



HAL
open science

Intelligent characteristics of potential microbial life during the LHB

Ian von Hegner

► **To cite this version:**

Ian von Hegner. Intelligent characteristics of potential microbial life during the LHB. 2022. hal-03761132v1

HAL Id: hal-03761132

<https://hal.science/hal-03761132v1>

Preprint submitted on 25 Aug 2022 (v1), last revised 18 Sep 2022 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Intelligent characteristics of potential microbial life during the LHB

Ian von Hegner

Future Foundation Assoc.

Egedal 21

DK-2690 Karlslunde

Abstract The 'disparitas conjecture' states that unicellular life may be common in the galaxy, but that multicellular life might be rare in comparison. A variation of this is that unicellular life may be common in the galaxy, but that intelligent life is rare. However, microbial life can and does indeed display characteristics of intelligence. Thus, in this work it has been investigated how life potentially could have endured through the Late Heavy Bombardment (LHB) through intelligent strategies such as decision making, association and anticipation, communication and self-awareness. At the LHB there would be for microbial life an unpredictable environmental fluctuation regarding pools of amino acids, lipids and fluids available when impacts and reimpacts launched organisms into new habitats. Thus, evolutionary strategies must have been favored that could stretch the available external and internal resources as long and as efficiently as possible. Thus, inclusive fitness or kin altruism could have emerged, where organisms adapt to acquire energy and nutrients from siblings who voluntarily autolysed in order to replenish the amino acid pool for their kin. A further strategy could also evolve where members of the same species can recognize each other and actively isolate themselves from other species, which allows them to utilize the amino acid pool better. Thus, the organisms will potentially be able to survive for a long time in these ways until new impacts launch them to new spots with amino acid pools. There has thus been an alternating increase and decrease in the number of organisms during this localized planetary reseeded and life may have endured this way until the bombardments were over. Thus, if a world inhabited only by analogous of bacteria, archaea and protists is located elsewhere in the galaxy, then this does not exclude the existence of intelligent life there.

Keywords: astrobiology, bacterial altruism, localized planetary reseeded, the Hadean.

1. Introduction

Whether there is life elsewhere in the galaxy and beyond is a much discussed topic, marked according to how probable the emergence of life and its subsequent evolution is considered to be. Yet, an ongoing search for exoplanets and exomoons with conditions suitable for life as we know it, and a search for worlds actually having life, is taking place.

In the search for life elsewhere, the informal middle position has emerged which states that unicellular life may be common in the galaxy, but that multicellular life might be rare in comparison. This 'disparitas conjecture' or 'disparitas hypothesis' may be the reason for the silence we observe when we search the galaxy for traces of technosignatures such as radio transmissions. After all, in the majority of the Earth's history life has existed in the form of unicellular life, and is, in fact, still the dominant, and in terms of reproductive fitness, the most successful lifeform known, existing in virtually all terrestrial habitats.

In a natural extension of the discussion about life elsewhere is the discussion about intelligent life elsewhere. Thus, an occasionally heard variation of this middle position is the view that unicellular life may be common in the galaxy, but that intelligent life is rare. This seemingly trivial variation is important to address, as it follows that if during a search for intelligent life one locates a world where only microbial life exists, then this excludes that there is intelligent life on that world. This has non-trivial implications, in that to say that microbial life is common and yet conclude that intelligent life is rare is self-contradictory.

Thus, in microbiology an attitude converges towards that microbial life indeed can and does display characteristics of intelligence. While a single microbial organism can be said to be an automaton (which may itself be debatable), macromolecular networks can confer intelligent characteristics in microbial organisms. Thus, microbial organisms do indeed display characteristics of intelligence such as: decision making, association and anticipation, self-awareness, robust adaptation, and problem solving capabilities [Westerhoff et al., 2014]. If a world is located where only microbial life thrives, then the probability of intelligent characteristics with this life is also high. So the conceptual distinction between microbial life and intelligent

life is a misnomer in the debate that should be moved away from, and a more precise terminology regarding the search for life elsewhere is required.

Life can display intelligent characteristics in many different situations. To illustrate this, a scenario relevant to astrobiology can be chosen. The Earth has been impacted ever since its formation approximately 4.5 billion years ago, although the frequency and size of these impactors have declined since the Late Heavy Bombardment (LHB) [Reyes-Ruiza et al., 2012]. This event, which may have been due to discrete early, post-accretion and later, planetary instability – driven populations of impactors [Bottke and Norman, 2017], began approximately 4 billion years ago and is estimated to have ended 3.8 billion years ago, although some evidence indicates that terrestrial impacts did not cease but rather waned gradually until approximately 3.0 billion years ago [Lowe et al., 2014].

While much remains to be elucidated regarding the details, an autonomous cell with a high degree of certainty existed on the Earth 3.5 billion years ago, in the Archean Eon [Schopf et al., 2007], dated to span between 3.8 and 2.5 billion years ago [Coenraads and Koivula, 2007]. Yet, the chemical evolution leading to this life were probably not a single event; instead, the transition from chemistry to biology was a gradual series of thresholds of increasing complexity over time [von Hegner, 2021]. Thus, some lines of evidence point to the emergence of life occurring earlier, between 4.1 to 3.5 billion years ago [Bell et al., 2015], in the Hadean Eon, dated from the end of the Earth's accretion until 3.8 billion years ago [Coenraads and Koivula, 2007].

The Hadean and early Archean world was in many ways an alien world compared to the current Phanerozoic world. Thus, the presence and composition of primitive continents at that time have been under intense debate. A study estimates that the few very large impactors that impacted the Earth would have resurfaced less than 25% of the planet's surface, meaning that most of the crust was not melted or thermally metamorphosed to a significant degree [Abramov and Mojzsis, 2009]. Another study has suggested that a large landmass had existed on the Hadean world, with an environment which could have included nearly all geochemical conditions that favor the chemical evolution of life [Maruyama et al., 2013].

Several hypotheses regarding where and how life could have arisen have been put forward over time. Life could, for example, may have started at hydrothermal vents at the ocean floor, but it could also have started at shallow ponds in what has been called Deamer's 'hot little puddle' [Damer, 2019], a modern version of Darwin's 'warm little pond'.

If life indeed existed in the period when the LHB took place, then the LHB must have had an influence on life, and life must have faced scenarios differently from later times. One of them is that at the LHB the incoming impactors would mean that for the organisms there was an unpredictable fluctuation of available building material, or in other words that there would be a depletion of a pool of amino acids, lipids and fluids available for a cell. Thus, it can be puzzling how life fared through this period.

There are many variables at play here, and many microbial strategies may have been at play and tested through the LHB. Yet, the LHB has been able to provide an environmental pressure different from anything else life has experienced on this planet. However, the evolutionary responses can be described and predicted, and the impact dynamics can be described and predicted, their interaction during this period may have yielded strategies different from anything else life has experienced, which could have pushed life through a unique survival course that has not been seen since in the same scale. Thus, in the following it will be looked at how life could potentially have managed through this period through strategies that displayed intelligent characteristics.

2. Discussion

In this article, Section 3 introduces the LHB and impact rate. Section 4 introduces the effect of the LHB from a life perspective. Section 5 introduces the course of action which life must have taken due to the restraints of the bombardment. Section 5.1 highlights the selection of organisms that can endure the longest. Section 5.2 highlights the evolution of altruism, a characteristic of intelligence. Section 5.3 highlights the evolution of cooperation, a characteristic of intelligence. Section 6 clarifies how the evolutionary strategies have enabled life to make it through the LHB. Finally, Section 7 summarizes the results of this investigation as well as its limitations and strengths, and its significance for the search for intelligent life on other worlds.

3. The Late Heavy Bombardement

Estimating how many impacts hit the Earth during the LHB is associated with considerable uncertainty, as the Earth has erased much of its own early history. A modern estimate, based both by lunar cratering, radiometric data and a record of the late Archaean (3.5–2.5 billion year) impact flux provided by terrestrial impact spherule layers gives an upper limit on the number of impacts in the time span 4.5–2.5 billion year as 60000 impactors with bodies ≥ 10 km in diameter. This estimate is based on a smoothly declining flux (no LHB), while a model with a LHB at 4.0 billion years would produce about a factor of 100 less impacts in the same time frame [Marchi et al., 2014; 2021].

While the record is likely incomplete and uncertainties remain, it is also the case that these estimates apply to large impactors. Thus, it seemed reasonable to hypothesize that many smaller impactors also hit the ground but failed to leave a trace. Thus, e.g. can be mentioned the current day flux of extraterrestrial material in terms of meteorites falling to the Earth's surface, where it has been estimated that the global fall flux is 17,600 objects each year for masses >50 g [Evatt et al., 2020].

Most of these meteorites does not cause significant damage to the Earth's surface, however, it is reasonable to assume that a scenario between these two extremes also existed during the LHB, where impactors large or dense enough to impact the Earth's surface, but not necessarily in capable of leaving traces in the present, existed. Their number and frequency may have been greater than for the large impactors, so that rather than the Earth being only hit by impactors ≥ 10 km in diameter every few million or thousands of years, the Earth was also hit in different places every year by impactors able to reach the surface and effect the potential habitats for life there. Thus, it is assumed here for the sake of discussion that an impact shower situation with 1000 impactors per year on average can be expected, that is, one impactor can be expected each:

$$\text{Impactor}_{\text{Rate}} = \left(\frac{525948.766 \text{ minutes}}{1000 \text{ impactors}} \right) \quad (1)$$

$$= 525.94 \text{ minutes},$$

i.e. one every 8.76 hours somewhere on Earth. From these values, the rate parameter for the impactor shower situation is obtained:

$$\left(\frac{1 \text{ impactor}}{525.9 \text{ minutes}} \right) \times 525948.8 \text{ minutes} = 1000 \text{ impactors expected}, \quad (2)$$

the most likely number of impactors that will be observed in a year.

At the LHB there would thus be an almost continuous incoming of impactors on the Earth. Although this was a global incoming of impactors, for microbial life these would be experienced as locally infrequent impactors spread over time and place, i.e. that there was an unpredictable environmental fluctuation in that new impacts would hit a habitat and send some organisms off to new environments.

During impacts, a ring system is formed, and a model for this ring system has been made by von Hegner [2022], consisting of two central rings, the primary ring, containing 5 rings, and the secondary ring, also containing 5 rings, which will be used in the following. Thus, the first stage of the redistribution of life as a result of impact dynamics is the landing of the impactor. It will be assumed here that each ring initially contains $N = 1 \times 10^6$ organisms evenly distributed throughout. This quantitative assessment might be considered a low number today, and perhaps too large a number then, but for the sake of calculation, this will be assumed here.

Thus, in ring 1, the center of impact, 100 % of the 1×10^6 organisms perish.

In ring 2, 80 % of the 1×10^6 organisms perish, thus, 200,000 organisms survive the impact blast.

For the next rings 3, 4 and 5, the survival rate decreases correspondingly by 60 %, 40 % and 20 %.

Thus, $n = 2 \times 10^6$ organisms out of $N = 5 \times 10^6$ organisms survive the impact blast T_1 .

In this model, the impactor could be considered an invariant, as although the incoming impacters will have variation in their diameters, densities and velocities, it is still the case that the organisms in the center of the impact blast perish, while some organisms in the adjacent rings can survive. The quantitative assessment with 100 %, 80 %, 60 %, 40 %, 20 % organisms that perish for each ring outward is an assumption, based on the effect of impact blast decreasing for each ring outward.

Only local impactors are taken into account, the minimum impact velocity a small body has with the Earth is 11.2 km/s [Cordero-Tercero et al., 2016], capable of reaching down through the atmospheric shield and make an impact. Global planet sterilizing impactors are not considered here, although this rain of local small impactors may have given life tools to be better equipped against the large global impactors.

In the second phase of the redistribution of life as a result of impact dynamics, some organisms are ejected into rings 6, 7, 8 and 9 as a result of impact blast.

Thus, in ring 1 in the primary ring, 100 % of the organisms had perished, ie. no living organisms will be launched into the secondary ring.

In ring 2, 80 % of the 2×10^5 organisms, i.e. 160.000 organisms, are launched into the secondary ring.

For the next rings 3, 4 and 5, the organisms are similarly launched over with the percentage 60 %, 40 % and 20 %.

So $n = 1.2 \times 10^6$ organisms remain in the primary ring, while $n = 8 \times 10^5$ organisms are launched into the secondary ring. A more simplified model than this will be sufficient, and will from now on be used, where survivors deposited in the 4 out of the 5 outer rings in the secondary ring are considered to be in a ring.

Such a continuous impacting and relaunching environment can be expected to lead to the emergence of the bet hedging strategy, which was discussed by von Hegner [2022], as it was an unpredictably fluctuating environment about which it was not possible for life to obtain cues as they did not hit the same place with the same frequency. Bet hedging can be characterized as a form of decision making, a characteristic of intelligence, in that a population can maintain two variants $V_{Robustus}$ and $V_{Intervallum}$ even when there is a uniform environment. But other strategies may also have arisen, as here there was a selection to not only survive the pressure from impacts, but also to survive in changed conditions regarding a pool of amino acids, lipids and fluids available.

4. The LHB from the perspective of life

At the LHB, the incoming impactors would mean that for microbial life there was an unpredictable environmental fluctuation in terms of available building material, or in other words, that there would be an alternating depletion of a pool of amino acids, lipids and fluids available for a cell, as the organisms when sent to a new location may be cut off from such an external pool.

Energy would indeed be available for life in the form of energy derived from light from the sun or chemical processes, but such available energy is not sufficient, a pool of amino acids, lipids and fluids must also be present. Thus, phototrophs, organisms that can use visible light as an energy source to manufacture organic compounds, require more than light, and that is an amino acid pool and water. Even chemotrophs, organisms that obtain energy by the oxidation of reduced compounds, either organic or inorganic, are no better off, as the abrupt change in the environment is the issue here. They are sent abruptly to new environments, so there is no time for gradual adaptations. So even if they can harvest the amino acids they need somewhere, they can again be sent to a place where they cannot immediately harvest it.

In today's Phanerozoic Eon, amino acid pools can be found in most places, but in the Hadean Eon it could be very different. There is much discussion regarding the presence of amino acids during the early Earth [McCullom, 2013], which will not be the goal of this work. It will be assumed here that amino acids existed, either as a result of terrestrial chemical processes, as a result of extraterrestrial delivery through impactors [Chyba and Sagan, 1992; Takeuchi et al., 2020], or both, and that some organisms had evolved metabolic pathways for amino acid biosynthesis. What matters is that they existed.

What is debatable was how widely spread and available they were at the time. There may have been two scenarios when the bombardment increased.

In one scenario, there may initially have been spots with amino acid pools scattered around the planet.

In the second scenario, there may initially have been an even distribution of amino acid pools on the planet, which the bombardment has gradually transformed into a lane with spots with amino acid pools on it. In the second scenario, the organisms initially had good life conditions, which gradually narrowed as the frequency of the bombardment increased, while the organisms in the first scenario already had narrow life conditions.

However, in both scenarios, for life, when the bombardment comes to an end, it will have become the same scenario. Thus, for simplicity, the discussion will be based on the scenario that there was not an even distribution of amino acid pools, but that they were spread unevenly around, like spots on a lane.

Life faces two potential issues when they are launched, as the organisms can in principle land in 2 places, an area that is sterile and one that is not. As time goes on and more and more impacts have hit, this will mean that the organisms can land in an area that is sterilized by a previous impact, and one that is not. The environment that has not been sterilized can itself be divided into two situations.

The environment can be so different that even if there is an amino acid pool there, the microbial life is initially unable to take advantage of it.

The environment can be virtually identical to the organisms native environment, making it easy to absorb the amino acid pool there. Thus, the first of these environments may initially have the same lack of utility as the environment that has been sterilized by impact.

It must be said that the organisms will never arrive at an ideal environment due to the very nature of the bombardment. Thus, the arriving matter will land with the same velocity as when they were sent up by impact [Melosh, 1989]. Thus, the incoming matter will land at a sufficiently high velocity to wreak havoc where it lands. It will not be destruction to the same extent as with an impact launch. There it was an entire impactor that landed, while here it will be fragments of material that land. So here there will be scattered areas with the possibility of an amino acid pool.

Thus, there are 3 situations at play.

In the first situation, the organisms are placed in an environment where there is no amino acid pool, because this has been destroyed or was not initially there. It is possible for a world to be habitable, yet uninhabited. It is also possible under certain circumstances for a region to be uninhabitable, yet be inhabited for a time. Being transported to such a spot will be like a person transported to the Atacama Desert, the person can immediately live there for a while, but not obtain external native resources to live on.

Thus, even if the organisms can pragmatically survive the initial arrival and placement there, the environment does not destroy them, there will not be an amino acid pool available for the organisms to live on. Initially, these sterilized areas belonged to the minority, but as the bombings have hit more and more areas, their number has increased and the scale of environmental severity has increased.

In the next situation, it applies that there is an inverse proportionality between life and environments. Even if an amino acid pool were present where the organisms land, the fact is that it may be in a form they are not adapted to use. Thus, microbial life can adapt quickly to new environments, but this applies when they spread by themselves, where reproduction, variation and selection, the key mechanisms of Darwinian evolution, are at stake. But here the organisms are sent off abruptly to new environments without their own influence, and may encounter a completely different environment. Thus, in the new environment there may be an amino acid pool they are initially unable to utilize. This will be the issue for phototrophs and even for chemotrophs.

In the next situation there is also an inverse proportionality between life and environments. But here the environment is virtually the same as the organisms' own, which means the organisms can absorb the amino acid pool.

In all 3 situations, it applies that new impacts can occur, where some organisms will again be thrown away from the impact site in all directions in the form of an expanding impact circle, and land in a new place. Since this will be one of those places with no, different, or usable resources, the situations discussed will again be in play.

5. Evolutionary strategies

The continuous, but infrequent bombardment, is a parameter that distinguishes this period of the Hadean from the present. In this situation there have been two types of pressures for life. The first has been to survive the bombings in the highest possible numbers. The second has been to economize with the amino acid pool as much as possible, i.e. to evolve strategies that make the most of the available resources. Here, the specific circumstances have been able to push the evolutionary strategies in certain directions. Thus, since the external environment under these circumstances has not been reliable in terms of an available amino acid pool, selection favoring survival mechanisms through utilization of the only reliable amino acid pools available, namely the limited amino acid pools available at the new site, must and/or those existing in the various organisms themselves, have evolved. Thus, during the LHB the evolutionary strategies would have gone to economize on the internal resources.

5.1. The first round and the second round

The third stage of the redistribution of life as a result of impact dynamics is the landing of the $n = 8 \times 10^5$ organisms in a new environment. It is assumed here that the first scenario described in section 4 applies, i.e. that the organisms land in a place where no amino acid pool exists.

As discussed in section 3, the organisms in each ring as a result of impact blast perished with a percent range of 100 %, 80 %, 60 %, 40 %, 20 % for each ring outward from the blast. The material ejected from an impact crater follows a nearly parabolic trajectory, and when it begins to fall back to the surface it will strike with the same velocity as when it was launched from the blast [Melosh, 1989]. Thus, in the secondary ring, some of the organisms will perish in a reverse sequence like the one in the primary ring.

Thus, matter from ring 1 will land although with no lifeing organisms, as they were eliminated by impact. Matter with 160.000 organisms from ring 2 will land, 80 % of the arrived organisms will not survive the landing. Thus, 32.000 surviving organisms will be deposited there.

For the next rings 3, 4 and 5, the survival percentage will similarly be 60 %, 40 % and 20%.

Thus, in total, $n = 4 \times 10^5$ surviving organisms will be deposited there, In the first round, there may have been different species that arrived with the posted material. These can compete against each other for access and utilization of the external amino acid pool that became available to them, see Figure 1. They will also compete against each other to evolve the best fit for the environment they arrived at. But such a strategy is costly overall, as an arms race will arise, in which both parties mutually evolve mechanisms against each other.

The special circumstances of the situation are that there is only a limited external amino acid pool available, so the different species cannot continue to compete for fitness as they otherwise could in today's more ideal conditions. So even if it is assumed that half of the arriving organisms perished and released their amino acid pool, there will not be enough for all the survivors to undergo reproduction. There may be enough for some strains to go through several reproductive cycles where adaptations can occur.

Evolution is a short term tinkerer, not a long term planner. Thus, the various species may eventually run out of the external amino acid pool before the next impact potentially sends them to a place where there is an amino acid pool.

The second round begins when the amino acid pool runs out. Here, a competition to stretch the internal resources as long as possible will then take place, where the organisms will have to stretch their metabolism as long as possible in order to survive. Thus, in the second round they will not compete with regard to fitness, but focus on enduring, as there are only internal resources, see Figure 1. When the second round begins, two things may have happened in the first round.

There may be only one variant from one species left that has outcompeted the others, or there may still be several variants from different species left that have managed to make it this far. However, whether there was one or more species that made it through the first round is immaterial with regard to the second round, as under these circumstances there will inevitably be one organism left that will make it here longer than the others.




Figure 1. The initial situation in the first round and the second round. In the first round, there are external resources so that new adaptations (shown with changing colors) in two different species (green and yellow) can take place. In the second round with internal resources, organisms are seen that gradually die in a stochastic manner (shown in dark), although due to differences in constitution, a species has more survivors. When one organism in a row dies, the others in the row have enough amino acids to survive to the next row. For simplicity, the organisms' reproduction is not depicted here. Credits: bacterial images adapted from Mirumur, 2011, 2014.

The second round is different from the first round. In the first round there was an external amino acid pool, but in the second there is only an internal amino acid pool. It exists in every single organism and can be accessed in two ways.

The first way is by one organism consuming another to obtain its amino acid pool. Thus, if there were two species that made it through the first round, they can initially continue in the second round by devouring each other. This may in other circumstances lead to an arm's race, but there are not the resources to continue this for long, even among those who manage it by devouring others.

So, under these conditions, another way can arise. Because regardless of how long they can stretch their metabolism, there are those who will perish before others, which means their amino acid pool becomes available to the others, and that without them taking it in a hostile way.

Thus, the organisms will be able to survive longer by peacefully absorbing the necromass pool from those who can't make it as long as themselves. This means that it is possible for members of different species to also survive, not by hostilely devouring others, but peacefully to obtain energy and nutrients from the detritus of organisms that perish by themselves. However, there will still inevitably be one individual left through the first round and the second round ultimately, as one must perish before the other.

Strictly speaking, there could be one surviving member of each species left before the last ultimate survivor, giving this scenario a 50% probability. However, it is more likely that what made an organism survive so long was due to its physiological constitution, an advantage shared by the clonal colony. Thus, one species possessed an advantage that made it survive longer than the other. So it is not entirely stochastic factors that come into play here. So the last two survivors are likely to be from the same species, after which one devours the other and only one individual remains.

Thus, a selection between taking the amino acid pool hostilely and between taking it peacefully from randomly killed organisms will be able to take place.

Thus, the organisms that can stretch the available external and internal resources as long as possible, and use them as efficiently as possible, are also those that have the greatest opportunity to survive the longest in

some spot in the first round and the second round until a new impact sends them to a place with an external amino acid pool. Since they are also the ones with the greatest opportunity to exist in the greatest numbers, they are also the most likely to send off more members of their species, or only their species.

5.2. *The third round I: altruism*

The environmental pressures discussed in the previous section could potentially lead to a remarkable strategy emerging, namely inclusive fitness or kin altruism. This was described by Hamilton [1963; 1964] in social insects, where one organism helps another to increase its reproductive fitness at the expense of decreasing its own. It has since been shown to also exist in microbial life such as *E. coli* [Akaizin et al., 1990], where the autolysis of a part of a starving population occurs, thereby replenishing the amino acid pool in the surviving organisms and thus promoting the survival of the rest of their kin.

This is a form of microbial self-awareness, a characteristic of intelligence, and for this strategy to occur, it requires a 3 round, where the surviving organisms are selected by being sent back and forth in spots over several rounds.

In new impacts, organisms will be flung away from the impact site in all directions in the form of an expanding circle, and some of the organisms will be able to end up in a new place with an amino acid pool. If the new site possesses a suitable amino acid pool, then the organisms that survive being placed there will also be able to build up their numbers strongly again. It has thus been a population that has repeatedly disappeared impact and landing and then grew forward again. Reproduction occurs by binary fission where the number of microbial life forms increases exponentially, which can be expressed as follows:

$$N_n = N_0 2^n \quad (3)$$

where N_n represents the number of organisms at the end of the time interval, N_0 represents the initial number of organisms at the beginning of a time interval, and n represents the number of generations. Thus, if there are sufficient amino acids in the new spot, then it will only take a single arriving organism 20 reproductive rounds to reach $\sim 1 \times 10^6$ organisms.

In the first round and second round, things were fairly mechanical. While evolutionary adaptations could take place in the first round, and acquired or existing preadaptations could play a role in the second round, the prevailing conditions still made things predictable.

While the evolutionary adaptations in the arms race in the first round were not entirely predictable as they could take many different directions, it was irrelevant as the organisms would run out of external resources anyway, and the second round would be decisive as it would take a stand in the adaptations that were there when the resources ran out, and individual members surviving on internal resources would ultimately be left.

The third round takes place fairly mechanically as well. The organisms are sent back and forth between spots mechanically. And only in a few places will a new impact send them off in time for survivors to come along. Those who may remain may be infused with a necromass amino acid pool, as the impact released it from those who perished on impact.

This repeated situation can lead to a cooperation between the organisms, where it is important to economize as much with the resources as possible, and as efficiently as possible. Thus, rather than organisms in the second round, organisms belonging here to the same species, starting a competition against each other, they can also initiate a cooperation to give cues by voluntary autolysis, see figure 2. A cooperation will in the situation be safer, as randomly recording the amino acid pool from those who perish will take time, and will be very uncertain, as it cannot be said when and where it happens.

But when the organisms communicate with each other about when there is a need to renew the amino acid pool, then this will reduce the randomness that prevails in these circumstances, and the chance of survival will increase as a result of communication, again a characteristic of intelligence.

So a selection will gradually occur where it will not be a random forced act that an organism dies and gives its amino acid pool to a sibling, but a selection will actually be able to happen, with which the colony will evolve such that a part of them voluntarily sacrifices themselves as food for their siblings, and the colony can even communicate when it happens or when it is best to do it, see figure 2.




Figure 2. The subsequent situation in the first round and the second round. In the first round, there are external resources that one species (green) makes better use of by having evolved the strategy of isolating itself from the other species. Next to it is the species (changing colors in yellow) found irregularly in an arm's race. In the second round, organisms undergoing autolysis are seen in a row, so that the others in the row have enough amino acids to survive to the next row. Although this scenario resembles the one in Figure 1, this one shows stochastic events, while this scenario shows altruistic sacrifice. In reality, there will not be an equal absorption of amino acids, some will be lost each time. When reproduction is included, uptake will follow an arithmetic sequence 11, 9, 7, 5, 3, 1. Credits: bacterial images adapted from Mirumur, 2011, 2014.

That this is possible has indeed been observed. Thus, an *E. coli* population experiencing starvation would gradually split into two subpopulations. One subpopulation would eventually perish through autolysis, whereas the other subpopulation would utilize the released cellular detritus and continue growing and reproducing [Akaizin et al., 1990]. The interesting thing here is that in other situations when a population of organisms reproduces, there will be a doubling in number.

But in this situation the population will both reproduce and yet decrease in number. In the rounds, if this happened over several rounds of being sent back and forth, there could now be adaptations in an arm's race to stretch the metabolism further, as there is now a selection for this in the renewed first round, and cues that this will be needed in the renewed second round and the third round. Thus, association and anticipation, characteristics of intelligence, can now be evolved.

The following calculation can illustrate the value of this. It is assumed that there are initially $N = 8 \times 10^5$ organisms in the same clonal population in the spot. Of those, 4×10^5 will be destroyed or autolyse voluntarily, leaving 4×10^5 organisms. For example, 15% of the cellular detritus is used for metabolism, reproduction and growth.

Of course, it is not a reproductive *perpetuum mobile*. So even if it is half of the population that sacrifices, there will not be a doubling in reproduction of the other half of the population, as the amino acid pool will diminish over time both because the energy released by an autolysed organism is less than the amount of energy required to build a new organism, and because some of the cellular detritus is lost, which here for the sake of the example is set to 5% for each turn.

So 20% of the detritus is collectively used or lost up to the first round, and again after each new round, while 80% of the detritus is reintroduced into the remaining population each time. Thus, the first generational cycle is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
 G_{\text{cycle}} &= P \times (1 - r \%)^n & (4) \\
 &= 8 \times 10^5 \times (1 - 0.20 \%)^n \\
 &= 8 \times 10^5 \times (0.80 \%)^1 \\
 &= 6.4 \times 10^5 \text{ organisms,}
 \end{aligned}$$

i.e. after the first round of reproduction, the surviving population has built up to 6.4×10^5 organisms.

When the next subpopulation among them has autolyzed there are 3.2×10^5 surviving organisms, these reproduce, and with 20% loss of the original amino acid pool they will have built up to 5.12×10^5 organisms after the second round and so on. Thus, it will take $n = 60$ reproductive rounds before ~ 1.23 organisms of the 8×10^5 are left, meaning that the population will be able to last 60 generations solely by the reintroduction of internal resources into the population. The situation is simplified both in terms of the biochemistry involved as well as the physical circumstances, but it will be appropriate here.

This self sacrificial behavior is as described by Hamilton not entirely altruistic, because it is aimed at transmitting the individual organisms own genes. Thus, organisms with a binary mode of reproduction represent virtually ideal clones and the genes of such microbial organisms are indeed transmitted to the next generation via an alternative carrier in the form of the sibling, not the individual organism *per se*. So whether an organism reproduces or whether it is its kin that reproduces is not important.

The continuation of the same genes continues in both cases. Thus, a strategy of cooperation and communication, a characteristic of intelligence, will lead to a safer use of the collective internal amino acid pool, thus ensuring a longer collective survival than if the organisms compete against each other (arms race), devouring each other hostile (arms race), devours those who perish (chance).

This cooperation does not occur by conscious choice, but by natural selection. There will simply be a selection on the one hand to absorb nourishment from those who randomly die, which implies randomness and a potentially long time between each time, and on the other hand for an organism to autolyse at an expected time and place, i.e. that other organisms have cues to where and when an amino acid pool is available. There is an intricate connection between the amino acid pool and the gene pool here, in that by providing its amino acid pool, an organism ensures that the offspring of its sibling can potentially achieve one more reproductive round in the future.

In addition, the passage of time has not been taken into account. Thus, how quickly they reproduce and how quickly they metabolize can occur at different rates. Thus, if organisms reproduce slowly and/or metabolize slowly, in order to economize on resources, then it applies that even if it were 60 generations, the duration could vary considerably from one scenario to the other.

This collaboration can also evolve to further increase the effectiveness of inclusive fitness, since on the one hand it is important to stretch the available resources as long as possible, but on the other hand also to use them as efficiently as possible. So only saving by lowering the metabolism and reusing the amino acid pool may not be sufficient due to the different situation then.

Thus, a collaborative strategy can eventually make stretching the metabolism and reuse the amino acid pool even more effective. Metabolism is the whole sum of reactions that occur within the cell, and which provide the energy needed for growth and reproduction, but also to maintain internal repair after damage. In fact, sublethal injuries may under these conditions have had a higher frequency.¹

Thus, initially selection must have gone on the one hand to ensure that maintenance of the organisms can take place, but also that the resources can be used efficiently for as long as possible. The organisms in a

¹ It is also known that bacteria can survive extremely long by entering a dormant state. But the special circumstances the LHB offered must be kept in mind. Thus, there could be an increased frequency of injuries in these circumstances, and a reproductive lifestyle may have been the better option.

clonal population maintain repair of damage, but there comes a point where it is not worthwhile to invest further in repair due to their extent. Thus, rather than invest further in repairing extensive damage, an organism sacrifices itself, saving the collective resources, and at the same time releases the amino acid pool for its kin. In this way, inclusive fitness can be made more efficient.

In addition, as mentioned, the organisms will eventually be able to evolve to communicate with each other about when it is best to initiate this response. This can gradually lead to an extensive coordinated altruistic response in situations not only specifically with injuries, but also generally with limited resources affecting the entire population, to which they react in an intelligent communicative way by many in the population sacrificing themselves for their siblings. Thus, organisms individually increase the amino acid pool in order to perpetuate the collective gene pool.

Although the self-sacrificial behavior in the interests of direct kin seemed incredible and contradicting classical Darwinian evolution, this altruistic behavior does not imply conscious self-sacrifice. What changes in evolution are changes in gene frequencies in gene pools as generations go by. Even fitness is in line with this genetic view of evolution where the genes programming autolysis for the sake of survival of the kin spread as a result of natural selection, provided that it contributes to the survival of the microbial population. Natural selection is here pushed the way due to the circumstances described so far at the LHB.

5.3. The third round II: cooperation

The environmental pressures discussed in the previous section could lead to inclusive fitness potentially arising in the form of organisms adapting to acquire energy and nutrients from cellular detritus from those that voluntarily autolysed. As reviewed, there will be a pressure to stretch the available resources as long as possible, but there will also be a pressure for evolve adaptations to use the available resources as efficiently as possible.

Thus, it applies that voluntarily giving one's amino acid pool to one's siblings only has maximum benefit when it is one's siblings, and not unrelated members from the competing species, who benefit from this sacrifice. This is the essence of Hamilton's rule [Hamilton, 1964]. In the calculation example reviewed in the previous section, there was e.g. 5% of the necromass amino acid pool wasted. While part of this is due to an unavoidable waste due to the circumstances, this could also be partly due to the fact that although organisms from the same colony are counted here, there is a possibility that the chunk of material that landed with them also contained members from other species, or that there were other species where they land. Thus, members of other species had the opportunity to take some of the available cellular detritus, and thus contribute to the 5% disappearing from the population.

As a response to this, the cooperative strategy will be able to evolve further to ensure the most effective recycling of the necromass pool. A cooperative strategy in the form of taking up the amino acid pool from its siblings, and developing it to give and perceive cues for when this happened, there was already a pressure to evolve. Thus, this could evolve further, so that members of the same species can recognize each other and gather together, thus actively isolating themselves from other species, which again is a characteristic of self-awareness, see figure 2. This isolation strategy evolves both from their collaboration on the internal amino acid pool as well as again the external amino acid pool. Because the rounds will happen again and again when new impacts send them to a place.

Firstly, when the organisms land in a new place with an external amino acid pool, reproduction will take place again. Organisms are already automatically collected as a necessary side consequence of other features. Thus, in clonal organisms such as bacteria and archaea, an organism will divide into two, the two into four, etc. Thus, a colony of siblings always begins in one point due to reproductive constraints and spreads from that one point.

Secondly, it applies that a selection of organisms had taken place, which could eventually give cues as to when autolysis occurs, could read cues as to when it happened, could initiate autolysis at 'agreed' times, could be ready when this happened.

Thus, after having gone through the third round several times and evolved an altruism strategy, the scenario in the first round will eventually play out differently. When the organisms in the clonal colony are thrown off again, they may land in a place where there is another species, but rather than the organisms

mixing arbitrarily and competing against each other, making adaptations in an arm's race, the organisms in the arriving colony will bring the adaptations for cues that removed the randomness that prevailed in random scattered autolysis regarding where and when they can take up the amino acid pool. The members therefore do not have to move far to gain access to the amino acid pool when there are cues about an autolysis in progress, and there will thus be a shorter time between release and uptake of the amino acid pool and as much as possible can be harvested from the necromass pool.

Thus, the scenario in the first round as it happens the first times will not happen again. Not only have they evolved a strategy to do better and more efficiently in the second round, but that strategy also leads to a strategy to do better in the renewed first round. If these are the first times for one species, then the arriving organisms will have an advantage. They are adapted to handle the situation that will inevitably happen in the next round, while the other species is in a race to be fit here and now, they gluttony with the resources so to speak. Thus, the isolationist species may be the only ones to reach the second round, they are naturally selected that way.

But as time goes by with many repeated impacts, both species will have evolved these strategies, and both species will isolate themselves from each other, focusing on utilizing the external and internal resources most efficiently to get through the rounds. Even if there are no other organisms where they land, the isolation strategy will still evolve, as the members do not have to move far to gain access to the amino acid pool when there are cues about an autolysis in progress.

Thus, gradually the first round will change character from being a short-term and costly arms race to a long-term isolationist scenario, just as the second round gradually changed character from being stochastic events to being an evolved strategy. Thus, the impacting dynamics are still the same, in fact, the situation with suitable spots may eventually get worse, but the evolutionary strategy gets better, and ensures that the organisms can cope for a longer time.

Cooperation among microbial organisms can arise for several different reasons and come in several forms, for example swarming motility, collective repairing of holes in biofilm, collective capture of food, collective aggression etc. [Westerhoff et al., 2014]. Their cooperation on the internal amino acid pool can also eventually effect their cooperation on the external amino acid pool. Since a new impact can send them to a place with an external amino acid pool available, the cooperative strategy can further evolve to also cooperate on utilizing these resources as best as possible rather than a new competition between them arising.

Thus, a collaboration to find an external amino acid pool could occur.

A cooperative effort to isolate themselves will also maximize the use of the internal amino acid pool, as they thus physically avoid the presence of other species among them, and thus avoid others gaining access to their collective amino acid pool.

But eventually two groups that isolate themselves from each other can also start an arms race against each other to gain access to each other's resources, even if the cost may be higher than the benefit. They can mount a common defense against other species that either seek to devour individuals from their colony, or gain access to resources they have collected themselves. Such a common defense against other species can arise quickly, as they not only occupy the amino acid pool, but also occasionally the gene pool from those who sacrifice themselves, and thus, if a variant obtains a defense against the other species, then this trait can be taken up and distributed by its kin, and a selection in which they quickly manage arms race occurs. Here there is also an arms race, not between members of the same species, but between species, where one species gradually achieves less cost through their cooperation on a common defense, and can thus be selected for further survival.

Among these cooperation strategies, a further one could potentially arise. As reviewed, it has been observed that bacteria have their own version of inclusive fitness, where some sacrifice their amino acid pool so that the gene pool of their siblings can continue. But a hypothesis could be made that it could also be possible under certain circumstances for microbial organisms to display the classic inclusive fitness seen in social insects, where they actually refrain from reproducing themselves, and instead dedicate themselves to assisting their siblings with to survive and reproduce.

In the second round, there comes a point where the last organism will not obtain enough from the amino acid pool of the penultimate organism to be able to reproduce. Here there is an intermediate stage between

many organisms and only one organism. While cues will eventually arise regarding organisms voluntarily autolyzing when it is best to do so, pick up when it happens, this intermediate stage may be significant enough for a selection with cues for a more profound cooperation to occur.

Thus, a strategy may evolve where, rather than the penultimate organism voluntarily autolyzing, it may refrain from giving its amino acid pool to the last organism, even though this may be critical under these circumstances.

Of course, in this situation it is not meaningful to say who is the second last and who is the last, as they both coexist here and one of them will eventually automatically perish sooner or later in the second round and give his amino acid pool to the last organism. But here it is said that a strategy could evolve after several rounds in the third round. If this intermediate stage is reached, the organisms can either continue with the first evolved strategy of providing their amino acid pool, or the stage can be so significant that a turn is made, so to speak, and an assistance strategy is initiated.

Here, either in the renewed first round or the renewed second round, or both, there can actually be a short period where an organism actively assists its kin, if there is a longer chance of survival for the gene pool this way until a new impact sends them off place. Here, organisms known for their fast, ruthless and complete reproduction by dividing into two organisms will instead decrease their own fitness to increase that of others, and thus ensure that their genes will live on in their kin. This could potentially take several forms.

If this is in the renewed first round, then they can cooperate to destroy the last member of a competing species, and one organism refrains from taking up the achieved amino acid pool in favor of the needy kin.

If this is in the second round, then it may provide a synergetic effect that will allow them to survive longer than otherwise expected under these circumstances.

The opposite of cooperating organisms are 'microbe-cheaters', meaning that while the colony can gradually evolve cooperation, where they share the internal amino acid pool among themselves, there can be organisms among them that instead acquire a disproportionate share of group-generated resources while making minor contributions themselves. Such 'microbe-cheaters' can disrupt cooperative systems [Westerhoff et al., 2014].

Such organisms correspond in their way to the organisms in the initial first round and the second round, where each organism fights for itself and for its own survival. Such an organism can, in the same way as the organisms in the cooperative strategy, be expected to be able to hold out until the next impact comes and transports it to a new amino acid pool. That new impacts will come is clear, but when it is not possible to know, thus, the organisms in the two strategies are on equal footing in this regard.

But in the subsequent first rounds and second rounds, where the organisms have repeatedly been through third rounds, it will apply that the organisms with the cooperative strategy will not only utilize the amino acid pool more efficiently than the free exchange strategy, it will also mean that a species isolates itself and keeps other species at a distance. It must be remembered that such organisms will disrupt cooperative systems. Thus, as the advantage of the system breaks down, nothing will be able to protect them from potentially being eaten by another species, thereby losing both their amino acid pool and their gene pool.

Thus, there will be an initial modest difference between the two strategies, which over time can slowly win out in favor of the collaborative strategy. Yet, the difference in how long each strategy has contributed to the survival of organisms may not initially have been that great. This means that life's overall survival through the LHB could have been even harder in that way, as some populations in some spots invariably collapsed in that way, while others managed to keep the free prey away from them.

Thus, under these circumstances, a selection will essentially take place between Darwinian evolution and Hamiltonian evolution (although Hamiltonian evolution is of course thereby derived from Darwinian evolution).

As the length of the LHB has progressed, the cooperative strategy will have had an edge that led to more survivors, more members being sent off on impact, and thus there was a selective advantage.

6. Localized planetary reseedling

It is clear that even these displays of intelligence in the form of association and anticipation, communication and self-awareness, will invariably lead to the downfall of the organisms as the number of organisms for each new generation decreases as the necromass recycling sustains the biological system is used up. Thus,

living isolated in a spot is a time-limited way to manage it, unless a new impact sends the organisms to an environment with a new amino acid pool.

When an impact occurs, an impact ring will appear, where matter is sent away from the impact site in all directions in the form of an expanding circle. If it is assumed that in a subsequent impact the impact ring will send matter in ten different directions, and one direction is towards an amino acid pool, then this can be viewed in two ways.

The first way is that if there are ≥ 10 organisms and they are sent in different directions, then at least one organism will arrive.

The other way is that if there was only one organism left and it can be sent in ten different directions, then the probability of it arriving at an amino acid pool is:

$$P(E) = \left(\frac{1}{10}\right) \quad (5)$$
$$= 0.1 = 10 \%$$

If the organism reaches the amino acid pool, it belongs, so to speak, to the statistically 'lucky' part, where an impact does not actually mean the organisms' (total) destruction, but their rescue from staying in a spot. Well placed in the new external amino acid pool, the organism can build up the number of organisms again.

Thus, the impact ring is both a destroyer, an initiator of adaptations, and the one that renews the organisms' possibility of survival by moving them to a new place.

But even in that way, overall, there will be a continuous decrease in the possibilities of survival. Because although this organism will quickly be able to build up the number of organisms again, life has only partially been able to rely on being sent to where there were spots with amino acid pools, as there was only a 10% probability of landing somewhere with an amino acid pool. As mentioned, this also includes the fact that some organisms will also perish both when the impact hits and when they land in a new place.

There has thus been an alternating increase and decrease in the number of organisms during this localized planetary reseeded, and although there are many variables at play here, the tendency must have been leading towards an overall decrease in the number of organisms.

In addition, life in many such spots has probably not survived, as the time before a new impact sends one or more of them off can be longer than their resources and number of generations can be stretched.² As mentioned, it could be expected that an impactor hits a place on Earth every 525.94 minutes, i.e. every 8.76 hours. There are several studies of how long a colony of microbial organisms can survive without the addition of nutrients. A study showed that *E. coli* can be maintained in batch culture at densities of $\sim 10^6$ CFU per ml for more than 5 years, although it was necessary to regularly provide sterile distilled water in order to maintain the volume and osmolarity [Finkel et al., 2000]. But even with these figures in mind, it is not certain that impact would come before the last organism had disappeared.

In addition, in the impact center all material is destroyed, including the cellular detritus, while in the adjacent rings part of the materials and part of the organisms will be destroyed.

Thus, initially many areas were untouched by the bombing, and these sterilized impact centers belonged to the minority, but as the bombings hit more and more areas, their number gradually increased and affected most places on the planet. So the number of such spots with amino acid pools has gradually fallen. Thus, the scale of environmental severity has increased, and may eventually have posed an issue even for life that survives by reuse of the collective amino acid pool.

However, evolutionary strategies take place in an ecological setting. Thus, if the organisms can manage long enough on the internal resources, then further ecological scenarios will also come into play, and thus one of the following 3 situations as briefly described in section 4 can take place.

² Although there may have been many spots where the organisms did not make it long enough to be sent off, fractional genetic transfer may be important here [von Hegner, 2020]. Even if the last organism didn't make it, its components can in principle still be sent to a place where there are organisms. These may incorporate some of its genes into their own, and thus genes that have previously been selected for altruism and cooperation may give some advantage to the new organisms.

In the first situation, it applies that even if the organisms have been placed in an environment where there is no amino acid pool, they may survive long enough on internal resources that individual organisms gradually move out of that environment to potentially fertile marginal areas with amino acid pools.

If such marginal areas exist, then life can gradually move to them, as this is how life in well-known ecological settings can spread. Evolution is adaptation to changing local environments, where organisms gradually adapt to changed environments in peripheral areas. This happens through reproduction, variation and selection, the key mechanisms of Darwinian evolution. However, the situation is initially different from the well-known gradual adaptation in peripheral areas today, in that the organisms cannot draw on external resources, but must draw on internal ones, at least until they have moved out of the center.

This situation can also apply to the impact dynamics itself. Thus, the arriving impactors could have different sizes, densities and velocities, meaning that the rings could travel different distances, and the impact ring could e.g. fling the organisms back in the direction they came from, but not the entire distance or even across the area. They land in the edge area of an amino acid pool and must move there.

In the second situation with an inverse proportionality between life and environment, it was true that even if an amino acid pool was present where the organisms landed, it could be in a form they are not adapted to use, they have not evolved a metabolic pathway to it. However, microbial life can adapt relatively quickly to use new amino acid pools. But the thing here is that they change environment abruptly. They have no influence on where they land. This is the issue for chemostrophs.

They can adapt relatively quickly however, and potentially the organisms could have adapted to be able to use the amino acid pool present before they reach the last generation and run out of the amino acid pool they reuse. After that, as in the first situation, they will gradually be able to move out into the peripheral areas, gradually adapting to the new conditions here, still drawing on what they are adapted to, but adapting to new conditions. Such an adaptation can be spread in a clonal colony by the fact that when some of the organisms have adapted, and some of these organisms subsequently autolyse, their kin, rather than letting their DNA be used up and reused, can incorporate part of it into their own DNA, with which this ability is quickly spread and fixed in the gene pool. This can be considered decision making, a characteristic of intelligence.

In the third situation, organisms that land in an environment with virtually the same amino acid pool as the one they came from will naturally survive. There are 3 subtle but important sub-scenarios in this latter one.

The first sub-scenario is that they can land in a completely new place with a new suitable amino acid pool.

The second sub-scenario is that an impact ring, as mentioned, will send matter away from the impact site in all directions in the form of an expanding circle, which was assumed to be in ten different directions. One direction must be back to where the progenitor of the organisms came from. As mentioned in section 3, some organisms will remain in the primary ring, while some organisms are launched into the secondary ring. Thus, there could potentially still be an adequate amino acid pool here that the organisms can live off of.

The third sub-scenario is that, in retrospect, life must have arisen where there was plenty of the amino acid pool. So if an organism is sent back to the starting point, back to where life originated, then of course there is a suitable amino acid pool here.

Thus, the organisms will potentially be able to survive for a very long time in these 3 scenarios, longer than by relying on internal resources. However, even if the organisms can manage in the 3 situations and thus go beyond the evolutionary strategies described, it applies that the organisms will still be in the same situation as before they were sent away. Thus, under the conditions the LHB offered, sooner or later the organisms will be sent off again by a new impact, and in this way the organisms in all 3 situations are in the same overall situation over time. The 3 scenarios therefore do not provide a long-term solution for the organisms.

Thus, there has been an alternating increase and decrease in the number of organisms during this localized planetary reseeded, leading towards an overall decrease in number.

Yet, life has endured by drawing on internal resources on the one hand, and locally increasing its numbers again and again after landing in places where there were external resources. On the other hand, it has also potentially been able to live a long time, and be distributed widely, through the 3 scenarios described. Thus, even as there are fewer spots, and the infrequent impacting has sent them from place to place, these two general scenarios combined have been able to make it so that life has made it through until the bombardments were over. Thus, the bombardment is a double edged sword. On the one hand, it has wreaked havoc by bombarding the planet and the environments in which life exists, but on the other hand, it may have

also preserved life by moving the organisms around in a localized planetary reseeded. It may actually have contributed to spreading life around the planet from the point where life must have necessarily arisen.

7. Conclusions

In this work, it has been described how intelligent characteristics can make a difference in a world, and some of these have been concretely reviewed to show how life could have come through the LHB, meaning that the LHB this way did not delay the emergence of intelligent life on Earth, as it may have been there all along during this period.

There are other intelligent characteristics than these, and other scenarios could probably also have been used as an illustration. But it has been sufficient here to show that the view that microbial life can be common in the galaxy, but that intelligent life is rare, is a misnomer in that macromolecular networks can confer intelligent characteristics.

If a world inhabited by analogous of bacteria, archaea and protists is located elsewhere in the galaxy, then this does not exclude the existence of intelligent life there; when life on Earth due to the sun's changes towards the red giant stage once again revert back to consisting solely of bacterial life, this does not exclude that intelligent life will still be on the planet. Thus, the conceptual distinction between microbial life and intelligent life should be abandoned, as it by its very statement hampers the search for intelligent life elsewhere.

While the conceptual distinction between microbial life and intelligent life is not valid, the distinction between intelligent life per se appears, and intelligent life able to harness the insight and power of science and philosophy, expressed in e.g. to be able to make interstellar communication through technology, the premise at e.g. SETI, to be sound.

It is interesting to note here that the presence of technology indicates the existence of intelligence, while the absence of technology does not indicate the absence of intelligence, just as, in the light of the generality, it is interesting to note that consciousness requires intelligence, while intelligence does not require consciousness, as microbial life did not appear to possess consciousness. However, this is a complex subject which falls outside the scope of the present work. It will suffice to say that a more precise terminology regarding talking about intelligent life in a search for life elsewhere is needed.

It is debatable whether the LHB was severe enough to drive the evolutionary responses discussed, even with the assumption of impacts occurring at intervals of hours. But the discussed impact dynamics, the evolutionary strategy, is still relevant as similar scenarios could potentially also occur on other worlds in the galaxy and beyond, for example Late Heavy Bombardment-like conditions around Eta Corvi, an F-type main-sequence star, may take place [Lisse et al. 2011].

The emergence of life and the appearance of the LHB appeared to have been unrelated events in this solar system. So it is debatable whether life actually existed during the period when the bombing took place. But the presented scenario is still relevant for astrobiology, as LHB like scenarios can not only exist in other solar systems, but can also potentially occur later in a world's history than it did for Earth, giving a greater possibility for life to exist when the bombardment starts.

It also applies that although the impact dynamics will mechanically take place in the same way in every world with the same conditions, altruism is only one intelligent response among several. Although environmental pressures push evolution down a certain path in this scenario, contingency still plays a role. Thus, other intelligent responses could potentially be selected for on a world. In fact, there could be a competition between strategies of different populations that met, meaning, that the very strategies evolve.

The strategies discussed may also be relevant in other situations applicable to space science. The ecological setting has been suggested to be taken into account in the unintentional but potential transport of organisms by spacecraft [von Hegner, 2021]. Thus, the inclusive fitness strategy could also potentially arise from spaceship mediated transport, here the external amino acid pool is cut off, but the internal amino acid pool can be used for a long time and thus contribute to the organisms reaching another world in the solar system.

Did these strategies occur? It is not certain that life has survived through this period in that way, and it may not be possible to show that this was the case due to the Earth having had much of its early history erased. Science proceeds in two ways, one is, as in the physical sciences, to test predictions despite issues

with potential auxiliary assumptions, the other is, as in the historical sciences, to look for a smoking gun that distinguishes between two or more hypotheses, whether there is overlap between both of these ways [Cleland, 2001; 2013]. The Earth has had much of its early history erased, making it hard to find clues between these responses either taking place or not taking place, but it can however be shown to be theoretically plausible as has been done here.

Thus, it is fruitful to let fields that are otherwise so different, evolutionary theory and physical dynamics, come together in a common framework to see what could have been going on at a time in the history of the Earth, and possibly life, which in the very nature not much is known about. This is obviously more of a retrodiction than it is a prediction.

However, the evolutionary responses can be described and predicted, and the impact dynamics can be described and predicted. Natural selection is the differential survival of genes in gene pools. It acts on the available varieties and is driven in certain directions both by selective pressure between organisms and pressure from the environment. There were certain environmental conditions here in the form of impacts and reimpacts and between spots with limited amino acid pools. The impacting dynamics itself act as selectors of organisms.

Evolution is fundamentally variation. It starts as a lump of variation that spreads outward in all directions. There is no specific direction and no measure for the spread of variation, and most of the varieties disappear again in competition with each other and against the pressure of the environment. But a few survive, and themselves become a point from which variation spreads outwards in all directions. In that sense, the LHB is an extension of this. The impactors act as initiators for certain evolutionary strategies that can allow life to react even to such celestial onslaughts.

The Copernican revolution and the Darwinian revolution belong to the great thresholds in history that adjusted humanity's journey in the cosmos.

The Copernican revolution removed the Earth from the center of the universe, indeed, the entire solar system from the center of the universe, opening up the possibility of the existence of other worlds, and ultimately, for life on other worlds.

The Darwinian revolution removed any particular species from the center of nature, indeed, removed any inherent direction from the center of nature, ultimately opening up that special characteristics are not monopolized by single species on any worlds.

That macromolecular networks in microbial life confer intelligent characteristics, and may even be a precursor to the intelligence seen in many multicellular organisms, simultaneously their descendants and cousins, should not be surprising. Thus, perhaps it is time to embrace both revolutions equally fully, and not view intelligence as seen from the human perspective, or even view intelligence as flowing from a particular body.

References

- Abramov, Oleg & Mojzsis, Stephen J. Microbial habitability of the Hadean Earth during the late heavy bombardment, *Nature*, 2009 May 21;459(7245):419-22.
- Akaizin, E.O., Voskun, S.E., Panova, L.A., and Smirnov, S.G., Heterogeneity of *Escherichia coli* Populations during Induced Autolysis, *Mikrobiologiya*, 1990, vol. 59, pp. 283–288.
- Bell, Elizabeth A.; Boehnike, Patrick; Harrison, T. Mark; Mao, Wendy L. (2015). "Potentially biogenic carbon preserved in a 4.1 billion-year-old zircon". *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 112 (47): 14518–14521.
- Bottke, William F.; Norman, Marc D. (30 August 2017). "The Late Heavy Bombardment". *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*. 45 (1): 619–647.
- Chyba, Christopher, Sagan, Carl. Endogenous production, exogenous delivery and impact-shock synthesis of organic molecules: an inventory for the origins of life, *Nature*, volume 355, pages 125–132 (1992).
- Cleland, Carol E. Historical science, experimental science, and the scientific method, *Geology* (2001) 29 (11): 987–990.
- Cleland, Carol E. Common cause explanation and the search for a smoking gun (2013), in Baker, V.R., ed., *Rethinking the Fabric of Geology: Geological Society of America Special Paper 502*, p. 1–9.

Coenraads, Robert R., Koivula, John I. *Geologica: Earth's dynamic forces*, Elanora Heights, NSW: Millennium House, 2007.

Cordero-Tercero, Guadalupe, Velázquez-Villegas, Fernando, Vázquez-Hernández, Carlos Francisco, Ramírez-Cruz, José Luis, Arévalo-Vieyra, Alejandro, Mendoza-San-Agustín, Asahel, Camacho-Martínez, Fernando.: *The Mexican Meteor Network: A Preliminary Proposal: Geofís. Intl vol.55 no.1 Ciudad de México ene./mar. 2016.*

Damer, Bruce. *David Deamer: Five Decades of Research on the Question of How Life Can Begin*, Life (Basel). 2019 Jun; 9(2): 36.

Evatt, G.W. Smedley, A.R.D. Joy, K.H. Hunter, L. Tey, W.H. Abrahams I.D. and Gerrish. L. The spatial flux of Earth's meteorite falls found via Antarctic data, *Geology* (2020) 48 (7): 683–687.

Finkel, S. E., Zinser, E. & Kolter, R. in *Bacterial Stress Responses* (eds Storz, G. & Hengge-Aronis, R.) 231–238 (ASM Press, Washington DC, 2000).

Hamilton, W. D. (1963). "The evolution of altruistic behaviour". *American Naturalist*. 97 (896): 354–6.

Hamilton W.D. (July 1964). "The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I". *J. Theor. Biol.* 7 (1): 1–16.

Hamilton W.D. (July 1964). "The genetical evolution of social behaviour. II". *J. Theor. Biol.* 7 (1): 17–52.

Lisse, C.M., Chen, C.H., Wyatt, M.C., Morlok, A., Thebault, P., Bryden, G., Watson, D.M., Manoj, P., Sheehan, P., Sloan, G., Currie, T.M.: *Linear and Planetary Institute Science Conference Abstracts* 42, (2011), p. 2438, Spitzer Observations of η Corvi : Evidence at ~ 1 Gyr for an LHB-Like Delifeery of Organics & Water-Rich Material to the THZ of a Sun-Like Star.”

Lowe, Donald R., Byerly; Gary R. Kyte, Frank T. Recently discovered 3.42–3.23 Ga impact layers, Barberton Belt, South Africa: 3.8 Ga detrital zircons, Archean impact history, and tectonic implications, *Geology* (2014) 42 (9): 747–750.

Marchi S.; Bottke W. F.; Elkins-Tanton L. T.; Bierhaus M.; Wuennemann K.; Morbidelli A.; Kring D. A. Widespread mixing and burial of Earth's Hadean crust by asteroid impacts. *Nature* 511, 578-582, 2014.

Marchi, S. Drabon, N. Schulz, T. Schaefer, L. Nesvorný, D. Bottke, W. F. Koeberl C. and Lyons. T. “Delayed and variable late Archean atmospheric oxidation due to high collision rates on Earth”, *Nature Geoscience*, 2021.

Maruyama, S., Ikoma, M., Genda, H., Hirose, K., Yokoyama, T., Santosh, M., 2013. The naked planet Earth: most essential pre-requisite for the origin and evolution of life. *Geoscience Frontiers* 4, 141e165.

McCullom Thomas M. Miller-Urey and Beyond: What Have We Learned About Prebiotic Organic Synthesis Reactions in the Past 60 Years? *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, Vol. 41:207-229 (Volume publication date May 2013).

Melosh, H. J.: 1989, *Impact Cratering: A Geologic Process*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Mirumur, 2011: <https://depositphotos.com/vector-images/bacterium.html>

Mirumur, 2014: <https://depositphotos.com/49770579/stock-illustration-e-coli-bacteria-isolated-red.html>

Reyes-Ruiza, M., Chaveza , C.E., Acevesa, H., Hernandezb, M.S., Vazqueza, R., Nunezc, P.G. Dynamics of escaping Earth ejecta and their collision probability with different Solar System bodies, *Icarus*, 2012.

Schopf, J. William, Kudryavtsev, Anatoliy B., Czaja, Andrew D., Tripathi, Abhishek B.: Evidence of Archean life: Stromatolites and microfossils *Precambrian Research* Volume 158, 5 October 2007, Pages 141-155.

Takeuchi, Yuto. Furukawa, Yoshihiro. Kobayashi, Takamichi. Sekine, Toshimori. Terada, Naoki. & Kakegawa, Takeshi. Impact-induced amino acid formation on Hadean Earth and Noachian Mars, *Scientific Reports* volume 10, Article number: 9220 (2020).

von Hegner, Ian: *Interplanetary transmissions of life in an evolutionary context*, *International Journal of Astrobiology*, (2020); published online 27 May 2020.

von Hegner, Ian: *The indeterminacy bottleneck: Implications for habitable worlds*, *Acta Biotheoretica*, Volume 70, Issue 1, 2022, published online 4 December 2021.

von Hegner, Ian: *Evolutionary processes transpiring in the stages of lithopanspermia*, *Acta Biotheoretica*, 10 April 2021; preprint published online in HAL archives-ouvertes.fr | CCSD, 21 April 2020.

von Hegner, Ian. A potential survival strategy during the Late Heavy Bombardment, in HAL archives-ouvertes.fr | CCSD, 9 February 2022.

Westerhoff, Hans V. Brooks, Aaron N. Simeonidis, Evangelos. Garcia-Contreas, Rodolfo. He, Fei. Boogerd, Fred C. Jackson, Victoria J. Goncharuk, Valeri and Kolodkin, Alexey: Macromolecular networks and intelligence in microorganisms. *Front. Microbiol.*, 22 July 2014.