

Where are the bits in atoms? A perspective on the physical origin and evolutionary nature of information

Wouter van der Wijngaart^{*1}

¹Department of Intelligent Systems, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden

ABSTRACT

This manuscript proposes a conceptual hypothesis regarding the ontology of information, which can serve as a foundation for future empirical exploration and theoretical development. Starting from the premise that information consists of a structural pattern of matter and analysing the current understanding of the evolution of structures and complexity in the universe, we propose to redefine information as a physical structure capable of evolving and driving complexity across multiple layers of self-organization—biological, cultural, civilizational, and cybernetic. The perspective highlights how information structures replicate, vary, and evolve across different domains, speculating on the emergence of a cybernetic layer where machines could evolve autonomously. This interdisciplinary framework challenges traditional views of information and encourages further research into its role in shaping the structures of the universe, offering a new perspective on the evolution of complexity across both natural and artificial systems.

Keywords: Emergence, Evolution, Information, Patterns, Self-organisation

Based on an analysis of the current understanding of the origin of physical structures in the universe, this perspective poses a hypothesis that redefines the nature of information, suggesting that it is not merely abstract data but a material, evolving structure that drives the self-organization and complexity of the universe. By looking at ideas from physics, biology, information theory, and epistemology through a new lens, this perspective suggests a unifying framework with the potential to reshape our understanding of evolution, self-replication, and information systems. The aim of this manuscript is not to provide a strictly empirical study; rather, it introduces a speculative hypothesis on the evolving nature of information, intended as a conceptual framework for further investigation, and future research and discussion across multiple domains.

There is no universally accepted definition of information, yet it is broadly understood as data imbued with meaning, capable of being communicated and having the potential to effect change. Scientifically, information is quantified using the "bit" as its unit. Given its profound influence on how our world is physically organized, information must have a physical basis. But where do these "bits" reside among the "atoms"? Information indeed has a material foundation, as it always consists of specific arrangements of matter components. This perspective explores the physical constitution of information from an evolutionary viewpoint, beginning with examining the origin of patterned physical structures. We then define which structural patterns qualify as information and explore their properties. Next, we describe how different types of information give rise to the main emergent layers of self-organisation, and speculate about the universality and future evolution of information. Finally, we suggest the research required for a formal description of the ideas in this perspective, as well as some profound questions that may be studied through the new lens here-provided.

*contact: wouter@kth.se

ON THE ORIGIN OF PHYSICAL PATTERNS

Structures and processes

We describe a *structure* as a set of matter constituents with persistent internal configuration.¹ The physical properties of a structure emerge from the relative poses (spatio-temporal position and orientation) and properties of its constituents. We define a *structure category* as the set of all identical structures.² A structure can transition to a different structure category when its constituents change or reconfigure.

We describe the laws of physics that work on a matter system as a *process* and treat them as a relation between matter systems at different points in time. Processes either alter or maintain the pose or properties of the structures in a matter system. Structures present in the system at the process starting time are termed *input* and those at the end time *output*. *Active* structures in a process are those in the input or output that are altered by the process, or that alter other structures during the process. *Passive* structures, vice versa, do not influence the outcome of the process. Moving forward, references to structures in processes will pertain specifically to active structures, unless otherwise stated.

Structure creation: de-novo vs replicating

Of specific interest in this Perspective are those processes producing new instances of a structure category in a matter system.³ *Replicating* refers to processes creating new instances, *copies*, of a structure category already present in the input. *De-novo* structuring refers to processes producing instances of a structure category not yet present in the input. Figure 1 provides examples of different types of structure-creating processes.

Spontaneous vs templating processes and complex structures

Active instances of structure categories that are neither created nor destroyed are called *templates*, and processes that involve templates are called *templating* processes. Conversely, processes that do not use templates are called *spontaneous* processes. Templates can actively influence processes through a variety of mechanisms, such as modifying force fields, creating zones of minimal energy, establishing passive inert boundaries (walls, recipients, membranes), dynamic mechanical manipulation (by tools or machines) or catalysing outcomes. Specific templates can consistently direct the formation of structures, although results may vary due to external influences or inherent system dynamics. Replicating is a specific class of templating processes that use (at least) the original instance as a template for the formation of copies.

The formation of complex structures through spontaneous de-novo-processing is limited by probability. The infinite monkey theorem illustrates the improbability of complex structures, such as the complete works of William Shakespeare, emerging from a spontaneous process (sha, 2002). For instance, amino acids (Oro, 1961) and fullerenes (Kroto et al., 1985; Foing and Ehrenfreund, 1994), are among the most complex molecules of extraterrestrial origin detected.

In contrast, certain templating processes can consistently generate highly complex output structures. These processes rely on the complexity inherent in the templates themselves. For instance on the microscale, the electronic structure of atoms and molecules acts as a template in chemical reactions, directing the formation of specific molecular structures based on principles of minimal energy configurations (Pauling, 1960). A macroscale example of a template structure is a casting mold during replica molding. We define *complex* structures as those more complex than what spontaneous processes produce and note that complex structures are always produced in templating processes.

¹A structure can be formally described as a 2-tuples of i) its pose (spatio-temporal position and orientation) and ii) the relative poses and properties of its constituents.

²Two structures can be considered identical if they belong to the same attractor, meaning that despite differences at the microscale, the configurations of their constituents stabilise within the same macroscopic pattern or state. Identical structures thus exhibit identical emergent properties and behaviours, making them effectively indistinguishable at the level of observation relevant to their function or classification.(Haken, 1977)

³Physical processes are inherently chaotic, although attractors, i.e., states that systems evolve towards and stabilize, may guide systems to predictable states (structures) despite initial variations.(Poincaré, 1899) Such attractors signify shifts in stability derived from the chaotic dynamics of physical processes. Such dynamics are crucial for understanding how self-regulating or self-organizing processes can produce predictable outcomes, as illustrated by the stability of dynamic systems amidst external disturbances (Prigogine and Stengers, 1984) or patterns in complex systems(Haken, 1977). Throughout this manuscript, the notions "identical" or "same" when referring to structures or processes must be understood as "being in the same attractor".

Figure 1. Examples of structure-creating processes

	Spontaneous processes	Templated processes
De-novo structuring	Exothermal chemical conversion Raindrop nucleation	River meandering, templated by the landscape Protein synthesis, templated by DNA and a ribosome Printing a text, templated by an electronic file and a printing machine
Replicating	(All replicating processes are templated by at least the original structure)	Growth of new crystal layers, templated by (only) the underlying original crystal layer Biological cell division, templated by (only) the original cell DNA replication in a polymerase chain reaction (PCR), templated by the original DNA strand and polymerase Copying a text, templated by the original page with text and a photocopy machine

INFORMATION*, SELF-REPLICATORS AND EVOLUTION

Information* and evolution

Analysing the origin of structures, one rapidly finds that information, as instruction in processes, plays a pivotal role in any structure synthesis in biology or by humans. The specific role of information emerges when specific structures are formed for which exist on one hand processes that replicate the structure and on the other hand processes that generate stable variations of that structure that can be replicated. Under such circumstances, evolutionary processes start taking place. This analysis leads me to propose the following hypothesis for the definition of information, in popularised wording:

Information* is physical structure undergoing and driving evolution, and any physical structure undergoing and driving evolution is information*.⁴

A specific, formal, definition would be:

Information* equals any physical structure that is an element of a set of structure categories ("variants"), for which exist:

- 1) a common associated replication process that can create identical *replicas* of each variant in the set;
- 2) *variation-creating* processes that can reconfigure variants in the set into instances of a different variant category within the set,⁵ and;
- 3) a common associated *translation* process that uses the specific variants as templates to produce specific *de novo phenotype* structures.

Examples of information* are DNA molecules, cultural memes (in the form of neuron structures in the brain), written text, and computer data. Templated replicating processes subject to evolutionary pressure improve the evolutionary fitness of processes that consistently form stable structures, a concept known as universal Darwinism (Hodgson, 2005). Complexity arises as natural selection accumulates small, advantageous variations that enhance functionality and adaptation.(Dawkins, 1986)

Self-replicators

We define a *self-replicator* as a set of structures produced in processes templated by other structures within the set. Our definition of a self-replicator thus generalises the definition of an autocatalytic set.

⁴The "*" notation emphasizes our specific definition of information and helps distinguish it from other potential interpretations. This definition of information* as 'evolving structure' has a lot of similarity with Richard Lewontin's idea that '*any entities in nature that have variation, reproduction, and heritability may evolve*', as he explained in the foreword to his seminal work, 'The Units of Selection' (Lewontin, 1970).

⁵Each variant is a specific stable attractor. In crystallisation, for example, defects can occur in the growing crystal structure, which defects are often replicated in subsequent layers as the crystal grows.(Kittel, 2005) In the biological context, Kauffman conceptualises genetic regulatory networks as dynamical systems that can stabilise into various attractors, which represent stable gene expression patterns capable of enduring over time, even amidst external disruptions.(Kauffman, 1993) When variants in new variant categories are created, they have an evolutionary benefit over random structures because (templates for) their replication process are more likely available in their environment. For information* in the form of genes, neural memory, or computer memory, variations typically involve changes in the orientation or type of structural constituents while preserving the overall internal order of the constituents, such that the overall structure of the variants geometrically fits the specific templates in the replication processes.

Through their autopoietic nature, (Maturana and Varela, 1980) self-replicators have the potential to fill their environment with replicas of themselves, typically at an exponential rate if unhindered. Among all self-replicators, those that contain information* among their structure set have an evolutionary benefit. Such self-replicators are, themselves, information*. For this reason, self-replicators with information* and their associated phenotype constitute a large fraction of the structures in our environment.

The emergence of self-replicating entities is critical in studying the origin of life. Information* alters its environment by proliferating copies of itself, its phenotypes, or any associated self-replicators. We can call the ensemble of structures originating from information* *Life*. Kauffman proposed that life may start from self-organized networks of molecular interactions that become autocatalytic (Kauffman, 1993). Mossel and Steel provided a framework to study conditions under which biochemical networks achieve autocatalysis (Mossel and Steel, 2005). Vasas et al. showed that multiple autocatalytic subsets can lead to evolutionary processes, including competition and selection (Vasas et al., 2012). Hordijk suggested extending autocatalytic sets to fields beyond biology, such as sociology, ecology, and economics (Hordijk, 2013). This manuscript suggests generalising these concepts throughout all emerging layers of self-organisation.

Information* vs Information

Reconfiguration of information* into a variant can occur via random processes or directed processes. Variants created randomly are *mutations*.

Sensing is a variation-creation process common for all variants in a set, templated by a *sensor* structure common to all processes and variants, and in which the output variant depends specifically on a *stimulus* being a specific process condition or an additional input structure. Sensing thus reconfigures information* into a specific variant depending on the specific stimulus.

Information* can be *communicated* from a sender at A to receiver at B through replication. Communication entails reconfiguring a variant structure at B to an instance of the category of the specific information* at A, templated by the information* at A. Signalling over a noisy channel additionally induces random reconfigurations to the information* at B.

Through phenotype production during translation, information* gains its essence as an *agent of change*, as is obvious in biological, technological, social, and cognitive systems. A crucial difference between information* and phenotype is that, although both may undergo (random) reconfiguration of their constituents, only variants of information* can be inherited through an associated replication processes.

Note that *information** differs slightly from the conventional understanding of *information*. Consider measuring the presence of rain with a rain sensor as a simple example. Conventionally, we consider the presence or absence of rain as information. However, in the reinterpretation of this manuscript, rain is a structure, but its presence or absence is not information* (there are no replication or variation processes associated with rain); rather, the information* here is the configured data storage structure that can be altered by the rain sensor based on the absence/presence of rain.

The *meaning* of information* is encoded in the type or pose of its constituents, a result of evolutionary processes. Once generated through probabilistic processes, information* changes through variation-creating processes in which evolutionary pressure leads to variants that are increasingly well-adapted to their environment. When information* is well-adapted (evolutionary fit) to its environment, we can call it *knowledge*.⁶ Knowledge does not reflect a representation of an external reality but rather the evolutionary fitness of an information* variant in this external environment.⁷ Increasing knowledge aligns with reducing Shannon entropy (Shannon, 1948) in that both deal with increasing the effectiveness of information replication. However, while Shannon entropy focuses on the statistical unpredictability of patterns without regard to meaning, evolutionary fitness depends on context-specific utility—information* that enhances fitness in one environment might not be universally optimal. Entropy minimization and

⁶Conventionally, knowledge is understood as information that is "true," in contrast to false information in the form of, e.g., propaganda, pseudoscience, or superstition. Within the framework of this perspective, truth can be defined as being best fitted to the environment, aligning with the Pragmatic Theory of Truth.(James, 1907)

⁷Donald Hoffman explores this evolutionary aspect in his book "The Case Against Reality: Why Evolution Hid the Truth from Our Eyes," where he argues that perception is a user interface crafted by natural selection to support survival and reproduction, rather than to disclose the truth (Hoffman, 2019). This thesis suggests that understanding of reality is more about enhancing evolutionary fitness than providing a true reflection of the external world. Where Hoffman deals mainly with biological perceptual systems, we here propose that this principle applies universally to all types of information*, across all domains, including not only brain structures but also other systems of information processing and storage.

fitness optimization represent different approaches to dealing with uncertainty, where fitness prioritizes adaptability, including resilience, over pure efficiency.

Information* processes and their interactions create the foundation for continuously evolving layers of self-organization, which we explore in the following section.

EMERGING LAYERS OF SELF-ORGANISATION

The world around us is abundant with patterned structures. These patterns emerge either from spontaneous de novo structuring or from information* processing. Different pattern formation processes can interact, potentially enhancing or constraining one another, thus creating an environment where natural selection continuously refines and adapts information*-driven structures. We can observe that the specific physical nature of information* and its associated processes (replication, variation, translation) underpin the emergence of primary layers of self-organisation, such as the physical, biological, cultural, civilisational and cybernetic layers.

The physical layer emerges without information*

The physical layer emerges in the *absence of information**, where de-novo structures emerge from the physical laws forming entities via symmetry breaking⁸ or spontaneous self-organisation⁹. Examples of de-novo structures include galaxies, planetary systems, sand dunes, volcanoes, meanders, snowflakes, and simple molecules.

The biological layer emerges from genetic information* evolution

Structure formation templated by information* in the form of genes, their methylation, and associated regulatory mechanisms underpins the biological layer. Originating from abiotic chemical reactions, the biological layer may have evolved under the influence of natural selection and environmental pressures (Kauffman, 1993). Variations in (epi)genetics can occur either randomly, as in the case of mutations, or in a directed manner influenced by environmental factors (e.g., DNA methylation, histone modification, chromatin remodeling, non-coding RNA regulation, RNA editing, DNA hydroxymethylation, and post-translational modification of transcription factors). Such directed variations are forms of sensing, where the information* changes adaptively to its environment, while random variations represent stochastic changes in the genetic or epigenetic code. The phenotype in this layer includes all biological structures. Cells and organisms are self-replicators in this layer. Where biology emerges, biological processes drive structure formation in their environment.

The cultural layer emerges from memetic information* evolution

Structure formation based on information* in the form of transferable ideas stored in neural structure of individuals, i.e., memes, gives rise to the cultural layer. Culture can be defined as information* capable of affecting individuals' behaviour that they acquire from other individuals through teaching, imitation, and other forms of social transmission processes. (Boyd and Richerson, 1985) Information* variations in the cultural layer and higher layers usually originate through sensory processes (including perception and thinking). The phenotype in this layer consists of tangible cultural artefacts and social structures that arise from these ideas, such as community practices or simple tools. Examples of self-replicators in the cultural layer include languages, myths, musical traditions, ceremonies, and cuisine, which replicate through learning and communication, storytelling and tradition, performance and oral transmission, ritual practice and social participation, and cooking practices and culinary teaching, respectively.

⁸Symmetry breaking is a process where a system transitions from symmetry to asymmetry due to perturbations. It is crucial in physical and chemical transformations such as phase transitions, where uniformity is disrupted, or in dynamic instabilities, where systems become unstable and transition to complex, unpredictable patterns. Star and planetary disk formation form an example of symmetry breaking, where an initial uniform isotropic molecular cloud collapses under gravity and rotational forces, leading to planetary systems.

⁹Spontaneous self-organization refers to processes by which system components interact according to intrinsic rules without external guidance, resulting in organized structures emerging from local interactions. Reaction-diffusion systems are a particular example of spontaneous self-organisation, where the interaction and diffusion of chemical substances form stable patterns like stripes or spirals, essential for biological morphogenesis. (Turing, 1952) Fractal growth is another form, characterised by iterative, scale-invariant patterns formed through repetitive interactions, as in the branching patterns of rivers.




Figure 2. Graph representation of structures and processes in the biological, cultural, civilisation and cybernetic layers of self-organisation. Structures, such as information* (i), phenotype (p), templates (t , including humans h or machines m) are indicated with italic versals and form elements of structure sets, indicated with bold capitals. Processes, such as replication (r), variation (v) or translation (t), are indicated as arrows with bold versals and have templates (t) as variables. In the biological and cultural layers, the set **I** of information* structures, i , and the set **P** of phenotype, p , are disjoint. In contrast, engineering by human structures, h , or machines, m , make these sets identical: **P = I**.

The civilisational layer emerges from inanimate matter information* evolving through human interaction

Through engineering, humans have acquired the ability to replicate and variate inanimate structures. This capability transforms inanimate structures into information*. For example, a chair becomes information* because it can be copied (replicated) by humans, and humans can adapt (variate) the design of the chair during this process to provide more comfort (evolutionary benefit) for the user sitting (phenotype) on the chair. Without human presence, a chair loses its information* ontology. Structure formation based on human-controlled transformation of phenotype into information* and variations underscores the emergence of the civilisation layer. Processes such as writing (i.e., generating coded information*), urbanisation, and technological advancement generate an ever-increasing amount of information*. Civilisation thus leads to humans gaining full control over, altering, and eventually dominating their environment. Examples of self-replicators in this layer include multinational corporations, religious organizations, and political parties, which replicate their structures through franchising, doctrine propagation, or political campaigning, respectively. Where civilisations emerge, engineered structures rapidly dominate their environment.

The cybernetic layer emerges from inanimate matter information* evolving through machine interaction

The past century saw the emergence of information-processing machines that allow replication, variation-creation (through sensing and information processing) and translation (through actuation). Engineering can increasingly be performed by machines that not only perform tasks but also communicate, adapt, and make decisions independently. We speculate that this can potentially give rise to a new emergent layer, the cybernetic layer, characterised by purely machine-driven evolution.

One evolutionary aspect yet to emerge is self-replicators independent of biological constraints. Such self-replicators* could be autonomous robotic systems capable of self-reproduction using environmental raw materials, mirroring biological self-replication. This concept, initially proposed by Von Neumann as universal constructors (von Neumann, 1966), has been further explored by Freitas and Merkle (Freitas Jr. and Merkle, 2004). Not involving biological structure, such evolution would move entirely beyond gene-centered evolution, i.e., where not genes are involved as units of selection (Williams, 1966). The evolution of such a new organizational layer ("*the rise of the machines*") hinges on the evolutionary fitness of synthetic over biological self-replicators.

Competition between the layers of self-organisation

From a human perspective, it is intriguing to speculate on the evolutionary success of the cybernetic layer. Ignoring the complex interactions between the layers, and without delving into rigorous quantification, we can hypothesize differences among some of the key factors influencing the evolutionary success of self-replicators:

Population size (n): A larger number of self-replicating entities increases the overall variety of offspring, leading to more diverse evolutionary pathways. Small but abundant entities, such as biological cells, here have a huge benefit over larger self-replicators.

Variation frequency (f_v): A higher rate of variation in individual entities improves the likelihood of beneficial adaptations, increasing the probability of achieving fitness. Cognitive self-replicators that rapidly probe their fitness landscape through proactive testing of the fitness of new information* variants have a benefit over entities passively depending on the occurrence of random mutations, as do less-complex entities in the biosphere.

Fitness improvement per variation (Δ): Larger leaps in fitness, aided by intelligent design, increase the likelihood that self-replicators will rapidly reach higher fitness peaks. Cognitive functions in the cultural layer and beyond enable intelligent design to overcome fitness barriers. Humans, for example, have excelled at this, creating technologies like wheels—impossible in biological evolution but feasible in the civilizational layer through human ingenuity. In contrast, entities relying on random mutations take small steps in their fitness landscapes, generally limited by local gradients. Significant changes in their fitness usually result from dramatic shifts in the landscape rather than internal variations.

Resilience against sudden environmental changes: here, self-replicators spanning a longer period of existence have a higher probability of resilient variants compared to more novel self-replicators. Simple biological structures may here have a benefit over specialised self-replicators. Here, resilience determines the longevity of information*.

The emergence and evolution of the cybernetic layer will likely depend on how effectively intelligent design tools, such as AI, can accelerate evolution through even larger jumps in the fitness landscape and whether these tools will predominantly benefit civilisational evolution or self-replicating robots. For self-replicating machines to dominate, they must first prove beneficial to human civilisation to avoid being outcompeted by existing structures. Only once their evolutionary fitness surpasses that of civilizations can they become dominant.

UNIVERSALITY OF INFORMATION AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES

In this last section, we speculate about the epistemological consequences of information-based structure* evolution. In his "Critique of Pure Reason" (Kant, 1781), Kant posits that inherent mental structures shape our understanding of reality, suggesting that our cognitive frameworks influence how we perceive and understand the world. Similarly, in "The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics in the Natural Sciences" (Wigner, 1960), Wigner highlights the surprising success of mathematics in describing natural phenomena, implying that our mathematical constructs might be inherently aligned with the universe's patterns.

We propose that the effectiveness of mathematics and science arises because both the biological phenotype of our brains and our cultural scientific and mathematical memes have evolved to enhance evolutionary fitness. This evolutionary perspective aligns with Kant's notion of pre-set organizational methods and suggests that our brain structures are fine-tuned to the universe's inherent patterns. While this supports the intertwined nature of mathematics and physical understanding, it contrasts with Tegmark's idea that the universe is inherently mathematical (Tegmark, 2014). Instead, we see mathematical ideas as evolutionary tools that emerge and spread on the basis of their utility.

If intelligent life evolves elsewhere, it would likely be driven by natural selection within its environment. Observations of convergent evolutionary processes reveal that certain traits, such as predation, "neural" structures adapted for sensory input processing, and curiosity, may independently emerge multiple times (McGhee, 2011). These traits are evolutionarily advantageous and may lead to intelligent extraterrestrials whose information structures are finely tuned to their environments. Given the universality of the laws of physics, one would expect that these "neural" structures would evolve a fitness to these laws. Consequently, extraterrestrials might develop their own forms of "physics" and "mathematics". While these would differ from the human equivalents, their structures would likely bear similarities, much like the independently evolved optical structures in the eyes of insects, molluscs, and mammals show both differences and similarities (Nilsson and Pelger, 1994). Ultimately, extraterrestrial "physics" and "mathematics" would be shaped to optimize extraterrestrial evolutionary fitness.

OUTLOOK

This perspective integrates concepts from various disciplines, including systems biology, information theory, and complex systems theory, while offering a broad view of how systems and information interact. We describe how structures first emerged as bound systems, resulting from symmetry breaking and self-organization in the physical layer. We define information* as structures capable of replication, variation, and translation processes, and these act as agents of evolution, marking the origin of biology. When sets of structures containing information* become autocatalytic, they become self-replicators, driving the propagation of information* within their environments. The emergence of different material systems and new modes of interaction—such as communication, engineering, and data processing—has given rise to further layers of self-organization, including culture, civilization, and cybernetics.

This perspective offers a speculative framework on the nature of information, encouraging future efforts to empirically test and refine the ideas presented. Rather than providing definitive answers, the intent is to propose pathways for theoretical and empirical inquiry. To develop this framework, formalization through graph or set representations, as illustrated in Figure 2, would be beneficial. Additionally, a quantitative metric for evolutionary fitness, which is currently lacking, would help in exploring and verifying the proposed framework.

A deeper investigation of the evolutionary perspective on structures and organization in our environment may yield new insights. Examples of open questions include:

What is the nature of cultural values like truth, justice, and power, and do these concepts primarily serve cultural self-replicators or human biological fitness?

State of the Art: Concepts like truth, justice, and power have been extensively explored in social sciences and philosophy, especially within cultural evolution and anthropology. Scholars such as Foucault (Foucault, 1977) and Dawkins (Dawkins, 1976) have examined the propagation and influence of these cultural values.

Novelty of Evolutionary Framework: While these concepts are well-studied, an evolutionary framework that explores whether these values primarily enhance cultural self-replicators or contribute directly to biological fitness could reveal new insights. This approach could clarify how cultural self-replicators (such as justice or goodness) align with or diverge from biological fitness, potentially developing their own adaptive landscapes.

What is the fitness of political ideologies like feudalism, communism, and capitalism within the civilization layer, and do they evolve to benefit their own propagation rather than serving human or cultural fitness?

State of the Art: Political ideologies have been widely analyzed in political science and sociology. Weber (Weber, 1978) and Marx (Marx, 1867) examined the development and spread of systems such as capitalism and communism. More recently, studies have investigated the self-propagating nature of ideologies (Boyd and Richerson, 1985; Mesoudi et al., 2006).

Novelty of Evolutionary Framework: Viewing political ideologies as self-replicators with adaptive strategies that favor their persistence within the civilization layer, independent of biological or cultural benefits, offers a novel approach. This perspective may help determine whether these systems persist due to societal utility or their self-propagating characteristics.

What drives the fitness of electronic information and machine self-replicators in cyber-physical systems, and how do they support or compete with self-replicators in other layers?

State of the Art: Cyber-physical systems and AI-driven technologies are only beginning to be viewed from an evolutionary perspective. Most studies emphasize their technical performance or ethical implications (Bostrom, 2014; Tegmark, 2017) rather than their roles as evolving self-replicators.

Novelty of Evolutionary Framework: Framing these technologies as self-replicators introduces a unique evolutionary analysis, suggesting they may evolve to support other layers (civilizational, cultural, or biological) or function as independent self-replicators. This perspective may illuminate the broader impacts of digital and cybernetic systems on societal and biological structures.

How can sustainability be interpreted in this evolutionary framework?

State of the Art: Sustainability is commonly discussed in ecological, economic, and environmental contexts, with foundational work on carrying capacity and resilience (Odum, 1983; Meadows et al., 1972).

Novelty of Evolutionary Framework: Examining whether and how sustainability influences the persistence or fitness of self-replicators across biological, cultural, and civilizational layers provides a new angle. This interpretation could clarify how sustainable practices contribute to resilience and co-evolution across layers.

By proposing these questions, this manuscript aims to provide a fresh perspective on complex systems and invites future research to refine and expand upon the ideas presented.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I could not have developed this perspective without the substantial assistance of ChatGPT, which provided overviews, challenged my ideas, and helped formulate sentences that spanned across multiple disciplines of science.

REFERENCES

- (2002). *Notes Towards The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. i-DAT. Accessed: 2024-05-08.
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Boyd, R. and Richerson, P. J. (1985). *Culture and the Evolutionary Process*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Dawkins, R. (1976). *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Dawkins, R. (1986). *The Blind Watchmaker*. W. W. Norton & Company, New York.
- Foing, B. H. and Ehrenfreund, P. (1994). Detection of two interstellar absorption bands coincident with spectral features of c60+. *Nature*, 369(6478):296–298.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Pantheon Books, New York.

- Freitas Jr., R. A. and Merkle, R. C. (2004). *Kinematic Self-Replicating Machines*. Landes Bioscience, Georgetown, TX. All rights reserved.
- Haken, H. (1977). *Synergetics: An Introduction*. Springer-Verlag.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2005). Generalizing darwinism to social evolution: Some early attempts. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 39(4):899–914.
- Hoffman, D. D. (2019). *The Case Against Reality: Why Evolution Hid the Truth from Our Eyes*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Hordijk, W. (2013). Autocatalytic sets: From the origin of life to the economy. *BioScience*, 63(11):877–881.
- James, W. (1907). *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking*. Longmans, Green, and Co., New York, NY.
- Kant, I. (1781). *Critique of Pure Reason*.
- Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The Origins of Order: Self-organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford University Press.
- Kittel, C. (2005). *Introduction to Solid State Physics*. Wiley, 8 edition. See Chapter on Crystallography and Defects in Crystals.
- Kroto, H. W., Heath, J. R., O'Brien, S. C., Curl, R. F., and Smalley, R. E. (1985). C60: Buckminsterfullerene. *Nature*, 318(6042):162–163.
- Lewontin, R. C. (1970). The units of selection. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 1:1–18.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Das Kapital*, volume 1. Verlag von Otto Meisner, Hamburg.
- Maturana, H. R. and Varela, F. J. (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, Holland.
- McGhee, G. R. (2011). *Convergent Evolution: Limited Forms Most Beautiful*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., and Behrens III, W. W. (1972). *The Limits to Growth*. Universe Books, New York.
- Mesoudi, A., Whiten, A., and Laland, K. N. (2006). Towards a unified science of cultural evolution. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 29(4):329–347.
- Mossel, E. and Steel, M. (2005). Random biochemical networks and the probability of self-sustaining autocatalysis. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 233(3):327–336.
- Nilsson, D.-E. and Pelger, S. (1994). A pessimistic estimate of the time required for an eye to evolve. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 256(1345):53–58.
- Odum, E. P. (1983). *Basic Ecology*. CBS College Publishing, New York.
- Oro, J. (1961). Comets and the formation of biochemical compounds on the primitive earth. *Nature*, 190:389–390.
- Pauling, L. (1960). *The Nature of the Chemical Bond and the Structure of Molecules and Crystals: An Introduction to Modern Structural Chemistry*. Cornell University Press.
- Poincaré, H. (1892-1899). *Les méthodes nouvelles de la mécanique céleste*. Gauthier-Villars, Paris. Translated into English as "New Methods of Celestial Mechanics".
- Prigogine, I. and Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. Bantam Books.
- Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3):379–423.
- Tegmark, M. (2014). *Our Mathematical Universe: My Quest for the Ultimate Nature of Reality*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Turing, A. M. (1952). The chemical basis of morphogenesis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 237(641):37–72.
- Vasas, V., Fernando, C., Santos, M., Kauffman, S., and Szathmáry, E. (2012). Evolution before genes. *Biology Direct*, 7(1):1.
- von Neumann, J. (1966). *Theory of Self-Reproducing Automata*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Wigner, E. (1960). The unreasonable effectiveness of mathematics in the natural sciences. *Communica-*

tions in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 13(1):1–14.
Williams, G. C. (1966). *Adaptation and Natural Selection: A Critique of Some Current Evolutionary Thought*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.