying to answer: What is the “life” whose origins we are trying to understand? What are the characteristics of a cell, the simplest embodiment of life, that might allow us to trace back to its origins? How do we recognize an “origin”? When does a set of molecules, and of processes that convert these molecules into one another, cross a line separating “not-alive” from “alive”? And what is the tool – the “scientific method” – that science will use to try to address this problem?

Let us begin with the scientific method, a very useful and quite reliable strategy for doing science. Although it sometimes seems plodding, the scientific method can tease apart astonishingly difficult and complicated problems by careful attention to detail. It starts with rigorously reproducible empirical observations: “Things fall down, not up.” “Two objects at different temperatures, when placed in contact, reach the same temperature.” “Hydrogen atoms absorb only light that has specific frequencies.” The scientific method codifies and quantifies these observations as “physical laws,” builds theories (Newtonian mechanics, thermodynamics, quantum mechanics) based on those laws, and then tests new observations or hypotheses for their compatibility with these theories. Based on these theories, science rationalizes the physical world and predicts aspects of it not previously observed. The tools of the scientific method are the millstones and the oven that science uses to grind observations into theory and bake theory into prediction.

The scientific method works most rigorously when it identifies observations that are incompatible with current hypotheses. Faced with a new observation, scientists list all hypotheses that might explain it and then discard those that are incompatible with accepted physical law. Hypotheses that are not discarded as incompatible remain possibilities. If only one remains, it is promoted to theory. If disproving all hypotheses but one is not possible, we may retreat to demonstrating compatibility with theory, recognizing that compatibility is weaker than proof. In science, we use the phrases “I think . . .” and “I believe . . .” as synonyms, both implying “. . . based on known physical law.” In other words, “This theory accommodates all the observations that we currently know.”

So, what is life? We can describe what it looks like and what it does, but not how it works (most of us are in the same situation even with much simpler systems: computers, electric toothbrushes, refrigerator magnets). I suggest that life has five major physical attributes (other scientists may suggest other lists, but the general principles will usually be the same):

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Foreword

xiii

1. *Life is compartmentalized.* All life that we know is embodied in cells, and all cells have a continuous, closed membrane that separates “inside” from “outside.”
2. *Life is dissipative, or out-of-equilibrium.* Life requires a flow of energy. If the chemical and physical processes in living cells reach equilibrium, and there is no flux of energy through the cell, it is, so far as we know, dead (or, at least, “not-alive”).
3. *Life is self-replicating.* The most evident characteristic of the cell is that it was produced by the division of a parent cell, and, in many cases, it too will divide and produce daughter cells.
4. *Life is adaptive.* The cell can adapt its internal environment so that it functions even when the outside environment changes; in some circumstances, it can even modify the outside environment to make its inside more comfortable.
5. *Life occurs in water.* All life, so far as we know, involves molecules and salts dissolved or organized in a medium that is mostly water. We do not know whether water is essential to all life or just to life as we know it. But, at this time, we know no exceptions: life occurs in water.

So, according to this view, life is a spatially distinct, highly organized network of chemical reactions that occur in water and is characterized by a set of remarkable properties that enable it to replicate itself and to adapt to changes in its environment. We can, thus, describe what we are still ignorant about, but not much more.

How remarkable is life? The answer is: *very*. Those of us who deal in networks of chemical reactions know of nothing like it. We understand some – but only some – of the characteristics of the network that make it so remarkable. One key to its behavior is catalysis. The rates of essentially all cellular reactions – the processes that convert one molecule into another – are controlled by other molecules (usually by a class of protein catalysts called enzymes). The catalysts are (in some sense) like valves in a chemical plant (which, in some sense, is what a cell is): they control the rate at which one kind of molecule becomes another in a way loosely analogous to that in which a valve controls the rate at which fluid flows through a pipe. The complexity of the network becomes clear when one realizes that the catalysts – the valves – are themselves controlled by the molecules they produce: the products of one reaction can control the rate at which another reaction takes place.

The catalysts provide plausible connections among the elements of the network. The conversations among catalysts – conversations controlled by the very molecules the catalysts are controlling – allow the components of the network to form a single, coherent, interconnected, albeit very complicated, entity rather than an inchoate collection of independent processes. And how intricate these “conversations” are! The molecules whose production is required for the cell to live and to replicate itself modify the activities of the catalysts that make them. These already very complex interactions are further modulated by additional signals that come from outside the cell and by signals generated by an internal “clock.” (This clock – the

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xiv

Foreword

“cell cycle” – is itself a set of chemical reactions that oscillates spontaneously in time and defines the sequence of stages through which the cell progresses as it replicates.) Many molecules in the cell also have multiple roles: intermediates in one or many synthetic pathways, controllers of the activity of catalysts, signals for generating the catalysts and other molecules, sources of energy, and components of the physical structure of the cell.

Today, we understand many aspects of the behavior of the cell and many fragments of the network, but not how it all fits together. We particularly do not understand the stability of life and of the networks that compose it. Our experience with other very complicated networks (e.g. the global climate, air-traffic-control systems, the stock market) is that they are puzzlingly unstable and idiosyncratic. But unlike these and other such networks, life is stable – it is able to withstand, or adapt to, remarkably severe external jolts and shocks; and its stability is even more puzzling than the instability of the climate. We have a hard enough time understanding even simple sets of coupled chemical reactions. And we have, at this time, no idea how to understand (and certainly not how to construct) the network of reactions that make up the simplest cell.

So, at least for now, the cell is beyond our ability to understand it. The community of people working on the nature of life has, nonetheless, great (and probably warranted) confidence that understanding life in purely physical terms is a tractable, if difficult, problem. This confidence is enormously bolstered by two facts.

First, we are surrounded by uncountable varieties of life, especially by multitudes of different types of living cells; we thus have many examples of different forms of life. We ourselves are communities of cells with the added complexities of hierarchical organization of these cells into tissues, of tissues into organs, and of organs into the organisms that are “we.”

Second, the tools of modern molecular biology have given us an astonishing capability to examine, modify, deconstruct, and reconstruct the molecular components of cells to see how they respond to our tinkering. The simplest cells (such as those of the primitive intracellular parasite *Mycoplasma genitalium*) appear to have fewer than a thousand proteins. That number of catalysts is still very complicated, and we have as yet no conceptual tools for understanding a network of reactions of such complexity. But this level of complexity does not, in principle, seem unreachably beyond our understanding. A cellular network of a thousand proteins (catalysts and molecules that sense, signal, and control passage across membranes; act as the structural skeleton; and perform many other functions) talking to one another in groups through the compounds they produce seems to be something that we will be able to disentangle. Certainly, those who call themselves “systems biologists” believe we will. Still, the path that scientists are now following in trying to understand the molecular basis of life will test their creativity and strain their endurance:

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Foreword*

xv

first, understanding the pieces of the networks as thoroughly as possible; then, perhaps, devising a computer model of a cell; and ultimately, in some distant future, validating the correctness of the principles suggested by this model by designing a set of reactions entirely different from those in the cells we now know.

It is one thing to analyze a Bach fugue; it is quite a different thing to play one, or to write one, or to create the kind of communication between humans that we call “music.” We shall, I confidently believe, eventually analyze the fugue of life – the interplay of metabolic processes in the cell – as a network of compartmentalized, adaptive chemical reactions that can, astonishingly, replicate repeatedly into identical, distinct, separate networks. This is a very difficult job, but one that we humans can accomplish. But where did the cell come from? How did this wonderfully, astonishingly complex system come into existence? We do not know. If it is very difficult to understand the operation of cellular life as we observe it today, it is even more difficult to understand how it might have originated in the past.

Thoughtful, deeply creative people from a wide range of backgrounds have been captivated by the question of the origin of life. There is no shortage of ideas about pieces of this puzzle. We know how the surfaces of minerals might have provided elementary, non-biological catalysts to start the process and how heat or sunlight might have contributed other reactions. We can guess why certain types of molecules and reactions tend to occur in metabolism. We understand how any number of plausible natural events occurring in a conceivable prebiotic earth – events that formed complex mixtures of chemicals in geothermal vents, in lightning, on impacts, and under intense solar irradiation – might have contributed relevant bits of chemistry. But we do *not* understand how something as subtle and complicated as the network of reactions that we recognize the cell to be – a network both responsive and robust – might have emerged from these rudimentary processes. How could a chemical sludge spontaneously become a rose, even with billions of years to try?

We can take two approaches in our research directed toward the origin of life: reasoning *backward* and reasoning *forward*. “Backward” starts with life as we know and characterize it now – cells, DNA, RNA, enzymes, membranes, metabolites, membrane receptors, channels, and import/export proteins – and extrapolates back to simpler and simpler systems to try to infer an origin. This approach has been spectacularly successful in “reverse engineering” evolution, at least part of the way; but it has always been guided by examples provided by the types of cells that are now alive. Still, there seems little doubt that evolution could proceed once there was a primitive cell, with RNA or an RNA-like molecule, and reactions that used RNA as a catalyst and also translated RNA into protein or protein-like catalysts that were part of the network of reactions. Several hundreds of millions of tidal pools, together with enormous volumes of lakes and oceans, over several hundreds of millions of years provided many opportunities to produce cellular and organismic

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

complexity. This part of the development of the complexity of life no longer seems to be a serious issue, at least conceptually. And the anatomical and physiological structures that now so enthrall us – the eye, the ear, the kidney, tentacles, muscles – these all seem to me transfixingly interesting products of evolution, but not ones whose origins are incomprehensibly improbable. If we and the squid have the same camera eye, why not? With enough tries, “best” solutions are bound to emerge many times. If some creatures walk on two legs, some on four, some on six or eight – again, why not? Many solutions may work well enough to survive the rigors of evolutionary selection.

Reasoning “forward” is much more problematic. Although we can imagine many possible managers for the birth of life – deep smokers in the abyssal depths, tidal pools, hot springs, and many others – and although each could plausibly produce primitive precursors to many of the reactions that now constitute cellular metabolism, we have (in my opinion) no idea how these simple reactions might have blundered together to make the first protocell. Monkeys sitting at typewriters pecking out Shakespeare seems child’s play by comparison. For example, we still do not know:

- *What were the first catalysts?* Were they protein-analogs or RNA-analogs or minerals or some other species of which there is now no trace?
- *How did the first networks form, and why did they persist?* One can imagine countless catalytic reactions that might have occurred, but how some of these reactions became self-sustaining networks is entirely obscure.
- *How could the process that stores the information that specifies the catalysts – the RNA or precursor of the primitive cells – have evolved?* The connection between RNA (or its younger, more evolved cousin, DNA) and the proteins that are catalysts, the enzymes, is not at all obvious; how the two co-evolved is even less clear.
- *How did the energetic cycles that power every cell emerge?* Why is there potassium ion on the inside of the cell and sodium ion on the outside? What was the origin of chemiosmosis? Given the extraordinary complexity of the ATPases – the complicated aggregates of proteins that generate ATP using the free energy that derives from differences in the concentration of ions across membranes – how could they have evolved? We simply do not know.

Nothing in the cell violates the fundamental laws of physical science. The second law of thermodynamics, the law that describes everything that occurs in the range of sizes relevant to life, can sleep untroubled. The flux of energy – now (although not necessarily originally) produced in nuclear reactions in our sun, transferred to the surface of earth as sunlight, absorbed by plants in photosynthesis, captured as glucose and other compounds, used in the cell to generate the intermediates that make metabolism possible, and ultimately dissipated to space by radiation as heat – can evidently support life. But how life originated is simply not apparent. It seems

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)*Foreword*

xvii

so improbable! The complexity of the simplest cell eludes our understanding – how could it be that any cell, even one simpler than the simplest that we know, emerged from the tangle of accidental reactions occurring in the molecular sludge that covered the prebiotic earth? We (or, at least, I) do not understand. It is not impossible, but it seems very, very improbable.

This improbability is the crux of the matter. The scientific method can be paralyzied by problems that require understanding the very improbable occurrences that result from very, very large numbers of throws of the dice. Sometimes we can understand the statistics of the problem; sometimes we cannot. How likely is it that a comet will hit the earth? We now have good geological records. How likely is it that a star will explode into a nova? There are many, many observable stars, and we now understand the statistics of nova formation quite well.

But how likely is it that a newly formed planet, with surface conditions that support liquid water, will give rise to life? We have, at this time, no clue, and no convincing way of estimating. From what we do now know, the answer falls somewhere between “impossibly unlikely” and “absolutely inevitable.” We cannot calculate the odds of the spontaneous emergence of cellular life on a plausible prebiotic earth in any satisfying and convincing way.

What to do? For all its apparent improbability, life does seem to have happened here (or perhaps on some similar planet that transferred life to here). Rationalizing the origin of life is a problem that chemists are probably best able to solve. Life is a molecular phenomenon. The possibilities of alternative universes and different distributions of the elements are irrelevant from the vantage point of the particular universe and planet – our earth – that we share with so many other forms of life. We understand the chemical elements (we do not need to know about exotic forms of matter or energy in this enterprise), the molecules they form, and their reactivities. We know the players in the game, and we understand the game they play. We can guess (albeit only roughly) the distribution of the elements on the surface of the earth in the epoch in which we believe that life emerged, and we can infer the abundances of the molecules that were probably present. We understand how catalysts function. But we do not see how it all fits together.

Is this a problem in which science can make progress? Yes, and perhaps no. Those researchers who have taken the approach of reasoning “backward” to infer how life might have been born have made rapid progress. They have used the tools of molecular biology to trace the early stages of evolution back to the point where DNA gave way to RNA, which in turn probably gave way to some more primitive molecule whose composition we don’t know, but which was probably related to RNA. The paths are fainter and fainter as the trail becomes older and colder and as we move from fact into speculation beyond RNA. We still do not understand the connections between RNA, or its forgotten ancestor, and enzymes, or their

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xviii

Foreword

also forgotten ancestors, and the metabolic web that supports and constitutes life. Moving “forward” – spinning and weaving the threads that connect “molecules” to “life” – has been technically and conceptually more difficult.

Still, compelling connections are apparent between what might have existed on the prebiotic earth and the molecules of surprising complexity that are now vital to life. We understand, for example, how molecules of astonishing sophistication, such as the porphyrins – the precursors to the “green” of the pigments that serve plants in photosynthesis and the “red” of the hemoglobin that transports oxygen in our blood – could have arisen from aqueous solutions of hydrogen cyanide, one of the simplest of molecules and a possible component of the atmosphere of prebiotic earth. But these demonstrations, marvelous as they are, do not bridge the gap between “forward” pathways from prebiotic molecules to life and “backward” pathways from modern cells to possible progenitors, those emerging from the gray area between “alive” and “not-alive.” As yet, no step goes from solutions of molecules to the networks of interconverting molecules that make up living cells. I believe that no one yet knows how to bridge that gap.

How to progress? The best lead to the hardest part of the problem – the “forward” problem – is the hypothesis that life evolved, somehow, from autocatalytic reactions (that is, reactions whose products are themselves catalysts for the reactions that produce them). We know something about autocatalytic reactions: flames are autocatalytic, and so are explosions (and one speaks, sometimes, of the “explosion” of life). We also know other reactions that are autocatalytic, although the subject of “autocatalysis” has not been a particular preoccupation of chemistry or biochemistry. Autocatalysis offers, I believe, a plausible trail into the wilderness.

Here, I suggest, is a *process* that science can use to examine this question. Let us build and understand autocatalytic reactions; extend that understanding to other networks of catalytic reactions; and develop simple, and then more complex, networks of autocatalytic and catalytic reactions. If, in time, we can trace a pathway from “chemical sludge” to “life,” we shall have provided an argument based on plausibility, if not on proof, for the origin of life.

If, in time, we cannot trace such a path, what then? In science, until it has been proven that something cannot be done, it is always possible that it can be done. Proving that life did not originate by accident in tidal pools or black smokers will be more difficult than proving that it might have done so. Also, patience may be in order. What is impossible for science today may be trivial for science in the future.

There is still much that we do not understand about nature. As we learn more, I believe that we will ultimately see a path – based on principles of chemistry and physics and geology – that could plausibly have led from disorganized mixtures of inanimate chemicals to the astonishingly ordered, self-replicating networks of reactions that provide the basis for life. The fact that I cannot yet understand how an

inconceivably large number of tries at an extraordinarily improbable event might lead to “life” is more a reflection of my limited ability to understand than evidence of a requirement for some new principle. But, having said all of that, I do not know, and in some sense do not care, whether physical science as I now know it ultimately explains the origin of life or whether the explanation will require principles entirely new to me. I do care that science makes every effort to develop the explanation.

Although I believe that science will ultimately be successful in rationalizing the origin of life in terms of physical principles, it should be cautious and claim credit only for the puzzles it has already solved, not those whose solutions still lie in the future. The central conundrum about the origin of life – that, as an accidental event, it seems so very improbable – is not one that science has yet resolved. Claiming credit prematurely – claiming, in effect, that current science holds all the answers – may stunt the growth of the new ideas that a resolution may require.

What, then, do I know? I know that I do not, yet, understand how life originated (and that I may not live long enough to do so). Order from disorder! How could it have happened?

I also know that my father never imagined cloning, and his father would not have believed television. Go far enough back, and the wheel was beyond comprehension. Difficult problems may take time – lots of time – to solve.

And so now, after I wake in the morning – at least on a good morning after I’ve had my coffee and am not distracted by the countless midges that constitute most of reality-as-we-know-it – my overwhelming response to existence, and to life, remains one of delight in its wonderfully wild improbability.

For now, call it what you will. *L’Chaim!*

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - *Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning*

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Preface

This book is part of a two-part program focused on the broad theme of “biochemistry and fine-tuning.” *Fitness of the Cosmos for Life* began with a symposium held at Harvard University in October 2003¹ in honor of the 90th anniversary of the publication of Lawrence J. Henderson’s *The Fitness of the Environment*.² The symposium was an interdisciplinary, exploratory research meeting of scientists and other scholars that served as a stimulus for the creative thinking process used in developing the content of this book. The chapters in this volume were developed following the symposium and take advantage of the rich technical and interdisciplinary exchange of ideas that occurred during the in-person discussions.

The *Fitness of the Cosmos* program has provided a high-level forum in which innovative research leaders could present their ideas. In the spirit of multidisciplinary, the fields represented by the meeting participants and book contributors are diverse. From the sciences, the fields of physics, astronomy, astrophysics, cosmology, organic and inorganic chemistry, biology, biochemistry, earth science, medicine, and biomedical engineering are represented; the humanistic disciplines represented include the history of science, philosophy, and theology.

This volume explores in greater depth issues around which the 2003 meeting was convened. It addresses the broad inquiry *Is the cosmos “biocentric” and “fitted” for life?* Keeping this question in mind, the authors presented their thoughts in the context of their own research and knowledge of others’ writings on topics of “fitness” and “fine-tuning.” This work pays tribute to the groundbreaking inquiry of L. J. Henderson.

¹ *Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning – An Interdisciplinary, Exploratory Research Project Commemorating the 90th Anniversary of the Publication of Lawrence J. Henderson’s THE FITNESS OF THE ENVIRONMENT*,² held at the Harvard–Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, October 11–12, 2003. See <http://www.templeton.org/archive/biochem-finetuning>.

² Henderson, L. J. (1913). *The Fitness of the Environment: An Inquiry into the Biological Significance of the Properties of Matter*. New York: MacMillan. Repr. (1958) Boston, MA: Beacon Press; (1970) Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - *Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning*

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xxii

Preface

The editors sought to develop in this collection of essays a variety of approaches to illuminating ways in which the sciences address questions of purpose with respect to the nature of the universe and our place within it. The chapters offer a range of insights reflecting themes and questions around which the meeting was organized and cover key areas of debate and uncertainty. In addition to George Whitesides' thought-provoking Foreword, twenty-four distinguished authors contributed twenty-one chapters, grouped according to four broad thematic areas:

Part I *The fitness of "fitness": Henderson in context*

Part II *The fitness of the cosmic environment*

Part III *The fitness of the terrestrial environment*

Part IV *The fitness of the chemical environment*

The various research agendas engaging questions of "fitness" and "fine-tuning" applied to the cosmos stress that important future opportunities exist for continued and expanded inquiry into areas where the sciences touch on wider, deeper issues of human interest. It is important to note that the preliminary discussion recorded here represents relatively early-stage exploration into what may in time become a much larger and more coherent area of research.

We hope that we have produced a book that will serve to stimulate thinking and new investigations among many scientists and scholars concerned with "really big questions," such as *Why can and does life exist in our universe?* If we have succeeded in any way, *Fitness of the Cosmos for Life* will serve as a stimulus to the creative thinking of people who can take the inquiry much farther.³

³ A follow-up symposium, *Water of Life: Counterfactual Chemistry and Fine-Tuning in Biochemistry*, took place in Varenna, Italy, in April 2005; a research volume based on that symposium is currently in development. See <http://www.templeton.org/archive/wateroflife>.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-87102-0 - Fitness of the Cosmos for Life: Biochemistry and Fine-Tuning

Edited by John D. Barrow, Simon Conway Morris, Stephen J. Freeland and Charles L. Harper

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Acknowledgments

The editors acknowledge the John Templeton Foundation,¹ and Sir John Templeton personally, for making this project possible.

We also thank:

Owen Gingerich, who contributed a chapter to this volume, and George Whitesides, who contributed the Foreword, for hosting the symposium at Harvard University in 2003 and for helping to develop the symposium and this book;

Hyung Choi, for assuming an important role in developing the academic program for the symposium in conjunction with Charles Harper; and

Pamela Bond Contractor, working in conjunction with the John Templeton Foundation and the volume editors, for organizing the 2003 symposium at Harvard and for serving as developmental editor of this book.

Finally, we thank Cambridge University Press for supporting this book project and, in particular, Jacqueline Garget and Vincent Higgs for their editorial management.

¹ See <http://www.templeton.org/>.