



HEIKKI J.  
PATRONEN

# RICHARD DAWKINS' THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF LIFE THE RISE AND FALL

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE BY CHANCE IS  
A FICTION BASED ON EXISTING LIFE

A PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAY

RICHARD DAWKINS' THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF LIFE  
THE RISE AND FALL



HEIKKI J. PATRONEN

**RICHARD  
DAWKINS'  
THEORIES OF THE  
ORIGIN OF LIFE  
THE RISE AND FALL**

**THE ORIGIN OF LIFE BY CHANCE IS A FICTION BASED  
ON EXISTING LIFE**

**A PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAY**

© 2025 Patronen, Heikki  
Taitto: Books on Demand  
Kustantaja: BoD · Books on Demand,  
Mannerheimintie 12 B, 00100 Helsinki, bod@bod.fi  
Kirjapaino: Libri Plureos GmbH, Friedensallee 273, 22763 Hampuri, Saksa  
ISBN: 9789528912408

**DEDICATED TO ALL PEOPLE WHO ARE INTERESTED  
IN THE EXISTENCE OF GOD**



## Content

TO THE READER .....	8
I FICTIONAL ORIGIN OF LIFE AND CHANCE .....	10
II VIRTUAL LIFE AND ITS BIRTH .....	17
III COPYING LIFE .....	19
IV. THE MECHANICAL ORIGIN OF LIFE .....	20
V THE CONCRETE ORIGIN OF LIFE .....	23
VI CONCLUSIONS .....	27
THANKS .....	31



# TO THE READER

Hardly anything is more important than what we know about the existence of God (or whether we know anything about it).

Philosophers and scientists have spent centuries on this problem, without solving it one way or the other.

Philosophical arguments proving the existence of God have been presented in a serious sense ever since ancient times. However, they are invariably stuck in the dense webs woven by philosophers.

As a result, the debate between the two sides has become an emotional 'yes it is-no it isn't' argument. In addition, the Enlightenment and the Darwinism of the naturalistic worldview has buried all the rational arguments for the existence of God.

However, I think that this problem is limited to one view, namely the origin of life. No sensible solution to this issue has been found (although plenty of absurd ones have). The question is perfectly logically correct, i.e. whether a mere dead, unknown, unidentifiable and also unconscious substance is the origin of life, or is it after all born from a soulful, intellectual and conscious personal principle.

There must be a logical and intellectually satisfactory answer to this question, in particular because there are only two alternatives. I have set against each other the only possible and a completely impossible process concerning the origin of life. This is the only way to solve the issue. I have drawn on Richard Dawkins' theories on the origin of life, because he will accept almost any evidence that shows that the materialistic worldview is the one and only correct one. Is Dawkins' evidence sustainable or not. This is up to each of my readers to decide for themselves.

Dawkins is an excellent populariser of science and a brilliant writer who certainly knows the noble art of manipulation. He knows how to mix fact

and fiction in such a way that we lose sight of the ultimate truth in imaginary space.

Dawkins can also humanise biology as evidenced by the “selfish gene”. Would “angry cell ” also be an appropriate word for a cancer cell ? Why not?

Dawkins makes man a god to man, according to the principles of the Enlightenment, and even an eternal being capable of solving all unsolved scientific questions.

However, he comes to the sceptical and irrational conclusion that “nobody knows” about the origin of life, Dawkins’ theories are based on philosophical materialism, but are they also destroyed by this materialism? This will become clear in this philosophical essay. Sapere aude !

# I FICTIONAL ORIGIN OF LIFE AND CHANCE

Before the appearance of matter, there was nothing, because matter came from nothing, not from nowhere (contrary to what the ancient natural philosophers assumed. This same idea continued until the present day). This matter also existed, of course, before life in all its possible forms and this matter was not only dead but also of an unknown nature and could not have been identified by anything (except by someone who has the faculty of recognition).

No matter what level and from what angle you examine this dead matter: as gases, atoms, particles or even smaller things, it has certain characteristics, necessary properties that are a consequence of its inanimate nature. This matter does not have any experience of existence, nor can it identify anything that is or is not born into it. Because the identification of creatures is impossible, they do not exist for this matter either. For identification can only be done by an intelligent being with the necessary abilities. Does matter exist or not? it is not possible to be certain of this from the matter itself. It is clear, however, that, before the existence of man and of life, matter certainly existed. But for matter itself, this is irrelevant, because everywhere there is the eternal infinity of death, which nothing unconscious and inanimate can change.

However, this completely dead matter should be able to give birth to life by itself but, as a result of human and speculative thinking, it is no longer a question of dead matter but of something else: matter with magical abilities: chemical evolution, i.e. the self-replicating molecules of primordial matter (chemical evolution = the dead helping the dead to spring to life and survive with human help) and so on, almost indefinitely. How did these

The author is a Finnish  
non-fiction writer and  
intellectual historian.

**BoD**



9 789528 912408