NOCTOGENESIS

Evolution's Quantum Secret

Lloyd A. Merriam

lmerriam3@gmail.com

No Affiliations

Disclosure:

The author created and utilized a GPT (ChatGPT v4.0, and v4.5 Deep Research) to assist extensively in the preparation, organization, and editing of this paper. Another paper, *Leveraging AI in Scientific Writing - How ChatGPT Assisted in the Creation of Noctogenesis.Preprint* (https://osf.io/4wz32) explains how this tool was configured and used.

Abstract

Noctogenesis challenges the classical view that evolution is an unguided process driven primarily by random genetic fluctuations and natural selection. Instead, it introduces a non-classical approach in which evolutionary gains unfold through intrinsic randomness, a quantum-level process distinct from the stochastic randomness of ordinary events. Crucially, Noctogenesis accounts for the presence and significance of ancient genetic blueprints, such as the regulatory gene networks Hox and Pax6, which were fully assembled at least 50 million years before the Cambrian Explosion, when thousands of complex body plans suddenly emerged en masse in a strikingly short time span. The preemptive presence of these genetic architectures contradicts conventional evolutionary models, requiring an explanation beyond blind chance and natural selection. Noctogenesis challenges the idea that life's complexity arose passively, arguing instead that syntropy, a counterforce to entropy, steers genetic fluctuations toward greater functionality and adaptability. Unlike the Darwinian model, which is purely reactive, Noctogenesis proposes that evolution is inherently proactive, guided by preconfigured genetic frameworks unfolding along syntropic pathways. By integrating quantum mechanics with the regulatory power of gene expression, Noctogenesis reframes evolution as a fundamentally non-classical process—refuting conventional evolutionary thought and accounting for biological innovations that traditional models like neo-Darwinism cannot.

Keywords and Terms

evolution, neo-Darwinism, modern synthesis, entropy, syntropy, expectancy, developmental dissonance, randomness, intrinsic, extrinsic, transactional interpretation, MWI, teleoverse, multi-threaded development, latent genetic architectures, hox, pax6

Revisions

This preprint (v4) presents a revised Disclosure and Abstract, updates references, and provides edits, corrections, and additional insights as needed.

Introduction

Do you believe in evolution?

That most of us will answer this question with a simple "Yes" or "No" highlights a common failure to distinguish between fact and theory—in this case, mistakenly conflating **whether** evolution happened with **how** it occurred. The question actually raises two completely separate issues:

- Did life in its many forms appear gradually over billions of years (or did life appear en masse as described, for example, in Christian theology)?
- And if life forms did evolve gradually, does contemporary evolutionary theory satisfactorily explain how?

There is a fundamental difference between the *fact* of evolution, which is overwhelmingly supported by scientific evidence, and the *mechanisms* by which evolution operates. In short, whether evolution happened ought not to be confused with a theory that purports to explain *how*.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that biological evolution happened. Science has amassed irrefutable evidence proving that life in its many forms appeared gradually over an enormous expanse of time. The evidence is so voluminous, and so convincing, that disbelieving it is to question the validity of science altogether. But while the fact of evolution is not in question, whether current evolutionary theory adequately explains it is another matter, and the subject of this paper.

For over a century, evolutionary theory has been anchored in a simple yet powerful idea: genetic mutations occur at random, and natural selection sculpts life's advance by amplifying beneficial variations. This neo-Darwinian model, while effective in explaining small-scale adaptation, struggles to account for the emergence of biological innovation and complexity. Certain discoveries call into question whether evolution can be explained purely as a reactive process. These include the sudden appearance of complex body plans in the Cambrian Explosion, the existence of highly conserved genetic toolkits long before their use, and the precise coordination required for intricate biological structures to function (Zimmer, 2006). The challenge is clear: Can a gradualist process relying on trial and error account for the diversity and complexity of the life we see all around us.

Noctogenesis proposes a radical paradigm shift. Rather than a blind, stepwise process, evolution operating under Noctogenesis unfolds proactively, with genetic transformations emerging in an anticipatory rather than purely reactive manner, guided by non-classical forces.

Overview of the Leading Evolutionary Theories

That biological evolution occurred is a certainty. But while **the fact of evolution is not in doubt**, the leading explanations for how it happened all have significant shortcomings. This paper will explore them and demonstrate how Noctogenesis might better account for the striking variety and complexity observed in biological systems.

Modern evolutionary theory (aka neo-Darwinism or the Modern Synthesis) is built on a clear and certain foundation: genetic fluctuations (mutations) arise, and natural selection amplifies those that confer an advantage (Dobzhansky, 1970). Of course, there's a lot more to be said. But that's the gist of it.

Evolutionary biology is not a monolithic field but a dynamic and evolving discipline with multiple competing and complementary perspectives. While Neo-Darwinism—the synthesis of Darwinian theory with molecular biology— is the overwhelmingly dominant framework, there are others that challenge and/or expand upon it. These include the Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution, the Extended Evolutionary Synthesis (EES), The Third Way, and others emphasizing self-organization and structural constraints.

The Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution

Motoo Kimura's Neutral Theory proposed that most genetic changes at the molecular level are neither beneficial nor harmful but instead spread through genetic drift—random fluctuations in allele frequencies (Kimura, 1968). Initially controversial, Neutral Theory is now a foundational concept in evolutionary biology, particularly in explaining genetic variation within populations. Extensive genomic evidence supports this view, revealing patterns of molecular change that align with neutral expectations rather than selective pressures (Kimura, 1983).

Neo-Darwinism and Neutral Theory constitute the two predominant schools of evolutionary thought, but they are not the only ones shaping contemporary scientific thinking. Over time, other perspectives have fought for legitimacy, challenging the traditional paradigms and expanding the boundaries of evolutionary theory. These include:

The Extended Evolutionary Synthesis (EES)

The Extended Evolutionary Synthesis builds upon the foundations of the Modern Synthesis but asserts that additional, non-genetic mechanisms play a crucial role in shaping evolutionary outcomes. This perspective challenges the notion that genetic changes arise purely by chance, instead proposing that developmental constraints, environmental influences, and feedback loops between organisms and their surroundings contribute to evolutionary innovation. For example, phenotypic plasticity allows organisms to respond to environmental pressures in real time, sometimes leading to inherited changes that shape future generations. Similarly, niche construction demonstrates that species are not merely shaped by their environments but actively transform them in ways that influence selection pressures on themselves and other organisms. Proponents of the EES argue that the Modern Synthesis is incomplete and needs expansion to include additional mechanisms that shape evolution (Laland et al., 2015). These include:

Developmental Bias—Organisms are not infinitely malleable; the structure of development itself constrains and guides evolution.

Phenotypic Plasticity – Organisms can alter their traits in response to environmental conditions, sometimes in ways that later become genetically encoded.

Niche Construction – Organisms actively modify their environments, which in turn influences their evolutionary trajectory.

Epigenetics – Non-genetic factors, such as chemical modifications to DNA, can influence traits across generations (Jablonka & Lamb, 2005).

Rather than rejecting Neo-Darwinism, the EES reframes evolution as an interplay between genes, development, environment, and inherited regulatory changes. Leading proponents of the EES include Kevin Laland, Eva Jablonka and Gerd B. Müller (Müller, 2017).

The Third Way

Championed by scientists like James Shapiro and Denis Noble, the Third Way movement challenges both traditional Neo-Darwinism and Intelligent Design (Shapiro, 2011; Noble, 2013).[1] It emphasizes:

- The role of cellular processes in actively directing evolution rather than seeing organisms as passive recipients of random mutations.
- The idea that genetic change is not purely random but influenced by complex regulatory networks.
- A rejection of the simplistic "random mutation + natural selection" model as the sole driver of evolutionary innovation (Shapiro, 2016).

This perspective is hotly debated, with some biologists finding elements compelling while others view it as overly speculative (Laland et al., 2014).

Self-Organization and Structural Constraints

Another school of thought, associated with researchers like Stuart Kauffman and Brian Goodwin, proposes that natural selection is not the only force shaping biological complexity. Instead, they argue that self-organizing principles and structural constraints inherent to biological systems play a fundamental role. According to this view, the patterns we observe in life arise not solely from selection, drift, and the like, but also from deeply embedded laws of physics and chemistry that govern biological systems.

---

[1] Intelligent Design (ID)— often positioned as *The Second Way* —is couched as a *theory*, but is more accurately described as a critique of neo-Darwinism. By attributing a "designer" to evolution, it presupposes its own conclusion, sidestepping scientific inquiry rather than engaging it. For a theory to be scientific, it must offer an explanation rather than making the sweeping proclamation that "God did it." That said, ID has effectively highlighted critical weaknesses in neo-Darwinian theory, particularly its inability to account for the origin of 'irreducibly complex' biological systems. One of its most formidable critics of neo-Darwinism is Michael Behe, a Lehigh University biochemist, who has presented several utterly devastating challenges to the idea that certain complex biological systems could have arisen through stepwise, undirected mutations.

Challenges to Modern Evolutionary Theory

Certain discoveries present challenges to contemporary evolutionary theory that are not easily accommodated. Among them are:

- **The Cambrian Explosion** – Far too many complex body plans emerged far too rapidly for a gradualist process to readily account for.
- **Convergent Evolution** – Strikingly similar biological solutions appear in unrelated lineages despite no shared evolutionary history.
- **Orphan Genes** – These genes appear suddenly, with no traceable ancestral precursors (Long et al., 2003; Tautz & Domazet-Lošo, 2011).
- **The Conservation of Non-Coding Regulatory Elements** – These persist across enormous evolutionary timescales, despite no apparent selective advantage along the way (Bejerano et al., 2004; Ponting et al., 2011).

While these are all serious challenges, there is one more in particular that's crippling: **ancient genetic blueprints.** The genetic toolkits responsible for constructing complex animal body plans—such as Hox genes—existed long before they were deployed, for example, in the Cambrian explosion which took place around 500 million years ago (Carroll, 2005; Davidson & Erwin, 2006).

According to evolutionary biologist Sean Carroll, "The genetic infrastructure needed to assemble the bodies of modern animals long predated the appearance of those bodies in the Cambrian explosion." He further notes, "The genetic potential was in place for at least 50 million years, and probably a fair bit longer, before large, complex forms emerged" (Carroll, 2005). In short, these toolkits were created by Nature long before the Cambrian, remaining latent for tens of millions of years before being utilized in full.

These ancient genetic blueprints do not merely encode isolated traits but orchestrate the complete architectural design of entire anatomical structures. This raises a compelling question: How could natural selection—a process reliant on immediate functional advantages—produce and preserve intricate genetic frameworks for biological structures that would not materialize for millions of years?

Integral to these blueprints are **regulatory networks**, intricate systems of genetic control that orchestrate the development of an organism with remarkable precision (Davidson, 2006). These networks, including deeply conserved gene families such as Hox and Pax, act as master switches, directing the spatial and temporal activation of genes necessary for forming specialized structures (Duboule, 2007). But how could such finely tuned regulatory mechanisms emerge in a stepwise, Darwinian fashion, when their functionality depends on the simultaneous existence of the very structures they regulate?

Consider the **Hox genes**, the master regulators of body plans (Carroll, 1995). These were not assembled piece by piece in response to selective pressures but existed as preconfigured developmental instructions long before their eventual deployment. The same is true for other key genetic regulators, such as Pax6, which governs eye formation, and Sonic Hedgehog, essential for limb development (Gehring, 1996; McMahon et al., 2003). These genes did not merely suggest a vague predisposition toward complexity; they encoded precise, complete blueprints for future anatomical structures (Davidson & Erwin, 2006).

If evolution is a gradual, trial-and-error process, how could these deeply conserved elements have existed—fully formed—50 million years before their first use?

Ancient Genetic Toolkits

Far from being isolated anomalies, the presence of preconfigured genetic architectures across diverse biological systems suggests an inherent forward-planning aspect to evolution. The following table showcases several well-documented examples of genes that were in place long before their final corresponding structures emerged.

Gene	Function	How It Challenges Evolutionary Theory
Hox	Body segmentation and organization	Existed long before complex body plans emerged
Pax6	Master regulator of eye development	Encodes eye formation in species that predate complex visual systems, appearing early in organisms without discernible eyes
TP53 (p53)	DNA repair, cancer suppression	Present before complex organisms required it
MYOD1	Muscle differentiation	Established before vertebrate musculature evolved
SHH (Sonic Hedgehog)	Limb and organ development	Encoded limb formation long before limbs existed
NOTCH	Cellular communication	Necessary for tissue specialization that didn't yet exist
FOXP2	Speech and language circuits	Predated human linguistic ability by millions of years
NANOG	Pluripotency regulation	Existed before complex multicellular development
BCL2	Cellular self-destruction (apoptosis)	Designed for immune regulation before complex immune systems evolved

SOX2	Sensory and neural development	Encoded for eyes and brain structures that had not yet formed
GATA3	Immune and organ development	Crucial for vertebrate survival before vertebrates appeared

These ancient genes were **preconfigured** architectures—complex, hierarchical genetic control systems. The blueprint for vision, Pax6, is found in an astonishing range of organisms, from jellyfish and insects to mammals, despite their eyes being radically different. And Pax6 doesn't just code for a single simple eye; it orchestrates an entire developmental program capable of manifesting in wildly different forms depending on the context (Gehring & Ikeo, 1999). This shows that genetic instructions for various eye types pre-existed their actual expression, locked away in the genome long before natural selection could have had the chance to shape them into functional organs.

Evolutionary Developmental Biology

Evolutionary Developmental Biology, or Evo-Devo, examines how changes in developmental processes drive evolutionary transformations. Rather than treating genetic mutations and natural selection as the primary forces, Evo-Devo emphasizes the role of deeply conserved regulatory mechanisms in shaping biological diversity. Unfazed by the challenge of the aforementioned ancient genes, Evo-Devo researchers have proposed various explanations for their existence and persistence. Here are six of their leading hypotheses, along with their justifications and possible rebuttals:

1. Pre-Adaptation (Exaptation)

Argument: Exaptation is the process by which a trait originally evolved for one function is later repurposed for another (Gould & Vrba, 1982). Neo-Darwinists argue that genes like Hox and Pax6 may not have originally evolved for the roles they play today but were gradually co-opted into regulatory networks controlling body plan development (True & Carroll, 2002). These genes were not "waiting" for the Cambrian explosion but were already being selected for other developmental roles. When conditions favored greater complexity, these pre-existing genes facilitated rapid diversification.
Rationale: Evolutionary pathways do not always proceed directly toward their eventual outcomes. Instead, genes often serve one function before taking on another. The same genetic architecture might have had adaptive significance in simpler, ancestral organisms, allowing them to be retained until more complex morphologies became possible. Example: Pax6 is present in species that lack complex eyes. Evolutionary biologists propose that it may have initially played a more general role in sensory or neural development before being recruited for eye formation (Gehring & Ikeo, 1999).

Rebuttal: This explanation assumes that a gene's future function was incidental to its past function, yet the high level of regulatory coordination required for (and embedded within) Hox genes—many millions of years before their full, inherent potential was realized—demands a degree of foresight that cannot be accounted for by exaptation. More critically—and central to this and all other Evo-Devo arguments—**how could these**

sophisticated regulatory networks have emerged fully functional without the gradual, stepwise refinement that classical Darwinism demands?

---

2. Pleiotropy and Co-option

Argument: Regulatory genes often serve multiple functions (pleiotropy), meaning they may have originally evolved for simpler roles before being co-opted for more complex body plan development (Carroll, 2000). These genes could have initially controlled basic cellular differentiation or patterning before being adapted for more elaborate structures.
Rationale: Evolution frequently repurposes existing genetic components. The recruitment of pre-existing genes into new developmental roles is well documented, such as in the evolution of vertebrate limbs from fish fins (Shubin et al., 1997). Hox genes, for example, could have had primitive roles in early metazoans before being co-opted into axial patterning during the Cambrian period (Ryan et al., 2007).

Rebuttal: The lack of direct evidence showing a gradual repurposing weakens this argument. And the notion that highly specific and intricately ordered regulatory sequences could be randomly "repurposed" without destabilizing development is deeply problematic. Moreover, if Hox genes initially governed only minor traits, what mechanism allowed them to assume control over entire body plans without producing dysfunctional intermediates?

---

3. Incremental Complexity via Gene Duplication and Modification

Argument: Gene duplication events provide raw material for evolution. Over time, duplicated genes can acquire new functions while retaining old ones, leading to increasingly complex body plans (Ohno, 1970).
Rationale: The presence of multiple Hox clusters in vertebrates compared to simpler animals suggests a history of duplications followed by a divergence in function (Holland et al., 1994). For example, the four Hox clusters in vertebrates are thought to have originated from a single ancestral cluster through genome duplications, allowing for the fine-tuning of developmental processes Kuraku et al., 2009).

Rebuttal: While gene duplication explains redundancy, it does not explain the sudden functional integration of duplicated genes into highly structured developmental programs. If duplication alone were responsible, one would expect to see more evidence of transitional forms with incomplete body plans—yet the fossil record shows abrupt shifts rather than gradual refinements.

---

4. Neutral Evolution and Genetic Drift

Argument: Some regulatory sequences persisted in ancient lineages not because they provided an immediate advantage but because they were neutral—neither harmful nor beneficial (Kimura, 1968). Over time, these genes may have acquired useful roles as complexity increased.
Rationale: The neutral theory of molecular evolution suggests that many genetic changes accumulate by

chance rather than selection (Kimura, 1983). This model allows for the presence of "pre-adaptive" genes that had no initial purpose but were later recruited into functional roles. Example: Hox genes may have existed in early metazoans without initially conferring an advantage, but as organisms evolved, these genes became essential for organizing more complex body plans (Levinton, 2008).

Rebuttal: First, the Hox gene had already embodied the ability to serve a useful role millions of years before it would actually do so. So the argument merely begs the question. Secondly, the neutral evolution argument fails to explain why such intricate genetic regulatory systems would remain conserved for hundreds of millions of years without selective pressure to preserve them. If they had no function, they should have accumulated mutations and degraded rather than remaining intact across vast evolutionary timescales.

5. Fitness Landscapes and Developmental Constraints

Argument: Evolution operates within a constrained "fitness landscape," where certain genetic configurations naturally lead to viable biological forms (Wagner, 2005). Ancient genetic toolkits like Hox and Pax6 may represent highly conserved solutions to common developmental challenges (Carroll, 2008).
Rationale: The convergent evolution of similar body plans across distantly related organisms suggests that developmental constraints limit the range of possible solutions (Gould, 1977). These constraints may have favored the early establishment of regulatory genes that have remained largely unchanged.

Rebuttal: While developmental constraints help explain why certain body plans might persist, they do not even begin to account for their primordial origin.

---

6. Epigenetics and Gene Regulation

Argument: The regulation of gene expression, rather than changes to gene sequences themselves, played a major role in early evolution (Jablonka & Lamb, 2005). Epigenetic mechanisms, such as DNA methylation and histone modification, allowed ancient genes to remain quiescent until activated under the right conditions (Bird, 2002).
Rationale: Many genes can remain dormant for generations before being "switched on" in response to environmental triggers. This provides a mechanism by which ancient genetic sequences could have been conserved without immediate function (Bonasio et al., 2010).

Rebuttal: Epigenetics explains how genes can be suppressed or activated but does not account for their origin or the remarkable specificity of their later functions. It also fails to explain how entire regulatory networks remained intact for millions of years without being lost due to genetic drift or mutational erosion.

Where Evo-Devo Falls Short

Each attempt to explain the existence of ancient genes shifts the burden of explanation without actually addressing the core issue. It's like describing a disappearing coin magic trick by listing the magician's tools rather than explaining the actual sleight of hand. Instead of providing a clear, mechanistic account, Evo-Devo proponents rely on abstract terms and jargon that create an illusion of confident understanding. As Newman

(2016) notes, "The predominant reliance on gene regulatory networks and natural selection to explain the origination of organismal form amounts to a form of circular reasoning: the existence of such networks is taken as given, but their origins, and the reasons for their particular architectures, are rarely addressed in mechanistic terms" (p. 3). In other words, when you strip away the terminology, Evo-Devo explanations do little more than repackage the problem rather than resolve it. Instead of explaining how a fully functional regulatory system could emerge in isolation from its intended use, Evo-Devo resorts to obfuscation—dressing up a glaring contradiction in layers of mumbo jumbo that do nothing to resolve the unresolvable.

BOTTOM LINE: Fully developed blueprints for advanced life forms existed when only the most primitive organisms inhabited the Earth. This isn't just a challenge to neo-Darwinian theory—it might be a death blow.

Nature's Evolutionary Foresight

Pax6 existed in primitive organisms that had no complex eyes, proving it wasn't built incrementally for vision. And its conservation across all bilaterians (~600 million years ago) unambiguously demonstrates it was prepared and waiting for future deployment, rather than evolving *in response to* environmental factors. Genetic networks like Pax6, in other words, were constructed *in anticipation* of their future deployment.

Their primordial existence, fully intact *in situ*, can only mean that the evolution of Pax6 and other genetic networks was **purposeful and proactive**—there is no way around this! Something had to have driven their formation toward an eventual purpose—an anticipatory capability embedded within Nature itself.

How do we resolve this?

What we seek is a way that Nature directs biological systems toward higher-order complexity. We need, specifically, to account for the **preemptive assembly** of genetic frameworks that anticipate future structures and functions. We need an overarching law-like principle capable of guiding evolution toward functional innovations long before, and beyond, any role that natural selection has to play.

To make much headway, we'll need a suitable approach. The first thing to recognize is that the question of how life evolved is as much a logistical problem as a scientific one. As such, we must identify starting assumptions from which we can construct a solid conceptual foundation, the first of which is a definition:

> ***Nature*: *that which is responsible for everything, including itself.***

This definition positions Nature as the ultimate arbiter of all physical laws, processes, and phenomena—evolution included. It excludes appeals to supernatural forces, ensuring that any explanation remains within the bounds of scientific inquiry.

Next, we must establish a set of working assumptions. In this case, what it is that we say *with certainty* about the process of biological evolution? They are as follows:

- All living things are built from the same fundamental components (amino acids, DNA, RNA, proteins, and so forth). This uniformity underscores life's common ancestry and highlights that evolutionary change is ultimately a reshuffling of these building blocks in ways that proved successful and sustainable across generations.

- The fossil record mirrors and chronicles the evolutionary process. Fossils document life's emergence, diversification, and increasing complexity over billions of years. This vast body of evidence is irrefutable proof that **evolution happened**, revealing an unbroken lineage from the earliest organisms, such as cyanobacteria, to the astonishing diversity of life we see today.

- Life's instructions are encoded at the molecular level within each organism's self-contained hereditary machinery (genome and epigenome).

- The instructions within the genome are biochemically executed and transmitted to subsequent generations through reproduction.

- All heritable changes in living things over time are directly linked to physical modifications within each organism's genomic instructions.

- Random genetic fluctuations are the one and only source of variability driving the evolutionary process.

Taken together, these principles reinforce a central tenet**:** Evolutionary change is governed by modifications to an organism's genome and epigenome, with all variability—mutations, genetic drift, horizontal gene transfer, etc.—ultimately reshuffling molecular components to drive biological complexity in some particular manner.

Evolution, then, is fundamentally a process of genetic transformation.

Next, let's establish a neutral theoretical framework—one that objectively considers the biological data as it stands. From there, we'll work backward, tracing the logistical pathways that could have led to the evolutionary outcomes we observe today. Rather than forcing the data to fit a predefined model, this approach treats evolution as a puzzle to solve, viz. What underlying mechanisms must have been at play for life to have unfolded as it demonstrably has (in rapid bursts; without transitional forms in the fossil record)?

The Cambrian Explosion

This was the defining event for evolution. For billions of years, life remained relatively simple—single-celled organisms, sponges, and simple aquatic creatures dominated the biosphere. Then, **around 540 million years ago**, something remarkable happened:[2]

✓ Entirely new body plans (arthropods, mollusks, chordates) emerged in a stunningly brief period.

[2] The Cambrian Explosion spanned approximately 20 to 25 million years—a mere blink of an eye in the history of life.

- ✓ Complex life forms appeared fully functional, with no clear transitional forms leading up to them.
- ✓ The ecological and environmental triggers for this sudden explosion of complexity remain largely unidentified, challenging conventional gradualist explanations.

All evidence suggests that speciation occurred in large, discrete leaps, with tens of thousands of diverse organisms appearing abruptly and without clear fossil evidence of gradual development (Marshall, 2006). The transitions were anything but gradual—new species emerged suddenly, defying the expectations of a stepwise evolutionary process. This pattern is not unique to the Cambrian—much later, flowering plants seemingly emerged out of nowhere, leaving paleontologists at a loss to trace their origins (Friis et al., 2011). Darwin himself found this abrupt appearance deeply troubling, famously referring to the origin of flowering plants as "an abominable mystery" due to the absence of clear ancestral forms in the fossil record (Darwin, 1879).

This raises a critical question: What could account for the sudden emergence of drastically unique phenotypes during the Cambrian explosion? The obvious—and only—answer to how new species could have appeared practically "out of thin air" is through **gene regulation**. After all, the genetic blueprints were already there—just inactive. This provides at least a partial explanation: the explosion of species diversity occurred when pre-existing, previously suppressed genetic blueprints were activated, producing dramatic biological transformations. Nature had quietly assembled the genetic instructions for higher-order organisms *in the dark* (hence, Noctogenesis), withholding their expression until conditions—both internal (organismal development) and external (environmental factors like oxygenation)—were optimal for their deployment.

As previously discussed, the raw genetic material for complex body plans was present long before the Cambrian. Besides Hox and Pax6, which we met earlier, key signaling pathways such as Wnt, which govern cellular differentiation and tissue patterning, were also primordially in place, patiently waiting to do their thing. Equally crucial were gene regulatory networks (GRNs), the hierarchical systems that orchestrate the activation of developmental genes. These networks dictate when and where genes are expressed, ensuring the precise coordination of morphological development (Carroll, 2005).

The **controlled activation of pre-existing developmental programs**, silently accumulating for millions of years, is the only viable explanation for the sudden appearance of new species during the Cambrian Explosion. No other mechanism sufficiently accounts for both the evidence of genetic continuity and the abruptness of morphological innovation. In essence, **the Cambrian Explosion was not a sudden genetic upheaval but the large-scale activation of long-prepared evolutionary scripts.**

The Next Question: *Why Was Complexity the Result?*

Understanding that gene regulation unlocked the Cambrian Explosion solves part of the mystery—but it raises an even deeper question. If life's genetic instructions had been accumulating for tens of millions of years, why did their activation result in such an explosion of complexity rather than a chaotic mix of random traits? How could ancient, pre-assembled genetic instructions consistently lead to highly sophisticated biological machines? How was this not simply impossible!?

If evolution is driven solely by mutations that are haphazard, indiscriminate, and void of direction, how did Nature produce intricately engineered toolkits like Pax6, neverminding the astonishingly sophisticated creatures that followed?

We can reach no other conclusion: **Genetic fluctuations are not directionless.** Nature must operate through a deeper, anticipatory process**—**one that unmistakably exhibits foresight.

I know, I know … we've strayed into creationism and intelligent design territory. And this, understandably, makes scientists very uncomfortable. *But here we are—this is where the facts have inexorably led us.*

Foresight In Evolution

How could foresight arise in a process inarguably governed by randomness? The answer is both inescapable and, in retrospect, quite obvious: **randomness *itself* must come in some other form.** A higher-order of randomness must exist to channel genetic fluctuations toward increasing complexity in a way that is anything but blind.

Contrary to common belief, randomness does exist in two fundamentally different forms: classical and quantum (Bricmont, 1995; Gisin, 2014). Yet the scientific community and public alike continue to use the term "random" interchangeably for both, as if they were conceptually identical. This is not just misleading—it is a travesty that has obscured a fundamental truth about evolution for over a century. By conflating these two distinct forms of randomness, mainstream evolutionary theory has painted an erroneous picture of how genetic fluctuations can behave.

The assumption that all mutations are the product of strictly classical randomness is not just an oversight—it is a fundamental misrepresentation of reality. A closer examination reveals that genetic change does not necessarily unfold as a series of haphazard, meaningless accidents but can be shaped by an underlying quantum-driven dynamic that subtly guides evolution's trajectory.

How did we let such a crucial distinction go unnoticed? And more importantly, what does it mean for our understanding of evolution if randomness itself is not as random as we once thought?

The Duality of Randomness

On the one hand, coin flips, dice rolls, and lottery drawings are examples of *classical* randomness. By classical we mean that provided sufficient information about their initial conditions, their outcome is potentially predictable. We'll also refer to this as *extrinsic* or *pseudo* randomness.

For example, if we know all the details—mass, force applied, atmospheric conditions, etc. —we can accurately predict the outcome of a coin flip as either heads or tails. Likewise, the random character of a lottery drawing is apparent only when our knowledge of its initial conditions is incomplete. Whether the apparatus is a computer algorithm, or a mechanical device filled with bouncing ping-pong balls, the outcome is predictable if we have complete information about the initial conditions and forces at play.

Unlike its classical counterpart, **quantum randomness is unpredictable in principle**, i.e. impossible to predict no matter the circumstances or how much information we might have (Heisenberg, 1958; Dirac, 1930). We'll also call this intrinsic (or genuine) randomness. Radioactive decay, electron spin and light polarization, for example, are quantum/genuinely random events and can never be predicted. But why?

You might wonder if the inability to predict implies a lack of crucial information about the atom itself, or perhaps its environment. Not the case. No matter how much we know about the initial conditions, when a radioactive atom will decay cannot be predicted and remains inherently unknowable (Born, 1926). Unlike classical coin flips or lottery drawings, non-classical events like radioactive decay lack an antecedent causal basis (Heisenberg, 1927). Quantum events are categorically unpredictable because **their cause is not just unknowable, but non-existent**.

There can only be one explanation for the intrinsic randomness of quantum phenomena: they must be inherently *acausal*—they simply happen. When a photon of light strikes a half-silvered mirror, it has a 50-50 chance of being either reflected back or passing straight through (Feynman, 1985). While unlikely, in a series of ten trials, the photon could pass straight through the mirror all ten times. However, if we repeat the experiment a million times, the distribution will stabilize and invariably approach 50-50 (Ball, 2018).

We might ask, 'What *caused* the photon to pass through the mirror ten times in a row?'—but that would be meaningless, because *nothing caused it*. However, the question, 'Why do photons follow the 50-50 rule in large trials?' is not meaningless. While both phenomena are acausal, the latter invites us to explore the deeper relationship between quantum mechanics and the probabilistic nature of reality.

If the preceding discussion of intrinsic randomness as being **uncaused** strikes you as shocking, you're not alone. Indeed, the very notion of something occurring without any cause defies our imagination. Nothing, after all, happens without something preceding to cause it, right? Yet quantum randomness undeniably exists. And no matter how counterintuitive—or even unscientific—something being uncaused may seem, it might explain how evolution unfolded in an insightful, purposeful manner.

This raises a critical and related question:

Could mutations also be intrinsically random—uncaused in the same way as quantum events? And if so, how might these *quantum mutations* differ from classical ones?

Quantum Physics Meets Biology

Quantum mechanics, the cornerstone of modern physics and well-established since the 1920s and invaluable in so many applications, is seldom integrated into fundamental biological research. One reason is that few biologists have the requisite training in mathematics and physics to explore its potential impact on biological processes. Even biochemists, whose work closely borders on quantum mechanics, rarely incorporate non-classical theories or methods into their research. Besides, even the most accomplished theoretical physicists struggle to comprehend the perplexing nature of their own field.

The principles of quantum mechanics, such as the uncertainty principle, wave-particle duality, and non-locality, depict a reality that seems fundamentally at odds with our unshakable conception that biological entities are deterministically constructed and causally interact. It might seem reasonable, therefore, for biologists to conclude that quantum mechanics plays, at best, a minor role in living things. Not to mention that to study quantum phenomena physicists require extreme conditions like near-vacuums and temperatures close to absolute zero. In the absence of these conditions, quantum phenomena cannot survive long enough to study.

Such thinking fuels a misguided assumption: if it can't be achieved in the lab, then Nature is similarly constrained when it comes to living systems. Accordingly, scientists frequently cite the delicate nature of quantum phenomena, like quantum coherence, to cast doubt on their relevance in biological systems (Engel et al., 2007). Until recently, the prevailing view had been that quantum effects are likely negligible or even non-existent in the "warm, wet, and noisy" milieu of living cells (Ball, 2011).[3]

While such reservations might have been justifiable twenty-five years ago, they are no longer defensible today. To illustrate, in 2004 physicist Paul Davies (Director of the BEYOND Center for Fundamental Concepts in Science at Arizona State University) bemoaned the lack of evidence that quantum forces play a significant role in the workings of living systems (Davies, 2004):

> There have been many claims that quantum mechanics plays a key role in the origin and/or operation of biological organisms, beyond merely providing the basis for the shapes and sizes of biological molecules and their chemical affinities.… The case for quantum biology remains one of “not proven.” There are many suggestive experiments and lines of argument indicating that some biological functions operate close to, or within, the quantum regime, but as yet no clear-cut example has been presented of non-trivial quantum effects at work in a key biological process.

Writing in 2009, a scant five years later, Davies conveys a far less reserved view:

> There is accumulating and tantalizing evidence that quantum mechanics plays a key role here and there in biology. What is lacking is any clear case for a general “quantum life principle” that might offer a new conceptual framework in which the remarkable properties of living systems can be understood, as Schrödinger and others hoped (Davies, 2009).

And then, just one year later, in 2010:

> My feeling is that nature has had billions of years to evolve to the 'quantum edge' and will exploit quantum efficiencies where they exist, even if the payoff is relatively small. I suspect that *many biological nanostructures can be understood fully only by reference to quantum coherence, tunneling, entanglement and other non-trivial processes.* The challenge is to identify such quantum goings-on amid the complex and noisy environment of the cell (Davies, 2010). (*My italics*)

---

[3] Such skepticism, however, underestimates the capabilities of *Nature*—defined, again, as "*that which is responsible for everything, including itself*." It's important to remember that Nature and the non-classical realm are inextricably linked. As we will explore, Nature has indeed found ways to harness quantum phenomena in biological processes. The astonishing efficiency with which it shapes nearly flawless biological machines is one testament to this.

Today, quantum biology is a thriving field on the verge of making dramatic breakthroughs. Research has demonstrated that fundamental quantum processes—such as superposition, tunneling, and entanglement—are actively at play in biological systems, overturning long-held assumptions that such effects would be disrupted by the dynamic, coherence-destroying conditions within living cells (McFadden & Al-Khalili, 2018).

Clarice Aiello, at the forefront of research on quantum effects in biology, leads the Quantum Biology Tech (QuBiT) Lab at UCLA, where she investigates how electron spin dynamics influence biological function (Aiello, 2023). Her pioneering research contributed to the formation of the Quantum Biology Institute, an interdisciplinary initiative dedicated to advancing quantum biological research through collaboration among physicists, biologists, and engineers. The institute's mission is to explore how quantum effects shape biological systems, bridging the gap between physics and the life sciences. Its activities to date include cutting-edge experiments in bio-magnetoreception and quantum-assisted enzymatic reactions, with upcoming projects aimed at designing quantum biosensors capable of detecting and manipulating quantum states in vivo (Hughes-Castleberry, 2023).

Empirical Evidence for Quantum Effects in Biology

While once considered implausible, quantum effects have been empirically demonstrated in several biological domains:

- **Photosynthesis: Quantum Coherence and Energy Efficiency**
  Photosynthetic organisms demonstrate remarkable efficiency in transferring light energy into chemical energy. Experiments have shown that excitons (energy packets) within photosynthetic complexes travel in a wave-like manner, simultaneously sampling multiple pathways before settling on the most efficient route (Engel et al., 2007). This phenomenon—known as quantum coherence—challenges classical models, which predict a less efficient, purely thermodynamic energy transfer process.
- **Enzyme Catalysis: Quantum Tunneling in Biological Reactions**
  Enzymes accelerate biochemical reactions beyond the limits imposed by classical chemistry. A growing body of research suggests they accomplish this by leveraging **quantum tunneling**, wherein subatomic particles bypass energy barriers that would otherwise be impassable under classical physics (Klinman & Kohen, 2013). Without such mechanisms, many biochemical reactions essential for life would be far too slow.
- **Avian Navigation: Quantum Entanglement and Magnetoreception**
  Certain migratory birds rely on Earth's magnetic field for navigation, an ability that remains unexplained by classical physics. Research has shown that cryptochrome proteins in bird retinas contain electron pairs that respond to magnetic fields through a quantum entanglement-based mechanism (Ritz et al., 2000). This process allows birds to detect and orient themselves to magnetic field lines, highlighting yet another biological adaptation that hinges on quantum principles.
- **Olfaction: Quantum Vibrational Sensing**
  The traditional lock-and-key model of smell posits that odorants are recognized based on molecular shape. However, evidence suggests that olfactory receptors also detect vibrational frequencies via quantum tunneling (Turin, 1996; Franco et al., 2011). This vibrational theory of olfaction implies that

quantum processes enhance sensory perception, reinforcing the idea that evolution has incorporated quantum effects in highly specific ways.

The intersection of quantum mechanics and biology aligns with Noctogenesis which posits that non-classical forces not only play a critical role in the functioning of living things, but are positioned to fundamentally shape evolution as well.

Entropy and Syntropy

Entropy, the universal tendency toward disorder, works relentlessly to destroy life (Schrödinger, 1944). Syntropy (proposed here as entropy's antithesis) strives to increase order and vitality (Fantappiè, 1942). Just as entropy does not do anything to bring about randomness and disorder in the universe, neither does syntropy explicitly advance its own reciprocal agenda of fostering organization and order. Yet, these two forces—or tendencies—operate in an eternal struggle, bringing both balance and directionality to the course of evolution.

Whereas entropy leads to dispersal and disorder, syntropy represents a counterforce—one that fosters structure, coherence, and self-organization. The fact that evolution produces beautifully engineered biological machines rather than a chaotic mess implies that something biases genomic alterations toward functional, integrated structures. That something is syntropy, which biases variation toward outcomes that are statistically more likely to be evolutionarily constructive. It does not dictate specific results but increases the probability that genetic fluctuations will collectively produce biologically advantageous traits.

Life is guided along its developmental path by syntropy—not as a result of environmental pressures and natural selection, but rather *despite* them. Evolution is not the product of scattershot genetic hiccups subjected to environmental filtering, selection pressures, and population dynamics; rather, it unfolds passively through the expression of syntropic biopotentiality.

The Problem of Latent Genetic Potential

The solution to the Hox (et al.) paradox should now be coming into focus: if mutations can arise quantum-mechanically, they may be influenced by non-classical forces like syntropy, which biases genetic variation toward increasing functionality, structural refinement, and physiological optimization. This guiding influence ensures that evolutionary advancements are coordinated, highly functional innovations that enhance the viability and adaptability of evolving organisms. Crucially, any improvements must remain inactive until all necessary components are in place and capable of functioning together. This enables what we'll call "multi-threaded" development, where multiple interdependent traits evolve can in parallel, latently, rather than sporadically and half-baked. As a result, evolutionary transitions unfold cohesively, avoiding the disjointed, piecemeal changes that would otherwise threaten a species' ongoing viability.

Consider, for example, the evolution of internal gestation in mammals. The development of a placenta, hormonal regulation, immune suppression to prevent maternal rejection, and live birth all had to emerge together in a coordinated fashion (Blackburn, 2015). A partial transition—such as an early placenta without the necessary hormonal support—would be maladaptive or even fatal (Carter & Mess, 2017). However, if the genetic instructions for these interdependent traits accumulated but remained unexpressed until all necessary components were in place, internal gestation could emerge as a fully functional system rather than through a series of non-viable intermediates (Lynch & Wagner, 2008). This exemplifies how multi-threaded development, guided by syntropy, allows evolutionary transitions to unfold without generating developmental dissonance, which would otherwise compromise viability and/or reproductive success.

Similarly, echolocation in bats and dolphins requires a suite of highly specialized and coordinated traits: the ability to emit high-frequency sound waves, an auditory system capable of detecting and processing returning echoes, neural adaptations to interpret spatial information, and behavioral modifications to use this sensory input effectively (Jones & Teeling, 2006). If any of these features had evolved in isolation—such as ultrasonic vocalization without the ability to perceive its reflections—it would have provided no evolutionary advantage (Simmons et al., 2010). Instead, these elements must remain latent until the full echolocation system could function cohesively.

Quantum Mutagenesis

Even if we accept that evolution harnesses not only classical but also intrinsic randomness, we must still ask: *How does any of this actually happen?* More specifically: *What possible mechanism could allow Nature to tap into quantum-level indeterminacy in a way that not only influences but actively refines evolutionary trajectories?*

For starters, genes—the molecular blueprints of life—exist at *microscopic scales* where quantum effects are significant (McFadden & Al-Khalili, 2014). This direct susceptibility to quantum-dynamical forces provides Nature with a means to shape biological evolution beyond the constraints of classical processes.

It is no coincidence that genes, by virtue of their submolecular scale, are inherently susceptible to quantum-level influences. Nor is it mere happenstance that sexual reproduction features a built-in mechanism—meiosis—that presents the perfect opportunity for such influences to act. With recombination and crossing-over (among others??) reshuffling genetic material, Nature has, in effect, laid out the conditions for quantum forces to shape evolution in ways that *could* potentially transcend blind chance. At the genetic level, mutations need not be purely reactive responses to the immediate environment but may instead emerge from higher-order, non-classical influences that might thereby guide evolutionary progression.

Several quantum effects could play a crucial role in evolution. These include:

- ✓ **Quantum Tunneling** – Protons within DNA bases can tunnel between tautomeric forms, leading to spontaneous mutations.
- ✓ **Tautomeric Shifts via Proton Transfer** – Quantum fluctuations can alter hydrogen bonding patterns, causing transient base-pair mismatches and potential mutations.
- ✓ **Electron Delocalization and Charge Transport** – Electron mobility along DNA strands influences molecular stability, repair mechanisms, and mutation rates.
- ✓ **Spin States and Radical Pair Mechanisms** – Quantum spin dynamics play a role in biochemical reactions, potentially affecting DNA repair and mutagenesis.

- ✓ **Wavefunction Superposition in Base-Pair Selection** – Some propose that quantum superposition may transiently influence base-pairing fidelity before decoherence resolves a final state.
- ✓ **Quantum Entanglement in Biomolecular Processes** (speculative) – Some researchers hypothesize that entanglement between molecules may play a role in enzymatic efficiency or genetic information processing.

Nature, that which is responsible for everything, might employ these processes to bias outcomes toward structural coherence, functional viability, and long-term adaptability within evolving organisms. One thing, however, is certain: the astonishing fruits of evolution *in and of themselves* demand an equally astonishing etiology. The forces responsible must surely lie beyond the realm of classical physics, which offers no conceivable mechanism for anticipating future needs and delivering the necessary innovations as Nature has been shown to do.

Because we're about to jump into the quantum realm with both feet, things are going to get even weirder and more speculative very quickly…

The Dilemma of Two Physics

Before we take this analysis any further, we should step back and recognize a fundamental truth: reality itself—much like randomness—**comes in two flavors**: the **classical** and **quantum** (Bohr, 1935). These realms are governed by separate and distinct principles, each with its own set of rules, behaviors, and constraints (Heisenberg, 1958). The classical domain, which governs the macroscopic world of everyday experience, operates on the principles of causality, determinism, and locality. It is governed by Newtonian mechanics, subject to entropy, and intuitively makes sense. The microscopic quantum domain, by contrast, is fundamentally probabilistic, acausal, and makes almost no sense at all.

	Classical	**Quantum**
Predictive Power	Approximate	Precise
Conceptual Framework	Intuitive	Non-intuitive
Mathematical Formalism	Deterministic	Probabilistic
Existential Domain	Macroverse	Microverse
Existential Expression	Actuality	Potentiality
Native Randomness	Pseudo (causal)	Genuine (acausal)
Driving Force	Entropy	Syntropy
Foundational Force	Causality	Expectancy
Mutagenesis	Extrinsic (seen)	Intrinsic (unseen)
Evolutionary Process	Reactive (Darwinian)	Proactive (Noctogenic)

Understanding the differences between classical and quantum reality is crucial to addressing the deficiencies inherent in classical evolutionary theory. If mutations can arise intrinsically—i.e., unconstrained by causality—then evolutionary change need not be the slow, blind process Darwin envisioned. Instead, genetic complexity can arise strategically, and accumulate latently, guided not by selection alone but by **expectancy**, a concept we will explore in greater detail in a future paper.

Interpreting Non-Classical Physics

Quantum mechanics is arguably the most successful scientific theory ever devised, underpinning everything from semiconductor technology to the fundamental nature of reality itself. Yet, despite its unparalleled predictive accuracy, it remains profoundly counterintuitive—so much so that more than a dozen competing interpretations have been proposed just in an attempt to explain what QM actually means (Tegmark & Wheeler, 2001). This level of theoretical fragmentation is unprecedented in fundamental science, highlighting just how bizarre and elusive quantum reality truly is (Schlosshauer, 2007).

Some of the leading interpretations of Quantum Mechanics include Copenhagen, Many-Worlds, Quantum Bayesianism, and Superdeterminism. Another, the Transactional Interpretation (TI), stands out—not only for its explanatory power but also for the theoretical support it lends to Noctogenesis.

The Transactional Interpretation (TI)

First proposed by physicist John G. Cramer in the 1980s, TI offers a unique perspective on quantum mechanics—yet it remains largely overlooked in favor of more mainstream alternatives such as Copenhagen and Many-Worlds (Cramer, 1986). This lack of recognition is both puzzling and unwarranted, given TI's conceptual elegance and explanatory depth (Cramer, 2016). Even more significant is its later refinement, the Possibilist Transactional Interpretation (PTI), developed by Ruth Kastner, which expands its potential relevance to understanding non-classical influences in biological evolution (Kastner, 2012).[4]

A Two-Way Exchange

TI builds upon an earlier idea introduced by Wheeler and Feynman in their absorber theory of electrodynamics (Wheeler & Feynman, 1945). This framework challenged the traditional notion of one-way causality by proposing that electromagnetic interactions involve a time-symmetric exchange of waves, meaning that influences can travel both forward and backward in time (Wheeler & Feynman, 1949). Cramer extended this idea into the quantum realm, suggesting that every quantum event is established through a "handshake" between waves propagating forward in time (from an emitter) and waves propagating backward in time (from an absorber) (Cramer, 1986).

[4] Kastner's work further extends TI into the Relativistic Transactional Interpretation (RTI), which adapts the framework to quantum field theory, incorporates a more rigorous treatment of spacetime, and addresses concerns regarding Lorentz invariance. It is this writer's view that Kastner's work warrants the Transactional Interpretation being a leading interpretation of QM rather than a trailing one.

Kastner refines this by rejecting the notion of backward-in-time propagation, arguing instead that the process occurs in a pre-spatiotemporal domain where time, as we understand it, has not emergent (Kastner, 2012). In her Possibilist Transactional Interpretation (PTI), quantum events are not determined by retrocausal signaling but by a selection process occurring within this realm of potentiality, where offer and confirmation waves represent possible interactions that resolve into actualized outcomes within spacetime (Kastner, 2015).

Unlike the Copenhagen interpretation (Bohr, 1928), which relies on an ad hoc "collapse" of the wavefunction upon measurement, TI provides a physical mechanism for this process—one that maintains the integrity of quantum mechanics without requiring an external observer to force an outcome. Crucially, TI also implies the Born rule rather than assuming it as an independent postulate. The Born rule states that the probability of a particular quantum outcome is given by the square of the amplitude of its corresponding wavefunction. In most interpretations, this rule is simply accepted without explanation. However, in TI, it follows naturally from the way offer and confirmation waves establish a transaction, providing a concrete basis for why quantum outcomes adhere to a probabilistic distribution. This makes TI a more self-contained interpretation, addressing a foundational question that other models leave unresolved (Kastner, 2012).

Cramer, this writer believes, stumbled by bringing time into the picture at all. While his model employed a backward-in-time confirmation wave, some physicists argue that time itself may not be fundamental in the quantum realm. This issue was raised by critics such as Louis Marchildon, who argued that Cramer's formulation lacked empirical support and did not provide a necessary improvement over standard quantum mechanics (Marchildon, 2006). As a result, TI struggled to gain mainstream acceptance, with many favoring interpretations that either sidestepped retrocausality or adhered to more conventional—but arguably less explanatory—models. This is where Kastner's Possibilist version of TI takes a crucial step forward.

The Possibilist Transactional Interpretation (PTI)

PTI refines and extends Cramer's original model by addressing a critical issue: the reality of quantum possibilities before they are actualized. Unlike standard TI, which remains tied to a fully time-symmetric view, PTI asserts that there exists a realm of quantum possibility outside of space-time—a domain where all potential outcomes exist as real but non-actualized possibilities (Kastner, 2015). This is a profound shift. Most mainstream interpretations of quantum mechanics, even those that reject wavefunction collapse, assume that "reality" only consists of what is actualized in space-time.

Kastner, however, makes a critical distinction: possibilities themselves are real—even before they materialize into definite outcomes. Kastner refers to this domain as *Quantumland*, an abstract, pre-spatiotemporal realm where quantum possibilities exist prior to selection (Kastner, 2018). In this view, the wavefunction is not merely a mathematical abstraction—it represents a genuine pre-reality that guides the emergence of actualized outcomes.

The Teleoverse

Life did not arise from an inanimate universe by mere chance. It emerged once conditions were primed for naturally self-organizing molecular machines to take shape, unfolding within an organic soup meticulously prepared by Nature for that very purpose.

All of life arose not as a product of blind trial-and-error but in the wake of syntropy, drawing from a supraphysical realm we'll call the **teleoverse**—an endless sea of quantum potentiality where every possible biophysical mechanism and form is virtually represented.

Just as *Quantumland* is a realm of undifferentiated possibilities from which physical reality emerges, the teleoverse is a vast, supraphysical domain where the full spectrum of biological potentiality resides. Both exist beyond space and time as we know them, serving as repositories for anything and everything that *could* be, long before transactions crystallize any specific outcomes.

The teleoverse is not a physical space, nor is it bound by the familiar constraints of time and causality. It is a supraphysical field of potentiality. Unlike classical evolutionary models that depict change as an accumulation of random mutations filtered by natural selection, the teleoverse provides a fundamentally different mechanism—one that does not depend on the improbable luck of haphazard genetic accidents. Instead, the latent blueprints for future biological structures *preexist as possibilities* within this timeless realm. These possibilities do not emerge arbitrarily; they cohere around syntropic attractors—principles that bias evolution toward increasing functional complexity and viability.

In this framework, evolution is not merely a historical process shaped by environmental pressures but an anticipatory system that taps into an inexhaustible reservoir of biological potential. The teleoverse serves as Nature's grand inventory—a limitless domain where every possible configuration of life exists as a latent possibility. From this vast wellspring of potential, only syntropically viable configurations emerge, not through strict causality, but through the principle of *expectancy*—a directional tendency embedded within the very fabric of evolution.

This perspective revolutionizes our understanding of biological change. Rather than imagining evolution as an aimless process driven by stochastic mutation, the teleoverse suggests a structured, ordered unfolding—one in which life does not merely react to circumstances but follows an implicit trajectory toward coherence and higher-order organization. Evolution, far from being conventionally random, is the realization of limitless potential woven by Nature into the fabric of life itself.

PTI and Noctogenesis: A Natural Affinity

Kastner's Possibilist Transactional Interpretation (PTI) provides a conceptual bridge between quantum physics and Noctogenesis. Just as quantum systems exist in a superposition of possibilities before collapsing into a definite state, so too does evolution operate within a landscape of pre-existing potentialities, selecting from them in accordance with syntropic constraints. Both describe a realm of pure potentiality that exists outside of space and time awaiting actualization in the physical world. However, whereas the teleoverse is framed in biological terms—describing the latent potential for evolutionary innovations—Quantumland is a more general ontological framework encompassing all quantum events, biological or otherwise.

In some respects, the Teleoverse parallels the **Many-Worlds interpretation** of quantum mechanics, which posits that quantum events do not "collapse" in the traditional sense but instead lead to a branching of reality, where all possible outcomes resolve into separate, non-communicating universes (Everett, 1957). With every quantum interaction—every superposition that would otherwise require a collapse—a new universe emerges, each following a different trajectory dictated by one of the possible outcomes (DeWitt, 1970). Many physicists are drawn to MWI because it makes the fewest assumptions—eliminating the need for a special collapse mechanism—and its mathematical formalism remains clean and self-consistent, aligning more naturally with the Schrödinger equation (Wallace, 2012).[5]

Rather than an infinite series of diverging timelines, however, the Teleoverse represents a boundless landscape—one that is **preexisting but not actually existing**. Unlike Many-Worlds, it does not "branch" into existence but instead contains all possibilities as ever-present, non-spatiotemporal potentialities.

Resolving Paradoxes

The fundamental question remains:

How does nature consistently arrive at functional, viable organisms rather than degenerating into evolutionary dead ends?

PTI provides a compelling clue: just as quantum interactions do not simply "collapse" arbitrarily—but instead negotiate outcomes from a field of pre-existing possibilities—so too might evolution operate through the intrinsic selection of syntropically favorable potentialities arising from the teleoverse, in this case a wellspring of morphogenetic possibilities to be instantiated in an organism's encoded genome as Nature sees fit.

In short, Noctogenesis proposes that evolution unfolds in a way analogous to PTI's offers and confirmations. By recognizing the ontological reality of possibility outside of space-time, Kastner's framework provides theoretical support for the teleoverse concept and, by extension, the role of syntropy and expectancy in evolution—where expectancy, rather than the Born rule per se, biases which biological potentialities become actualized.

According to Noctogenesis, evolution is not simply a reactive process but a structured, anticipatory unfolding of biological potential. This shift in perspective *naturally* resolves many of the long-standing paradoxes in evolutionary theory, including:

- **The Cambrian Explosion** – Complex body plans appeared abruptly in the fossil record when latent genetic architectures were expressed as conditions enabled their viability.

[5] Physicist David Mermin cleverly quipped that the Many-Worlds interpretation is "cheap on assumptions, but expensive on universes."

- **The lack of compelling transitional forms** – Transitional forms are absent because they never existed; indeed, they never *could* have existed, as they would have been non-viable works in progress.
- **The absence of "failed experiments"** – Evolution does not generate incomplete, non-viable forms.
- **The rapid emergence of complex traits** – Complex traits arise swiftly because genetic changes accumulate latently, remaining unexpressed until all necessary components are in place.
- **Evolutionary "leaps"** –Unique and widely-varied species emerge fully-formed through Noctogenesis.
- **Convergent evolution** – Similar traits evolve independently in different lineages because certain biological solutions are optimal. Nature repeatedly arrives at these solutions by drawing from a shared reservoir of latent genetic potential in the teleoverse.
- **Punctuated equilibrium** –Long periods of evolutionary stability followed by rapid bursts of change are expected under Noctogenesis.
- **Irreducibly complex biological systems** – Can only be explained by an anticipatory, multi-threaded developmental process to ensure that all necessary components emerge in structural and functional coordination.
- **Rapid environmental adaptation** – Latent genetic potential can be activated in response to changing environmental conditions, allowing for swift and precise adaptation without reliance on slow, trial-and-error mutations.
- **The ubiquity of sexual reproduction** – Despite its costs, sexual reproduction persists as a fertile ground for fostering advantageous genetic fluctuations through mechanisms like recombination and crossing over.

Evidence Supporting Noctogenesis

If Noctogenesis is correct, then we should expect abundant evidence of evolutionary changes occurring in a structured, anticipatory manner—favoring the simultaneous emergence of interdependent traits that no gradualistic process could plausibly produce. Here are four particularly compelling examples:

1. The Cambrian Explosion

Darwin himself recognized the Cambrian Explosion as a major challenge to gradualism, and while various hypotheses have been proposed (as discussed earlier), none adequately explain why the genetic foundations for this event would have been in place millions of years beforehand. Noctogenesis, however, does.

2. An Aquatic Flatworm

The flatworm *Microstomum lineare* has a remarkable relationship with its freshwater neighbor, the hydra (Weis, 2010). Hydra are equipped with nematocysts—microscopic, harpoon-like stinging cells used to ensnare and immobilize prey, much like those found in jellyfish (Tardent, 1995). While *M. lineare* also possesses nematocysts, it did not evolve them directly. Instead, it acquires these stinging cells by ingesting hydra and repurposing their nematocysts for its own defense (Marques & Collins, 2004).

What makes this process extraordinary is that *M. lineare* does not digest the hydra's nematocysts. Instead, it integrates them into its own tissues and relocates them—intact—from its gut to its outer skin, where they become its primary defense mechanism. This complex biological process allows *M. lineare* to absorb and repurpose the nematocysts without harming them or itself (Kass-Simon & Scappaticci, 2002).

That this simple flatworm has evolved a mechanism to bypass its own digestive processes while safeguarding these foreign cellular structures from harm is astonishing in itself. But *M. lineare* goes even further. Somehow, it transports the nematocysts through its body—likely via its muscular and/or nervous system—to their final destination within its skin, where they serve as a functional defense. Given that nematocysts are primed to fire upon the slightest disturbance, their intact ingestion and relocation should be outright impossible. The fact that *M. lineare* accomplishes this feat could make it one of the most improbable biological adaptations ever observed.

Researchers have barely begun to unravel the sophistication of this process. Yet even in its incompleteness, it raises serious questions about how such an intricate mechanism could have emerged through a series of haphazard genetic fluctuations shaped solely by natural selection. How did *M. lineare* acquire the ability to extract and repurpose nematocysts while avoiding accidental triggering? How were the necessary internal transport mechanisms established? Why did these mutations not prove disabling or even lethal in their early, incomplete forms?

No matter how much time natural selection may have had, the emergence of this process through purely incremental, trial-and-error mutations remains implausible. There is no clear Darwinian pathway that could even remotely account for the seamless coordination of digestion suppression, cellular transport, and functional integration. That this astonishing biological feat exists at all suggests that something far more extraordinary was at play in the evolutionary process.

3. The Botfly

The botfly (*Hypoderma lineatum*) presents a striking challenge to gradualist evolution, as its reproductive strategy relies on a suite of interlocking adaptations that must work in concert to succeed. This parasitic insect, roughly the size of a bumblebee, cannot approach cattle directly to deposit its eggs, as the herd will flee or even stampede at its presence. Instead, the botfly has evolved an ingenious workaround: it captures houseflies, secures them, and attaches its eggs to their abdomens before releasing them to continue their normal behavior, which includes alighting on the backs of cattle to drink their sweat.

The process is astonishingly rich and highly specialized. After seizing a housefly—sometimes even in mid-air—the botfly carefully positions the insect to attach roughly two dozen eggs to its abdomen. The act is meticulously performed:

- ✓ The payload's weight must be carefully adjusted to avoid overburdening the housefly, ensuring it can still fly effectively.
- ✓ The eggs must be evenly distributed to maintain aerodynamic stability.
- ✓ A biological adhesive (glue) is secreted to securely fasten the eggs to the housefly's body. Once the eggs have been attached, the botfly releases the housefly, which resumes its normal behavior (Bennett, 1962).

Upon sensing the heat of the warm-blooded host upon which the botfly has landed, the botfly eggs quickly hatch and drop onto the unsuspecting cow, where the larvae immediately begin to burrow through the animal's tough hide. They embed themselves within the host's tissues, feeding and developing in a precise, time-regulated cycle (Hall & Smith, 1993). Shielded from external threats, the larvae spend three months growing inside the cow's body,. When fully developed, they emerge from the skin and drop to the ground, where they burrow into the soil. After a final maturation phase, an adult botfly emerges, ready to repeat the process.

The botfly's life cycle poses a formidable challenge to stepwise evolution. None of these adaptations would confer a naturally-selectable advantage unless the others were already in place. This entangled dependency results in an unsolvable chicken-and-egg dilemma—one that incremental adaptation cannot plausibly explain:

- Did the larvae first develop the ability to sense body heat, or the ability to bore through the host's tough hide? One without the other is useless: if the larvae cannot burrow, they cannot survive; if they cannot sense heat, they may never drop onto that warm-blooded animal at all.
- Did the botfly first evolve the ability to capture houseflies, or the glue to attach its eggs? If the glue came first, what purpose did it serve before the botfly had a way to deliver any eggs? If it evolved the ability to catch flies first, what was the advantage in isolation? Moreover, why on earth would the botfly have perfected the ability to capture the lightning-quick and agile housefly *in the first place*?

Each of the aforementioned adaptations is essential for the reproductive cycle as a whole to function. How could the botfly's precisely synchronized adaptive mechanisms have evolved incrementally when classical Darwinian evolution requires that each step provide an independent selective advantage before becoming fixed in the population? The answer is clear—it couldn't have.

4. The Jewel Wasp (*Ampulex compressa)*

Sporting an impressive iridescent coat and on the smallish side for a wasp, *A. compressa* preys upon the common American cockroach (Libersat & Gal, 2014). But unlike most predators, which kill and consume their prey outright, this parasitoid wasp instead requires a durable, living food source to sustain its larva throughout development.

Her goal is to maneuver a fully alive cockroach to the bottom of a concealed burrow, where she will lay a single egg upon it. That she stings and incapacitates her prey is no surprise—many predators do the same. But what happens next is far more bizarre: the much larger cockroach, too heavy for the wasp to drag herself, is compelled to walk into its own grave.

The attack begins with two highly specialized stings: The first is delivered to the cockroach's thorax, paralyzing the front legs. The roach, unable to hold itself upright, collapses forward. The second sting is far more remarkable: the wasp precisely injects venom directly into the cockroach's brain. The wasp does not simply render the cockroach immobile—it reprograms its neural circuits, triggering profound behavioral changes (Gal et al., 2005). The venom does not affect locomotion itself; the cockroach is still physically capable of walking. What it can no longer do is initiate movement on its own. Its escape reflex is gone and it no longer perceives itself as being in danger. The cockroach has become a passive host—alive but unresponsive.

After being stung, the cockroach enters a state of compulsive grooming, meticulously scrubbing itself for roughly half an hour—plenty of time for the wasp to prepare its burrow. Once completed, *A. compressa* returns to the roach and chews off half of its antennae, drinking some of the seeping hemolymph. Then, she tugs at the remaining stump, leading the cockroach towards the burrow as if walking a reluctant dog on a leash (Fouad et al., 1996). Upon reaching the bottom, the wasp lays a single egg on the cockroach's leg and then seals the entrance with small stones and debris. The cockroach, still alive and fully intact, does not even attempt to escape.

After the wasp larva hatches, it will consume the cockroach in a precise sequence, feeding on non-vital tissues first and saving the internal organs for last. This ensures that the host remains alive for as long as possible, maximizing the larva's access to fresh, living food (Weisel-Eichler et al., 1999). The wasp's venom does even more than just subdue and zombify—it metabolically acts to preserve the host for her offspring. The toxin slows the cockroach's metabolism, reducing energy consumption and water loss, thereby extending its viability (Gal, R., & Libersat, F. 2010).

The specificity of this interaction suggests a precisely encoded, massively complex genetic program, where multiple traits—from the wasp's astoundingly specific neurotoxic venom composition to the larva's propensity to avoid vital organs when feeding—must operate in unison. That such a perfectly engineered predatory machine could have evolved through a fortuitous series of genetic accidents is preposterous.

Conclusion

Modern evolutionary theories—whether Neo-Darwinism, Neutral Theory, or the Extended Evolutionary Synthesis—remain trapped within a classical framework, where change unfolds through incremental steps, dictated by chance and selection. This mechanistic view cannot account for the staggering complexity of life, nor can it explain how the intricate blueprints for entire body plans existed long before they were realized.

Classical physics has no capacity for such foresight—no principle within its laws can account for Nature's ability to preassemble complexity and hold it in reserve for future use. For that, we must turn to the non-classical realm—quantum randomness and syntropy, in particular—which holds the key to breaking deterministic constraints and enabling the kind of anticipatory processes evolution requires.

The only scientific alternative to a supernatural designer is a *naturally anticipatory* process—one whereby Nature somehow "sees ahead," encoding vastly complex, latent potential into genomes, waiting for the right conditions to bring them to fruition. **This isn't theoretical. This is what happened.**

Compelled to look beyond the classical, we must ask whether this "other reality"—the quantum world—holds anything powerful enough to make the impossible possible. It turns out, it does. Quantum mechanics, through phenomena like quantum tunneling, defies even nature's own constraints. In the quantum realm, entities routinely cross energy barriers they should not be able to surmount—not through force, but through probabilistic behavior, as their wave function extends beyond the barrier itself. This is the very principle that allows transistors to function, enabling modern computing, cell phones, and MRI technology. The same quantum laws that shape our digital world may also drive the intricate, seemingly magical process of biological evolution.

But is quantum mechanics the final frontier, or merely a stepping stone to something even deeper? I frequently use the term 'non-classical' rather than 'quantum' for a reason. While quantum mechanics offers a profound conceptual leap from classical physics, we cannot assume it represents the full breadth of Nature's reality. There could be a still deeper and more fundamental domain—one that transcends even quantum mechanics, perhaps as decisively as quantum theory transcended Newtonian physics. By using 'non-classical,' I leave room for that possibility: a richer, more expansive reality—one that governs Nature's workings beyond our current models.

A challenge this paper has aimed to resolve is how novel body plans emerged so abruptly during the Cambrian Explosion. Ironically, the answer has been hiding in plain sight all along in the exquisite, almost otherworldly process of *metamorphosis*. Within the fleeting caterpillar, the genetic instructions for an entirely different body plan—one that does not yet exist—are already encoded (Gilbert et al., 2000). When the time is ripe, unseen regulatory mechanisms activate these instructions, dissolving old structures and orchestrating a transformation unlike any other in biology (Meredith et al., 2013).

Metamorphosis is not a process of continuous, externally visible development, like the growth of a developing fetus. Instead, it is one of dissolution and reassembly—a fluid reinvention carried out in suspended animation. Evolutionary leaps follow a similar concealed trajectory: detailed instructions for perfectly engineered biological forms lie encoded within ancient genes, awaiting the right conditions to be unleashed and set in motion.

The amazing wealth of creatures we see today are not the products of blind trial and error but of a non-classical manifestation of primal—perhaps even unfathomable—forces capable of drawing upon possibility itself to make life not just happen, but to flourish in spectacular ways.

In the end, Noctogenesis doesn't so much theorize as it describes. While so many details remain elusive, it may offer a useful perspective to better understand the mysterious process of evolution.

References

Abbott, D., Davies, P. C. W., & Pati, A. K. (2008). *Quantum aspects of life*. Imperial College Press.

Aiello, C. D. (2023, May 10). *It's time to take quantum biology research seriously*. Physics.

Arndt, M., Juffmann, T., & Vedral, V. (2009). Quantum physics meets biology. *HFSP Journal, 3*(6), 386–400.

Arthur, W. (2004). *Biased embryos and evolution*. Cambridge University Press.

Ball, P. (2018). *Beyond weird: Why everything you thought you knew about quantum physics is different*. University of Chicago Press.

Ball, P. (2011). Physics of life: The dawn of quantum biology. *Nature, 474*(7351), 272–274.

Beebe, W. (1953). The role of instinct in the evolution of myiasis-causing Diptera. *Evolution, 7*(2), 127-143.

Bejerano, G., Pheasant, M., Makunin, I., Stephen, S., Kent, W. J., Mattick, J. S., & Haussler, D. (2004). Ultraconserved elements in the human genome. *Science, 304*(5675), 1321-1325.

Bennett, G. F. (1962). The influence of host species on the development of *Hypoderma lineatum* (Diptera: Oestridae) larvae. *Canadian Journal of Zoology, 40*(7), 1113-1120.

Bird, A. (2002). DNA methylation patterns and epigenetic memory. *Genes & Development, 16*(1), 6-21.

Blackburn, D. G. (2015). Evolution of vertebrate viviparity and placentation: Where next? *Placenta, 36*(1), S6-S14.

Bohr, N. (1928). The quantum postulate and the recent development of atomic theory. *Nature, 121*, 580-590.

Bohr, N. (1935). Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Physical Review, 48*(8), 696-702.

Bonasio, R., Tu, S., & Reinberg, D. (2010). Molecular signals of epigenetic states. *Science, 330*(6004), 612-616.

Born, M. (1926). Quantum mechanics of collision processes. *Zeitschrift für Physik, 37*, 863-867.

Bricmont, J. (1995). Science of chaos or chaos in science? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 775*, 131-175.

Brookes, J. C. (2017). Quantum effects in biology: Golden rule in enzymes, olfaction, photosynthesis and magnetodetection. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 473*(2201), 20160822.

Carter, A. M., & Mess, A. (2017). Evolution of the placenta in eutherian mammals. *Annual Review of Animal Biosciences, 5*, 593-615.

Carroll, S. B. (1995). Homeotic genes and the evolution of arthropods and chordates. *Nature, 376*(6540), 479-485.

Carroll, S. B. (2000). Endless forms: The evolution of gene regulation and morphological diversity. *Cell, 101*(6), 577-580.

Carroll, S. B. (2005). *Endless forms most beautiful: The new science of Evo Devo and the making of the animal kingdom*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Carroll, S. B. (2008). Evo-devo and an expanding evolutionary synthesis: A genetic theory of morphological evolution. *Cell, 134*(1), 25-36.

Catts, E. P. (1982). Biology of New World botflies: Cuterebridae. *Annual Review of Entomology, 27*, 313-338.

Conway Morris, S. (2003). *Life's solution: Inevitable humans in a lonely universe*. Cambridge University Press.

Cramer, J. G. (1986). The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics, 58*(3), 647-688.

Cramer, J. G. (2016). *The quantum handshake: Entanglement, nonlocality, and transactions*. Springer.

Darwin, C. (1879). Letter to J.D. Hooker, July 22, 1879. In F. Darwin (Ed.), *The life and letters of Charles Darwin*. John Murray.

Davidson, E. H. (2006). *The regulatory genome: Gene regulatory networks in development and evolution*. Academic Press.

Davidson, E. H., & Erwin, D. H. (2006). Gene regulatory networks and the evolution of animal body plans. *Science, 311*(5762), 796-800.

Davies, K. T., Cotton, J. A., Kirwan, J. D., & Rossiter, S. J. (2013). Parallel signatures of echolocation adaptation in the genomes of bats and toothed whales. *Nature, 502*(7470), 228-231.

Davies, P. (2004). *The cosmic blueprint: New discoveries in nature's creative ability to order the universe*. Templeton Foundation Press.

Davies, P. C. W. (2004). Does quantum mechanics play a non-trivial role in life? *BioSystems, 78*(1–3), 69–79.

Davies, P. C. W. (2009, July). The quantum life. *Physics World*, 22(7), 24–28.

Davies, P. C. W. (2010). [Comment on quantum biology]. *Physics World*.

Davies, P. C. W. (2019). *The demon in the machine: How hidden webs of information are solving the mystery of life*. Allen Lane.

DeWitt, B. S. (1970). Quantum mechanics and reality. *Physics Today, 23*(9), 30-35.

Dirac, P. A. M. (1930). *The principles of quantum mechanics*. Oxford University Press.

Dobzhansky, T. (1970). *Genetics of the evolutionary process*. Columbia University Press.

Duboule, D. (2007). The rise and fall of Hox gene clusters. *Development, 134*(14), 2549-2560.

Einstein, A. (1936). Physics and reality. *Journal of the Franklin Institute, 221*(3), 349-382.

Engel, G. S., Calhoun, T. R., Read, E. L., Ahn, T.-K., Mančal, T., Cheng, Y.-C., Blankenship, R. E., & Fleming, G. R. (2007). Evidence for wavelike energy transfer through quantum coherence in photosynthetic systems. *Nature, 446*(7137), 782–786.

Everett, H. (1957). "Relative state" formulation of quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics, 29*(3), 454-462.

Fantappiè, L. (1942). *Principi di una teoria unitaria del mondo fisico e biologico* [Principles of a unified theory of the physical and biological world]. Humanitas.

Feynman, R. P. (1965). *The character of physical law*. MIT Press.

Feynman, R. P. (1985). *QED: The strange theory of light and matter*. Princeton University Press.

Franco, M. I., Turin, L., Mershin, A., & Skoulakis, E. M. C. (2011). Molecular vibration-sensing component in *Drosophila melanogaster* olfaction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108*(9), 3797–3802.

Friis, E. M., Pedersen, K. R., & Crane, P. R. (2011). *Early flowers and angiosperm evolution*. Cambridge University Press.

Gehring, W. J., & Ikeo, K. (1999). Pax6: Mastering eye morphogenesis and evolution. *Trends in Genetics, 15*(9), 371-377.

Gisin, N. (2014). "Quantum Chance: Nonlocality, Teleportation, and Other Quantum Marvels." Springer.

Gould, S. J. (1977). *Ontogeny and phylogeny*. Harvard University Press.

Gould, S. J., & Vrba, E. S. (1982). Exaptation—A missing term in the science of form. *Paleobiology, 8*(1), 4-15.

Heisenberg, W. (1927). Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik [On the perceptible content of quantum theoretical kinematics and mechanics]. *Zeitschrift für Physik, 43*, 172-198.

Heisenberg, W. (1958). *Physics and philosophy: The revolution in modern science*. Harper & Brothers.

Holland, P. W. H., Garcia-Fernàndez, J., Williams, N. A., & Sidow, A. (1994). Gene duplications and the origins of vertebrate development. *Development, 1994*(Supplement), 125-133.

Hughes-Castleberry, K. (2023, June 5). *Legitimizing the field of quantum biology: An interview with Dr. Clarice D. Aiello*. Inside Quantum Technology.

Hunter, P. (2006). A quantum leap in biology: One inscrutable field helps another, as quantum physics unravels consciousness. *EMBO Reports, 7*(10), 971–974.

Kastner, R. E. (2012). *The transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics: The reality of possibility*. Cambridge University Press.

Kastner, R. E. (2015). *Understanding our unseen reality: Solving quantum riddles*. Imperial College Press.

Kastner, R. E. (2018). Quantumland: A relational, possibilist framework for reality. *Foundations of Physics, 48*(2), 160-177.

Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The origins of order: Self-organization and selection in evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Kimura, M. (1968). Evolutionary rate at the molecular level. *Nature, 217*(5129), 624-626.

Kimura, M. (1983). *The neutral theory of molecular evolution*. Cambridge University Press.

Kuraku, S., Meyer, A., & Kuratani, S. (2009). Timing of genome duplications relative to the origin of vertebrates: Did cyclostomes arise before or after? *Molecular Biology and Evolution, 26*(1), 47-59.

Laland, K. N., Uller, T., Feldman, M. W., Sterelny, K., Müller, G. B., Moczek, A., Jablonka, E., & Odling-Smee, J. (2014). Does evolutionary theory need a rethink? *Nature, 514*(7521), 161-164.

Laland, K. N., Uller, T., Feldman, M. W., Sterelny, K., Müller, G. B., Moczek, A., Jablonka, E., & Odling-Smee, J. (2015). The extended evolutionary synthesis: Its structure, assumptions, and predictions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 282*(1813), 20151019.

Levinton, J. S. (2008). The Cambrian explosion: How do we use the evidence? *BioScience, 58*(9), 855-864.

Libersat, F., & Gal, R. (2014). Wasp manipulation of cockroach behavior via the modulation of neurotransmitter receptors. *Insect Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, 48*, 17-24.

Libersat, F., Kaiser, M., & Gal, R. (2018). Neuroparasitology: How parasites manipulate host behavior. *Current Biology, 28*(23), R1183-R1194.

Long, M., Betrán, E., Thornton, K., & Wang, W. (2003). The origin of new genes: Glimpses from the young and old. *Nature Reviews Genetics, 4*(11), 865-875.

Lynch, M. (2007). *The origins of genome architecture*. Sinauer Associates.

Lynch, V. J., & Wagner, G. P. (2008). Resurrecting the role of development in the evolution of placental mammals. *Evolution, 62*(6), 1486-1499.

Maeda, K., Henbest, K. B., Cintolesi, F., Kuprov, I., Rodgers, C. T., Liddell, P. A., Gust, D., Timmel, C. R., & Hore, P. J. (2008). Chemical compass model of avian magnetoreception. *Nature, 453*(7193), 387–390.

Marchildon, L. (2006). Causal loops and collapse in the transactional interpretation of quantum mechanics. *Physics Essays, 19*(3), 422-429.

Marshall, C. R. (2006). Explaining the Cambrian "explosion" of animals. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 34*, 355-384.

Marques, A. C., & Collins, A. G. (2004). Cladistic analysis of Medusozoa and the evolution of cnidarian life cycles. *Evolution & Development, 6*(6), 331-345.

Maudlin, T. (2011). *Quantum non-locality and relativity: Metaphysical intimations of modern physics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

McFadden, J. (2000). *Quantum evolution: How physics' weirdest theory explains life's biggest mystery.* HarperCollins.

McFadden, J., & Al-Khalili, J. (1999). A quantum mechanical model of adaptive mutation. *BioSystems, 50*(3), 203–211.

McFadden, J., & Al-Khalili, J. (2014). *Life on the edge: The coming of age of quantum biology*. Crown Publishing.

McFadden, J., & Al-Khalili, J. (2018). The origins of quantum biology. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 474*(2220), 20180674.

McMahon, A. P., Ingham, P. W., & Tabin, C. J. (2003). Developmental roles and clinical significance of Hedgehog signaling pathways in mammals. *Nature Reviews Genetics, 4*(6), 469-479.

Meredith, P., Salazar-Ciudad, I., & Marden, J. H. (2013). The evolution and development of insect metamorphosis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 368*(1610), 20120465.

Müller, G. B. (2017). Why an extended evolutionary synthesis is necessary. *Interface Focus, 7*(5), 20170015.

Newman, S. A. (2016). Inherency and agency in the origin and evolution of biological form. *Frontiers in Physiology, 7*, 456.

Noble, D. (2013). Physiology is rocking the foundations of evolutionary biology. *Experimental Physiology, 98*(8), 1235-1243.

Noble, D. (2016). *Dance to the tune of life: Biological relativity*. Cambridge University Press.

Ohno, S. (1970). *Evolution by gene duplication*. Springer.

Ponting, C. P., Armstrong, J., Fryxell, K. J., & Rubin, G. M. (2011). Evolution of noncoding DNA and the role of selection. *Annual Review of Genomics and Human Genetics, 12*, 275-299.

Ryan, J. F., Baxevanis, A. D., et al. (2007). The evolution of early animal body plans: Hox, ParaHox, and the origin of complexity in the metazoan body plan. *Developmental Biology, 305*(2), 490-502.

Sancar, A., Lindsey-Boltz, L. A., Unsal-Kaçmaz, K., & Linn, S. (2004). Molecular mechanisms of mammalian DNA repair and the DNA damage checkpoints. *Annual Review of Biochemistry, 73*, 39-85.

Schlosshauer, M. (2007). *Decoherence and the quantum-to-classical transition*. Springer.

Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What is life? The physical aspect of the living cell*. Cambridge University Press.

Shapiro, J. A. (2011). *Evolution: A view from the 21st century*. Pearson Education.

Shapiro, J. A. (2016). Nothing in evolution makes sense except in the light of genomics. *Annual Review of Genetics, 50*, 1-30.

Shubin, N., Tabin, C., & Carroll, S. (1997). Fossils, genes, and the evolution of animal limbs. *Nature, 388*(6643), 639-648.

Tautz, D., & Domazet-Lošo, T. (2011). The evolutionary origin of orphan genes. *Nature Reviews Genetics, 12*(10), 692-702.

Tegmark, M., & Wheeler, J. A. (2001). 100 years of quantum mysteries. *Scientific American, 284*(2), 68-75.

Truman, J. W., & Riddiford, L. M. (1999). The origins of insect metamorphosis. *Nature, 401*(6752), 447-452.

Wallace, D. (2012). *The emergent multiverse: Quantum theory according to the Everett interpretation*. Oxford University Press.

Weinberg, S. (1992). *Dreams of a final theory: The scientist's search for the ultimate laws of nature*. Pantheon Books.

West-Eberhard, M. J. (2003). *Developmental plasticity and evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Zimmer, C. *Parasite Rex: Inside the Bizarre World of Nature's Most Dangerous Creatures.* Free Press; 2000.

Zimmer, C. *Evolution: The Triumph of an Idea.* Harper Perennial; 2006.

Zimmer, C. *Microcosm: E. coli and the New Science of Life.* Pantheon Books; 2008.

Zimmer, C. (2013, July 16). The surprising origins of life's complexity. *Quanta magazine*.

Zumpt, F. (1965). *Myiasis in man and animals in the Old World*. Butterworths.