SÁNDOR BÚTI

THEORY OF MOTION, THEORY OF REPRODUCTION

(NEW APPROACH OF PHILOSOPHY)

2023

THE WORLD IS UNIFORM

ISBN 978-615-81609-6-4

Prepress and printing:
Print 2000 Nyomda Kft.
Responsible manager: András Kovács Executive Director

Contents

1 INTRODUCTION 7

2. MOTION HAS POWER (Essay study) 8

1. A series of phenomena and processes cannot be interpreted coherently if no power is assumed in the motion or state of motion of entities, phenomena, objects 8
2. The force of motion in the motion state of entities and the field-like forces that change the state of motion of the entities together determine the speed and direction of the motions 10
3. The force theory of physics, the theory of motion, the theories related to motion need further development. 13
4. Field-like forces, the force of motion, also have an effect on the state of motion of the entities. Do both types of forces move? 15
5. There are two types of distancing forces. Determination of the decay of the construction levels of organization of the material (atoms, molecules, etc.), its relatively lasting existence 18
6. One of the basic correlations of physics is motion. or this reason, several other physical items and relationships are associated with it 20

3. HYPOTHESIS, GENERAL THEORY OF A SEXUAL AND SEXUAL REPRODUCTION
(essay-type study)..... 22

I. ASEXUAL REPRODUCTION..... 24

1.1. What consequences does the polygenicity of organisms have on the value of individual genes in organisms? 24

1.2 The viability of organisms changes — randomly — as a result of gene mutations. Genes are the basic units of living adaptation 26

1.3 The adaptation value and viability of organisms are fundamentally altered by two types of gene mutations. 28

1.4 How one of the effects of each gene on the viability of organisms is formed (changing, decreasing) as the number of genes increases 29

1.5 In asexual reproduction, as the number of genes increases, the viability influence of a gene decreases for other reasons 30

1.6 Why genes encoding new functions are much less likely to form, mutate than pre-existing genes in organisms 32

II. SEXUAL REPRODUCTION 35

2.1 The evolution of life beyond the prokaryotes and the increase in biological complexity is made possible by the development of more efficient sexual reproduction? 35

2.2 The preferential gene combinations that arise during sexual reproduction have two logically distinct components 37

III. THE RELEASE OF BAD GENES FROM POPULATIONS UNDER DIFFERENT REPRODUCTIVE MODES 39

3.1. The condition for the continuity of existence of populations is that the population gets rid of the wrong gene surplus. 39

3.2. Getting rid of populations from bad genes in case of different ways of reproduction 40

3.3. What is the advantage of the fact that many of the species that reproduce more efficiently by asexual reproduction also reproduce asexually? 42

3.4. Already prokaryotes reproduce in a less efficient way of sexual reproduction. What is characteristic of this type of sexual reproduction? 44

IV. SOME QUESTIONS RELATED TO SEXUAL REPRODUCTION 46

4.1. Types of mutation 46

4.2. The hypothesis of what could be the explanation for the fact that very rarely organisms (individuals) with average abilities have outstanding offspring and those with very weak abilities? 47

V. OUTLOOK 50

5.1 Two levels of genetic development of life, their relationship to each other 50

5.2. Summary questions 52

4. ABOUT ASEXUAL AND SEXUAL REPRODUCTION IN BRIEF (Essay) 53

Asexual reproduction 53

Sexual reproduction 54

5. FOUNDATIONS OF MY ASEXUAL, SEXUAL REPRODUCTION THEORY AND HYPOTHESIS 56

1. In my new philosophy approach, I attempted to build a hypothetical deductive theory based on the general correlations revealed by biology 56

2. I have built my theory and hypothesis of reproduction on the following relationships, supported by experience, revealed by biology: 56

3. I have studied and I study asexual and sexual reproduction in the perspective of materialistic philosophy more general than biology 58

4. List of new relationships that my theory of asexual and sexual reproduction contains: 59

ABOUT THE NEW PHILOSOPHY, NEW THEORIES, THE DIFFICULTIES OF INCORPORATING THEM INTO THE SCIENTIFIC CIRCULATION 65

Brief description of my work 65

1 INTRODUCTION

In this work, to illustrate the heuristic power of a new philosophy, I outline **two theories refuting and correcting essay-like scientific theorems (physics, biology)**.

The work on physics science is entitled **"There is force in motion**". This theorem is supported by experience. The science of physics does not assume force in motion. — The theorem concerning motion is one of the fundamental theorems of physics.

The subject of my studies in the field of biology science is asexual and sexual reproduction. The titles are: **"Theory of asexual and sexual reproduction", "About asexual and sexual reproduction in brief", "The justification of my theory of asexual and sexual reproduction"**. In these works, I have succeeded in giving substantive answers to the hitherto unanswered questions of the theory of reproduction.

I have printed and distribute this short monograph (in Hungarian and English). **I hope it will reach people who appreciate these works in a meaningful way. And who see the scientific value in them**. If any.

I am also aware that there are not many people interested in my work. Knowing and understanding it requires a higher generalization capacity and a high concentration of attention. —I am aware that the more common features and relationships a substance deals with, the fewer people are interested in it.

2 MOTION HAS POWER (Essay study)

The essay "There is power in motion" is a (corrected) excerpt from my book **"Generalization of physical theorems and relations in the new materialist philosophy".** The book also includes correlations that have neither yet been discovered nor corrected by physical science. Related to the fact that I suppose power in motion.

1. A series of phenomena and processes cannot be interpreted coherently if no power is assumed in the motion or state of motion of entities, phenomena, objects

The problem*: Physics basically only considers forces acting on each other at some distance from each other (gravitational force, nuclear force, electromagnetic force). No force is assumed in motion. Experience shows that there is force in motion. The force of motion is in the state of motion. It does not act between entities, so it does not accelerate or slow down.*

Experience has shown that the trajectory of motion, direction and velocity of every moving entity are determined together by the force of motion and field-like forces. — By assuming the force in motion, the theory of force and energy can be integrated into a unified force theory.

Physics essentially only considers field-like forces (gravitational force, nuclear force, electromagnetic force) as forces. Under the influence of field-like forces, the state of motion of the entities changes. It is not the state of motion that acts with force on the field-like forces, but these latter act on the motion state. The change in the state of motion is a consequence of the force effect.

Motion is a *state*. Physics science, I think, among other things, asserts that motion is powerless, based on the following facts:

1. The moving object, its state of motion does not exert any force on other objects or entities at different distances from it. Field-like forces attract or repel entities further away from them; they change the state of motion of objects. Change in motion direction and speed (acceleration, deceleration) occurs.

2. No force action is required to maintain the states of motion. Every field-like force (acting at some distance) triggers a change in the state of motion unless other field-like forces prevent this.

Specific experiences contradict the "no force in motion" theorem:

1 If there is no force in the state of motion, how is it that moving objects, colliding with other objects, set them in motion? They set them in motion in the same way as they move under the force of gravity, for example, moving accelerated by higher located objects that are not supported.

2 If there is no force in motion, then how is it that an object moving in the opposite direction of the attraction force (for example, a ball thrown up), in whose motion current physics asserts no force, does not fall in the direction of the centre of mass, and even continues (slowing down) in the opposite direction? To stopping. Then, accelerating, it will fall back.

There is force in motion — theory is that a bouncing ball can be interpreted as an interaction of the force of gravity and the force of motion. This theorem is supported by experience. Under the influence of the force of motion, the kinetic energy and force of motion (reaching the dead stop) of an object moving in the direction opposite to the gravitational force is gradually dissipated. Then, due to the force of motion that is no longer acting at the dead point, the gravitational force acting there, causes the object to fall back. And the absorbed kinetic energy is released.

3 If there is no force in motion, what is the source of the inertial force, the centrifugal force, which can be measured by the instrument? Is inertial force, centrifugal force just pseudo-force, fictitious force? Because, according to physics science, there is no object that triggers it.

There are numerous phenomena that show that there is force in motion.

The undoubted fact is that the **force in motion is of a different nature than the accelerating and decelerating field-like** forces. It is not a question of whether there is force in motion. Because there is. The question is, where is it? What is the nature of this force? How is it different from or similar to field-like forces? A further question is how to interpret the interaction between the forces in motion and field-like forces. If these questions are answered, it will be possible to create a unified theory of force, i.e. to reconstruct a theory that integrates energy and forces.

Experience has shown that **changes in the state of motion cannot be interpreted *only* as the effect of field-like forces**. Changes in the state of motion can always be interpreted as the resultant of field-like forces and movement forces. From this we can also conclude that there is force in motion.

The speed and direction of motion of a moving object is determined by the interaction of field-like forces and the force of motion. In aware of the peculiarities of the force of motion, one can interpret the inertial force, the centrifugal force.

On what basis does physics today assume that there is no force in motion?

What effect does the force of gravity have on the state of motion of receding entities if its effect is not prevented by other force (s) acting in opposite directions?

What experiences show that there is force in motion?

2. The force of motion in the motion state of entities and the field-like forces that change the state of motion of the entities together determine the speed and direction of the motions

It is possible for entities to move in a direction opposite as the direction of action of the field-like forces because there is force in the state of motion as well. Based on the interaction of motion force and field-like forces, the change in direction and velocity of moving entities can be interpreted. (Acceleration and deceleration..)

The key point is the following: Field-like forces are forces acting between entities at some distance from each other, the force of motion itself is the force in the state of motion.

We need a theory on the basis of which the above phenomena can be interpreted. The force of motion is a different type of force, as the field-like forces that change the state of motion (direction, speed).

The gravitational force of attraction would move the thrown object in a different direction — toward the centre of mass. An object moving in the opposite direction to the force of gravity (such as a shot bullet) does not move in the direction of the larger object that attracts it. It moves in the opposite direction because there **is a force acting in the opposite direction to the direction of the gravitational** ***force in the object's motion, state of motion.*** A force which, as long as the object moves in a direction opposite to the direction of action of the gravitational force, is more intense than the force of gravity. On an object moving in the opposite direction to the force of gravity, the force of gravity and the distancing kinetic force of motion act together.

Why does the velocity of this object decrease? This is because, as the object moves away from the centre of mass, the combined force of motion and gravity gradually absorbs the object's momentum.

What happens if during the absorption there is only enough kinetic energy left that holds a counterweight to the force of gravity for a moment? The object comes to rest for a moment. What happens to the object after absorption has occurred, the force of motion of the ball has decreased to zero — where the force of gravity is still acting? Since there the distancing force of motion no longer acts on it, but the force of gravity acts there, the object falls towards the centre of mass with accelerating velocity.

The fall releases, gradually, the kinetic energy that was gradually absorbed during the distancing movement.

The thrown object or ball moves in the opposite direction to the force of gravity because the force in motion is more intense than the force of gravity that would move it in the opposite direction.

The movement of the object, the ball, slows down because the force of gravity and the force of motion moving the object in the opposite direction act together in such a way that the force of motion is gradually absorbed. When the dead point is reached, the total kinetic energy is absorbed. From this it follows that there is no longer any force of motion (it is already absorbed, "run out") that would hold against the gravitational force acting at that point. Because of this, the object moves towards the centre of mass due to the force of gravity of the ball. It moves at an accelerated pace. The force of motion which is absorbed by the force of gravity in the upward movement is released during the downward movement.

It also follows from the above that there is a precise intensity-quantitative correspondence between the force of motion and the force of gravity. Specifically: There is a precise intensity and quantitative correspondence between the weight of the thrown object, its starting speed and the distance of the dead point from the surface.

How do field-like forces act, how does the force of motion act?

On the bouncing ball, the force of motion and the gravitational field-like force act together.

How are the intensity values of the force of motion and the force of gravity formed during the up-and-down motion of the ball?

Can the bouncing of the ball be interpreted as the force of motion interacting with the force of gravity in the up and down motion of the ball, where the force of motion is absorbed by the force of gravity in the upward motion, and then released from the bound of the force of gravity in the opposite direction?

What do we mean by the correspondence relationship between these two types of force, force intensities?

During the up-and-down movement of the bouncing ball, how can the intensity and intensity change of the motion force be interpreted, and the intensity change of field-like force?

Can this relationship be interpreted as integrating energy theory and force theory into a unified theory of force?

3. The force theory of physics, the theory of motion, the theories related to motion need further development.

In field-like forces, accelerating, decelerating forces (e.g. gravitational force), the force effect is illustrative. To recognise that there is a force in the state of movement requires a higher level of generalisation and analysis. This force is of a different nature than the forces that change speed and direction of motion. The science of physics does not assume force in motion. Although the inertial force proven by experience and the centrifugal force can only be interpreted by assuming that there is a (measurable) force associated with motion, state of motion. According to physics, these forces prevail, but they cannot be real forces because there is no object that triggers them. I think the theory of force in physics is wrong. A new theory of force would be needed. One that finds a source for the forces in question. It does not assumer fictitious, pseudo-forces among the prevailing forces. My theory of motion: the force we are looking for is in the state of motion.

According to physics science, only forces that change the state of motion are forces. So far, physics science has not substantially clarified why it is that the same motion-changing field-like force changes the trajectories of entities moving in different directions at different speeds in different directions in different ways. Why does the principle of "the same force effects have the same consequences" not applied to the situation described above? Experience has shown that the effect of the same force on the same mass at the same distance is different because the different objects have different states of motion (direction, speed).

What is the explanation for the fact that the science of physics has not assumed a force in motion until today? It is easier to know the force nature of field-like forces. Gravitational force attracts. We simply experience this. It was also not difficult to recognize that objects at altitude move at an accelerated pace if left unsupported. The effect of electric and electromagnetic forces changing the state of motion is also illustrative. Motion-changing attractive, repulsive forces act on the motion state. — If some counterforce does not compensate for these forces (for example, if the object at altitude is not supported).

After lengthy analytical work, it became clear to me that there is another type of force in the state of motion. It is not of the same nature as field-like forces. Through the state of motion of a moving object, it does not attract or repel. No force action is required to maintain a state of movement. **In the state of motion itself there is the force effect. Force intensity proportional to the speed of a moving object and a quantity of force proportional to the square of its mass and velocity**.

The need arose to create a theory on the basis of which phenomena and changes can be explained that did not fit into the concept that there is no force in motion. The inertial force, especially its manifestation in the form of centrifugal force, has caused — perhaps — the greatest problem for current physics to accept that "motion is forceless." What can be done with centrifugal force if the basic theorem of physics is that there is no force in motion? If a thorough analysis of motion is missed. — Current physics considers centrifugal force to be a pseudo-force. Not real power, just fake force. But it must be taken into account!

Physics considers only field-like forces as forces. Forces that act between entities at some distance and change the state of motion of objects that are not impeded in their motion. They accelerate, slow down movement, and also provoke a change in direction. If we define forces in this way, we consider only the above effects as forces, then — according to this interpretation — no force belongs, it cannot belong to the state of motion.

The effect of field-like forces is illustrative. There is no difficulty in defining it either. However, in the course of the effect of field-like forces changing the state of motion, we also encounter phenomena from which it follows that there is force in motion as well.

Physics has so far been unable to explain the source of the forces associated with motion, although measurable (for example, centrifugal force). It is supposed as a pseudo-force. **If we cannot give a substantive answer to a question, analytical work must be continued until the answer is found**. Long research and analytical activities are crowned with success. Where is this **force**? In the **state of motion of the object** itself. And this force interacts with field-like forces. Energy and force theory can thus be brought together, and can be integrated into a single theory of force.

Which type of force (field-like force, motion force) is easier in nature and which is more difficult to know; despite the fact that these two types of force act together in all movements? What's the explanation for this?

Does experience support the following theorem? The understanding of field-like forces and the force nature of kinetic force and kinetic energy made it possible to unify kinetic force and kinetic energy into a unified theory of force.

4. Field-like forces, the force of motion, also have an effect on the state of motion of the entities. Do both types of forces move?

According to physics, field-like forces are the motion-changing forces, the motive forces. In my theory of motion, I came to the opposite conclusion. According to the interpretation of motion based on the interaction of motion force and field-like forces, only the force of motion moves. Field-like forces do not move. But they act on the states of movement. They affect the direction and speed of motion, but they do not move. — The evolution of the specific parameter values of the states of motion is always determined by the two types of forces (field-like force/s/, movement force) together.

Only those entities, objects, items move that have an unabsorbed motive force. Only in the presence of the force of movement is there motion. Not only the ball moving upwards is driven by force of motion.

A falling ball is also a force of motion, moved by the kinetic force released by the gravitational force.. Field-like forces do not move.

What makes one think, for example, that the ball falling back is being moved by the force of gravity? Because its motion occurs in the direction of gravitational attraction (no doubt also articulated and determined by the gravitational force of attraction). It appears that the falling ball is moved only by the field-like (gravitational) force, that the moving force is released by the gravitational force.- The interaction of the moving force with the field-like forces often results in a situation (during the movement) where the moving force is released by the field-like forces. The main point is: the release of the force of motion (for example) from the force of gravity is not the motion of the force of gravity. But it is the movement of the force of motion that is released from the gravitational force.

Let us not introduce more explanatory principles where things can be interpreted on the basis of one principle. This item also applies to movement. Occasionally, thorough analytical work is needed to prevent unnecessarily multiplication of explanatory principles. The cause of the ball moving in the opposite direction to the force of gravity cannot be the force of gravity, only the force of motion. However, a downward-moving, falling ball appears to be moved by the force of gravity. Two kinds of forces would move? The upward movement is also motion such like the downward movement. Would the falling ball also be moved by the force of motion? Yes.

Field-like forces do not move, their role is only to change the state of motion. They also play a role in absorbing and release of the force of motion. All movement is a result of the force of motion. Motion force and field-like forces together determine the parameter values of motion and their changes. The result of these effects is the change in

direction and velocity of moving entities. Absorbing or releasing of the force of motion. No field-like force moves. It just articulates the movement. Its direction and speed.. Where there is movement, there is always (unabsorbed) force of motion.

How can it be interpreted that the downward motion was also triggered by the force of motion, since it was the gravitational force that the object started downward?

The intensity (velocity) of the motion changed to such a value at the dead point that this change resulted in absorbing the force of motion. Since the gravitational force was still acting at that point, its effect was accompanied by the fall of the object, the release of the force of motion absorbed during the upward movement. It is not the change in the intensity of the force of gravity, but the intensity change in the force of motion coefficient with the field-like force (here the force of gravity) (which was absorbed at the dead point) that also triggered the downward motion.

There is movement where there is unabsorbed motion force, matter with mass of motion, "motion material". The force of motion, the "motion material", always acts together with the field-like forces.

Interpret the following theorems:

There is only movement where there is unabsorbed force of motion.

All changes in the state of motion (both absorbing and release of the force of motion) are triggered jointly by the motive force and the field-like forces. Only the force of motion moves from these two types of force.

For example, a slowdown in the movement force and then its change to 0 is the trigger for the thrown object to fall. (At this point, the intensity of the gravitational force does not change, it has a fixed value.

Field-like forces are neither triggers nor inducers of any movement. They merely change and articulate the state of motion.

5. There are two types of distancing forces. Determination of the decay of the construction levels of organization of the material (atoms, molecules, etc.), its relatively lasting existence

What do we mean by that the universal peculiarity of the force of motion is that it is a distancing force? That **the moving object is always moving away from the place where it is at any given moment**. For this reason, the spatial position of the moving entity, in time, to all other phenomena or entities changes by moving away from the place where it was before in a particular direction.

This is the basic peculiarity of moving entities with the force of movement.

What is the fundamental difference between motion force and field-like forces? **Field-like forces are the (dominantly attractive) force effects of phenomena at some distance from each other**. Gravitational force is just a force of attraction. The forces acting between the components of micro-levels (atoms, molecules, etc.) also have a repulsive effect. Although dominantly these forces are also attractive forces.

In relatively stable phenomena belonging to micro-levels, the components of the dominantly attractive field-like forces acting between them also have a repulsive effect. The attractive force is dominant, but — because of the repulsive force — they only approach each other up to a certain distance. There they get in balance with each other. They don't fall into each other. **The resultant of the field-like attractive and repulsive effect of oppositely charged components (their specific balance) determines the distance between the oppositely charged components and triggers (causes) the stability of *the phenomena.***

The force of movement, is a force that produces distancing. Can we consider the force of motion as a repulsion force? After all, as a

result, the components of the phenomena and phenomena move away from each other? The field-like, far-acting repulsion force is also a distancing force, so is the force of motion.

Another type of distancing force is the field-like distancing force, or the force of motion. Although both are forces, with distancing effect. Not only can entities move away from each other by a field-like distancing force acting between entities at some distance from each other. **The moving entity's distancing is caused by its state of motion, that it always moves away from the spatial environment in which it is present** at any given moment.

The force of motion, as well as, the field-like forces also act in a straight direction. But while field-like forces are dominantly attractive, the force of motion of the moving object, by its nature, moves away from all places in a straight direction. (More precisely, it would move away if it were not also influenced by a field-like force.)

Entities that have both force of motion and an attractive field-like force (constituent) will separate or move away from each other if the motive force that moves their constituents (e.g. electrons and nucleus) away from each other is more intense than the micro-level (dominantly attractive) field-like force that binds the constituents.

The force of motion alone causes objects to move in a straight direction, moving away from the points where they are at the moment. As a result **of the interaction of the ever-prevailing field-like forces and of the force of motion, the entities move only in a curved trajectory.** Partly because of the attractive gravitational force that acts everywhere in our universe. On the other hand, there are also micro-level field-like forces. These forces are also dominantly attractive.

One of the field-like forces is the gravitational force acting at long distances. The cosmic dusts become gravitational objects, if the intensity of the force keeping the dusts apart is exceeded by the intensity of the gravitational force. (Organization of gravitational objects.) Micro-level phenomena (also) continue to organize and build up when the

intensity of the force of motion keeping their potential constituents apart is less than the intensity of the force of attraction of the potential constituents (...From particles to crystals to solids).

Whether or not the potential constituents of matter knots merge into higher order phenomena depends on whether the dominant attractive field-like forces in the potential constituents, in a given space-time environment, are the more intense, or the distancing force of motion.

I will only mention here that micro-level knots are also broken (compressed) by the force of gravity, insofar as it is more intense attraction than the distancing force acting between the components of a given phenomenon (Assuming that the above changes in the gravitational object are due to the conditions determined by the gravitational force - pressure)

Forces are material knot builders, material knot decomposers. Which types, if they are valid, are built upon, and which are broken down?

What is the difference between the removal effect of micro-level field-like forces and the distancing effect of the motive force?

6 One of the basic correlations of physics is motion. For this reason, several other physical items and relationships are associated with it

The concept of motion, of whether there is or is not force in motion, is related to several physical theories and theories of motion, interpreted in different ways. This is explained in **detail my monograph "Generalizations of Physical Theorems and Contexts in the New Materialistic Philosopher's Perspectives".** Here I will only list which (major) physical theories and theorems have been justified in connection with the new interpretation of motion (hypothesis):

My hypothesis is that the **interpretation of energy in physics is wrong**. This concept is interpreted both broadly and narrowly. The

problem is that the difference in meaning between these two interpretations is not separated.

Energy absorbed by field-like forces (gravitational force, forces of micro-levels) is potential energy, to be sharply separated from kinetic energy.

The pulse theorem is not a conservation theorem.

In the processes taking place in our universe, not only the degradation and devaluation of energy, but also the opposite processes take place. During certain changes, the regularity of energy does not decrease, but increases. That is, the entropy theorem is wrong.

By accepting the theory (hypothesis) that there is force in motion, the **basic processes of the universe must also be modelled differently**.

The distancing of matter in the universe is not triggered by the expansion of space. The force of motion is the cause, it results in distancing of the matter of the universe.

This force of motion is gradually absorbed by the force of gravity. And - according to my hypothesis - the expansion phase later turns into a contraction phase.

And the kinetic energy (predominantly in the form of heat) released from its gravitational absorption, which is articulated in an increasingly disordered manner, breaks up the entities into particles belonging to deeper and deeper levels. With this, the disordered kinetic energy in the form of heat (in the cascading breakdown of phenomena belonging to higher levels) is absorbed to an ever greater extent. (Thereby, the motion mass of the universe is converted into resting mass in gigantic proportions.) Because of this, the force of gravity compresses the material of the universe into a very small size.

My speculative hypothesis is that the fusion of certain particles (maybe quarks?) releases a gigantic amount of matter in motion from matter at rest. It is the distancing force of this motion material that

disperses and distances the matter of the universe from its mass centre. According to the pulsating universe model, this receding continues until it is slowed down by the force of gravity. Subsequently, the expansion turns into shrinkage.

3 HYPOTHESIS, GENERAL THEORY OF ASEXUAL AND SEXUAL REPRODUCTION (essay-type study)

With these modes of reproduction, it has a place in the living arrangement

In fact, in the case of asexual reproduction, development through gene number increase is blocked at the prokaryotic level. Why? I realized that a thorough analysis of the adaptations of polygenic organisms is needed to answer this question.

If we find an explanation for this question, we can already understand which relationships pass the obstacle before the growth of the gene number through the development of a more efficient type of sexual reproduction.

I was looking for more general contexts. In the search for a reason for the difference between the prevalence of asexual and sexual reproduction, it would only be justified to examine the energy requirements and complexity of these reproductive modes if higher organisms could also evolve by asexual reproduction alone. It is not possible.

Key Relations Related to Two Modes of Reproduction

I built my theory (hypothesis) by relying on the peculiarities and relationships revealed by biological science. In the course of this I had to analyse many peculiarities, relationships and their relationship to each other. I will only outline the most basic of these below.

The structure of genes in organisms changes independently and randomly by mutation. Because of this, there may be

differences in the adaptation values of an organism's genes. Genes are elementary units of adaptation. At the same time, the many genes in organisms only together determine — through proteins — the continuity of existence of organisms, including genes. For this reason, the environment can measure the adaptability of the organism, i.e. of all genes, rather than the individual genes (preference, selection, etc.).

The viability of an organism is the weighted average of the adaptation value of its genes. With asexual reproduction, all genes in an organism (the better, the worse) reproduce at the same rate. This is associated with the parasitizing of genes on each other, helping each other. (Gene communism) What follows from this gene number-increasing rearrangement?

1 During the multiplication of the number of genes, each gene has less and less influence on the viability of the organism.

2 There are many more bad genes than good gene mutations. It follows from this — that in case of only asexual reproduction and less efficient sexual reproduction — during gene number reproduction, bad genes are also fixed in the "shadow" of good genes. For this reason, with asexual reproduction, better and more perfect compensation of the worse genes is achieved as the gene number increases. Because of this, differences in viability between organisms in the population are minimized. At the level of prokaryotes, gene number growth development that encodes the new function stops. Why?

The genes encoding the new function have a very low probability of mutating. "Finding" it requires a significant difference in viability between the organisms in the population. This condition is only met with asexual reproduction or less efficient sexual reproduction (conjugation) only up to the number of genes in prokaryotes.

It is only possible to develop further by increasing the gene number of prokaryotes if, in some way, there is a significant

difference in adaptation values between the organisms of the population.

This was possible with the development of more effective sexual reproduction. In this way, the genes of two organisms (between which there are differences in adaptation values) are randomly combined. Organisms with an above-average adaptation value gene combination proliferated, and the weak ones were selected. With sexual reproduction, a second level of gene organization is formed.

I ASEXUAL REPRODUCTION

1.1What consequences does the polygenicity of organisms have on the value of individual genes in organisms?

Organisms are polygenic. Only together can the many genes of an organism determine the continuity of existence of organisms, including itself. Not directly. By defining the functions of the proteins of the organism and the structure and function of other compounds belonging to organisms. — That is, genes and proteins and other compounds defined by them together. ...

Organisms may have more advantageous and disadvantageous adaptive values, in other words, better or worse genes. Better than average genes increase, worse ones reduce the viability of the organism. From this we concluded that, under **given environmental conditions, the *weighted* average of the organism's own adaptation values determines the viability, value and degree of adaptation of the organism**. (I characterize genes with higher adaptation value than the adaptation value of the organism as good genes, and genes with weaker adaptation value as bad genes.)

In organisms, **each gene has its own adaptive value.** On the other hand, **the value of the genes in organisms is also interdependent.** The better or worse genes of the organism, due to dependence, mutually **impair** each other's value. **Good genes impair**

the adaptation-based validation of bad genes. By blocking their selection. **Bad genes impair the adaptation-based validation of good genes.** By helping weaker genes.

Organisms and their genes only together realize and can realize their own continuity of existence and that of the organism. Therefore, their genes that determine the different functions of the organism can only reproduce at the same rate. During this process, genes with above-average adaptation values, and the under-average ones also receive the same "reward", they reproduce at the same rate. Therefore, it is inevitable that genes with below average adaptation values **"parasitize" the above-average** ones. They reduce their value. **In parallel, the values of those with below-average adjustment values are also hurt by helping those above average.** It would not be damaged if genes with below-average adaptive value were not helped by genes with above-average adaptive value. **Due to the polygenic organization of life, due to** the different adaptive value of their different genes, the help of genes and their parasitization on each other, i.e. "gene communism" cannot be eliminated.

Note: In the case of the above relationship, it should be borne in mind that certain genes (good and bad) determining different functions have very large differences in determining the viability of the organism.

Further note: due to the randomness of mutations, organisms may contain genes that have no influence on the adaptation value of the organism under specific environmental conditions and over a given period of time. They can also remain part of organizations. ... During reproduction, these genes are also passed on to the offspring organisms. In later offspring, as conditions change, previously fixed genes that do not change viability may also develop some adaptive value (positive, negative).

The continuity of the organism is determined only by many genes together. There are differences in adaptation values between the genes of an organism. What follows from this for the valuation of the adaptive value of individual genes within the organism?

What is the relationship between the individual genes of the organism and the adaptation value of the organism?

What do we mean by gene communism? What is the explanation for the fact that the relationship between the genes of an organism can also be characterized by parasitizing and helping?

1.2 The viability of organisms changes — randomly — as a result of gene mutations. Genes are the basic units of living adaptation

Gene mutations cause the adaptation value of genes to change. (This relationship prevails through changes in the adaptive value of the functions of proteins determined by genes.)

Organisms have a continuity of existence (stability of the organism to create a viable offspring) whose weighted average of the adaptation value of their genes reaches a value that, under given environmental conditions, is a condition for the realization of their continuity of existence. Organisms with weaker viability will die. (There may be differences and significant differences between the genes that implement the continuity of the existence of organisms in terms of their adaptive value.)

In asexual **reproduction—this is the basic level of gene arrangement—the adaptive value of organisms can only change through gene mutations**. Advantageously and disadvantageously. In this mode of reproduction, the adaptation value of organisms can only change through gene change (change in gene number, change in the adaptation value of genes).

What follows from this? That **only genes** can be **elementary units of living adaptation**. (Here, I'm just referring to the fact that the adaptive value of organisms and populations can be traced back

to the adaptive value of genes. I will not address this question in more detail in this study.)

Living organization is achieved in such a way that simpler organisms continue to build and become more complex. Asexual reproduction is the simpler way of reproduction. From this evolves the sexual reproduction, which is more complex. — Living arrangement progresses from a simpler structure to more complex, more sophisticated structures.

Note: By tendency, all genes and changes in genes are fixed in proportion to the beneficial existence continuity of the organism. This relationship also applies to modes of reproduction (conjugation and other gene combinations typical of prokaryotes). The less efficient and more efficient way of sexual reproduction is fixed after its formation because it has a beneficial effect on the continuity of the existence of organisms by tendency.

In **addition to the less efficient level of sexual reproduction (conjugation, transduction, transformation), gene-number-enhancing development encoding new functions is blocked at the level of** prokaryotes. We can conclude that the advantage of this level of sexual reproduction **is not sufficient** to lead to the **emergence and widespread distribution of organisms with a higher number of genes** - tending to be of a higher order - encoding a **greater variety of functions.**

Although the less efficient method of sexual reproduction allows the formation of multigenic organisms, it proves to be insufficient in this respect for organisms higher than prokaryotes to develop in addition to this mode of reproduction. For this reason, I use the simplification that I discuss it t**ogether with asexual reproduction** - the schematic description of this less efficient type of sexual reproduction will be described later.

Gene mutations are random in several respects. It is random which of the organisms' genes will or will not be mutagenically affected, and when. Is it also random whether the change in structure

of the mutating gene affects or does not affect the adaptation value of the gene? And if so, unfavourably or advantageously; and to what extent?

What is the explanation that different genes in organisms differ in terms of their adaptive value? **Genes in organisms** mutate **independently of each other, randomly**. It follows that the probability that the genes of an organism will mutate to have the same adaptive value is very small. And there is a very high probability that **differences in adaptation values will develop between the genes of the organism**. **Genes with above-average adaptation values are considered good** genes, those with below average adaptation value are considered bad genes.

From which peculiarity of genes follows: genes are units of living adaptation?

What is the explanation for differences in adaptation values between mutation-determined genes in organisms?

What is the relationship between the weighted average of the adaptation value of an organism's genes, environmental conditions and the existence continuity of the organism?

1.3 The adaptation value and viability of organisms are fundamentally altered by two types of gene mutations.

1 Mutations that trigger structural changes in already existing genes.

2 Mutations that form genes encoding new functions and increasing the number of genes in an organism.

The viability of the organism varies advantageously:

1 When mutation causes the structure of the organism's **existing genes** to change advantageously with respect to the adaptation value.

2 When genes **encoding a new function with adaptation value are formed** through mutation. Of these, only those that are

beneficial, increase the viability of organizations, are fixed in a trend manner.

New gene mutations that encode new adaptive functions are an order of magnitude **less likely to be "searched" "found" than the former.**

.Mutations that result in structural changes to pre-existing genes are not associated with the formation of higher order organisms, an increase in biological complexity.

Structurally, functionally more complex, higher order organisms evolve through the accumulation of genes encoding new functions with new adaptive value.

During my analytical work, I concluded that ***there is a significant difference between*** **gene mutations that alter the adaptive value of** ***existing genes and gene mutations forming new genes (adaptive value) as regards their role in*** **living arrangements**.

Note: The increase in the number of genes is a prerequisite for the formation of all higher organisms. However, there is no clear correlation between the gene number and the higher order of the organism. It is only the increase in the number of genes encoding new functions that accompanies the emergence of higher and higher organisms.

What types of mutations do we distinguish? Which of these is more or less likely to occur?

Which type of mutation tends to lead to the evolution of higher organisms?

1.4 How one of the effects of each gene on the viability of organisms is formed (changing, decreasing) as the number of genes increases

As the number of genes of an organism increases, the effect of a gene on the adaptation value of the organism, so the value of the given gene becomes smaller — by tendency — all the more.

As the gene number increases, individual genes make the organism more viable and unviable to a lesser extent. The more polygenic an organism is, the less a gene, a gene change (good or bad mutations) can change the viability of the organism; improve or worsen it. For this reason, there is a relation that **the further development of life slows down proportionally to the multiplication of the organism's genes. - This relationship also applies to asexual and sexual reproduction (in its less efficient and more efficient** form).

How does the influence of a gene in an organism on the adaptation value of an organism change as the number of genes in the organism increases?

1.5 In asexual reproduction, as the number of genes increases, the viability influence of a gene decreases for other reasons

In addition to asexual reproduction, **the increase in the number of genes in an organism affects the organism's ability to evolve in other ways, i.e. by increasing the number of genes.** Below I explain how:

The viability of organisms is "measured" by the natural environment. Genes are elementary units of living adaptation. **The stable existence and continuity of existence of organisms, including the genes of the organism, can be achieved through the cooperation of** many genes.

The natural environment can measure and it measures only the average adaptation value of the organism's co-adaptive genes, i.e. the adaptation value of the **organism**. The more viable "good gene surplus" organisms are propagated (preferred), the "bad gene surplus" organisms with poor viability are selected out.

The natural environment does not measure or measure the adaptation value of individual genes of organisms as an elementary unit of living adaptation. There is **"gene communism"** in organisms.

Genes are elementary units of living adaptation. For the natural environment, at **the same time, only organisms can be units of adaptation.** What follows if we also take into account the fact that **only a small proportion of mutations** are beneficial and the vast majority are disadvantageous?

Since the environment can only evaluate and evaluates the adaptability of organisms, the weighted average of the adaptation value of its genes.

***With only asexual reproduction*, there is no possibility in principle that even the bad genes parallel to the good genes can accumulate up to a certain limit without the possibility of** their elimination. **Organisms can accumulate without dying, as long as the average of the adaptation value of genes is still sufficient for the genes and organisms to achieve a continuum of existence**. The natural environment selects and can select only those organisms whose average adaptation value is less than necessary for the continuity of existence.

In addition to asexual reproduction, due to the beneficial and unfavourable mutations in individuals belonging to the same population (the latter are much more common), more accurate equalization and compensation of good and bad genes is achieved. - As long as the weighted average of the adaptation value of the organism's genes still allows the continuity of existence of organisms**.**

In addition to the growth of organisms with a beneficial gene, it is possible to incorporate disadvantageous genes into organisms (compensation) without the organism dying. This compensation is usually very likely to occur. This is only asexual reproduction and, in addition to the less efficient type of sexual reproduction, the consequence is that the difference in viability **between organisms in a population belonging to a given race becomes smaller and smaller as the gene number of organisms increases.**

Due to the above, the growth of new adaptive functions stops at the gene number of prokaryotes. In fact, many of the races of prokaryotes also reproduce by conjugation in a less efficient way of sexual reproduction (and gene combination occurs also by transduction and transformation). This mode of sexual reproduction seems to be only enough to cause multigene prokaryotic races to develop multigene prokaryotic races in prokaryotes that reproduce only asexually. It is no longer effective enough to prevent the compensation of good and bad genes that make it impossible to develop. It means that organisms higher than prokaryotes develop.

What is the reason why the adaptive value of the units of adaptation, of individual genes, cannot be evaluated by the natural environment, that it can only evaluate the adaptability of the organism?

What is the explanation for the fact that good gene mutations and good genes in the body create the possibility that in addition to good genes, bad genes that compensate for their value can also be incorporated into the body?

What is the explanation for the fact that, in asexual reproduction, the difference in adaptation value and viability between organisms belonging to the same population decreases with increasing number of genes in a tendency?

1.6 Why genes encoding new functions are much less likely to form, mutate than pre-existing genes in organisms

The more multigenic organisms belonging to a given population of asexually or less effective sexually reproducing (conjugation, transduction, transformation) population, the more perfect the compensation of beneficial or disadvantageous genes in them. Consequently, the **smaller the difference** in **viability between organisms belonging to the** same population.

Let us examine the relationship outlined above a little more closely. How can **it be explained that the development of *new gene mutations of adaptive value, i.e. the further development of* life, would require a significant difference in viability between the organisms of the population**?

As a tendency - **only after many organisms with very high viability will there be so many progenies left, among whose mutants new gene mutants with only a very low probability of evolving adaptive value could appear.**

With **asexual and lower efficiency sexual reproduction (conjugation) and other gene combinations, due to the increasingly perfect compensation of good and** bad genes, **this condition is only met today until prokaryotes increase the number** of genes. What is the explanation for the fact that it is fulfilled until then?

With fewer gene numbers, one gene (good or bad) has an even greater influence on the viability of the organism. Thus, **with fewer gene numbers, asexual reproduction, and with lower efficiency sexual reproduction, significant viability** differences develop between organisms in the population. The more viable organisms in the population leave behind so many offspring, among which the adaptive gene mutations encoding the new function that is only likely to emerge with low probability of adaptation.

In prokaryotes, there are not currently multigenic organisms that reproduce in this way, as far as I know. It is supposed, **I suppose, that the high degree of compensation of good and bad genes in multi-gene organisms increases beyond prokaryotes, explains that only in addition to reproduction in the above ways**, multigene, higher organisms no longer develop in prokaryotes.

Based on the **law of probability in mathematics**, it can be clearly illustrated that as the number of cases increases, the distribution becomes both more precise (more precisely compensated) and more equalized. In a dice roll, the proportion of rolls to the different sides

(1-6) tends to be more even, the greater the number of rolls. In other words, the more times you roll the dice, the smaller the difference between the frequency of falling on different sides.

The prevalence of this probabilistic relationship also explains that with the higher frequency of the bad gene mutation, the compensation of good and bad genes becomes more and more perfect as the gene number increases.

What is more likely? The beneficial mutation of an existing gene in the organism, or the development of a new mutant with adaptive value?

What is the relationship between the increase in the number of mutations resulting in a new gene with adaptive value encoding a new function in an organism belonging to a given population with this mode of reproduction and the difference in viability of these organisms belonging to their populations?

What is the correlation between the increase in the number of mutations resulting in a new gene with an adaptive value encoding a new function in a given population of organisms with the reproductive mode in question and the difference in viability between organisms in these populations?

A comprehensive question integrating the above questions: What could be the explanation for the fact that only asexual and low-efficiency sexual reproduction (conjugation) with other gene combinations and a certain number of genes (prokaryotes) still exist - but we do not see species with a higher gene number than these organisms anymore?

II. SEXUAL REPRODUCTION

2.1 The evolution of life beyond the prokaryotes and the increase in biological complexity is made possible by the development of more efficient sexual reproduction

Experience has shown that life in prokaryotes could evolve towards multi-gene, **higher organisms encoding new functions, only with a** specific change. **Only if the increasingly perfect compensation of prokaryotic organisms belonging to the same population is systematically disrupted in a more efficient way than the gene combinations of prokaryotes.** Thus, significant differences between the viability of the organisms belonging to the population — with a tendency nature — can develop and develop.

If there is a significant viability difference between organisms in the population, more viable organisms will leave more offspring.

Many of these mutate. Thus, new genes with only a low probability of adaptive value can and do evolve. **The increase in the number of genes in organisms can continue with the emergence of higher and higher orders of organisms. The development and perfection of an efficient form of sexual reproduction (isogametism, anisogametism) has opened up the possibility for this.**

Basic correlation of the more effective sexual reproduction: The progeny organisms are formed by **randomly combining genes or groups of genes (in gametes) of two organisms** in a given population that code for the same functions.

In addition to the random combination, there is **another condition** for significant viability differences between **different** random gene combinations. These combinations only allow for a meaningful disruption of compensation **if the genes (gene alleles) of the two organisms that code for the same functions** also contain gene groups that have **minor or major differences in adaptive value.** That is, **when genes encoding a function develop alleles with**

different adaptive values. This condition — most likely due to independent random mutations in the genes of organisms **— is met.**

I note that these differences in adaptation values are not conditional on differences in the adaptation values of organizations. **The adaptation value of organisms belonging to a population can also quasi-match**. The gene combinations of two organisms result in a difference in adaptation value **if *their gene alleles* coding for the same functions have those with** differences in adaptation values.

Let's start from the fact that the **gene alleles and groups of genes** of the same two organisms can combine and combine in many specific ways — randomly. **Significant differences in adaptation values can arise and develop between the gene combinations of the offspring organisms that develop in this way — randomly**.

That is, there is a disrupted, compensation of beneficial and disadvantageous genes in asexual and less efficient sexual reproduction.

What follows from this? In efficient asexual reproduction, in a population, organisms with high viability in a population with many more efficient combinations of genes leave many offspring. New genes with adaptive value are sought in the **many organisms** of a population, so there is a high probability that mutations that cause **new genes with adaptive value, which are very unlikely to occur, will also develop in the many organisms.**

For this reason, **through sexual reproduction it is possible to "find out" new adaptive genes (genes encoding new functions), the formation of both multifunctional and higher organisms, and the further development of life.**

Tendency correlation: **Half of the new combinations have higher and half have lower adaptability and viability** than their parents' gene combinations or their average. The natural environment prefers, selects. Combinations with **low viability are selected, combinations with high adaptive value are multiplied. —**

Through this efficient mode of sexual reproduction, both multi-gene and higher organisms and species are formed.

What is the explanation for the slowing down of development during asexual reproduction and low-efficiency asexual reproduction? What needs to change in a population of organisms in order for new genes with adaptive value to be added to the organism and for life to evolve?

Apart from more efficient sexual reproduction, random combinations of genes from two or more organisms in a given population, what other conditions are required for differences in adaptive value to arise between random combinations? What is the explanation for the fact that, in a tendency nature, this other condition is very likely to be met?

As a result of random gene combinations, half of their gene combinations have higher adaptation values and the other half lower adaptation values than their parents. How can it be explained that all of these combinations are not more viable than their parents, yet these random gene combinations allow for the formation and reproduction of higher and higher organisms?

Under given environmental conditions, what happens to organisms with different viability gene combinations?

2.2 The preferential gene combinations that arise during sexual reproduction have two logically distinct components

On the one hand, in asexual reproduction, the difference in the adaptive value of the offspring organisms in the population increases because they tend to get rid of the bad genes.

On the other hand, in addition to sexual reproduction, better and better gene combinations can also evolve because the random gene combinations of two or two organisms can - also as a tendency - lead to the progeny organisms having access to new gene mutants with higher adaptive value that have been "sought" in many organisms of

the population and are therefore more likely to be "found". **Which are only very unlikely to mutate.**

In addition to asexual reproduction, none of the advantages could prevail. However, the fact that further development is stalled in the presence of asexual reproduction is not equally due to the absence of both types of advantage. **The failure of prokaryotes to evolve is a consequence of the impossibility of getting rid of bad genes.**

The increase in the adaptive value of these two sides, and hence further evolution through the same combination of genes, occurs in parallel. Under a given set of environmental conditions, organisms that inherit genes of high adaptive value and get rid of genes of low adaptive value reproduce rapidly, and organisms that inherit genes of low adaptive value are lost by selection.

The above advantage of asexual reproduction also applies to this less efficient and more efficient method of reproduction. However, the difference between the benefits is very significant. A less effective way of sexual reproduction is also beneficial. (If it weren't beneficial, it wouldn't have been fixed.) It can be presumed that it is possible to increase the number of genes. But only to a limited extent. Experience has shown that this has not been sufficient to increase the number of genes beyond that of the prokaryotes, and to allow the evolution of higher organisms with many genes.

What are the two logically separable advantages of effective sexual reproduction that together with this mode of reproduction allowed the formation of both multigenic and higher organisms?

Which of these two advantages, the inefficiency of asexual reproduction and the inefficiency of asexual reproduction, has stalled the evolution of the living world at the prokaryotic level?

III. THE RELEASE OF BAD GENES FROM POPULATIONS UNDER DIFFERENT REPRODUCTIVE MODES

3.1. The condition for the continuity of existence of populations is that the population gets rid of the wrong gene surplus.

A universally valid correlation is that only those organisms can exist in which the compensation of good and bad genes is only achieved up to a level where there is a surplus of good genes - to a greater or lesser extent - that still allows the organism to exist under the given environmental conditions. This is a universal condition for the existence continuity of organisms.

Experience has shown that mutations have a **much higher frequency of unfavourable bad mutations than beneficial, good mutations**. Knowing this, the question arises: **how is it possible that the average adaptive value of genes in prokaryotic organisms is still high enough to ensure the continuity of the organism under given environmental conditions?** Enrichment with bad genes can only continue without destroying the organisms as long as there is still the adaptive value plus, which - under given environmental conditions - is sufficient for the organisms to continue to exist.

How do organisations get rid of predominantly unwanted mutants? **Organisms in which the harmful mutations predominate are destroyed.** Only those organisms survive whose genes are determined by the organism's genes and which contain sufficient beneficial genes under given environmental conditions. This relationship, regardless of the mode of reproduction, is universal.

Prokaryotes, like higher populations, can get rid of the bad genes that prevent them from continuing to exist. In the presence of asexual reproduction and less efficient sexual reproduction, this "getting rid" is more efficient the fewer the genes of the organism. - Until the gene number of the prokaryotes.

Firstly, because up to this number of genes, a good gene has a greater positive effect on the viability of the organism than the disadvantage that would be caused by compensating for a good and a bad gene at a given gene number. Up to the number of genes in prokaryotes, a gene has an even greater influence on the life of the organism. On the other hand, because less efficient sexual reproduction also "helps" to get rid of bad genes, to "find" new genes encoding new functions. (However, this help is not enough to cause multigene organisms to form in prokaryotes. This is supported by the fact that only the more efficient type of sexual reproduction gives rise to higher organisms with more genes.)

What is the relationship between the gene number of an organism, the substantive influence of the adaptation value of a gene on the adaptation of the organism, and the possibility of getting rid of bad genes resulting from a random mutation?

What is the explanation for the fact that even with less efficient sexual reproduction, gene number growth stops at the level of prokaryotes?

3.2. Getting rid of populations from bad genes in case of different ways of reproduction

Let's start from the fact that **among the higher species there are more species that reproduce both asexually (in a more efficient way of sexual reproduction) and asexually**. As we have discussed before, the genes of organisms, when mutated, tend to change in such a way that the bad mutations tend to predominate. Because of this, bad mutations accumulate in higher organisms during the **asexual reproductive stage**. The viability of organisms belonging to the population deteriorates. **With only asexual reproduction, or a less efficient method of sexual reproduction, populations of higher organisms not only fail to form, but they are not capable of getting rid of the spontaneously occurring excess of bad genes.** If the asexual reproductive stage were not followed periodically, by (the more efficient) sexual reproductive stage, then due to the

accumulation of bad mutations, the population of the higher species would sooner or later disappear, be selected.

Let's have a closer look at this problem Prokaryotes that reproduce only asexually and in the less efficient way of sexual reproduction, as well as higher organisms that reproduce in a more efficient way of sexual reproduction and asexually, are also affected by gene mutations. Mostly by bad mutations. Still, prokaryotes are only able to get rid of their bad gene surplus with asexual reproduction and a less efficient way of sexual reproduction. Higher populations and organisms are not able to do this, only by reproducing asexually.

1 In **the case of prokaryotes, the number of genes is low enough that a good or bad gene can cause a significant change in the adaptation value of the organism.** It is possible for organisms in a population to differ significantly in viability. This gives the natural environment room for preference and selection. This advantage is complemented by the fact that less efficient sexual reproduction also “helps” to some extent to get rid of bad genes, to develop and spread better genes.

2 In keeping **good and bad genes balanced in prokaryotic populations**, the fact that these organisms reproduce rapidly due to their few genes **and short life** programs also plays an important role..

In polygenic organisms, all of the above conditions are absent.

1 A single gene plays a much smaller role in determining the adaptive value and viability of an organism. Thus, as the number of genes increases, the less frequently occurring good (advantageous) genes are unable to compensate for the more likely occurrence of bad genes. A shift in the direction of a bad (disadvantageous) gene surplus is associated with selection.

2 They reproduce much slower than prokaryotes because of their multiple genes, longer life programs.

Because of the predominance of bad gene mutations, the polygenic higher organisms in the population would become less viable if they were to reproduce only asexually. Thus, they would not be able to maintain the balance of their good and bad genes—allowing continuity of existence. They would be selected. They are only able to get rid of a bad surplus of genes if, in addition to asexual reproduction, they also reproduce through a more efficient way of sexual reproduction.

In higher (more efficient) sexually reproducing organisms, which also reproduce asexually, the bad genes are multiplied in the asexual reproduction stage. The higher polygenic organisms can and do get rid of their accumulated bad genes **in the (efficient) sexual reproduction stage, through random gene combinations**.

In higher species, which reproduce only by efficient sexual reproduction, each reproductive event provides an opportunity to get rid of their bad genes, to get - by tendency - access to the high adaptability genes that are found in many organisms of the population.

What is the explanation for the fact that, as the number of genes in organisms increases, the possibility of organisms getting rid of the more frequently mutating bad gene predominance becomes smaller (and then disappears), in addition to the less efficient way of asexual or sexual reproduction?

What is the relationship between an organism's small number of genes, short life program, rapid reproduction, rapid proliferation, and the possibility of getting rid of bad mutants?

3.3. What is the advantage of the fact that many of the species that reproduce more efficiently by asexual reproduction also reproduce asexually?

Among the established peculiarities in the living world, those that benefit the continuity of existence of organisms are fixed. The question arises, what is the advantage of having multiple species that

reproduce (more efficiently) both sexually and asexually? What do species that reproduce in both ways gain from this?

Organisms give birth to a finite number of offspring during their reproduction-active life. Those with good and worse gene combinations. The **asexual reproductive stage following the (more effective) sexual reproductive stage can be interpreted as a specific prolongation of the reproduction-active life of** an organism. Those with good gene combinations reproduce more offspring asexually than if they could only reproduce sexually in one generation.

Thus, they can become more widespread. **The advantage of the asexual reproductive stage is: Organisms inheriting previously developed advantageous gene combinations spread over many generations, and in this way the better ones** displace the less viable organisms.

However, this method of reproduction **also has disadvantages. This disadvantage is eliminated in the sexual reproductive stage**.

What are the shortcomings, disadvantages, of the asexual reproductive stage only? 1. **In the asexual reproductive stage, higher species, due to the** validity of the relationships already discussed above, cannot get rid of the accumulated bad mutations. 2. By reproducing only asexually, organisms **do not have access to genes with higher adaptive value in the large population, sought by many organisms, and thus — by tendency — of higher** adaptive value.

The alternation and ratio of the two modes of reproduction can be optimized and is optimized with a tendency nature.

Plants that also reproduce asexually reproduce both ways in each generation. Reproduction by asexual allows the gene combination to be become efficiently valid, while also allowing reproduction by the more efficient asexual method of "fertilized seed". The same organism, parallel to each other, reproduces both

asexually and sexually. By reproducing in the more efficient way of sexual reproduction, organisms can also acquire genes encoding new functions that are less likely to evolve and that are "sought" and "found" in many organisms in the population. Subsequently, these reproduce faster — asexually as well.

Does the value of a combination of genes, for example in animals, influence the reproduction-active life phase of the organism? The fact, how many offspring can it produce at this stage of life?

How does the value of a gene combination change if the species reproduces asexually?

What are the advantages and disadvantages of both ways of reproduction?

Can it be presumed that the two modes of reproduction (alternation, appropriate ratio) were fixed because they proved to be beneficial for the life and distribution of the species, the population?

3.4. Already prokaryotes reproduce in a less efficient way of sexual reproduction. What is characteristic of this type of sexual reproduction?

In addition to asexual reproduction, sexual reproduction also developed and prevailed in prokaryotes. A less effective way of it. Living order evolves from lower levels of order with fewer genes and functions to higher levels with more functions. **Asexual reproduction represents the basic orderliness of life**. The less efficient mode of sexual reproduction (the genes and functions that enable them) could only develop after that. Once they are formed, they are fixed. The random combination of genes through this less efficient mode of sexual reproduction has also disrupted — to some extent — the improved compensation of good and bad genes.

Briefly about how this less efficient way of sexual reproduction is realized. The longer asexually reproducing stage of prokaryotes is followed by the sexual reproductive stage of conjugation. ***Two organisms merge*, between them random gene exchanges, gene**

combinations occur. In the course of this process, organisms with higher and lower viability may have formed, formed and form between the gene combinations of the two fusing organisms. Those with higher adaptive values proliferated, the weaker ones were selected.

Biologists have also discovered a different way of combining genes in prokaryotes. Among prokaryotes belonging to the same population, DNA molecules in their environment can **enter the gene system of some individuals**. *Genes from dead organisms* can be introduced whose alleles the organism did not yet have **(transduction). There is also a random combination of the genes of bacteria ingested by bacteriophages (transformation).** This also gave way that prokaryotic organisms could also obtain (to a limited extent) new genes of adaptive value. During this process, a combination of genes can form and forms that **adds a new gene with adaptive value to the organism**. **Or one gene in the organism is exchanged in this way for a gene with a higher adaptive value.**

It **can be presumed that in the process described above, organisms have also formed (are formed) which,** even if less efficiently than the sexual reproduction of higher organisms, but disrupt the good-bad gene compensation that becomes more **and more perfect with increasing gene number in addition to asexual** reproduction. **New genes with adaptive value encoding new functions are also formed this way.** Then they multiply rapidly.

It is reasonable to assume, however, that this less efficient method of sexual reproduction only allowed the prokaryotes to grow to the number of genes. The fact is that the increase in the number of genes in organisms encoding new functions is curbed and stops in prokaryotes.

Is the basic order of life only part of the arrangement by asexual reproduction, or is it also part of less efficient sexual reproduction in prokaryotes?

What could be the explanation for the fact that less efficient sexual reproduction has already been established and stabilized at the level of prokaryotes? Can it be presumed that the development of this mode of reproduction contributed to the increase in the gene number of prokaryotes?

What could be the explanation for the fact that both multi-gene and more complex organisms than prokaryotes evolved only with a more efficient way of sexual reproduction?

IV SOME QUESTIONS RELATED TO SEXUAL REPRODUCTION

4.1. Types of mutation

Biology distinguishes the following types of mutations: Gene mutation (point mutation), a mutation that causes chromosomal aberration that causes a change in the structure of several genes in a chromosome, and a genome mutation, which causes the chromosome number of organisms to change.

During the study of reproduction modes, the gene mutation that changes the adaptation value of organisms turned out to be of two types. Mutations that change the structure or function of genes already present in the organism, and mutations that create new genes coding for new functions. These two types of gene mutations **differ significantly in their role in the evolution of** wildlife. There is also a significant difference between the "finding" of these two types of beneficial gene mutations. Experience has shown that a **gene-forming mutation with a new** beneficial adaptive value encoding a new function has an order of magnitude lower **probability of occurrence than that of a repairing mutation that changes** the adaptation value of existing genes in the organism.

Valid for all mutations: Mutations are only fixed on a tendency basis if the organism whose genetic material has been altered has a

continuity of existence under the given environmental conditions. This relationship applies to both types of gene mutation products.

Chromosomal aberration is also a gene mutation. A mutation that causes structural changes in more than one gene on a chromosome at a time. **Since the vast majority of mutations are disadvantageous, chromosomal aberrations are most likely lethal.**

The preferred genome mutation that occurs with a low probability varies the number of chromosomes in an organism. If it increases the number of chromosomes, the genes previously belonging to one chromosome will be transferred to different chromosomes. It connects the chromosomes, genes belonging to different chromosomes are placed in one chromosome. As a **result of the restructuring of the chromosome, the former position of the organism's genes changes.** As a result, the **possibility and reality of the further re-organization** changes.

Knowing that sexual reproduction basically only allows genes from organisms with the same chromosome number to combine, genome mutations allow new species to evolve.

As with all mutations, the continuity of existence of the organism is not broken after a mutation of the genome, the organism-initiative with a new chromosome structure will only evolve, its continuity of existence will only be achieved, if the organism is able to do so under given environmental conditions due to the altered hereditary material.

4.2. The *hypothesis* of what could be the explanation for the fact that very rarely organisms (individuals) with average abilities have outstanding offspring and those with very weak abilities?

It is also characteristic of the human race that parents of average ability - very rarely - have excellent offspring (poets, writers, scientists, warlords, etc.). We could answer this question

by saying that at conception the genes with the highest adaptive value for the ability given by both parents were combined, randomly.

However, it can be assumed that a different context may also play a role in this. What context? **Many functions are determined by multiple genes**. And such functions depend on the matching and alignment of the adaptation values of many genes.

During sexual reproduction, individual genes combine. And not clusters of genes coding together for the same functions. **That is, during sexual reproduction, only the own adaptation value-based** arrangement of **individual genes** with different adaptive values can take place. Thus, in effective sexual reproduction, the adaptation value-based arrangement of a **multi-gene** block encoding the same function is no longer possible.

It can be assumed that this very rare occurrence in the case of children of average-achieving parents cannot be explained by a combination of the genes that are most advantageous in terms of the adaptive value of each gene. It can be assumed that in persons with such exceptional abilities, **the *genes of polygenic functions and abilities, which co-determine* a function with a very high adaptive value, are** combined.

During sexual reproduction, the adaptation value of *individual genes is searched* for, and not that of groups of genes. Thus, there is no possibility of ordering for groups of genes coding for one function during sexual reproduction. For this reason, the probability of a very advantageous (or very disadvantageous) combination of genes encoding the same function is several orders of magnitude lower than the probability of a different (advantageous, disadvantageous) combination of genes based on their adaptation value.

Why? Because **— not these groups of genes, but individual genes are units of adaptation and gene combination.** Sexual reproduction only has a "mechanism" for combining individual genes based on their adaptive value.

Gene alleles with high adaptive value that cause polygenic excellence are usually combined only with a very low probability, subject to the above relationships. This is supported by the fact that, in general, it is very rarely determined in the population that parents with good ability have children with outstanding ability. Even less often, it is for parents of average ability to have an offspring with outstanding abilities.

The genes for multigene functions can - also with very low probability - be combined or recombined in an unfavourable way.

Because of this, very, very weak offspring are also born.

Gene combinations for sexual reproduction are combinations of individual genes. In doing so, only the (own) adaptation value-based ordering of individual genes and not the alignment of many genes of multigene functions together can take place. I think this could explain why organisms with abilities very different from the average ability have a very low probability of being determined.

What is the reason to deal separately with gene mutations that change the adaptation value of pre-existing genes, as well as the mutation determining the new gene that determines the new function?

What is the role of gene aberration inducing mutations and genome mutations in living arrangements?

What correlation can be explained if parents have offspring with excellent abilities or very weak abilities based on the combination of some of their genes? 2007

V OUTLOOK

5.1 Two levels of genetic development of life, their relationship to each other

In addition to asexual reproduction, the basic gene regulation of life is achieved by mutation-selection. The existence continuity of an organism is fulfilled through many genes and gene functions. With sexual reproduction, a second-level gene arrangement occurs.

Development and gene arrangement through basic mutation—selection could be followed and was followed — whenever possible — by types of sexual reproduction (second level gene arrangements**), because the polygenicity of organisms, in addition to asexual and less efficient sexual reproduction, development could only take place to a limited extent, up to the number of genes** in prokaryotes. With the development of more efficient sexual reproduction functions, organisms could start to have more genes coding for new functions than prokaryotes, and organisms of higher and higher orders could evolve.

Asexual reproduction is the basic order of life. What is the relationship between this arrangement and second-level gene arrangement? Only at the base of the basic ordering - as a product of the basic gene arrangement - did the life functions evolve that allowed organisms to reproduce less efficiently and then more efficiently by sexual reproduction at the second level of gene ordering. Through sexual reproduction, the adaptation value-based reconciliation of the genes of *organisms* takes place. This is the second level of gene arrangement.

In addition to simpler, **less efficient sexual reproduction** (too), both **multi-gene** and higher organisms may have evolved and evolved actually. The genes and gene functions for the less efficient type of asexual reproduction have evolved as a product of asexual reproduction. These genes and gene functions — as they created an opportunity for gene-increasing development — were fixed.

With the less efficient level of asexual reproduction prevailing, life has settled down to the gene pool of prokaryotes. (And the resulting advantageous gene combinations have already served as a basis for the formation of multigene organisms.) Experience also confirms that the possibility of organizing species with greater gene numbers than prokaryotes was possible only with a more efficient way of sexual reproduction.

It can be **presumed that many "steps" of settlement have led to the effective sexual reproduction currently prevailing in higher organisms.** This could have been achieved by the fact that the lower steps on the basis of which all the higher ones were formed were selected after this change.

This relationship is universal in the living world. More efficient functions tend to mutate through less efficient ones, and then - as a tendency - as new mutants become more efficient, the old ones that mutated to form the new ones are selected out. The more imperfect functions played the role of a bridge in the process of development which, after giving way to the more perfect, disappeared, were selected. The more perfect ones have selected them, through which the more perfect ones were created.

The development and perfection of more efficient types of sexual reproduction have made it possible to create effective gene combinations that have allowed both multigenic and higher organisms and species to evolve; and they have evolved and evolve.

What is the relationship and the difference between the basic level (mutation-selection, asexual reproduction) and the second level (two types of sexual reproduction)?

What is the relationship, as well as the difference, between the less efficient and second level gene arrangement of sexual reproduction in more efficient types?

5.2. Summary questions

The theory (hypothesis) of asexual and sexual reproduction should attempt to answer the following questions:

What is the basic unit of living adaptation? What do we mean by gene communism? What are the two types of gene mutation affecting the viability of organisms? What are the differences between the probability of their occurrence? Why, in addition to asexual and less efficient sexual reproduction, genes could reproduce to the level of prokaryotes? And why did the growth of the gene number stop at this level of reproduction? How do prokaryotes get rid of the bad gene surplus induced by a bad gene mutation that makes up a greater proportion of mutations?

Following the development of a more efficient mode of sexual reproduction (followed by the perfection of this mode), which consequence of the change in the random combination of genes or groups of genes of two organisms allowed life to evolve by increasing the number of genes? What is the difference between a less efficient and a more efficient way of sexual reproduction in terms of the rate at which gene numbers increase? How do sexually reproducing organisms in a population get rid of bad gene surpluses? And how do organisms get access to genes with a higher adaptive value that are found in many organisms in the population and thus less likely to evolve? What could be the advantage of certain species reproducing both sexually and asexually? At what reproductive stage is it possible to propagate a combination of genes, genomes in many copies, and to increase the number of genes in these species? At what stage of reproduction is it possible to get rid of the wrong gene surplus that develops spontaneously? 2007

Note: The basic contexts for solving the "mystery of sexual reproduction" discussed in this paper are - in short - already available online as of 2018... In English.

4 ABOUT ASEXUAL AND SEXUAL REPRODUCTION IN BRIEF (Essay)

When modelling the place of asexual and sexual reproduction in the evolution of the world of life, the many interdependencies that actually exist between these reproductive modes must be taken into account. For this reason, the characterization of these modes of reproduction and their relationship to each other cannot be cleared up in a few sentences. In this short study, I describe only the most basic relationship between the two modes of reproduction. Briefly.

Asexual reproduction

Organisms can only realize their continuity of existence with many genes, many vital functions.

The structure of genes coding for different functions in the body changes randomly for mutagenic effects. The structure of the genes of organisms determines their adaptive value, by mediation of proteins of the structure determined by it. The vast majority of gene mutations are disadvantageous.

One of the characteristics of each gene is that they have an independent adaptation value.

However, since its many genes can only achieve continuity of existence (and continuity of existence of the organism) only together, the value of the adaptation of each gene of the organism depends on the adaptation value of the other genes of the organism.

The adaptive value of individual genes in organisms, due to their random mutation, differs by tendency.

The adaptation value of an organism, its viability, is the weighted average of the adaptation value of its genes.

Because organisms only achieve continuity of existence and reproduction, if they have genes encoding all functions. Thus — with asexual reproduction — all genes in an organism

reproduce at the same rate. Both better than the average adaptation value and the worse ones. Gene communism prevails. This means that genes with different adaptation values all reproduce according to the weighted average of the adaptation value of the organism's genes. (“Helping”, “Parasitizing”)

In addition to asexual reproduction, the above problem arises from the peculiarity of the living reproduction that, while genes are units of adaptation, the environment can only evaluate the adaptation of many genes of the organism.

They can be explained by the validity of the above relation:

On the one hand, the increase in the functions of the genes of the organism has a beneficial effect on the viability of the organism. Multiple functions allow for a more perfect adaptation of the organism to the environment.

On the other hand:

1 Due to the increase in the number of genes in an organism, the influence of each gene on the adaptation value of the organism decreases as the number of genes increases.

2 Since the environment only evaluates the weighted average of the adaptation value of the organism's genes, beneficial gene mutations also create an opportunity for disadvantageous genes and gene mutations in the organism to remain part of the organism.

The increase in the number of genes is achieved through more and more perfect compensation of beneficial and disadvantageous genes. (Disadvantageous mutations are much more common than beneficial ones.) For this reason, asexual reproduction, and in addition to a less efficient way of sexual reproduction, the development associated with gene number growth slows down, stops at the level of prokaryotes. Why is that?

Mutations that form genes encoding new function are less likely to occur than mutations that change existing genes. In cases where

there is a very significant difference in adaptive values between organisms in the same racial population. In this case, more viable organisms leave behind so many offspring, including gene mutations encoding new adaptive functions. At the level of prokaryotes, this condition is not met.

Sexual reproduction

The increase in the number of genes coding for several new functions in prokaryotes can only continue if there is a significant difference in viability between the organisms of the population for the development of a gene mutation with a new adaptive value

This condition is met with the formation of a more effective type of sexual reproduction. The essence of this is that offspring organisms are formed by random combinations of genes from two organisms in the population. (Another condition is that among the gene alleles of the parent organisms there should be some that differ in adaptive value.)

Half of the random gene combinations of offspring organisms are more viable and half more unviable than their parents. The more viable organisms proliferate, the more non-viable ones are selected.

At the population level, mutations that form new adaptive genes are “searched” and “found” in many of the more viable combinations that reproduce rapidly. It is possible for the new genes of adaptive value of organisms to "be found", to become fixed, to evolve towards higher and higher organisms. More than 99% of the species also reproduce sexually.

5 FOUNDATIONS OF MY ASEXUAL, SEXUAL REPRODUCTION THEORY AND HYPOTHESIS

In my new philosophy approach, I attempted to build a hypothetical deductive theory based on the general correlations revealed by biology

Knowing the basic relationships revealed by biological science, I searched and found higher general relationships to solve the mystery of sexual reproduction.

I relied on biological correlations revealed by **biological science and supported** by experience. The justification for the existence of these many correlations also supports my theory of reproduction.

I take the risk to make the following statement: Since **my theory is based on the co-existence of many correlations, proven by experience, it is better supported than any single correlation found in biological science.**

In the course of scientific cognition, knowledge of the general context in a given field is increasing. This creates the opportunity to learn about the more general characteristics and relationships in a given area. In my Theory of Reproduction, I attempted to do this. Which, like all theories, is a hypothesis.

2 I have built my theory and hypothesis of reproduction on the following relationships, supported by experience, revealed by biology:

1 The basic compounds of organisms are nucleic acids and proteins and the structure they define.

2 In organisms, there is a precise correspondence between the sequence of bases of nucleic acids and the amino acid sequence of the protein determined by them in each section of nucleic acid compounds (in the genes).

3 Organisms are polygenic.

The genes of an organism, together with the proteins they define, their protein functions, and other compounds defined by proteins, determine the continuity of existence of organisms. (That is, the relatively stable existence of organisms, the creation of viable offspring.)

5 The nucleic acid compounds of organisms and their individual gene sections (independently and randomly) are subjected to mutagenic effects, which, in most cases, change their structure, thus their adaptation value, and therefore the viability of the organism (also).

6 It is common experience that the vast majority of gene mutations are disadvantageous in relation to the continuity of existence of organisms. Only a small percentage of them benefit.

7 Organisms belonging to the same species or population may have differences in the adaptation value of their genes (gene alleles) that determine the same functions due to their random, independent mutations.

8 Organisms reproduce asexually as well as sexually.

9 Essence of asexual reproduction: Organisms transfer their own genes to their offspring. Asexual reproduction, compared to sexual reproduction, is simpler, faster, less energy-intensive.

10 The basic relationship of sexual reproduction types is that during reproduction, the genes of two organisms belonging to the same population that encode the same functions are combined — randomly during reproduction. Thus, the genomes of the offspring - due to the randomness of mutations, with a greater or lesser probability - differ from those of their parents.

11 In addition to gene mutation, the viability of sexually reproducing organisms also changes in response to gene combination. Sexual reproduction is more disadvantageous than asexual due to the following: It is more complex, due to its operation with more functions, more energy-intensive and slower.

13 **Some unanswered key questions of reproductive modes**: **What is the great advantage of sexual reproduction that explains that, despite the disadvantages outlined above, more than 99% of species reproduce sexually?** On the other hand, once the advantage of asexual reproduction is very large, for reasons that are still a mystery to us, what explains why many species that reproduce sexually also reproduce asexually?

3 I have studied and I study asexual and sexual reproduction in the perspective of materialistic philosophy more general than biology

The general theorems of biology on which I model my theory of reproduction were already known in the last third of the previous century. As far as I know, no theory or hypothesis has been published so far that could provide a meaningful answer to the questions I am trying to answer on the basis of my hypothesis.

Perhaps this did not happen because the relationships that need to be explored are more general than the ones that biology deals with? I think these are also philosophical questions. Philosophers have not yet dealt with questions of this type, which concern scientific contexts

I suppose that answering these questions is a matter of philosophy. This requires a philosophy that is more general than the contexts studied by the sciences and captures the relationships that prevail at all levels of the material world. I have made one kind of experiment to model such a philosophy over the last 50 years. I formulated a new materialistic theory of the world, a philosophy (hypothesis). One whose theorems and those of the sciences fit together harmoniously.

The theory of asexual and sexual reproduction I have outlined is based on the basic biological relationships described in the point outlined above. I have assumed the validity of the basic relationships revealed by biology. I built my theory by further analysing these relationships in the view of a new philosophy.

In the course of my research, questions and answers to these questions were formulated.

The study of asexual and sexual reproduction in the perspective of my new philosophy theory has led to many new questions that I have been able to answer.

Understanding my theory — because it contains more general relationships than the relationships studied by biology — requires a **high level of generalities and considerable intellectual effort.**

4 List of new relationships that my theory of asexual and sexual reproduction contains:

Asexual reproduction

The elementary units of living adaptation can only be genes. Organisms contain many genes (coding for different functions), among which, because they mutate independently of each other, there is a very high probability of differences in adaptation values.

The adaptation value of an organism is the weighted average of the adaptation value of its genes.

The genes of the organism, due to the difference in their adaptive value, mutually hinder each other's value in the body. (Weak genes prevent stronger ones from multiplying faster. Stronger genes hinder the selection of weaker ones.) This has a curbing effect on the development of life. (Gene communism, parasitism, help.)

(I also use the term good gene allele for alleles with a higher adaptive value than the average adaptive value of the genes of the organism, and the term bad gene allele for alleles with a lower adaptive value than the average adaptive value of the organism.)

In my hypothesis, I consider it important to distinguish between the two types of gene mutations that affect the adaptation value of an organism 1 Those that determine the adaptation value of the already existing genes. *2 Those developing genes encoding new functions.*

The frequency (probability) of mutations that create genes encoding new (adaptive value) functions is much lower than that of mutations that change already existing genes to more advantageous ones.

Mutations that create a gene with a new adaptive value provide the organism with new proteins and new functions catalysed by this gene. In this way, higher and more biologically complex organisms can evolve.

The more genes an organism has, the less the influence (advantageous or disadvantageous) of the adaptive value of a gene on the adaptive value of the organism, as a tendency.

Environmental conditions can only "measure", " they measure" the adaptation value of an organism, that is, the average adaptation value of an organism's genes. — Not that of individual genes.

Bad mutations *(impairing the adaptation value and viability of the organism)* are much more common than good mutations (improving the adaptation value of the organism). *While there is a smaller number of genes (up to the level of prokaryotes), there are also more significant differences in adaptation value with asexual reproduction and a less efficient way of sexual reproduction. (Although compensation for good and bad genes, the higher incidence of the latter is a universal peculiarity of living arrangement.)*

Thus, an advantageous or disadvantageous gene has an even more significant influence on the viability of the organism. - Organisms with a high level of viability leave behind a lot of offspring, among which many mutations can also develop genes that encode new functions.

As the number of genes in the body increases, more and more perfect compensation for the good and bad genes of organisms is achieved.

What effect does this have on the further development of organizations? The viability gap between the organisms in the population is minimized due to improved compensation. A significant difference would be needed to produce organisms with very many offspring. And that genes encoding new functions are also form among these mutations. In the absence of this, the gene number growth of organisms that reproduce only asexually and in a less efficient way of sexual reproduction encoding new functions is curbed and stopped at the level of prokaryotes.

Sexual reproduction

The formation of new genes encoding new functions could only continue if there were significant differences in viability between the organisms belonging to the population.

This is possible after a more efficient (isogamy, anisogamy) mode of sexual reproduction has evolved (by randomly combining the genes of two organisms at the time of procreation).

Correlations associated with more effective sexual reproduction:

Basic relationship: the genes of two organisms belonging to the population are randomly combined.

These random gene combinations are associated with differences in adaptation values (in offspring) only if the gene alleles of organisms of the same population encoding the same function have differences in adaptation values.

Due to the random mutation of the organism's genes independently of each other, this condition is most likely met.

When the genes of two organisms are randomly combined, there is a tendency for offspring organisms to get rid of their bad genes (through natural selection), and to obtain genes encoding new

functions that are more likely to be "found" in many organisms in the population.

Between gene combinations — tendencies — combinations higher (50%) or lower (50%) than the parents' adaptation value — tend to be the same probability. Organisms with a genome with an adaptation value higher than the adaptive value of the parents reproduce rapidly.

Ridding population organisms from bad genes (genes with below average adaptive value) is accomplished by tendencies selection of organisms containing these genes.

The more viable ones with higher adaptability values can leave behind so many offspring that may already occur, new gene mutations with adaptive value also occur. In this way, ever higher, ever more biologically complex species can and do evolve.

The larger the population, the more organisms are "searched", the genes encoding new functions of ever higher adaptive value, and the more likely they are to be "found" by tendency. Thus, it is possible for the random gene combination of two organisms belonging to the same population to obtain adaptation-value genes "sought" by many organisms in the population that encode new functions.

Getting rid of the wrong genes of asexually or sexually reproducing organisms

The continuity of existence of any population is conditional on getting rid of the wrong gene-surplus organisms by selection. And so that organisms with higher adaptive value proliferate in the population. They fill the living space that the selected organisms left empty.

The condition for the continuity of existence of each organism is: The organism should have as many good "surpluses" as the continuity of existence is achieved under given environmental conditions.

In addition to asexual reproduction and less efficient sexual reproduction (in prokaryotes), a gene with better or worse adaptive value still changes the adaptation value of the organism relatively significantly. (Few gene numbers, a greater influence of one gene on the adaptation value of the organism.) Organisms with a bad gene surplus are selected, those with a good gene surplus proliferate. - From the point of view of getting rid of the bad gene surplus, the faster reproduction of these organisms due to the few genes is also beneficial.

In addition to sexual reproduction, the genes of two organisms each belonging to the population are randomly combined. There are also more significant adaptive value differences between the many combinations. Consequence: The proliferation of organisms with good gene surpluses, the selection of bad gene surpluses.

What is the explanation for the fact that among sexually reproducing species there are also those that reproduce asexually. What is the benefit of alternating these reproductive modes?

Advantage of asexual reproduction stage: Organisms with the same gene combination can reproduce over several generations. Thus, organisms with a more viable gene allele combination are more effective at displacing organisms with poor gene allele combinations in the population with weaker viability.

Because of their many genes, long life-program and slow reproduction, the higher organisms that reproduce in both ways cannot get rid of their bad genes by asexual reproduction, as prokaryotes with few genes, short life-program and fast reproduction can. In higher organisms, this is possible during the sexual reproductive stage.

As outlined above, polygenic organisms that reproduce asexually are unable to form or maintain their continuity of existence only when they reproduce asexually. Only if they reproduce sexually.

Place of asexual and sexual reproduction in the living world

In my hypothesis, I also modelled the place of asexual and sexual reproduction in the living world, in the living order:

Gene mutation—selection is the basic arrangement of life. Within this framework, genes and gene functions that allow sexual reproduction are also formed. Sexual reproduction is a second-level gene arrangement. With this, it is possible for the genes of each organism to also be arranged according to their adaptation value. 2007

ABOUT THE NEW PHILOSOPHY, NEW THEORIES, THE DIFFICULTIES OF INCORPORATING THEM INTO THE SCIENTIFIC CIRCULATION

Brief description of my work

The majority of materialistic thinkers consider the world to be unified and material.

The sciences study different levels of the world, different areas of each level. **Their findings and theories are confirmed or refuted by experience. — Although most scientists claim the world to be uniform and material, they do not research this hypothetic unit.**

The world is organized in knots. Its knots and entities belong to levels. All higher levels are the product of the specific rearrangement of the lower order. It follows from this fact that the **phenomena of different levels are of the same substance**. —Different articulations thereof. The material world is unified.

The relatively lasting existence of phenomena belonging to different levels and their further arrangement is assumed by consistent materialists to be determinate.

Higher levels are determined from lower levels. This determinacy connects and links the inanimate levels of the world, and here on Earth the quasi-infinite living world, organised in many steps. This is a moment of unity. Until now, the unity of the world has not been substantially investigated by sciences or philosophies. The **task of philosophies would be to model the unity of the world**. **Philosophers have not dealt with this for a long time**. Philosophers also deal with partial questions (such as cognition, human existence, etc.).

I have been modelling the theorized unit of the world for over 50 years. I build my theory from the point of view **of the determination of level organisation.** I **rely on scientific theories and experiences**. I searched for the determination of inanimate

micro-level organisation (from particles to crystals) and then of life, of the organisation of the living world - including our own species.

Starting from the general (universal) theorem (**determinacy**), I build my theory, starting from which I **not only know what characteristics and properties different phenomena have, but also what is the reason for their emergence, their relatively stable existence, their evolution, their decay.**

In the course of my research work, I have concluded that materialistic theory of determination needs further development. I **am modelling a new materialistic determination theory.** This **includes new research.** The research in the new "track", **I think, turned out to be very successful.** In researching the level organization of matter, I follow the principle of progress towards concrete cognition from general to that of concrete knowledge.

The key issue in philosophies are those related to our own species. I also approach the answers to these questions from the side of the determinations of the organization of the living world. (The context in this latter area is still only recorded in a rough draft. They will be printed only later.)

The Problem of Accepting New Theories

The advancement of science is achieved by the birth of new theories with a higher level of explanatory power than previously accepted, by entering the scientific "bloodstream".

It is a common phenomenon that new theories are difficult for the scientific community to accept. The more difficult it is, the more accepted theories are criticised, refuted or changed by the new theory. The new theories refute the old ones to a greater or lesser extent, and thus challenge the knowledge that the scientific society accepts.

I am certain that my theories are well-founded. I offered a larger sum (one million forints or its equivalent in other currencies) to evaluators who have a meaningful understanding of its basic context, and as a result to those who have a meaningful refutation of its basic context - already in 2018. **(At a time when, in my new philosophical approach, I think I have "solved" the mystery of sexual reproduction.)- So far no one has undertaken a substantive evaluation of my work.**

If these studies turn out to have scientific value, then so does my new materialist philosophy and the rest of my work, too. (The 7 monographs I have already printed, and for the theories I have only recorded in rough drafts.)

The acceptance of new theories is usually achieved by the fact that **among scientists and philosophers there are individuals who are more open to** new theories. Knowledge of more general theories requires a higher level of generalization ability, making them more difficult to master.

The general experience is that younger people, **university students**, are more willing to do this. I really want to be able to present my theories to interested young people.

I need help to evaluate my work - if it is of positive value - to get it into the scientific mainstream. In order to make my theory known, I also plan to establish a foundation. For this, too, I would ask for the help of those who understood my theories, who believe that my works have scientific value.

As for the scientific value of my work, there is a big difference of opinion between me and those who - until now - have rated the scientific value of my work as 0. I hope that among those who study my works in Hungarian and English, there will be more people who will appreciate what is written in this monograph. And if they find scientific values in them, in different ways, they will help me to get my works into the scientific circulation.

My email address: filozofusbuti41@gmail.com

Sincerely, Sándor Búti