

CHAPTER TWO:

Toward an Integral Anthropology: Chemistry, Biology, and the Origin of Life

Politics is the study of the common good for human beings living in society; it is dependent on ancillary studies in ethics that deal with the good of individual persons. It must be possible to answer ethical questions pertaining to the individual good or it will prove impossible to answer political questions pertaining to the broader social good. However, before being able to talk about individual human good, it is first necessary to know what a human being is. Therefore, ethics is dependent on ancillary studies in psychology/anthropology that provide a definition of what it means to be a human being. When this is understood, it becomes clear why the study of politics is premature without a prior study of ethics and psychology. Consequently, **an answer to the question, *what is man* is the preamble and fundamental starting point for all work in the fields of political and social science.**

This chapter is devoted to initiating the search for an answer to this essential question.

Since human beings possess both a mind and a body, it will be necessary, in this chapter, to make a foray into the fields of biology and chemistry for answers to basic questions about the human body, which is the first thing that is apparent when we begin to study human nature and its relationship to the soul.

Both scientists and philosophers have approached this topic by observation and classification of living and non-living things through which they arrive at an understanding and definition of their nature or essence followed by classification in some broad taxonomy that facilitates comprehension of the phenomenal world and the relationships among its various parts. The earliest philosopher to engage in empirical research of this type was Aristotle the "Father of Biology". Later taxonomies were generated by scientists such as Carl Linnaeus the "Father of Modern Taxonomy". Linnaeus arranged all living and non-living things into three kingdoms: Mineral, Plant and Animal. Although Aristotle did not label minerals as a kingdom, he, like Linnaeus, acknowledged their existence but focused his emphasis on living things in the animal and plant kingdoms. *

Crossing the Threshold from Nonliving Elements to Living Organisms

Earth's biosphere teems with an abundant array of diverse life forms that share a common set of characteristics associated with all living things. Most philosophers and scientists consider something alive if characterized by self-movement, metabolism, organization, growth, reproduction, and homeostasis, which they generally agree are the characteristics shared by all living things.

Self-Motion: The quality of an organism to move itself. A rock flying through the air has motion but not self-motion; a non-living thing cannot move itself. Living things are capable of self-motion. For example, a tree, though stationary, moves itself upward through the ground and toward the sky via its own internal organic powers.

* While recent taxonomy has listed up to six kingdoms of living organisms having the above attributes, (**Fungi, Protista, Archaea, Eubacteria, Plantae and Animalia**) we are most interested in the lower and more recent end of the taxonomy dealing with (plants and animals). The six kingdom system is simply a more detailed modification of the original two-kingdom system of plants and animals; I am also including the third Mineral Kingdom. Thus, for our purposes, we will speak of three kingdoms.

Metabolism: The process whereby living organisms break down substances and convert them into usable energy necessary to drive cellular work. This work is required for synthesizing other substances into functional cellular parts by first breaking them down or “de composing” them and then integrating or “composing” them into constituent cellular parts in a process necessary for growth and continued life.

Organization: The complex and systematic conversion of separate substances having their own identity into a new substance in which the old substance is taken up into the new and, in the process, shares its identity and is organically arranged as part of an integrated set of systems and sub-systems functioning together for the good of the organism.

Growth: Orderly increase in size by the accumulation of matter that requires organized synthesis (composition) of the products of metabolism.

Reproduction: The ability to produce new cells within a living being as the result of cell division or the production of new individuals from a parent organism.

Homeostasis: The ability of an organism to self regulate and maintain a constant balance of its parts for the good of the whole, for example, shivering to increase or perspiring to reduce body temperature and keep it in a range necessary for the continued good of the organism.

Although, psychology is the study of living human beings, non-living elements and minerals are an extremely important part of the discussion. In fact, since human bodies are composed of these nonliving element; they are the necessary and appropriate starting point for our understanding of the human being and crossing the threshold from non-life to life.

Thus, our analysis begins with a study of the Mineral Kingdom, which consists of non-living atoms, elements, and molecules that are the basic material building blocks of all observable things. After having classified all observable phenomena into living and non-living categories, one of the first questions that usually comes to mind is: why do some things have life and others do not? A perplexing question follows: what is the origin of life? This vital question is quite astounding, especially when it is realized that all *living* human and animal bodies are composed of *non-living* minerals and elements found in soil and water that somehow acquire form and come into life.*

The question about the origin of life from non-living matter is so perplexing that Darwin initially ignored it and began thinking about evolution on the foundation of life as a given without an attempt to explain its origin. Darwin wrote his famous treatise about the, “Origin of Species”; he did not attempt to answer the philosophical/theological question about the “origin of life”; that was beyond the ability of empirical science. This attitude soon changed; scientists have continually attempted to provide a natural materialistic cause for the origin of life. All subsequent hypothesis and experiments, including the now famous “Miller-Urey Experiment”, intending to demonstrate that living organisms evolve chemically from non-living matter, have proven unsatisfactory. In fact, it is conceded by leading empirical scientists that IN OUR CURRENT ENVIRONMENT, the one we know and can observe, the origin of life from non-life is improbable if not impossible.

However, there are some so opposed to the idea of a Creator, that they remain zealously committed to the idea of “chemical evolution.” This sub-group of scientists finds it necessary to advocate spontaneous generation/abiogenesis and thus is opposed to scientists such as Louis Pasteur whose experiments, we thought, put the death nail in the coffin of spontaneous generation. However, these scientists, often atheists, strangely continue to insist that Pasteur’s

* Minerals constitute 4% of the body’s mass; the rest consists of a 70% isotonic solution of inorganic water and approximately 25% non-living amino acids, hormonal fluids and fats that are also composed of non-living atomic molecules.

experiments pertaining to spontaneous generation of life are irrelevant because **they only apply to the "current environment"** as we know it:

"What Louis Pasteur and the others who denied spontaneous generation (life from non-life) demonstrated is that life does not **currently spontaneously** arise in *complex* form from nonlife in nature" (Wilkins, 2004).

Since it has proven impossible to demonstrate that any life (not just "complex" life) arises spontaneously from nonliving elements, in our current environment, scientists committed to atheistic evolution, such as Wilkins, dismiss Pasteur's findings as irrelevant.

Since they cannot accept the fact that life cannot be verified to rise from non-life, they believe that some other unobservable and therefore unverifiable environment had to exist for the hypothesis of life from non-life to be plausible. Unfortunately, such a hypothetical environment is an imaginary construct that **CAN NEVER BE KNOWN OR VERIFIED**. No such imaginary environment in which life is shown to arise from non-life has ever been concocted. Even if such an environment could be hypothetically constructed, one in which life could be demonstrated to rise spontaneously from non-life, no one could be sure, to any high degree of certainty that is required for such a proof, that such an artificially constructed laboratory environment did in fact ever exist.

In short, the only verifiable environment we know is the one we live in, the "current one"; the one the geologists operating under the law of uniformity say is only one we can rely on. Anything else is a result of scientific imagination. For example, Buffon wrote:

"In order to judge what has happened, or even what will happen, one need only examine what is happening....Events which occur every day, movements which succeed each other and repeat themselves without interruption, constant and constantly reiterated operations, these are our causes and our reasons" (Quoted in Gillespie, p. 578).

Arguing for this same universal uniformity James Hutton the Father of Modern Geology wrote:

"The past history of our globe must be explained by what can be seen to be happening now....No powers are to be employed that are not natural to the globe, no action to be admitted except that of which we know the principle" (Quoted in Holmes, p. 43-4).

Finally, Sir Charles Lyell, author of *The Principles of Geology*, established the geological principles governing the use of methods still employed by geologists today, methods such as radiometric dating. According to Lyell,

"Only present-day erosional, sedimentary, volcanic, and tectonic processes at present-day rates of intensity, frequency, and magnitude should be used to interpret past geological activity" (Mortenson, 2007).

In spite of the insistence by geologists to necessarily adhere to current observed phenomena, biologists who advocate spontaneous generation are forced to deny the ubiquitous facts of everyday life; these should be "our causes and our reasons", as geologists argue. Believers in spontaneous generation deny the fact that the mystery of life must be explained by what is universally observable and verifiable as Hutton, Lyell, Buffon and almost every reputable geologist continues to affirm, that ubiquitous data which Pasteur used to demonstrate the invalidity of spontaneous generation. Instead they concoct some unverifiable idea to rescue their unverified hypothesis, a hypothesis that runs contrary to everything we can observe about the origin of life in every single thing that acquires life from tiny one celled organisms to more complex plants, animals and human beings, everything and everywhere throughout the entire globe and at every period of recorded human history.

Numerous attempts have been made to induce life in all kinds of hypothetical environments and

with all kinds of stimuli but nothing living has ever resulted. They simply cannot have it both ways, (see end note). Either we adhere to current data or we default to specious assumptions about primordial data, which they are forced to do because ubiquitous data do not support their unsupported hypothesis. You think they would change their hypothesis, but apparently, that must be preceded by a change in ideology.

The laws of nature are the same today as they were yesterday; this is a fundamental rule of physics. According to distinguished physicist Harold Schroeder (2009, p 25), "If the laws of nature are not fixed, if they are being tampered with in some miraculous way, then science is useless. **The consistency of nature is a basic tenet of all scientific inquiry**" (p 4).

Instead of doing the reasonable thing and accepting the fact that life cannot arise from non-life by any observable means as you would expect any reasonable person would do and, in fact, as many scientists since Pasteur have done, some scientists just cannot let go. For some uncertain reason they cling to an undemonstrated and unverifiable belief that life came from non-life and spend countless hours in vain trying to prove their point to an increasingly unconvinced audience of scientific and philosophical experts; even untrained laymen and laywomen find this one hard to believe, esp. when it is realized that it is backed by the scantiest of evidence, in fact, by no valid scientific evidence at all. It seems odd that those who clamor the loudest for scientific objectivity are themselves the biggest violators of their unverified shibboleth.

No one should seriously expect a reasonable person to accept a conclusion based upon some imaginary unknown that might be or might have been while everything that is shouts against it. Nonetheless, the question deserves further investigation (See endnote: Cannot Have it Both Ways: Spontaneous Generation and Geometric Dating).

NOTE

Before proceeding, it is necessary to distinguish "Spontaneous Generation" from what scientists now call "Abiogenesis". Spontaneous generation is not technically a theory that addresses the origin of life, but rather a belief that living things can emerge from non-living matter; it is not specifically about the VERY FIRST ORIGIN of life but about life coming from non-life at any time; **abiogenesis is concerned with the actual origin of the first life.**

Abiogenesis is a theory based on the idea of chemical evolution. It is believed that nucleic acids (the building blocks of DNA that contain instructions for building bodily parts) somehow self assembled themselves into RNA/DNA, then into cellular parts and ultimately into a complex cell that then somehow came to life. The idea began with Russian scientist Aleksandr Ivanovich Oparin (who worked for Lenin and the Communist Party at the Soviet Academy of Science) who published the Origin of Life (1924) in which he proposed that life emerged through a gradual chemical evolution of carbon based molecules within the now famous (but imaginary) "primordial soup".

Although, technically speaking, spontaneous generation is not the same as chemical evolution or abiogenesis, both deal with the same topic, life from non-life. Chemicals are not alive and a supposed evolution of dead chemicals into living things is certainly a spontaneous (that is unplanned or undirected) process. Although, spontaneous generation does not result from evolution of chemical elements into cells but from decaying organic substances, they seem to be essentially the same thing; they both defy modern observation of chemical and biological processes and they both rely on chemical composition of either dead or decaying matter.

Although Aristotle believed in spontaneous generation, his lack of any sophisticated scientific instruments that aid observation makes it easy to excuse him; he had no way of seeing into the minute realms of microbiology and therefore incorrectly concluded that flies arise from putrid matter, mice from decaying hay and crocodiles from rotten logs immersed in water. Moreover, because ancient cosmogony did not know God as a "creator" he had no theological basis to consider. The atheists have no such excuse.

Francesco Redi (1626–1697) showed that plants and animals develop from eggs and semen; putrefying matter is merely a substrate on which animals deposit their eggs. However, atheists like Lamarck insisted on spontaneous generation. "Lamarck believed that spontaneous generation is necessary in order to understand the discontinuities in fossil records and the evolution from the lower forms on the escalator of life to the more complex higher organisms" (Gason, 1995). Advances in the field of molecular biology, especially the development of DNA and RNA sequence technology, reinvigorated evolutionary biology and gave rise to the idea of abiogenesis.

Nevertheless, whether it is a chemical evolutionary process (non-biological abiogenesis) or a reversal of decomposition toward chemical composition (heterogenesis or spontaneous generation), they seem to imply the same thing: abiogenesis is simply a more improbable variant that instead of involving decomposing matter that once was alive, involves the composing of dirt or chemicals that never was. According to Drews, "All proponents of spontaneous generation believed that living entities can arise suddenly by chance from inorganic matter (abiogenesis) or from organic matter, which was itself derived from (once living) organisms (heterogenesis), independently of any parents." Thus, if Pasteur "debunked" spontaneous generation (including that of decaying animal or plant cells that have every type of chemical in the proper order and sequence, including DNA and RNA as well as amino acids and everything else needed for life as well as the actual cell itself); how much more should "Chemical Evolution" (which lacks everything and has to somehow manufacture amino acids, nucleic acids, cells and all their parts from scratch) be rejected?

If Aristotle's idea about mice and flies sounds crazy than abiogenesis sounds even more so. If all the essentials necessary for forming a cell are present but cannot generate life than how can assorted chemicals some lacking and some present randomly scattered throughout nature get the job done? This is an even more difficult task. Abiogenesis or chemical evolution (they mean the same) is merely a more incredible form of spontaneous generation; I will use the terms interchangeably.

Moving Forward: Non-Living Elements and Living Cells

Nonliving elements in the human body are composed of major and trace minerals. Major Minerals are those which the human body requires 100 milligrams (mg.) or more of each day. They consist of:

Sodium	Phosphorus	Chloride
Potassium	Magnesium	
Calcium	Sulfur	

Trace Minerals are those of which the Human body requires less than 100 mg. each day. They consist of:

Iron	Selenium	Chromium
Zinc	Iodine	Boron
Copper	Cobalt	Silicon
Manganese	Fluorine	Vanadium

The integration of these nonliving minerals contributes to vital bodily functions such as:

- Forming bones and teeth
- Maintaining normal acid to base balance, heart rhythm, muscle contraction and the transmission of nerve impulses
- Providing structure for the cells and for making hormones and enzymes that variously effect cell activity

All the minerals used for these operations are non-living substances derived from the water and soil, which, through complex metabolic processes, become part of living plant and animal cells. Thus, **living** human bodies receive minerals and other **non-living** nutrients (vitamins, sugars, amino acids, and salts) from dead soil and use a cellular conversion process whereby dead matter acquires life and becomes an integral part of a living cell.

Tremendous! **Living cells derive their constituent parts from non-living matter.** The perplexing question is: **how did nonliving matter get transformed into a living cell?** Where in the process did life begin? It is clear that the vital life giving force is not in the elements; they are non-living matter that merely takes on the attributes and characteristics of already living organisms through a metabolic process of conversion and cellular integration by which they acquire life. **THIS IS THE ONLY ORIGIN OF LIFE THAT SCIENCE HAS EVER OBSERVED: the genesis of life in non-living elements by contact with and incorporation into already living organisms. Abiogenesis, which asserts that life somehow sprang from non-life, involves dead chemicals; it does not involve living cells.** This is a problem that empirical science has never been able to solve and an imaginary process that no one has ever been able to demonstrate.

On the other hand, empirical science has demonstrated the opposite, (life from life) and it has demonstrated that life does not arise spontaneously from non-life. Louis Pasteur conducted empirical experiments to challenge the hypothesis that life arises spontaneously from non-life. Since his time, the theory of “spontaneous generation” is widely believed to have been rejected by almost everyone. In reality, as just mentioned, a considerable number of atheistic/agnostic scientists who realize that they need abiogenesis as a prop of their atheism still broadly accepts it because without it, the whole hypothetical schema of atheistic chemical evolution unravels; in the absence of abiogenesis some other cause of life, such as God would have to be posited.

Interestingly, it is possible to believe in a Creator and to simultaneously believe in biological evolution as well; there are many scientists, such as Francis Collins who headed up the Human Genome Project, who do this. While believing in evolution, he also states in his book about DNA, The Language of God that, “God is the source of all life and that life expresses the will of God (Collins, p. 203).” Moreover, the Catholic Church has long held this position. In his address to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, Pope John Paul II stated that, “In his encyclical *Humani Generis* (1950) my predecessor Pius XII has already affirmed that there is no conflict between evolution and the doctrine of the faith regarding man and his vocation, provided that we do not lose sight of certain fixed points.” These fixed points, include the origin of life and the spiritual nature of the soul, which we will explore latter.

Empirical scientists perplexed by the question of the origin of life have consistently been unable to provide a satisfactory and broadly accepted answer. They have (as stated, but worth repeating) therefore had to argue that although Pasteur’s findings are correct, they are, nonetheless, irrelevant. It is asserted that they are irrelevant because they apply only to current atmospheric conditions. Thus, since spontaneous generation (abiogenesis) has not and cannot be demonstrated to have occurred in our current environment, they insist it must have occurred in a hypothetically different one; otherwise, spontaneous generation could never have occurred

at all.

Ernst Haeckel (19th century) was among the first to argue that although spontaneous generation was not observable under the **current** conditions on earth, it must have taken place in the past under different, albeit, unobservable chemical conditions. In 1924, following Haeckel's lead, I.A. Oparin, a Russian biochemist proposed that life had first arisen from simple non-living molecules in a much different atmospheric environment than we know and experience today.

Building on the same unverified hypothesis Harold Urey assisted by Stanley Miller, (1952) pointed out that unlike earth; most of the other planets in our solar system have very little oxygen in their atmosphere. Knowing that **amino acids are easily destroyed by oxygen**, Urey hypothesized that spontaneous generation (which requires amino acids) must have occurred in a different unobservable atmospheric environment that he thought consisted of ammonia, hydrogen, water vapor and methane but little or no free oxygen (oxygen not bonded to other elements). **He imagined that these chemicals began interacting when stimulated by an outside energy source** (various candidates including lightening, solar energy, deep sea volcanic vents have been proposed by Urey and others) **and were transformed** from a few chemicals, (hydrogen, water vapor, methane and ammonia) **into amino acids. The amino acids then hypothetically fell into a primeval sea** (another unobservable but hypothetical construct) and in this sea they again hypothetically began to interact **until they collided with DNA or RNA** which also somehow hypothetically self assembled and guided the formation of amino acids into complex proteins. **All of this is imagined to have occurred outside of a living cell, because no such cell existed. In fact, the whole hypothetical process is supposed to explain the spontaneous generation (or chemical evolution) of the first cell structure that somehow resulted from this imaginary process and then miraculously came to life.**

"To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by bimolecular biology, we must magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometers in diameter and resembles a giant airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would then see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell, we would see millions of openings, like the portholes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings, we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity... Is it really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality, the smallest element of which-a functional protein or gene - is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality which is the very antithesis of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man (Molecular biologist, Michael Denton, 1986, p. 328)?

Although any trained eye can observe the formation of RNA and DNA taking place inside of a living cell and can also observe the formation of amino acids into proteins also occurring inside of a living cell, **no one has ever observed either of these amazing processes occur outside of a living cell. Yet, this is the scenario we are expected to believe: amino acids self-assembled outside of a cell, proteins self-assemble outside of a cell, DNA and RNA self-assemble outside of a cell, and then somehow all of these separate processes unintentionally coordinated their random movement resulting in the development of a complex cell structure and then, beyond all supported evidence or reason, the cell structure somehow miraculously acquired life and became a living organism.**

We are asked to believe that this ineffable process happened randomly outside of a cell, that dead chemicals somehow performed mathematical miracles and self-assembled into long polypeptide and polynucleotide chains containing hundreds of millions of data bits necessary to form proteins and DNA. **The dead chemicals**, and I am not being at all facetious, but sincere, miraculously (that is beyond any scientific explanation) **never, over hundreds of millions of years, underwent decay like every other observable thing subject to the chemical laws of nature**, but **over thousands and millions of years of uninterrupted growth without any decay** (no decomposition only uninterrupted composition) these dead elements not only directed themselves into DNA and RNA chains, they also determined and developed the most complex code that has ever been observed and embedded it in an ineffable genetic language consisting of three bit codons arranged along DNA in the correct order. That is, **not only did dead matter make DNA, it also engendered the genetic code and embedded it on the DNA**. To top it off **it built every cellular part** (organelle) and integrated them into a cellular system able to convert energy, remove wastes, interpret the genetic code, utilize the DNA, the RNA, and the amino acids to manufacture body parts capable of seeing, hearing and thinking.

It did this by randomly learning to combine and arrange amino acids, like letters of the alphabet, into a vast array of words necessary to form thousands of proteins needed to manufacture bodily parts. Dead matter somehow knew exactly what amino acids were needed, how they interacted, and in what exact sequence they had to be placed to make ears and eyes, hearts and lungs. It knew that exactly twenty amino acids were needed, it knew their chemical properties, and how each interacted with every other one and thus could be bound together into long complex polypeptide chains requiring billions of integrated bits of data to guide the process of forming plant, animal, and human parts and even entire bodies consisting of thousands of these properly ordered and integrated parts.

All of this, we are told without any conclusive evidence, happened randomly and spontaneously. This is incredulous and way beyond anything fair. It is not even possible for the human mind to conceive of such a process. No one can simultaneously hold over a BILLION variables in the mind necessary to simply imagine such an event let alone understand and manipulate each of the variables or to order and arrange them in such a fashion that a human body could result. However, **this is not merely an exercise of the imagination; we are expected to believe it actually happened**. Thomas Edison had enough problems dealing with one element at a time; here we have millions and even billions.

To develop ineffable genetic code meant that non-living chemicals had to randomly produce sugars, phosphates, and nitrogen bases needed to make DNA and then organize these separate parts into long strands of nucleic acid in such a way that the genetic code consisting of billions of bits of information could be built into the DNA itself. These billions of chemical bits had to properly sequence themselves in the absolute correct order to create a mysterious and little understood coded genetic language necessary to govern the process of creating a single complex cell. It randomly included inter alia, a self-developed retrieval mechanism whereby DNA duplicates itself using various types of RNA (which also had to be randomly produced and integrated into this staggering process) to transfer correct bits of its own data to manufacturing machines called ribosomes (also randomly produced and integrated into this process) where the data is used to guide the manufacture and conversion of single non-functioning and non-living amino acids into complex functioning proteins of which every living cellular and bodily organ is made.

This is a process that human beings with all of our knowledge and ability have not even begun to understand. We cannot even generate one living cell let alone an entire cellular mechanism for producing all bodily parts. **The best we can do is engage lab scientists in information piracy via a process whereby they gather bits of DNA from lab donors and then exploit living cells to do the complex work of building proteins by introducing the DNA bits into cellular cytoplasm while all they do is sit and watch what happens.** If we understood the process, we would be able to do it ourselves. All we understand is that non-living chemicals are transformed by living cells using DNA and cellular machinery to turn out complex living bodily parts. In other words, all we know is what we can see and mimic (monkey see-monkey do). With all of our intelligence, we are still in the monkey stage, but all this is believed by the atheists to have happened spontaneously without any direction.

Non-living chemicals somehow did something no thinking being has ever been able to do, viz., arrange chemical compounds to engender a living cell or a body part. We have never created a cell, not even one nor have we ever created a body part. We are exploring ways to induce pluripotent and totipotent cells to manufacture body parts, but **we are unable to engage in such a process without the existence and cooperation of an already existing cell.** Yet, this is supposed to have miraculously happened without any cell at all.

Moreover, in this imaginary scenario, DNA not only created itself, it also had some type of unknown relationship with amino acids so that the DNA molecules could know beforehand exactly how many and what types of amino acids existed, what their properties and functions were and how they reacted when combined. Without knowledge of these things, it would not be possible to code the genetic instructions into the DNA necessary for the synthesis of amino acids to make the proteins from which cells and body parts are made. These non-living and non-thinking "miracle chemicals" accidentally figured out what amino acids were needed to make each body part and purportedly developed the ineffable code for creating them, while related miracle chemicals somehow simultaneously developed into amino acids ready to be manipulated by the self-assembled cell and its self-assembled DNA with its self-assembled genetic code and self-assembled cellular machinery (organelles) to produce even more complex living cells.

Of course, none of this imaginary hypothesis has ever been observed. Instead of dismissing it and relying on the evidence before us in every living cell viz., life comes from life and proteins as well as DNA/RNA are manufactured inside of living cells, we are told, with a straight face, that the logical, observable and verifiable evidence before us and valid experiments such as Pasteur's must be dismissed, while some creative bit of imagination about some hypothetical and fantastic process of chemical evolution must be accepted because without it spontaneous generation the first principle of life and therefore of atheistic evolution must be dismissed.

Why All the Fuss?

Abiogenesis is the first principle of "Atheistic Evolution"; it stands at the threshold of chemical evolution; it is the point where chemical evolution terminates and biological evolution begins, where chemicals supposedly cease to be dead and come to life. Abiogenesis is therefore the first biological reality; it is not solely a chemical reality anymore; it crossed that threshold when dead chemicals hypothetically acquired life. In fact, if biological evolution is to occur (without a Creator), spontaneous generation is its starting point and therefore its first principle. To build an evolutionary house requires a foundation, without it the house will eventually crumble.

Abiogenesis is the unverified hypothetical foundation of atheistic evolution.

I would like to clarify the point: the topic at this moment is spontaneous generation; it is not evolution. Obviously, as pointed out above, an evolutionary argument can be made from a theistic premise without spontaneous generation or abiogenesis; however, "*atheistic evolution*" requires spontaneous generation as a starting point. **I am interested in the question not from a chemical or biological perspective, but from an ontological and sociological one.** My concern is (1) for a demonstrably correct definition of human nature and (2) the existence of a moral order and its effect on political and social life; this chapter is written with this intent in mind. **I am not arguing against evolution, rather, I am saying that spontaneous generation is a bad starting point.** Moreover, it leaves society without a solid objective foundation for the rights and dignity of man. Consequently, SOCIAL PHILOSOPHIES ALLIED WITH ATHEISTIC BIOLOGICAL THEORIES ULTIMATELY WORK AGAINST MAN as the history of Atheistic Communism attests.

This bit of understanding helps us to realize why such scientists as Oparin, Miller, and Urey et al are so invested in the ideas of spontaneous generation; without it the entire edifice of **atheistic evolution** must necessarily crumble. **Abiogenesis is not a valid first principle; it is neither a-priori self-evident nor a-posteriori empirically verified**, so what is it. **Absent a valid and necessary foundational principle, it is difficult to understand how atheistic evolution can claim to be a theory;** (it is sunk before it even gets started). It is at best a working hypothesis in need of a demonstrated first principle to establish its validity. Thus, it seems incorrect to refer to it as a theory.

Theistic Evolution, as seen above, can be a valid theory; it has a logical although empirically unverifiable first principle. Atheistic evolution, regardless of Pope John Paul II's 1996 statement to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences (he was talking about "Theistic Evolution") cannot say the same; its first principle is neither logically demonstrable nor empirically verifiable. Although it might proceed logically and empirically from the point of life forward, **it cannot even begin to move until it accounts for the origin of life, which is, according to the atheists, an evolutionary chemical process, that gives rise to an evolutionary biological process, that has never been verified.** I do not see how a valid evolutionary jump can be made to the discussion of biology when its very first principle, life (biology is a life science), has not been established.

Some argue that just because DNA, RNA, amino acids and proteins have never been observed to self replicate does not mean that they did not self replicate; then they charge people who disavow the idea of abiogenesis as illogical with a statement something like this: "Just because you have never seen a black bird does not mean that it does not exist." Pushing the matter, they go further and state that to say that abiogenesis does not exist is to commit a "logical fallacy" thereby implying that those who dismiss abiogenesis just because it has never been observed are stupid Then they shake their hands and declare a victory. Having become so accustomed to easy victories over the last hundred years, they presume they should win one on this point; their specious reasons have always worked before.

Not so fast, hold on, we are now in the 21st century and people are growing tired of all the old games. All around the world, from Egypt to Western Europe from Libya to the United States and Istanbul to Moscow, people are sensing that something is wrong and are therefore beginning to challenge the political, financial, and intellectual ponzi schemes that work to their detriment.

Of course, "anything is possible" but simple possibility does not make it true.
SCIENTISTS QUA SCIENTISTS MAKE PREDICTIONS BASED UPON HIGH PROBABILITY

NOT MERE POSSIBILITY. Tests of probability are based upon observation. **Anything is possible; that is why we have tests of probability.** As we saw in chapter one, the more observations made and the more general the population sampled the more certain is the test of probability. If a person looks five times and sees only white birds and concludes there are no black ones, his conclusion is based on a weak sample. If he looks a thousand times and sees none, it becomes more valid; if 100,000 times and then a million and sees only white birds on all seven continents, it becomes less and less probable that black ones exist until the point is reached that its possibility is generally excluded. Generally speaking, the more observations that are made the more valid are inferences drawn from them. **We have seen billions and billions and billions of cells and have looked under microscopes billions of times and never once has anything like that being proposed by the atheists ever been examined.** PROBABILITY IS AN OBJECTIVE MEASURE OF POSSIBILITY; **being merely possible with no empirical evidence, none at all, to support the possibility is no measure of probability at all, scientifically speaking, it is nothing.** But the atheist would have us believe that just because it is possible, it must be true.

Instead of scientists guided by a well-established theory, we have scientists guided by a extraordinarily improbable unverified imaginary hypothesis and acting as if atheistic evolution was a well-established theory while at the same time being aware of the weakness. If a hypothesis has not been proven, it is normally rejected. But, it cannot be rejected without damaging and indeed obliterating the entire atheistic edifice, so they teach it and believe it with impunity. They, claim that theism is faith based and fail to see the hypocrisy in the claim. viz., their whole idea is faith based, but not faith based in God rather faith based on their own unverified and illogical ideas. It is time for spontaneous generation and atheistic evolution along with Marxism-Leninism and the Soviet Union to go; such ideas are part of the dustbin of world history.

Oparin, Miller, Urey and others, who believe or have believed in the idea of the atheistic evolution of species, must also, to be consistent, believe or have believed that life arose spontaneously. They are therefore in frenzied search of an experiment to prove their hypothesis. **The idea of atheistic evolution would be valid if they admitted that it was only an hypothesis** in need of a logical or demonstrated first principle; then everything I just said would be retracted and I would rest content with the process, **but the claim has gone out to all four corners of the globe that atheistic evolution is a "theory"**. They might not, for marketing purposes, call it "**atheistic evolution**", but any evolutionary schema that rests on spontaneous generation as a starting point in the end shows itself to be atheistic. I sincerely and quite simply respond: **demonstrate the first principle of spontaneous generation then I can begin to take the "theory" seriously.**

In short, to save themselves an egregious embarrassment, they must establish the first principle. Therefore, Ernst Haeckel (1883), one of the patriarchs of atheistic evolution, stated,

"If we do not accept the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, then at this one point in the history of evolution we must have recourse to the miracle of a supernatural creation."

But, this is exactly what the atheists are unwilling to have recourse to; they have an emotional passion against it. Therefore, they continue to look increasingly ridiculous and are able to cover their foolishness by projecting it onto anyone who would dare question their hallowed beliefs or by imagining and proposing some alternative and equally or more ludicrous ideas to explain the origin of life, as we shall see.

Unfortunately, for the atheists, Miller's experiment does not come close to proving the specious idea that life comes from non-life in some illogical random fashion or in any fashion at all.

Rather, science appears to be moving closer to the admission of supernatural creation.

In this regard, Anthony Flew, a British philosopher (once considered among the world's leading atheists) who lectured for over twenty years at the Universities of Oxford and Aberdeen and authored such books as *Atheistic Humanism* (1993) and *Darwinian Evolution: Social Policy and Social Theory Series* (1984) has looked at the evidence and decided that spontaneous generation is too weak a base on which to build a theory that proceeds from an unverifiable first principle. In an interview with Dr. Benjamin Wiker, (2007) Flew stated:

"I believe that the origin of life and reproduction simply cannot be explained from a biological standpoint despite numerous efforts to do so. With every passing year, the more that was discovered about the richness and inherent intelligence of life, the less it seemed likely that a chemical soup could magically generate the genetic code. The difference between life and non-life, it became apparent to me, was ontological and not chemical. The best confirmation of this radical gulf is Richard Dawkins' comical effort to argue in *The God Delusion* that **the origin of life can be attributed to a lucky chance. If that's the best argument you have, then the game is over. No, I did not hear a voice. It was the evidence itself that led me to this conclusion.**"

The evidence also compels me to a similar conclusion. In a Sunday Times review, Flew concluded that, "I have been persuaded that it is simply out of the question that the first living matter evolved out of dead matter and then developed into an extraordinarily complicated creature" (Wavell, 2004).

To say that life arises from non-life is simply illogical and non-verifiable. **This statement not only contradicts the logical principle of existential causality**, which tells us that you cannot get something from something else that it does not have to give (you cannot get apples from a peach tree or a living organism from dead chemicals) **it is also not empirically verifiable**; no one has ever observed spontaneous generation-that would be a true miracle that transcends the laws of nature.

However, it is logical to say that life arises from previously existing life (a priori self-evident principle effect from proportionate cause). **This statement is also empirically verifiable** (a posteriori empirical principle, I can see it everywhere I look). Moreover, since science cannot provide any empirical evidence in defiance of logic and in defiance of its own observations, I confidently conclude that non-living phenomena acquire life from already living organisms and that the origin of life is a metaphysical potency beyond the ability of empirical science to explain. It is therefore necessary to approach the question through philosophy, which informs us that it is the soul which is the source of life.

We can empirically verify this principle (life from life) by examining the processes of cellular growth and replication. Anyone who examines these processes is able to observe a unique profundity: cells grow from incorporation of non-living mineral elements, (water, oil, sugars and amino acids) through a metabolic process, whereby **nonliving matter is transformed into living matter**. That is, each cell is a living organism that contains both the instructions and the chemical ingredients necessary to both grow and to form other living cells. **The mother cell transmits life to each daughter cell and to all the incorporated non-living elements** that are needed for further cell growth and replication. The elements do not confer life to the cell; **THE CELL CONFERS LIFE TO THE ELEMENTS.**

Decomposition of Nonliving Chemical Compounds

At the other end of the life spectrum, when a human being dies, the body undergoes another, but reverse, metamorphosis (cell degradation) via a process of decomposition by which life ceases and the constituent parts of each cell slowly, but gradually and inevitably separate and

return to their original non-living and random state. Matter is not lost, (it is converted) BUT LIFE IS. Decomposition is synonymous with the breakdown of molecules that were held together by the living cell. Without life, the cell cannot maintain its organized integrity and it begins to decompose. In the process, the many organized and united minerals that made up the complex parts of the human body return to their original and simple chemical state.

Thus, outside of a living cell the move from organized composition to unorganized decomposition, complex to simple occurs throughout nature. The only naturally occurring move, in the opposite direction, from unorganized decomposition to organized composition that we know of takes place inside of a living cell; outside of this dynamic organism we always find the opposite, a move from complex to simpler molecules and ultimately to the most simple atomic elements. Since the law of conservation of matter, states that matter cannot be created or destroyed but can be converted from one form into another we universally find the complex tissue composed of living cells breaking down into non-living molecules and elements by a process of DECOMPOSITION when the cell dies. That is, when subject to various climatic influences, molecules/elements tend to return to their original non-living and thus unorganized or more correctly, simply organized (not complex but simple organization) state.

This is a universal empirical phenomenon; it is observable everywhere we look. However, there is an exception to this movement toward simple chemical order; it is known as "reverse entropy" or **anti-entropy**, which involves movement in the opposite direction, unorganized to organized, simple to complex. **Anti-entropy occurs when complex machinery or mechanical systems exist that are able to convert non-useable or unused energy outside of a system into a form of useable energy inside of a system necessary to conduct work that produces an organized product.**

For example, the temperature in a house that loses its source of heat in winter will diminish overtime until it equals that of its surrounding environment, freezing. To avoid this, human beings have invented complex mechanical devices to regulate temperature and keep it constant regardless of outside influences such as frost, wind, and snow.

Heaters and air conditioners are mechanical devices that rely on converted energy in the form of electricity to do their work. The inside of the house affected by the work of these mechanical devices resists the move toward entropy. In the absence of such machinery, the inside of the house, in hot summer months, is not going to cool itself to a continual point below the outside temperature no matter how much outside energy is concentrated on the house in the form of sunshine or air (unconverted energy). To keep bodies cool in the summer, when temperatures are uncomfortable, requires mechanical devices capable of work by the conversion of raw energy to useable energy. Without (1) such mechanical devices and (2) an energy conversion process necessary for them to function, the heat inside of a house will over time equal that of its surroundings; hot in the summer and cold in the winter.

Living cells function in a similar fashion. The cell is able to import glycogen (unused or potential energy) from the blood across its permeable barrier. Glycogen once inside of the cell is converted into ATP or a useable form of cellular energy necessary for the cell to do its work. So long as the cell remains alive and healthy, it is continually able to use its energy conversion system to convert glycogen to ATP necessary for the work of the cellular machinery, which then produces proteins for the building up of bodily parts. In this process, a cell is able to work against entropy and convert simple molecules into complex parts of a larger complex system. **Once the cell dies, the energy conversion stops, the machines break down and the universal phenomenon of decomposition asserts itself again.**

The interesting observation that should yield expressions of awe, the blasting of a thousand trumpets and the tolling of a million bells is **that at death, the process of cellular composition**

is replaced by a process of decomposition. When life disappears, living matter returns to its original non-living and simple state. The once living cell dies and its constituent parts separate into individual non-living elements of zinc, copper, sodium, calcium, hydrogen, where they become capable of future life by incorporation into another living organism, plant, animal or human, but until such a time, they remain simply dead.

Make no mistake about it, this process is real and observable; it is not a hypothetical construct of the imagination like spontaneous generation but a universal and empirical reality present and verifiable everywhere. I refer to it as "spontaneous degeneration." There is no such thing as "spontaneous generation" of non-life to life, but there is such a thing as spontaneous degeneration of life to non-life accompanied by decomposition or move from complex to simple, composed to decomposed. Life being complex is "downward compatible," it can become less complex than it is; however, non-living unorganized simple elements cannot become more complex than they are. They can become different than they are through a process of conversion but they do not organize themselves, acquire functions and begin interacting on the environment as living cells do; instead, THE ENVIRONMENT ACTS ON THEM. The only time they act on the environment is when they are constituent parts of living cells. The cell is simply remarkable!

Those scientists who believe in spontaneous generation also believe in ANTI-ENTROPY OUTSIDE OF LIVING CELLS but, **again, they have never been able to verify it. They believe that somehow anti-entropy can occur by the mere presence of energy and matter in an "open system"**. Because earth is an "open system" energy and matter do converge; however, they believe the energy somehow caused matter to organize and then, once organized, they further believe that it somehow came to life. This is an unacceptable and unverifiable hypothesis; let's see why. Physicists have identified three types of energy systems: isolated, closed, and open.

An **Isolated system** does not exchange **matter** or **energy** with its surrounding environment. The **universe** is an isolated system; it has no surroundings to exchange matter or energy with.

A **Closed system** is capable of exchanging **energy** but **not matter** with its surrounding environment. An example of this would be a **greenhouse**. Since it is closed or covered with glass, no new matter enters in; however, energy from the sun penetrates though the glass walls and is able to interact with and affect the cellular system in the plants.

An **Open system** **exchanges energy and matter** with its surrounding environment and has a permeable barrier. An open boundary is also called a permeable boundary. The human cell is an open system; it has a permeable boundary that selectively permits the entrance of matter that can be converted into energy or used to organize and build. Thus, it is possible for an open system, like the cell, to receive both energy and matter necessary to organize and to fuel cellular work of building complex bodily parts (anti-entropy) and bodily systems from simple molecules and elements.

We must be careful not to make the mistake of assuming that all that is needed for anti-entropy to occur is the concurrence of energy and matter in an open system. Energy and matter are necessary, but by themselves are insufficient to resist entropy. Even though the introduction of energy in a *closed* system (greenhouse) permits the possibility of anti-entropy and even though the introduction of both energy and matter in an *open* system (cell, planet earth) also permit the possibility of anti-entropy, **both the open and closed system, in addition to energy, need, as stated, an energy conversion process and a mechanical device capable of doing complex organized work as well as a third ingredient, information such as a computer program to guide the process.**

Anti-entropy can occur in both open and closed systems because both of these systems have something in common that permits the occurrence of anti-entropy, that is, a living cell capable of (1) converting energy and (2) having machinery necessary to build body parts. **The "primordial soup" has both chemical matter and energy from the sun but it lacks (1) an energy conversion mechanism and also (2) complex machinery** that runs on this converted energy do the work of resisting entropy and building body parts **and (3) organized information** to guide the entire process.

Living cells have all three requisites. If a greenhouse lacked living *plant cells* capable of converting solar energy into useable plant energy via photosynthesis (and further capable of using the converted energy to do the cellular work of building living plant cells and tissue as well as giving off waste products in the form of oxygen) plants would not grow, flower, and reproduce. **In fact, without a living cell, the presence of solar energy would not generate anti-entropy at all but would, contrary to the advocates of spontaneous generation, actually result in increased entropy or plant decomposition caused by the radiation of the sun acting on the plant leaves. Outside of the cell, the sun will radiate and actually kill any thing trying to organize itself into a plant. Things are grossly different on the inside;** inside an existing plant cell, the sun is harnessed by a complex conversion mechanism, known as photosynthesis, to drive cellular work or anti-entropy and **instead of decomposition and death, we find composition and life;** just by crossing that tiny little cell barrier, life and DNA work with cellular machinery against entropy.

Moreover, if energy as well as matter in the form of water were introduced to chemicals outside of a cell, the process of entropy (not anti-entropy as the atheists maintain) would be further accelerated by the combined radiation of the sun and reduction of composition caused by water a powerful and universal solvent. What does that do to the chemical soup? Outside of a cell, nutrients are dissolved in *water*, but inside the cell, *water* is the medium in which most chemical reactions take place. Thus, water like sunshine outside of cell increases entropy but inside it increases anti-entropy. Simply put, outside of a living cell raw solar energy merely exacerbates entropy and the addition of water makes it even worst. It takes a living cell (1) capable of transforming **destructive solar energy** into **useable cellular energy** and (2) capable of doing work, which further requires complex integrated parts and water (*water* is the medium in which most chemical reactions take place). Interestingly, outside of a cell, water, like solar radiation, is destructive to growth but inside of the cell, it is conducive to growth and composition.

THE CELL IS AN AMAZING LIVING ORGANISM MAKING WHAT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR NON-LIVING CHEMICALS POSSIBLE, viz., organization, increased complexity, transition of life, and anti-entropy.

So the atheists are correct, entropy can be resisted in an open system, entropy can be resisted in all systems. But, never in the absence of subsystems that are alive such as living cells or in subsystems that have been created and are cable of energy conversion and mechanical work because they are designed for such work, such as air conditioners or robots. Atomic elements and chemical compounds are not such sub-systems; they are not designed for complex work or for energy conversion and they are not alive. So while it might be true to say as the atheists do that entropy is not a universal law; it is also true to say that it is not a universal law because certain subsystems in an open system such as living cells oppose it; they are capable of complex mechanical work and designed for such work through unity of parts and conversion of energy guided by built in information system.

Advocates of spontaneous generation or chemical evolution want to argue that entropy is not a universal law, because this permits them to say that chemical evolution is

possible. If honest, they should not neglect to add that the reason it is not a universal law is because of the existence of cellular systems capable of energy conversion and work. They neglect the later because they are trying to argue (in fact their position forces them to argue), contrary to logic and all empirical evidence, that cells evolved chemically from non-living elements. The truth is that the only way non-living elements evolve, as empirical science demonstrates, is within an already living cell capable of composition.

To counter this empirical verity, the atheists argue, that atoms and snowflakes are capable of forming complex patterns or crystallizing into highly organized pattern states without the aid of a living cell. There is no denying that snowflakes are arranged in geometric patterns, but these patterns are not arranged the way amino acids are in living cells whose work is directed by information contained in DNA. **Crystalizing atoms do not have nor do they need information or programming to acquire geometric form. They are governed by natural properties inherent in the atoms themselves**, which when combined with atmospheric conditions account for the crystal patterns; **THE ENVIRONMENT ACTS ON THEM; THEY DO NOT ACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT**. Living organisms unlike nonliving atoms and molecules have built in information and complex integrated organs that interpret and utilize the information to form integrated parts of more complex wholes; they operate on the environment by absorbing it, transforming it, and expelling wastes into it. Snowflakes do not operate; they are operated on. Atoms simply adhere to their chemical properties. The order apparent in atoms crystalizing is a difference of kind from that found in living organisms. One requires information the other does not. One generates living organs the other has never been observed to do so. One alters then environment, the other does not.

Decomposition of DNA: The Instructions for Bodily Parts

Profound as the law of entropy or spontaneous degeneration might be, **equally striking is the phenomenal disappearance of the DNA which contains the genetic code necessary for ordering the construction of living bodily parts from non-living amino acids; when a body dies**, it completely vanishes. **DNA** is wrongly called "The Code of Life." **DNA IS NOT A PRINCIPLE OF LIFE; IT IS A PRINCIPLE OF INFORMATION** that is responsible for organizing matter inside of a living organism. **Life is not in the DNA nor does life spring from the DNA**; non-living or decomposing DNA never reverses the entropic process and comes to life. In fact, **in the absence of cellular life, DNA decomposes and disappears**. It is not some immortal or spiritual substance or "Code of Life"; it is a quasi-material phenomenon, as we shall see. However, **the information or genetic code stored on the DNA is, like life itself, a very unusual and empirically unexplainable phenomenon**.

DNA the "Miracle Code"

DNA or deoxyribonucleic acid is a highly specialized and unique data storage medium found exclusively (accepting for non-living viruses*) **in living organisms**. It is not; however,

* The origins of viruses is not known because they do not form fossils. There are 3 theories that endeavor to account for their origin:

Regressive evolution - viruses originated in living cells, but the cell regressed to a virus until it retained only the genetic information essential to their parasitic way of life. This is both plausible and probable; it is simply the DNA from a decaying cell

Cellular origins - viruses DNA/RNA that have escaped from inside cells (presumable when the cell lyses or decomposes). This is the most likely scenario; it is verifiable.

Independent entities - viruses evolved spontaneously from self-replicating molecules believed to have existed in the prebiotic 'RNA world'. **There is no evidence of any virus this old**. This is another hypothetical construct without any verification in objective reality, a bit of poorly demonstrated imagination from the annals of spontaneous generation to support their waning hypothesis.

the “code of life” as it is frequently called. DNA although associated with living things, does not bring them to life.

In fact, DNA is manufactured by living organisms and therefore cannot be the “code of life”. Rather, DNA IS THE CODE FOR BUILDING PROTEINS. Nonetheless, it is a “Miracle Code”, as I will endeavor to show.

What is DNA?

DNA is a long vertical strand consisting of alternating sugar/phosphate molecules joined by strong chemical bonds and interspersed by various nitrogenous bases. It consists of five parts:

- 1. Nucleobases:** These are 4 bases (Cytosine (C) Guanine (G) Adenine (A) and Thymine (T) arranged vertically **along the sugar-phosphate strand**. They are essential for the genetic code.
- 2. Nucleosides:** A nucleoside consists of the combination of a nucleobase (CGAT) to a sugar (deoxyribose). It is called a “side” because it protrudes horizontally (out of the side) from the sugar on the DNA strand.
- 3. Nucleotide:** A nucleotide consists of a nucleoside (sugar and nitrogen base) and a phosphate. The whole unit (base, sugar and phosphate) form a single nucleotide.
- 4. Polynucleotide:** A polynucleotide is a long vertical strand of nucleotides (it can consist of millions of nucleotides) joined by strong (phosphodiester) bonds between the sugars and phosphate molecules.
- 5. Double Helix:** The well known classic shape of DNA that is formed by the union of two polynucleotide strands from which a series of nitrogen bases protrudes horizontally. The nitrogen bases on each strand have the unique property of attracting each other in a specific manner. A will only attach to T and C only attaches to G.

To help envision this, imagine two long but separate and parallel vertical strands of sugar and phosphate. Each strand has numerous nitrogen bases protruding horizontally from top to bottom looking for its complimentary base on some other strand such that all the As become attached to all the Ts and all the Cs are attached to all the Gs by weak hydrogen bonds.

The result is deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) consisting of two vertical sugar/phosphate backbones united by weak horizontal base pairs arranged in such a way as to make the strands wrap around each other like a twisted ladder to form a single strand of DNA.

The Genetic Code in the DNA

As mentioned, there are only four possible nitrogen bases adenine (A); thymine (T); cytosine (C); and Guanine (G). A reaches out and attaches to T and C reaches out and attaches to G. Each AT or CG connection along the DNA strand is referred to as a "base pair". These base pairs are the “alphabet” of the genetic code.

* Genes differ in size depending on the type of protein they code for. Human beings have about 23,000 genes consisting of 3 billion base pairs (99 percent of those bases are the same in all people) distributed unevenly among 23 chromosomes or strings of DNA. The average gene consists of 3000 bases, but sizes vary; the largest known human gene, dystrophin has 2.4 million bases. Chromosome number 1 has the most genes (2968), and the Y autosome has the least (231)

The human genome (complete set of genes needed to make a human body) consists of approximately 3 billion base pairs. The way these bases are ordered along the DNA determines the genetic code or instructions for building bodily parts. Each base pair can be considered a **letter**; every three bases, known as a codon, can be considered a **genetic word** that stands for a particular amino acid of which there are twenty. These words can be combined in trillions of diverse combinations (20^{20}). Each unique combination (consisting of thousand or millions of base pairs) is arranged in a highly specific order to make a gene, which is like a **chapter** in a book, necessary for building a particular protein consisting of individual amino acid words.

There are 23 chromosomes (strings of DNA) in the human cell nucleus; each is like a particular **book** or volume containing genetic instructions from many genes* for building specific body parts. All the genetic data in all of the chromosomes is like an integrated **set of encyclopedias** consisting of 23 volumes of genetic information necessary for forming a human body and all of its complex parts (organs, tissue, and cells).

In summary, **the genetic code is made of approximately 3 billion base pairs, which code for amino acids and are organized into genetic chapters called genes along a strand of DNA or chromosome, which is like an entire book or volume containing many chapters/genes.**

Each chromosome is a separate volume in a set containing 23 volumes situated inside the nucleus of each somatic cell that make up the human body:

Interestingly, the genetic data is not written **on the DNA** (like notes are written on paper) but is actually **part of the DNA itself**. The code exists in the empirically **unexplained ordering** of the base pairs. That is, codons are arranged in a specific order such that every three base pairs represent a chemical word that stands for one specific amino acid. For example, the base sequence ATG codes for the amino acid methionine. Thus, the genetic code is a sequence of codons that indicate which amino acids are required in which specific order to make specific proteins. A gene is a section of codons on a string of DNA that codes for a specific protein made of many amino acids assembled in the proper order for the making of a specific body part.

Be careful, although this might sound redundant, it is not. THE DNA IS ONE THING, THE CODE IS ANOTHER, but **materially BOTH ARE THE SAME THING**, while in essence they are very different, as we shall see in chapter four.

What Makes DNA a Unique Storage Medium?

DNA is distinguished by the sheer amount of information that is stored on such a small medium and packed inside a microscopic cell nucleus. Within the nucleus, we find 23 chromosomes containing the complete genetic code necessary to construct a human body. Even more fascinating is the unique way the data is stored. Every other data storage mechanism known to man utilizes two media.

For example, a formula written on paper requires the paper (one media) and a second media (ink or lead) with which to write the information on the paper. Similarly, information written on a chalkboard requires both the chalkboard and chalk with which to write the data on the board. Data stored on a computer disk requires both the disk and a set of binary digits to communicate the data.

DNA is quite different. The information stored on DNA requires just the DNA and no additional medium to communicate the words. Both the DNA and the genetic words it contains share the same medium. In a sense the words are not written on anything; the genetic data is not written on the DNA but within it. Thus, unlike all other information recording schemas, which permit the removal of data but the retention of storage media, when it comes to DNA and its inherent genetic code, one cannot be simply taken away without also losing the other. The genetic data cannot be taken away without losing the DNA nor the DNA be taken without losing the data. That is, if the codons are taken away all that is left are unconnected linear strands of sugar and phosphates. Or if the sugar/phosphate strands are taken away all that is left are unconnected and meaningless nitrogen bases neither of which is DNA or organized genetic data found only in DNA. We will come back to explore the ramifications of this remarkable quality of DNA in the next chapter.

A Closer Look at DNA

A cell is the smallest unit of biological analysis, but is not the smallest unit of chemical analysis. Each living cell, small as it might be, is made completely (that is 100%) of still smaller non-living elements, molecules, atoms and sub-atomic parts. **None of these atomic and subatomic parts contain any DNA or any trace of ever having had any DNA. DNA and its genetic data, as far as any logical and empirical evidence has been able to determine, exists only in living organisms or as remnants of once living organisms (viruses) that have undergone the normal entropic process of genetic decay when life ceases.**

DNA, to be sure, can be created from dead matter, (sugars, phosphates, nitrogen bases), as proteins can be created from amino acids, **but this only happens inside of a living cell, as is universally verified by empirical science.** Genetic data does not now and, judging by all available evidence, never has existed in any non-living element, atom or atomic part. **It is acquired only from a living organism and decomposes when that organism dies.**

The more durable the medium on which the data is stored, the longer it will remain in existence. A DVD disc is a durable medium used to store millions of data bits, but like all material things, DVD discs decompose and the digital data imprinted or encoded on them disappears with the discs. Likewise, **all the genetic data encoded within a cell disappears when the cell matter decomposes.** Because every cell in the human body contains an exact copy of the DNA found in every other cell (excepting gamete cells), biologists are able to find DNA in decomposing bones; they are among the most durable bodily parts. Unfortunately, the other parts decompose more rapidly than bones taking the DNA with them. The bones will also disappear. Before they do, paleoanthropologists try to extract the precious data. In short, **DNA can be found breaking down all over the place as a byproduct of organic decay.**

All of these interesting phenomena lead to, what is for most people, a profound yet common sense conclusion: because DNA, like life, does not arise from non-living elements nor does it remain with them when they return to their original state after having been part of a living organism, these inorganic elements are merely the stuff out of which DNA is manufactured. Only living things can direct growth, and they do this by a mysterious but observable process by which DNA (along with RNA) directs the transformation of non-living amino acids, into complex proteins, which become integral parts of living organisms and in the process acquire life themselves.

Since the living cell is built completely of nonliving matter; the mystery of life found in the cells must come from somewhere other than the nonliving matter. Life does not just

pop into existence. Yet, bodies indisputably have a mysterious life force; although it cannot be empirically observed, it is surely there.

Moreover, when this mysterious power ceases to be present, a once living and complex integrated system capable of reproduction, growth, memory and imagination decomposes and each of its living parts separate and return to its original simple inorganic or non-living state. Atheistic scientists have been unable to account for this phenomenal life-cycle, but **philosophers, for over three thousand years, have studied this imperceptible but very real and mysterious force that unites, harmonizes, organizes and enlivens and have consistently referred to it as the soul.**

That is why they have insisted that every living thing must have a soul—humans, animals and plants. Although it might be shocking at first sight to think of plants and animals having souls, when the soul is understood as the life force, it is not so shocking since all living things share the same life properties. The soul has been defined as THE VITAL PRINCIPLE OR SUBSTANTIAL "FORM" OF A LIVING BODY OR THAT WHICH GIVES MATTER LIFE AND ACTUALIZES ITS POTENCIES (Wuellner, S.J., 1956. p 116).

By form, philosophers mean the expressed nature or essence of a thing, that which interacts with amorphous matter and makes it to be one thing rather than another, a nucleotide rather than a peptide, gold rather than silver. The form is the specific constituent in a substance (a being, like the soul, which has existence in itself and not in another) which communicates itself to indeterminate matter and actualizes its potential to become a definite thing. (Wuellner, p. 49). Form is that substance that composes amorphous decomposed atoms into a specific thing such as a human cell, which is a combination of millions of atoms that function together in an organized fashion with specific powers and properties that greatly exceed that of the individual atoms of which it is made. Form must in some material way be communicated to matter.

As demonstrated, matter is unable to organize itself into a complex and living body. To be so transformed it needs a life giving force (soul) a set of instructions (DNA) and complex mechanisms (cellular organisms) to initiate, energize and guide the process of transforming simple atomic elements into complex cellular tissues, organs and integrated bodily systems. Imagine trying to bake a cake; several constituent parts are necessary without which a cake cannot be made. To bake a cake, a cook book or a set of instructions (DNA) is needed. But the instructions, by themselves, are practically useless without the proper ingredients eggs, milk, flour, sugar, and spices (minerals, amino acids and sugars).

It is not possible to simply place the cookbook and all of the necessary ingredients on a table and expect a cake to materialize. Proper tools such as an oven, bowls, mixers, and spoons (ribosomes, endoplasmic reticulum, golgi, and other organelles) are also needed. Most importantly, there is also need of life or a living being (the living cell itself) capable of generating energy to initiate the process, of **interpreting the instructions, assembling the ingredients, turning on the oven and removing the cake from the oven when complete.**

Thus, in the process of baking a cake or creating a human body four things are needed (1) the proper ingredients (2) a set of instructions (3) proper tools or machinery (4) an initiator or living cause. All four are necessary, none by themselves or in union with any other two are sufficient; all are necessary.

Thus, the **atheistic evolutionists** who believe in spontaneous generation and reverse entropy outside of living cells are faced with observable and universal evidence and good old common sense that negates their hypothesis about the origin of the genetic code, and the cellular mechanisms necessary for its decoding and assembly. **According to them nature made the instructions (DNA) and manufactured the tools (cellular organelle) before the**

manufacturing machine (cell) itself existed (but it needed the manufacturing machine to make the tools and the tools to make the machine). **It also provided all the ingredients (amino acids, nucleic acids, glycogen, minerals etc) and somehow acquired a life force and transferred it to the machine assembled for manufacturing.**

The Origin of DNA

Where did DNA and the living cell come from? It seems that **the two are related. The genetic code used to build complex protein body parts is useless without the decoding and assembly mechanisms found in living cells.** However, when we think about both the cell and its DNA we are faced with a perplexing enigma, viz., **DNA cannot be made without a cell but a cell cannot be made without DNA.** If a cell is needed to manufacture DNA (as is universally verified in every cell), and DNA is needed to manufacture another cell (as is universally verified in every cell), which came first, the cell or the DNA?

Neither could be first because each is contingent upon the others existence. DNA does not self manufacture outside of a cell nor is it logical to say that it self-assembled inside the first living cell; without DNA being prior to the cell to guide its composition, there could be no cell within which DNA could self-manufacture. That is, DNA is needed by to guide matter to become a cell, but the cell is needed to manufacture DNA.

In summary:

(1) A cell is made of complex and integrated protein parts that require DNA instructions for its own creation; cells have never been observed to be manufactured without DNA.

Therefore

(2) The DNA had to exist before the cell could be created. However, this is impossible or highly improbable because:

DNA has been empirically verified to assemble only within cells.

In one case the DNA had to exist before the cell and in the other, the cell had to exist before the DNA. Since this is a circular argument and therefore logically impossible as well as empirically unverifiable; it is necessary to conclude that the two are positively correlated, but one cannot be the cause of the other (correlation is not causation) because each requires the impossible previous existence of the other before it is capable of its own existence. This is indeed a unique relationship.

The Chicken or Egg Riddle Solved

The relationship between a cell and DNA is similar to the relationship between a chicken and an egg; which came first? This is a difficult but solvable riddle. **It is usually asked which came first, the chicken or the egg, (the cell or the DNA) without ever considering the possibility that neither came first; maybe they were simultaneous; maybe there are other possibilities.** When first asked the question, the mind becomes quickly involved in the perplexing circular puzzle. Because it immediately begins to explore each possibility, (egg first or chicken first) it misses the logical way out, viz., **neither came first.**

There are actually four possible solutions (chicken + egg = 2²) to the problem **not just the two that are offered in the question** (chicken or egg). The other two alternatives are: (3) both came first (simultaneous) or (4) neither came first.

Only One Choice is Possible

The question is misleading; it proffers only two choices (chicken or egg) when in fact there are four. When reviewing the possibilities it becomes clear that only one choice is possible.

Consider the first answer, the chicken. This possibility is easily negated; **one chicken cannot lay a fertilized egg because it takes two chickens to make an egg before one can lay an egg** (except on a chicken farm where the egg is simply an unfertilized product induced by artificial means). This is empirically verifiable. Moreover, was the one chicken an adult or did it develop from a baby; if from a baby how did it survive without a parent to nurture and protect it, if an adult, where did it find a partner to propagate the species?

The second answer, the egg, is also negated by empirical verification. **What is the sense of one egg? Two eggs are needed** (male and female) **because once one is hatched the species will die; it takes both a male and a female chicken to continue the species.** Moreover, how would one egg if it even hatched (an egg cannot hatch without a chicken to incubate it) survive without a mature chicken to feed and protect it?

To make matters worse, it is highly probable that more than a minimum two eggs or two chickens would be needed. What is the possibility that if there were only two eggs or two chickens that in both cases one would be male and the other would be female? It is highly probable that, in at least one of the two cases, both would be of the same gender and perhaps this would be true in both cases, in which case we would not need two eggs or two chickens but three four or five of each. Moreover, if there were two eggs both would (1) need incubation, (2) would have to be found in the same location and hatch at the same time (in a billion year time span), (3) would both have to be of different genders and (4) be able to survive without any form of protection or any means of sustenance.

The third answer (they both were first) is impossible for the same reason the first two are (nurture and sustenance). Besides, the question asks, which came first. Moreover, a **chicken and an egg cannot mate unless the chicken waited for the egg to hatch** and the infant reaches maturity; but even then, what are the odds of them being different genders, existing in the same place, at the same time and of them both surviving (in a jungle where only the fittest survive) to mate later. Moreover, we have the more difficult question that if both came first, where did they both come from if one did not come from the other. **Making them both first does not answer the question, which came first; it only exacerbates the question.**

This leaves choice four, neither came first. Obviously, if none of the other answers work (and three are only four choices) and chickens do in fact exist, something has to give. If the fourth choice, neither came first, is correct, which it has to be by process of elimination, we are left asking what, in fact, was first.

If we examine the question from only two perspectives, as we almost always do, (chicken or egg) the question becomes ridiculously circular, illogical, incapable of sense verification and therefore nonsensical and dismissed as an unsolvable dilemma. However, it is not unsolvable; it is a trick question meant to confuse and therefore cast a cloud of skepticism or doubt over a vital topic.

The sleight of hand is missed because all four possibilities are not proffered and

therefore not seen. If they are not seen, they are not known to exist and therefore not examined. When they are examined, something interesting emerges: Although, **none of the answers to the question are empirically verifiable**, ONE, the fourth, IS LOGICAL, viz., neither came first.

Neither came first because something else was first, a necessary Being or Creator as **the cause of two chickens or two eggs**. They had to come from somewhere; both logical demonstration and empirical verification tell us that (1) they did not assemble themselves and (2) the first three choices are empirically impossible. Logic and observation both tell us that two chickens or two eggs are required. Thus, according to scripture, **God did not make just one egg or one chicken. He avoided the problem because, as the theologians tell us, he made two (male and female) at the same time.** *This might not be empirically verifiable but it is logical. The other choices are not empirically verifiable or logical.*

Thus, the fourth answer is the correct one, nether came first, because something or someone else did.

This logic coupled with knowing that spontaneous generation is an invalidated hypothesis, permits me to answer that neither the DNA nor the cell came first. **Like the chicken and the egg, DNA or cell first, results in a circular and empirically unverified hypothesis. It is more logical to posit a creator because both DNA and a living cell (like the chicken and the egg) are both certainly in existence, one cannot empirically be shown to be the cause of the other and it is not logical for one to be antecedent to the other when each needs the other for its own existence.**

Parthenogenesis:

The atheists, as expected, instead of making life easy, refuse to cooperate and scour the world looking for an anomaly as proof for their ailing case. They try to circumvent this idea by claiming that in actuality it is possible and empirically verifiable that it only takes one and not two to engender another animal. This unusual behavior is verified in several species and is known as parthenogenesis, a form of asexual reproduction where growth of an embryo occurs in the female without fertilization from a male. **In plants, it is called apomixis.** Parthenogenesis, which ALWAYS RESULTS IN THE BIRTH OF A FEMALE, occurs in aphids and some bee and scorpion species as well as several reptiles, fish and sharks, but has never been observed in mammals.

Interesting as this observation is, the idea of **PARTHENOGENESIS DOES NOT APPLY TO OUR DISCUSSION ABOUT ABIOGENESIS BECAUSE PARTHENOGENESIS PRESUPPOSES BIOGENESIS.** Parthenogenesis is observed only in rare **LIVING** plants and animals. **Our topic is about abiogenesis (non-living chemicals) not biogenesis; we are trying to understand the very origin of life itself not how births occurs after life has been attained.**

In addition, if parthenogenesis results only in female offspring, we are still left with the problem where did the males come from? Moreover, parthenogenesis reduces genetic diversity (because the genetic code used to produce offspring comes from only one source: the mother) and thus is harmful to a species survival. **It has therefore been found that species such as the komodo dragon that are capable of parthenogenesis also reproduce bisexually.** Research entitled, "Parthenogenesis in Komodo Dragons" was conducted by a team of scientists led by Phillip Watts (2006). According to Watts et al:

"The likelihood of the formation of life from inanimate matter is one to a number with 40,000 naughts (zeros) after it... It is big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution. There was no primeval soup, neither on this planet nor any other, and if the beginnings of life were not random, they must therefore have been the product of purposeful intelligence" (New Dawn Magazine, 2006).

Even Francis Crick (1973) the eminent molecular biologist who was the co-discoverer of DNA concluded that abiogenesis could not have risen by chance without an intelligent being involved.

However, because, like Hoyle, he is an atheist, Crick mistakenly replaces God as the logical first cause with, believe it or not, creatures from outer space. Like the parents of Superman, they hypothetically sent living single celled spores to earth from interstellar space. This idea of Panspermia is increasingly finding a larger audience. **While the Protestants are busy fighting evolution, empirical atheists are jumping from the Darwinian ship for the new idea of Panspermia and/or aligning with Panentheists forming a new eclectic religion and expecting the coming of avatars in space ships from another "dimension" or, as Benjamin Creme suggests, in an "airplane" to rescue an ailing humanity.** These benign aliens and/or this new syncretic alliance will presumably solve human psychological, sociological and cosmological problems including the origin of life by introducing new gods and a new religion more palatable to the atheists who have helped usher in a New Age.

"Terming his model Directed Panspermia, Crick suggested that a "spaceship" carrying "large samples of... microorganisms" was sent to the Earth billions of years ago by an extraterrestrial civilization – either as an experiment, preparation for colonization or a genetic Noah's Ark of some sort" (New Dawn Magazine, 2006).

The esteemed Sir Frederick Hoyle, like Crick, is unable to make the logical jump to a Creator but must rely on something else. Like Crick, he advocates Panspermia:

"Human beings are simply pawns in the game of alien minds that control our every move. They are everywhere, in the sky, on the sea, and in the Earth... It is not an alien intelligence from another planet. It is actually from another universe which entered ours at the very beginning and has been controlling all that has happened since" (New Dawn).

Hoyle is perhaps best known for his contribution to the theory of stellar nucleosynthesis (nuclear reactions taking place inside stars to form the nuclei of elements heavier than hydrogen) and his rejection of the "Big Bang" in favor of the discredited "Steady State Theory" of the universe. Interestingly, the discredited "Steady State Theory" argued for an eternal universe, one that had no beginning (and thus no need of a Creator).

Hoyle probably adopted this theory as a result of his atheism; **the big bang theory originated with a Roman Catholic priest, Monsignor George Lemaitre**, who in 1930 proposed the "Primeval Atom Theory" that served as the precursor to the big bang.

"Einstein embraced Lemaitre's theory in light of the new data. He publicly accepted the new paradigm of expansion in April 1931 in Pasadena and at Mount Wilson, and mentioned Lemaitre's work in conjunction with Tolman's as being the convincing factor for him" (Farrel (2005), p 117).

According to the Primeval Atom Theory, before exploding all the matter in the universe was concentrated in one primordial point called the "primeval atom" The universe began when this "primeval atom" exploded as the first manifestation of the big bang (Farrel, 2005, pgs 99-120).

Pope Pius XII (1951) declared to the Pontifical Academy of Sciences that the Big Bang theory accorded with the Catholic concept of creation.

"...it would seem that present-day science, with one sweep back across the centuries, has succeeded in bearing witness to the august instant of the primordial Fiat Lux [Let there be Light], when along with matter, there burst forth from nothing a sea of light and radiation, and the elements split and churned and formed into millions of galaxies."

Like Miller and Urey before them, Hoyle and allied "atheistic scientists" seem to let their atheism guide their science. They are thus in search of an alternative hypothetical environment (or at a minimum an extraterrestrial life or even a water molecule on a meteorite, anything that might support the idea) that might have been more favorable to the spontaneous generation of life before it was sent to planet earth where the *known laws* of chemistry and physics preclude the fabled occurrence of spontaneous generation.

I am unable to understand this bit of panspermic logic. It suffers from all the weaknesses of spontaneous generation mentioned above (which Crick, Hoyle, et al reject) and probably others unidentified. Panspermia merely moves the problem to outer space; it does not answer the question how life arose from non-living elements nor does it answer how matter came forth from nothing in the remotest regions of the universe. It does not matter if, as Panspermia supposes, advanced beings sent live molecules to earth, the problem of the origin of life remains. Despite the hypothesis and hopes of Crick and Hoyle, they are still stuck with the idea of spontaneous generation. The only advance they have made is to correctly state that spontaneous generation did not happen on earth.

They have simply replaced one illogical hypothesis with another because atheists, for whatever reason, cannot stomach the idea of a monotheistic creator (Muslim, Jewish or Christian-it does not matter; the idea is simply repugnant to them). Unfortunately, they cannot verify their hypothesis, but like Miller and Urey, they are sure to spend time in the laboratory trying to concoct a primordial soup wherein chemicals are created and united spontaneously into complex nucleic acids and cellular forms mimicking some hypothetical interstellar environment.

Nonetheless, even if such experiments do produce the proper amino and nucleic acids, they still do not solve the problem of biogenesis. Laboratory manipulation of diverse chemicals can, at best, result in some more complex concoction, but it does not confer life to non-living things. Nucleic acids and cellular forms, even if they could self-assemble, do not have life. Life does not just happen because a model goop similar to a cell has been made; a model does not have life. **Even a model car does not automatically move itself; it needs to be plugged in or somehow turned on. Complex models and living models are two different things. Cells not only have complex structural integrity; they also have life.** But the life is not from the parts; they do not have life to give. It comes from somewhere else, from a living being that has life to confer.

Even a New Age sympathizer like Keith Thompson (1993, p. 235) writing about alien avatars recognizes this fact; according to a supposed alien "contactee":

"If we are the genetic experiment of a scientifically advanced race, the experiment can only be a manipulation of existing life forms; it does not include the invention of our whole existence (*that is of life itself*). Our genes can be synthesized, or rearranged; the biological frame of life can be altered, but biology (*life*) itself cannot be invented out of nothing by something that is itself an evolutionary product of the universe."

Eventually the atheists (like Anthony Flew, Hoyle and Crick) are going to have to admit the existence of a Creator or an alternative intelligence that accounts for the physical universe and its various life forms. Even New Age evolutionists admit this or, at least, something very much

like it. Although they do not posit a "Creator God", they do acknowledge an Ultimate Being or Absolute (Brahman) and his threefold manifestation (Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva or Ray One, Ray Two and Ray Three) which are three aspects of the divinity that emanate from Brahman and in turn are emanated outward from the three as a manifestation of the divine essence that gives rise to both life and matter (not "created" from nothing, but "emanated") as the first principle of evolution.

Most likely, the atheists advancing the idea of Panspermia and other "old" and "new" atheists will join the Panentheists.*

Both are already busily engaged in looking for advanced alien creatures who seeded the earth or are coming back as avatars to take us into an advanced New Age, one where Christian ideas of life have been replaced by Panentheist ones more acceptable to the atheists.

In this regard, molecular biologist Michael Denton poignantly comments, "Nothing illustrates more clearly just how intractable a problem the origin of life has become than the fact that world authorities can seriously toy with the ideas of Panspermia" (1986, p. 271). I am not going to offer a critique of Panspermia; I think the idea is so weak that it does not merit further discussion as a scientific theory. It certainly merits discussion as an imaginary or feigned eschatological scenario; but that is neither the topic nor the purpose of this chapter or of this book. My limited purpose in this chapter is to show the implausibility of spontaneous generation, the necessity of a life force and the relationship between this life force and DNA thereby showing the plausibility of philosophical knowledge about the soul necessary to demonstrate a difference of kind (while maintaining the importance of differences of degree) between animals and human beings.

As stated above, Panspermia suffers from all the weaknesses of spontaneous generation. No matter what the atheists might hypothesize about the origin of life, they still have been unable to empirically validate it and it still suffers from lack of logic (the principles are not empirically verified nor are they self-evident). Life is associated with voluminous data and organized knowledge as is found in DNA. It does not matter how far out in the universe atheists propose to set their imaginative gaze, it takes information, such as that found in DNA and life to organize atoms and chemicals into complex forms. Once this is realized and admitted the circular argument about cells and DNA, explored above, is unavoidable. Logic sides with the idea of a Creator as the cause of life. **According to verifiable laws of nature (not imaginary ones)**, matter, even if eternal, cannot organize itself into a cell (**over time matter deteriorates and decomposes, wood rots and iron rusts**). Even if it could perform such a miracle, (contrary to known material and physical laws); it does not just pop itself into life. This requires a living being with intelligence capable of organizing matter and then conferring life. "I am the way and the truth and *the life*."

The bottom line is that we are being asked by the proponents of atheistic evolution to support an illogical idea about abiogenesis as the cause of life and genetic information while everything that is or can be seen and verified empirically argues against it. At the same time, the cause (Creator) which they say cannot be verified is in fact verified by all that is seen. "For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his eternal power also, and divinity" (Romans 1:18).

In summary:

- We do not see DNA replicating outside of cells as abiogenesis states
- We do not see proteins being generated outside of cells as abiogenesis states

- We do not see life coming from non-life as abiogenesis states

But

- We do see life coming from life
- We do see DNA generated inside of living cells
- We do see proteins generated inside of living cells

Moreover, it is logical to say that life comes from a life giving power; it is illogical to maintain the converse. But, **we are asked to accept the illogical on the notion of probability**, viz., according to Peter Atkins, an atheist and professor of chemistry at Oxford University, "It's absurd to think that because something is improbable it's impossible" (Wavell, 2004). **The ramification being that spontaneous generation is possible and should therefore be accepted**, believed in, supported, and advocated even though the sheer mass of the evidence weighs heavily against it.

I find scientists uttering this kind of mumbo jumbo to be hypocritical and ask them to live the rest of their lives (mortgage payments, investments, health care, research etc.) by the same standard that they use for ultimate questions about life and death, cause and effect. Why would anyone side with the highly improbable just because it is "possible?"

According to Schroeder (2009, p 27).

"It's true that probability never says never, but all of physics, which means all of nature, is based on the understanding that the very very unlikely never happens. Without this basic understanding, there is no foundation for any assumption of physics or cosmology."

I understand that atheists might adhere to their atheistic position because the theistic one seems improbable as well. Thus, in their minds there is a choice between two improbables; they choose abiogenesis, in spite of the fact that it has never been verified, because it is possible that someday it might be. I can understand and appreciate this train of thought. However, it seems dubious. God is not a being that can be tested empirically because He is a spirit; the same test applied to chemicals cannot be applied to a spiritual being. What we are left with then is logic or reason and it is reason that makes the difference.

It is logical to posit a necessary being to account for contingent beings as Aquinas does. It is logical to posit a sufficient cause for subsequent effects, **but it is illogical to posit a cause not commensurate to its effects. Moreover, the violation of known laws, of observable facts and of common sense to account for chemical evolution is a further step into the illogical.** The construction of an unverifiable imaginary planet different than the one we know (simply because the one we do know does not yield the results they are hoping for) and hoping that it might be suitable for abiogenesis **AND THAN ACCEPTING ABIOGENESIS SIMPLY BECAUSE, ALTHOUGH IMPROBABLE, IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE** is wishful thinking **THAT SEEMS INAPPROPRIATE FOR A MIND COMMITTED TO EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE.**

To be consistent and side with the improbable JUST BECAUSE IT IS "POSSIBLE" as they do on such a crucial issue as life, they would have to also choose the least probable course of events on lesser questions. Thus, they should begin missing mortgage payments because although it is improbable that they will keep their house if they miss payments it is possible. **They should invest in collapsing businesses and in governments that are going bankrupt because although it is improbable they will protect their assets and receive a return on their investment this way, it is possible.** They should engage in unsafe sex because although it is improbable that they will not suffer illness with multiple partners, it is

possible, and they should neglect their research because although it is improbable that they will gain new knowledge and understanding by this method, it is possible. **Since the atheist is willing to risk life on a mega improbability simply because in spite of all the evidence it might be possible, he/she should be comfortable engaging all the forgoing scenarios with equal gusto; they are even more probable than abiogenesis.** They can keep that kind of logic; it is a prescription for death and misery.

If they continue to deny objective reality and superimpose their subjective imagery into the discussion and insist in spite of the paucity of empirical evidence, (I think it is fair to say contrary to the evidence) that such imposition is scientific simply because they have degrees in science, and if, because of this denial of empirical facts in favor of unverified imaginary scenarios, **they continue to act illogically, they are leaving the realm of empirical science and will need the help of psychoanalysis.** We are dealing with highly intelligent people suffering from what appears to be a severe bout of creative imagination that, in spite of my sincere desire to affirm, I cannot confirm. We are dealing with serious questions. Scientific investigation is not for elementary school children that feign tantrums in order to induce compassionate reassurance every time their troubled interior world is unconfirmed.

Some children BECAUSE OF THEIR DISCONNECT WITH REALITY (in the case of abiogenesis, it is probably more of a discontent with reality or some aspect of it that leads to a disconnect) imagine they can fly AND THEREFORE JUMP OUT WINDOWS. I cannot confirm this desire. It is possible to imagine anything, but if I cannot prove my mental musings with logical demonstration or empirical verification, they should most likely be dismissed; this is what normal people do and this is why we have science in the first place. But, the more I examine this issue, the more I am persuaded that we are dealing with some sort of defense mechanism engendered by a disassociation from reality (which thus permits self-deceit) due to the operation of some strong passion or prejudice, what John Quincy Adams referred to as self-deceit or self-love (which usually proceeds from a narcissistic preoccupation with the self caused by the intense desire for pleasure and the ceaseless desire for more or from pain and trauma that has resulted in a failure to forgive and be reconciled):

"THERE is nothing in the science of human nature more curious, or that deserves a critical attention from every order of men so much, as that principle which moral writers have distinguished by the name of self-deceit. This principle is the spurious spring of self-love; and is, perhaps, the source of the greatest and worst part of the vices and calamities among mankind" (1763).

St. Augustine pithily plumbs these depths in his august work, *The City of God* in which he claims (Book xiv, chapter 28) two existential realities based on two species of love.

"Accordingly, two cities have been formed by two loves: the earthly by the love of self, even to the contempt of God; the heavenly by the love of God, even to the contempt of self. The former, in a word, glories in itself, the latter in the Lord. For the one seeks glory from men; but the greatest glory of the other is God, the witness of conscience. The one lifts up its head in its own glory; the other says to its God, "Thou art my glory, and the lifter up of mine head." And therefore the wise men of the one city, living according to man ... became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened; professing themselves to be wise,"--that is, glorying in their own wisdom, and being possessed by pride,"--"they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."

Abiogenesis is an imaginary construct; it is not surprising that such constructs (since imaginary)

often proceed from self-deceit as Adams recognized. Augustine takes the analysis deeper by analyzing the relationship between self-deceit, self-love, and contempt of God. From this perspective, abiogenesis is more than self-deceit; it is a symptom of self-love and contempt of God as confirmed by the fact that it has its origins in atheism.

In this regard, I offer excerpts from Harold Lewis' letter of resignation written to Curtis G. Callan Jr, Princeton University, President of the American Physical Society (APS). Lewis is Emeritus Professor of Physics at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He is also a former member of the Defense Science Board (DSB); Chairperson DSB study on Nuclear Winter; former member of the President's Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee; Chairperson APS study on Nuclear Reactor Safety and former member of the United States Air Force Scientific Advisory Board. Although I do not necessarily agree with his view of global warming, I do agree with his conclusion:

"For reasons that will soon become clear my former pride at being an APS Fellow all these years has been turned into shame, and I am forced, with no pleasure at all, to offer you my resignation from the Society."

It is of course, the global warming scam, with the (literally) trillions of dollars driving it, that has corrupted so many scientists, and has carried APS before it like a rogue wave. It is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life as a physicist. Anyone who has the faintest doubt that this is so should force himself to read the ClimateGate documents, which lay it bare. I don't believe that any real physicist, nay scientist, can read that stuff without revulsion....Everything that has been done in the last year has been designed to silence debate.

This is not fun and games, these are serious matters involving vast fractions of our national substance, and the reputation of the Society as a scientific society is at stake....It is fraud on a scale I have never seen....**This is not science; other forces are at work**" (Watts 2010).

If empirical verification and logical demonstration support creative imagination there are valid tools to work with to substantiate a point; atheistic evolutionists have no such tools and thus rely on public ignorance, argument ad hominem, unconscious denial of reality and distortion of facts. I say unconscious based on what I perceive to be intellectual sincerity, the emotional inability to befriend adversaries and the over expenditure of negative energy (vitriolic) spent combating them. Empathetic as I might be, I am forced to conclude with Lewis: "This is not science; other forces are at work."

What is Going On?

Quite simply, it appears that science is being held captive by atheistic ideologues in contempt of God. Science qua science and theology (faith and reason) are natural allies as presented in Chapter one; truth in science begets truth in philosophy, which supports and is supported by truth in theology. **Science and religion are not opposed, but the atheists would like everyone to believe that they are.** It is true that theology derives its first principles from faith, but these principles, once acquired, are rationally ordered following strict rules of logic; perhaps if the atheists followed more of these rules their arguments might be more logical.

There is **(1) science opposed to theism** (atheistic science) there is **(2) science aligned with pseudo-theism/mysticism** (the New Age), and there is **(3) science aligned with theism** through faith and reason as in the monotheistic traditions of Judaism and Christianity. Either

way science and theism are significantly correlated (either positively [3] or negatively [1 and 2]). Positive correlation means where one is valued so is the other; they move in the same direction. Negative correlation, on the other hand, means that as one goes up or down the other goes in the opposite direction. Thus, numbers one and three are clear, but number two needs a brief explanation. The New Age for all its talk about science is vehemently opposed to it. They like science but not science that proceeds from a rational perspective as it always has. **The New Agers are seeking a new paradigm in which science will proceed not by rational thought but by intuition.** To them rational thought is part of a retrograde cultural lag left over from Christianity. The new science must proceed on the Buddhic Plane of advanced consciousness associated with intuition, which they claim is part of the evolution of the human spirit when in fact, it is merely the result of contact or communication with demons who know more about science than we do and share it with the Gnostics who claim it is from their own evolving minds when in fact, they know where it is coming from unless they are so duped as to believe their own New Age rhetoric intended for the uninitiated to deceive them into possession. What the New Age covets is not natural human knowledge attained by reason but supernatural angelic knowledge attained by communication with angels to men and women who like them are at war with God.

New Ageism meets atheism in mutual contempt of God. It matters little whether the New Age is ultra theistic, the fact is that it stands in contempt of the Holy Trinity and this is enough to cement an alliance with atheism which is in sore need of an ally in an age that thirsts for spiritual meaning. **This is the direction atheism, if it is to have any sort of future, is headed** (it is the direction Communism under Gorbachev was headed); man being a spiritual being has spiritual needs which must be met; they were neglected under Communism and are neglected by the so called "New Atheism", which must endeavor to somehow meet these spiritual needs (even falsely) if it is to have a future. If atheistic science is rooted in contempt of God, it makes little practical difference if it maintains God does not exist or if it aligns with pseudo-theistic forces of the New Age contrary to the monotheism of the great world religions.

Actually, this falsely labeled "new" atheism of thinkers such as Dawkins et al is not new at all; it is merely an attempt to fuse life into a dying horse, a pathetic Western ersatz leftover from Soviet Communist days, which is, like the parent that spawned it, headed toward the pacific land of the setting sun. For all their talk about scientific objectivity and recourse to reason, they seem to operate more from emotion and thus blatantly (and it seems blindly) violate the laws of logic and empirical verification whenever it suits them. As Dr. David Aikman (2008) notices there is an emotional

"Tone to Dawkins and Hitchens that leaves one scratching one's head in amazement, one of sizzling vitriol. Not to shock you, but early on in his book Dawkins almost quivers with rage when talking about the Almighty. 'The God of the Old Testament,' he thunders in his second chapter, 'is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction.' He is 'jealous and proud of it, a petty, unjust, unforgiving control freak'. God is among other things, 'vindictive', 'bloodthirsty'...'misogynistic', 'racist', 'infanticidal', 'genocidal', 'filicidal', 'pestilential' and, of course, 'homophobic.'"

This does not sound like objective science but the ranting of an emotionally disturbed mad man. Of course, as Aikman notices, if God does not exist as the atheists maintain, then how can He be any of these things. Moreover, if they would objectively check out their own history and tradition (and stop trying to distort it) they will find all of these things, and much more, in the infamous annals of atheism which contain abundant and unequivocal records that detail human abuse and atrocities committed by atheist leaders such as Chairman Mao, Joseph Stalin, the pseudo theist/mystic, Adolf Hitler and their comrade, Pol Pot known for the killing fields of his

Khmer Rouge who decimated Cambodia.

When people believe as the atheists do, that feeble men make religion (as either a psychological construct that eviscerates and alienates them from their true human potential [Feuerbach, Freud, Nietzsche], or a social construct created by cunning men for purposes of social control [Marx]),

"It is the simplest thing to unmake it and, having done so, to erect in its place a Frankenstein-like structure of idolatry (the Cult of the Lenin, the Cult of Chairman Mao, the Cult of Kim Chong-il, the Cult of Stalin et al) that unleashes upon the human race all the wickedness and cruelty of which humanity has shown itself capable (Aikman, 2008).

The Soviet experiment failed because it was built upon atheism and a flawed anthropology resulting in faulty socio-economic and political paradigms that in the name of man worked against him. Atheism, "on that grand a scale cannot sustain a sizeable nation, let alone a civilization" (Abusharif, 2009).

With the Kremlin bastion of international communism in ruins and the new Russia awakening to its Christian culture and heritage, Western atheism is a withering fruit off of the vine which, like the Soviet Union, is headed for the dust bin of history. The Communist Era vanished when the presidents of Russia, Ukraine, and Byelorussia announced its formal dissolution on Dec. 8, 1991 the feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary who had said at Fatima, "In the end my Immaculate Heart will triumph, Russia will be converted and an Era of Peace will be granted to mankind." When Russia permitted religious freedom and, on December 25, 1991, when Gorbachev resigned and the Red Flag was brought down from the Kremlin for the last time, **worldwide atheism lost its economic and ideological support and began its pervasive decline**; all that is left are ideological holdovers who are increasingly becoming a vanishing breed.

Something new is on the horizon, we are on the verge of a new world era, an Era of Peace that depends on the reparation of Russia for its great error of spreading atheism into every realm of the globe, into politics, ethics, law, education, the media and even into the supposed objective halls of empirical science (abiogenesis began in the Soviet Union with Oparin working for Communist controlled Moscow State University) where its effects are still being felt in the new atheism and the birth of Panenthiesm its long prepared for successor. Russia has a debt to pay, first to God and itself and then to the rest of the world

Russian Prime Minister, Vladimir Putin addressing an Orthodox gathering declared that

"Both he and those who work with him represent a state which has done a lot over the previous decades to undermine the roots of our history and culture, including the spiritual one."

He concluded by asserting his hope,

"That the state will repay its debt to the Russian Orthodox Church and other traditional denominations and its debt to the Russian people" (Interfax 2008).

In a televised Christmas message on January 7, 2008, Putin announced:

"The Russian Orthodox Church contributes to the promotion of moral values in society. One should not completely draw a line between the culture and the church. Of course,

by law in our country the church is separate from the state. But in the soul and the history of our people it's all together. It always has been and always will be."

According to Interfax (October 7, 2010)" Patriarch Kirill emphasized the personal involvement and active support by Vladimir Putin who has facilitated "good relations of trust" between the Church and the government. The Patriarch expressed his appreciation of **"full assistance rendered by the government to recover (the) cultural heritage of Orthodox Russia and its contribution in spiritual education and development of citizens."**

Events such as these indicate that **the theoretical and practical breeding ground for atheistic ideas is undergoing a transformation, atheism is dying; it is going its way along with Communism and Marxism, but syncretism is on the crest of a New Age.** In this regard, a potentially deeper malady than atheism itself is, as indicated, an alliance between pseudo-mysticism and atheism. This is the direction atheism, if it is to have any sort of future, must go. As stated above: **most likely, atheists advancing the idea of Panspermia will join hands with the Panentheists.** Both are already busily engaged in looking for advanced alien creatures who seeded the earth or are coming back as avatars to take us into an advanced New Age, one where Christian ideas of life have been replaced by Panentheist ones more acceptable to the atheists. These benign avatar/alien humanists and/or this new syncretic alliance will presumably solve the problem of life's origins by introducing new gods and a new religion more palatable to the atheists who, because they hold God in contempt, will most likely labor to usher in a New Age, and a new socio-economic and religio-political system.

Stephen Asma (2011) **writing about the new atheism** (of Richard Dawkins and others like Sam Harris who has been identified as one of the "Four Horsemen of Atheism" along with Dawkins, Dan Dennett and Christopher Hitchens) **for the highly regarded Chronicle of Higher Education**, that both reflects and helps shape the cultural climate on campuses across America, notes the tilt toward theism (pseudo-theism):

"Sam Harris's new book may be a subtle **turning point** toward a more normative social agenda. **If public policy is eventually expected to flow from atheism, then its proponents need to have a more nuanced and global understanding of religion.**"

If Asma is correct, and I believe he is, an alliance between atheism and pseudo mysticism remains a possibility and, I would say, an inevitability (Harris, one of the daunted four horsemen of atheism, admits to drug induced exploration for higher states of consciousness and is or has been a devotee of Oriental Mysticism). **According to Asma, Harris and the other horsemen are not upset by religion per-se; rather, "they are wringing their hands primarily about Islam and Christianity, which they think constitute our main combatants in a "zero-sum conflict." ***

Nonetheless, not all Christians are necessarily viewed as enemies of science or as outdated cultural lags inhibiting progress in a "zero sum" game where a gain for one is a loss the other. There is a distinction made between "Christian Progressive" and "Christian Regressive". It is possible for Christianity, like other religions, to adjust and fit into the syncretic pantheon, but first it must purge archaic teachings such as birth control, abortion and papal authority before it can fit as an "alternative new rite" under the New Age Umbrella.

Objective reporting from Asma's perspective includes subjective evaluation and speculation to make a point :

"In 2009, in Brazil, the archbishop excommunicated doctors for performing an abortion on a 9-year-old girl who had been repeatedly raped by her stepfather. The stepfather had impregnated her with twins. The girl's mother, too, was kicked out of the church, but the rapist was not. That is the kind of dehumanizing and dogmatic religion that should be eliminated. Catholics deserve a better religion than that. But **there are still aspects of Catholicism that are humanizing, consoling, and inspirational.** Whether it is Catholicism, Protestantism, Islam, Buddhism, or animism, the virtues can be retained while the vices are moderated."

This is a bit of anecdotal reporting intended to inflame, and that is my point, presumably, **there is a place for the Catholic position in the syncretic world view.** That which is "humanizing, consoling, and inspirational" can remain but the "dogmatic, ethical, and judgmental" are, from the New Age position, anathema.

So here we have it. A confrontation between ailing Western atheists whose best bet is to align with the syncretists versus Christian theism. **The real issue behind atheism is contempt of God, thus it makes little difference to them if they insist on no God or on a false god.** Given this verity, it is a simple extrapolation, the atheists will predictably join hands with the Panentheists. **Communist holdovers will predictably adopt a false spirituality and continue to spew forth their hatred of God by offering the world a new paradigm including a new religion, a new social order and a new god.**

THIS IS THE NEW BATTLE GROUND:

The Christian ideas of a new man and new social order based upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ ushering in an "Era of Peace" under the Queenship of the Blessed Virgin Mary or a new man and a new god based upon the theosophy of Madame Blavatsky and Alice Bailey ushering in a "New Age" under the overshadowing spirit of avatars under the influence of Lucifer.

Although science and traditional religion are being reconciled from a bout of misunderstanding, atheistic scientists will have none of it and are thus forced to look for allies to buttress their contempt of God and paternal authority. **They can expect little support from their old Kremlin champion who is increasingly involved in a different game: the strengthening of their own country and building a national consensus open to the Christian faith.**

In fact, the Russians are seriously considering the continued value of Darwinism in the public school curriculum. In February 2009, the Russian Justice Ministry established an Expert Religious Studies Council. According to Blitt, (2010) The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) reported that this Council has:

"Wide powers to recommend investigations of religious groups during the registration procedure, (new religious organizations must register with the state) to assess if a registered community's activity is in accord with its charter, and to ascertain if an organization, one of its members, or the literature it produces or distributes is extremist."

The Council is headed by Aleksandr Dvorkin who is known as "Russia's most prominent 'anti-cult' activist (Blitt 2010). It consists of five other members who are affiliated with the Russian Orthodox Church whom, Blitt reports, are "known for their "anti-sect" activities. The Council has the authority to recommend curricula and participate in the approval process.

Reuters reports that the **Council's proposed curriculum which would introduce moral and theological instruction into Russia's' public schools is challenging abiogenesis and atheistic evolution.** According to Metropolitan Hilarion who heads the Russian Orthodox Church's external relations department:

"The time has come for the monopoly of Darwinism and the deceptive idea that science in general contradicts religion. These ideas should be left in the past. . . . Darwin's theory remains a theory. This means it should be taught to children as one of several theories, but children should know of other theories too" (Humphreys 2010).

Russian President Medvedev, demonstrating his commitment to Orthodoxy and the Christian roots of the nation signed a law on June 1, 2010 **making July 28 a national holiday to mark the Church's founding with the baptism of Prince Vladimir in Kiev in 988.** Speaking at the annual celebration commemorating the Baptism of Russia he said:

"The continual work of the Russian Orthodox Church will effect the revival of Christianity in our nation. Thanks to the Orthodox faith Russian culture through the years has acquired Biblical values on which the system of moral ideals for our nation is built" (US Department of State, 2010).

Putin sent his own message on Easter Sunday 2008 saying,

"The state will continue to support the Church in all its work to enlighten the moral education of our citizens, strengthen the influence of family values, and consolidate unity in the Orthodox community (Archives of the President of Russia, 2010).

On January 14, 2008 Prime Minister Putin spoke at a prayer ceremony for the sanctification of the Assumption Cathedral at the Valday Iversky Monastery in the Novgorod region. According to Interfax (2008) Putin said that

"The Russian government is indebted to the Russian Orthodox Church" and he "promised to facilitate the revival of religion in Russia" and expressed his sincere hope to "repay" the debt."

In this regard, According to the United States Department of State (2010) "In January 2010 Putin announced that the Russian government would provide \$64 million (two billion rubles) to restore ROC (Russian Orthodox Church) holy sites, monasteries, and churches destroyed by the Soviet government." On November 30, 2010, President Medvedev was present at the Church of Nativity of the Mother of God in the Grand Kremlin Palace to deliver a personal message to Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and all Russia:

"I would like to inform you that today I have signed a law on religious property return to religious organizations. It is a serious law that was long discussed and coordinated" (Interfax, November 2010).

Whether they acknowledge it or not, news such as this places the atheists in an uncomfortable and (for them) an unusual position, that is, **due to one of the most phenomenal turn arounds in world history, they no longer have the support of heavily bankrolled, crafty and sophisticated Kremlin Communists dedicated to atheism and abiogenesis;** cut off from the vine they will most likely wither and die. Moreover, at the same time, Western political elites and

academics are increasingly touting spiritual values while moving toward a syncretic world view, while **the new atheist's inane logic is increasingly coming under attack from many corners. They have lost their most powerful and influential allies and they are unable to carry either the empirical or the logical field.**

Eric Reitan recently released his critique of the new atheism in a book entitled, *Is God a Delusion*. In his review of the book, **Dean Watt (2008) clearly illustrates the intellectual trend against the new atheism:**

"While Reitan is only one of many who have entered the fray between the "no God" and the "God" believers, his writing deserves our attention because he has a deeper knowledge of the subject than many others, some of whom **he accuses of "careless thinking and intellectual laziness" which "are masked behind bluster and bravado. Dawkins mangling of Aquinas is a perfect example of this wretched trend."**

Reitan serves up Dawkin's mangling of Aquinas in chapter five. Abusharif (2009) summarizes the introduction to this chapter by recalling a personal experience of the author (Reitan) with an unprepared new atheist colleague in over his head. According to Abusharif one of Reitan's colleagues,

"Photocopied a page from a book without identifying the author. The page contained summaries of some of Thomas Aquinas' arguments for the existence of God. When Reitan read the photocopy, he was immediately struck by **the fact that the "writer of the passage got the arguments wrong."** The writer then proceeded to make no-God arguments that hinge on these errors. **The author of that photocopied page was Richard Dawkins"**, one of the acclaimed four horsemen of the New Atheism.

As he read Dawkins' book he says;

"I was taken in by the author's swagger. **Dawkins is clearly confident, writing as if he knows what he's talking about. The only problem is that, as often as not, he has no idea what he's talking about."**

When he comments on Dawkins' refutation of Aquinas, he states;

"No important objections, successful or not, come from Dawkins. **Instead he offers cavalier attack on a caricature, in which swagger replaces careful thinking."**

Peter Harrison, Professor of Science and Religion at the University of Oxford, offers similar remarks:

"Dawkins attempts to show the irrationality of religious belief by attacking some of the standard philosophical arguments for God's existence. Unfortunately, Dawkins has blundered into a field he knows very little about. He misunderstands the logic of the arguments and how they function in a religious context. His own naive and plodding counter-arguments would make a philosophy undergraduate cringe, and a number of reviewers have mercifully dispatched them" (the arguments, not the undergraduates).

"The book contains more factual and logical blunders than can be dealt with here.

However, it has two general weaknesses that are worth highlighting. First, the case presented violates a standard principle of academic debate— that the most powerful critiques are those that succeed against the strongest version of the opponent's position.

Dawkins has simply not bothered to familiarise himself with the vast literature on philosophy of religion and science and religion. He has not taken on the most sophisticated representatives of the religious viewpoint. Instead, he finds himself a few easy targets and scores cheap points" (Harrison, 2007).

In summation, **given lack of support from the Kremlin, (the twentieth century's behemoth of liberalism and atheism); the corollary increasing loss of interest among Western elites/academics; and their own inability to adhere to the rules of academia, empiricism and logic, the new atheists seem forced into a necessary alliance with New Age pseudo-theists who share their hatred of the Christian and Jewish God and the desire for a new civilization without Him.**

Interesting as this topic might be, at the moment there is a more important one which is our focus: finding a difference of kind between human beings and other animals that will help yield a definition of human nature necessary for politics and social reconstruction for a new man and a new humanity. Other than for analysis and desire for objectivity, mature people do not use their minds to review literature with the purpose of bashing adversaries (this is an unbecoming waste of time); they spend it developing their positions.

Thus, I hope that in this little chapter, I have said what is sufficient to move forward toward an integral anthropology. **My purpose in this chapter was to explore the first phenomena that is observed when the human person is analyzed, viz., life.** This necessarily involved us in making a distinction between living and nonliving things, abiogenesis and biogenesis. In the process, we explored some basic information about cells, DNA and life, which led to the conclusion that life comes from life. Although atheistic empiricists have erred grievously while trying to demonstrate a material cause of this life, they have not learned from their errors and instead have embraced or are embracing a New Age paradigm. After demonstrating the weakness of the materialist position and introducing the logic underlying the philosophical position as well as factual observations regarding the relationship between the cell and DNA and DNA and life, we are led to the conclusion that neither life or DNA can be explained naturally by recourse to matter.

The atheist's attempts to ascribe life and information to matter have all failed; it is clear that they violate both logic and all that we know from empirical science itself. **The explanation offered by the philosophers, the soul, and the theologians, a creator, are at least logical and in accord with empirical evidence, life from life, intelligence form intelligence.** The alternative offered by the Panentheists and New Atheists is an imaginative return to the world of super heroes and the seeding of our planet from alien intelligence known as the Theory of **Panspermia.** This idea **is not only illogical, it is empirically unverified as were all their attempts to demonstrate abiogenesis until they finally gave up and defaulted to outer space;** their ideas are as far out as the planet Krypton. In fact, all empirical evidence stands against the idea and they find themselves in a sorry position in need of allies, whom they have found in the Syncretic New Age while being abandoned by the Kremlin.

Disregarding Panspermia and focusing on a more logical and empirically verifiable position, we

will proceed with an analysis of the relationship between life and DNA (life, matter, and intelligence) in search for a difference of kind by which human beings can be distinguished from all other animals. This analysis will require a closer examination of the cell and DNA utilizing an integral approach uniting philosophy and empirical science or logical demonstration and empirical verification rather than logical demonization and empirical vexation.

ENDNOTE:

The Atheists Cannot Have it Both Ways: Spontaneous Generation and Geometric Dating

To be consistent, the ideologues would have to accept the fact that their thinking on spontaneous generation invalidates their thinking on related matters such as geological dating that they hold to as a scientific proof for the earth's age using data supplied by carbon dating, DNA testing of fossil remains and radiometric dating. If, as they contend, we cannot rely on the current environment to test hypothesis about the ancient environment and therefore conclude that current experiments such as Pasteur's are inconclusive, **they must be equally prepared to say that "current "carbon dating, radiometric dating and related tests are also inconclusive because today's rocks and minerals cannot be tested in their primordial state (before ice ages, shifting plates and changing climates) when conditions were hypothetically different.** Instead, WHEN IT COMES TO GEOLOGICAL DATING, WE FIND THEM INSISTING THAT WE MUST ADHERE TO CURRENT ENVIRONMENTS as the rule by which to make scientific statements and predictions about primordial ones.

Scientific Double Standards

Geology and Biology are the two empirical sciences that are used extensively to make evolutionary arguments. However, the two disciplines contradict each other over on one of the central tenets of the whole evolutionary edifice. On the one hand, concerning spontaneous generation, we are told that current evidence regarding living cells emerging only from living cells must be disregarded because billions of years ago the primordial earth was "different", in fact, so different that life somehow spontaneously arose from non-life and then immediately afterwards ceased to arise spontaneously anymore.

However, when it comes to dating the earth we are told that primordial atmospheric conditions must be disregarded and we must abide solely by currently observed data such as decay rates which are assumed to be constant and thus measured at the rate currently detected. There is increasing evidence using decay rates adjusted for primordial atmospheric conditions that the earth might be younger than calculations made using today's atmospheric conditions. **To make their hypothesis work the atheists think they need a lot of time; the only way to get this time is by using today's atmospheric conditions to calculate the age earth's age.**

You simply cannot have it both ways, we either adhere to current data or we default to specious assumptions about primordial data. In the case of evolution and spontaneous generation, the biologist's closest allies, the geologists, disagree with them over the very basics by which they seek to understand development on earth. **In the one case involving life, current data works against the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, (so it must be rejected) while in the other case, current data is presumed valid because it favors the elapse of long time assumed necessary for the evolutionary hypothesis (so it must be accepted).**

Even more interesting is the fact that spontaneous generation is a hypothesis built on geological facts, viz., it is assumed that life somehow arose from rocks and minerals or other non-living elements in the geological strata which is the domain and proper subject matter of the geologists—it is, in fact, their area of competence and expertise. **The geologists look at this same data, data for which they are the most competent observers, and insist that this primordial domain must be studied by specific recourse to current facts and knowledge about things as they are universally observed.** We must date minerals, elements, and rocks according to current observations and processes. Everything including decay rates, they claim are constant and must be presumed to remain the same.

The biologists, who are not experts in minerals and elements look at the same data as the

geologists and insist that it must be studied according to some unobservable and unverifiable bit of imagination that as far as anyone knows, never existed. Yet they continue to claim, without any credible evidence that geological phenomena (minerals coming to life in imaginary environments) violate every law that we know to exist. These, they say must be conveniently ignored contrary to the geologist who firmly advocates that they must be strictly confirmed.

To be consistent, **the geologists should be the first to reject the idea of spontaneous generation based on a hypothetical primeval construct that exists only in the imagination of the ideologues, those who are so zealous about their hypothesis that they willingly reject observable and measurable facts.** So who's got it right, the geologists or the ideological biologists? They cannot both be correct; they can both be wrong, but they cannot both be correct.

There is inconsistency because there must be. To be consistent about different environments would destroy their argument about either the age of the earth or about spontaneous generation, which are both necessary for their conjectures; so, they are inconsistent and hope no one recognizes; it is the lesser evil.