

CHAPTER THREE: Relationship of Soul and DNA (Life, Matter and Intelligence)

"The origin of the [genetic] code is perhaps the most perplexing problem in evolutionary biology. The existing translational machinery is at the same time so complex, so universal and so essential that it is hard to see how it could have come into existences or how life could have existed without it."

Maynard and Szathmary (1995)

"The origin of the genetic code is still as obscure as the origin of life itself"

John Maddox (1994)

In this chapter, we focus on the origin of the genetic code and its relationship to the soul as life force and form of the body. Miraculously, we are dealing with a miraculous topic that no one has yet explained; miraculously the human body is composed of mere dirt. This "dirt", (Hebrew *adama-Adam*) however, not only comes to life, it also acquires definite form due to a spectacular set of embedded genetic data (DNA) for the transformation of non-living matter into complex and living bodily parts. **The two, life and information, of necessity are always found together.** The genetic data or information contained in DNA, to be of any use, requires a living organism (such as a microscopic cell capable of inter and intra-communication, of successful decoding and interpretation of the genetic data and the ability to carry out these mysterious and little understood directions using highly specific mechanical devices or cellular organelle to transform simple amino acids into eyes and ears, cartilage and bones, hearts and brains etc. that function in unison as parts of a living body) to carry out it plan. **Without the living cell, the data would be useless, but without the data, the living cell would produce nothing.**

This presents us with a curious dilemma: if anthropologists or archeologists discovered non-living mechanical devices (automobiles or airplanes etc.) during an excavation, most of them, including the atheist, would likely conclude that they were designed and manufactured by some type of living and intellectual being. On the other hand, a human body, whose complexity transcends any mechanical device ever devised and whose inexplicable life force is so complex that no amount of science has been able to explain it, is thought to have spontaneously assembled itself from non-living dirt (chemical evolution), after which it conferred life on itself (biogenesis) and then evolved from a single cell (biological evolution) without a living or intelligent creator.

I find this more than intriguing; this is a phenomenal disconnect, an inconsistency challenged only by the hypocrisy of the Pharisees. **Since the creation of a non-living thing is a facile matter compared to creation of a living thing** (human beings have never created a living thing from a non-living thing) **and since** the complexity of an automobile, or any other manufactured thing, pales in comparison to the complexity of human body, nonliving mechanical things should have self-manufactured and evolved all over the place; if chemical evolution can produce a marvel as complex as a living human body we literally should have planes and cars, stop signs, wagons, dolls; you name it, anything, all over the place. The specifics required for the evolution of any such "thing" is mere child's play compared to those required for development of a human body.

First, the issue of life does not have to be hurdled and second, the information required for such a non-living thing, even a space ship, is simple in comparison to the information needed for the creation of a living human body. If non-living chemicals can randomly combine to form a living dog they certainly should be able to combine to form a non-living stuffed animal; yet, when an anthropologist finds a puppet she concludes that someone created or manufactured it; that it is

a cultural artifact to be studied for its value in revealing the beliefs, norms and folkways of a particular tribe or people. Yet, the same anthropologist finding an intricate cache of DNA embedded in a fossil bone and concludes that it randomly self-assembled, spontaneously acquired life, and then evolved. Anyone who claimed that the less intricate stuffed animal self-assembled, spontaneously came to life, and then evolved and then, on top of that, subsequently invested significant amounts of time constructing a theory without a verified hypothesis and spent the rest of her life trying to demonstrate the self-assembly of stuffed animals and their subsequent evolution would be considered a bit odd. Who would fund that research? Presumably, no one has an ideological stake in the evolution of puppets, and if they did, it would show us all how foolhardy the whole idea is.

If a highly complex and living body evolved, then it is more likely that a less complex one, living or not, should have also evolved. **After all the more complex is seriously thought and then universally taught to have chemically evolved before it ever acquired life**, but I have never heard anyone claim this for something so simple as a doll or even a mere piece of pottery. **If a simple artifact, like a piece of pottery, was created, it is immensely more likely that a complex one was also created.** If the greater evolved, how much more the lesser? In fact, greater things are built upon lesser. Similarly, if the lesser was created how much more the greater? The human body and its DNA, like the puppet and its arms and legs is a sign of creative intelligence. Moreover, **the body, unlike any inanimate thing, has intelligence encoded into its every fiber, and still we insist on its unintelligent, purposeless, and random chemical evolution. Remarkable!**

Cars and planes do not have intelligence written into them and yet we conclude that intelligence is involved in their manufacture by someone else. There is no sign of sanity in this approach; a simple non-living piece of silver jewelry indicates intelligence but a multifaceted, ineffable living orgasm characterized by embedded information so complex we still do not understand it, indicates non-intelligent random self-assembly. **Amazing, simply amazing! We see jewelry and we conclude: designed and created by purposeful intelligence and art. We see the human body, a vast array of complex organized information with intelligence written into its every cell and we conclude zero intelligence and chemical evolution.**

If chemical evolution can engender the vast intelligence necessary to create a human body, it certainly should be able to develop the miniscule intelligence necessary to create a stuffed doll or to even do so without intelligence by random chance as it is purported to have done in the manufacture of the cell and DNA itself; in comparison, the task is remarkably simple, yet no atheist has ever claimed it. If it is stupid to claim this, it is the height of folly to claim the other. Apparently, they prefer to be seen as fools before being seen as stupid.

"For they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator." and therefore, "Professing to be wise, they became fools (Romans 1: 22-25).

We see stone carvings on Easter Island and we talk of space men and advanced intelligence, we see a cell and its genetic code and we talk about chemical evolution; what an amazing inconsistency. **If cells, genetic code, and moving human bodies can evolve chemically over hundreds of millions of years, simple non-moving stone carvings should require nothing more than a few decades.** Yet the atheists and their new New Age allies are so amazed at the intellectual complexity of a stone carving or something, by way of comparison to DNA and a living cell, as mere as Nazca lines drawn in the sands of Peru and they are forced to conjecture space men necessary to explain the intelligence for so remarkable a feat.

The discovery of DNA is so astounding that it should have quieted much of the anthropological speculation about other less complex artifacts: to be consistent, the atheists would have to say that just about every artifact they unearth results from chemical evolution, wind, erosion and innumerable possible combinations of elements that over time took on numerous shapes, structures and functions; they are simply evolutionary remnants that tell us about the age of the earth and its almost infinite evolutionary forms. Many people have seen eroded stones that have facial characteristics; these are empirically verifiable; from there it should be an easy step to concluding that the stone figures on Easter Island randomly assembled; instead, we conclude advanced aliens or remnants from Atlantis assembled them.

Strange that those who speak loudest about chemical evolution of NA and cells are often the same ones to be fascinated by space men who built the pyramids; certainly, the Panentheists are. **If we are not prepared to say that the creation of sculptured rocks and Nazca lines are the result of chemical chance and the relentless forces of nature, than we should certainly not say that DNA is. If anthropological artifacts are used as evidence to discern unknown cultures, peoples, places and times, than certainly DNA has a claim to be used similarly; it is an effect that must, like pyramids, rock carvings and Nazaca lines, have a cause.** Like the cause that created the artifacts the cause that created the DNA must be intelligent enough to have generated it.

Soul Life Force not Miracle Worker

Although empirical science has been unable to deal satisfactorily with the origins of life, philosophy tells us is that it arises from a life force that philosophers have long termed the soul. **The soul is said to be the form of the body and that which sets it in motion.** Form and life force are two different things; **all matter has form, but not all matter has life.**

The soul informs the body when it communicates to matter and provides information for the ordering of its parts into a constituent unified whole. The soul may be thought to inform the body or to communicate with it through the provision of DNA or information necessary to order an organism's growth and development. To **inform** means to confer **information** by **informing** or **putting form in**. DNA is information that is communicated to every cell of a living organism; every cell in the entire human body (excepting gametes) contains the exact same DNA. **DNA is not the form; the soul is the form. DNA results from the communication of the soul to indeterminate matter giving it the necessary information via a material medium by which the cell regulates and directs all subsequent growth and becomes what it is** and not something else in virtue of its form.

Although the human body loses millions of cells and replaces them with new ones daily, the form of the body persists through the change. The form is essential for a thing to be what it is; the matter is also essential but it is "accidental". That is, the matter is an integral part of the essence of things (giving it such diversities as color, size, texture etc as well as senses for seeing and lungs for breathing.), **but it is not that which makes it to be this thing rather than that thing.** Matter, such as tissue, atoms, and elements can decompose and in the future become part of another living thing. But, Matter cannot exist per-se as a human body (or any type of body) without form; without the form, it decomposes back into basic elements capable of being transformed into just about anything within the realm of its potential. **Without form, matter is amorphous; with form, it takes on specific shape and functions that remain as long as there is life and the ability of an organism to inform or impart information through the processing of DNA at the cellular level.** This processing of cellular information accounts for the constancy of form in spite of continual change. ***The human soul is the form of the body that communicates itself to matter and actualizes its potencies to become a particular thing.***

In addition to informing matter or putting form into it, the soul confers life, which makes the processing of information by cellular organelle possible; the two (form and life) necessarily go together. In the absence of a soul as a life force, cells die and consequently decompose; bodily parts lose their organization or form and fall back into amorphous random order, entropy.

A scientist might say that decomposition results from the inability of dead matter to metabolize nutrients because of a malfunction in the body that caused death. In this, he or she is probably correct; however, this is beside the point. Decomposition happens to something that is dead, that is, something that no longer has life. Of course, dead matter cannot take in nutrients; but, we are not interested in death; we are interested in life. **We are not interested in decomposition (spontaneous degeneration) but rather with composition. The soul is the principle of life and composition not of death and decomposition.** Signs of decomposition associated with death indicate the lack or absence of a soul or that which brings the dead matter to life in the first place.

The soul enlivens dead matter, but it does not keep it perpetually alive. Cells function according to physical and material laws; if a body experiences severe trauma during which it cannot repair itself quickly enough to prevent breakdown, such as a gunshot wound or a fatal blow to the head, it will presumably die. **The soul provides the life force which initiates cellular movement in the first place;** it also confers information necessary to organize cells into unified bodies; **beyond this, the soul functions within parameters of the material world.**

The soul cannot stop decay and malfunction; they are inherent in matter over time. The soul is not God; it cannot perform a miracle and bring a dying body to life or cure cancer. Like the body, it too is created. **It depends on a body's structural functional integrity through which, with which, and in which it performs its functions.** It confers life and communicates information to indeterminate or less determinate matter to form a composite being (a being consisting of body and soul). **Once that composite being is formed and functioning, the soul is subject to its malfunctions;** if the central nervous system is destroyed, the body is going to malfunction and die, but as long as a human body is capable of life, the soul remains. The soul confers life but once life is given to an organism, it is subject to the basic vegetative needs and continued health of that organism. **The soul is not able to multiply loaves and fishes; in the absence of food and other vegetative needs a body will die.**

The soul separates from the body when the body is no longer capable of performing its vegetative functions; at this the point five stages of decomposition begin.*

*Fresh: Fresh begins when the heart stops beating. Because blood is no longer being pumped, it drains to the lower extremities causing discoloration (livor mortis) in the vacated parts. Shortly thereafter, the muscles become rigid (rigor mortis). Finally, because the cells are no longer performing work, the body begins to cool (algor mortis). The cells begin to lose their structural integrity resulting in the release of enzymes that further the process of decay (autolysis). Autolysis is often identified by blisters on the skin's surface. As oxygen is depleted anaerobic organisms in the gastrointestinal tract and respiratory system multiply and begin to breakdown fats, proteins and carbohydrates into acids and gases (putrefaction) which leads to bloat:

Bloat: Gases accumulate causing the abdomen to distend and overall bloating. Built up gas pressure is released through mouth, nose and anus. During bloat stages, maggots hatch and promote further decay by feeding on the bodies tissue leading to skin ruptures and the release of additional gases resulting in the stench associated with decay.

Active Decay: Increased maggot feeding results in tremendous loss of body mass. As cellular fluids are released, bodily tissues are liquefied and bodily stench persists. Active decay ceases with exodus of maggots.

Advanced Decay: Decomposition slows because easier skin tissue has been largely consumed. Stench decreases and "skin beetles" arrive .

Dry/Remains: All that remains is dry skin, cartilage and bones; the cadaver is skeletonised.

However, **bodily death has nothing to do with the soul's nature as a life force. The soul initiates life but cannot maintain it in violation of physical and material laws**, which make it subject to malfunction and decay.

What can Logic tell us about the Relationship of the Soul and DNA?

If a living cell is composed of nonliving elements that do not have DNA either before or after their integration into the cell, how did the cell acquire the DNA to begin with? **DNA is in the living cell, but it is not in the elements of which the cell is composed nor could it have been manufactured by the cell itself for the cell requires the previous existence DNA to guide its own assembly and manufacture.** As seen in the last chapter, DNA is only manufactured inside of a cell; it has never been seen by anyone not even an atheist to manufacture outside of a cell as the atheists without any evidence, except a brilliantly concocted "theory" that proves nothing, like to claim. A living cell could not logically have evolved out of non-living matter nor has it ever been empirically verified to have done so, **nor does it have the intelligence** (cells do not have brains; in fact it takes billions of highly diverse cells to make a brain, not one) **to self-manufacture itself** or its genetic code from chemical elements as both empirical science and philosophy demonstrate. **Moreover, these coding and living elements inside a living cell lose both their information code and their life when they cease to be parts of the cell.**

Life force and genetic information are *sui generis* but correlated processes that are not found in inorganic elements either before they begin to be or after they cease to be parts of a living cell. Because these statements are logical and verifiable, it can be concluded that life is a mysterious process that cannot be accounted for by any recourse to matter itself.

Because it is clear that life and genome both exist and equally clear that their origin cannot be explained by empirical or physical science, we have before us a metaphysical issue requiring different methods that complement and add understanding to our empirical observations.

As stated by Maynard and Szatmary (1995) at the outset of the chapter:

"The origin of the [genetic] code is perhaps the most perplexing problem in evolutionary biology. The existing translational machinery is at the same time so complex, so universal and so essential that it is hard to see how it could have come into existences or how life could have existed without it."

When we view the issue as a metaphysical phenomenon a profound array of awe inspiring observations open up before us. First, DNA and its genetic code are both associated with matter and with the soul or life force. That DNA is associated with matter is clear; it is made from it. That it is associated with the soul (the principle of life) is unclear until it is pointed out, viz.

- **WHEREVER LIFE IS FOUND, DNA IS ALSO FOUND.**
- **DNA IS NEVER FOUND IN MATTER OR ANYTHING THAT LACKS LIFE EXCEPT DECOMPOSING FRAGMENTS OF A ONCE LIVING ORGANISM.**

Thus, DNA is associated more with life and the soul than it is with nonlife and matter from which it is composed. This is a simple but profound correlation, please take a moment, and consider it:

DNA is more associated with life and the soul than it is with matter.

This conclusion is a simple deduction from the facts; it is a fact of life.

Although DNA is manufactured from non-living matter, IT IS ONLY FOUND IN LIVING THINGS; IT IS NEVER FOUND IN ANY NONLIVING THING.

Regardless of how much or what type of matter it might have and despite what the abiogenesis crowd manufactures about viruses (see end note), **DNA outside of a living cell has only been found in a state of decomposition; DNA outside of a cell has never been found in a state of composition**, which requires organizing life to maintain it and to carry out the instructions contained in its genetic code. Like steel everything else in nature, DNA decomposes when separated from a living organism.

Without life, DNA and information are useless (form by itself without life would be static information incapable of fulfilling its potential); it would be **mere potency without actualization**. **On the other hand, life without form is meaningless** (life by itself without form would be amorphous with no function, structure or unified design); **it would be formless existence without essence**. **Thus, the soul must, it seems of necessity, be able to confer both life and form**. It would be inconsistent to provide the one without the other, a futile exercise. **IF LIFE IS CONFERRED TO A CELL, TO HAVE ANY MEANING OR PURPOSE, THE CELL MUST ALSO BE INFORMED**. This is presumably the reason we find DNA associated with life more than it is with matter. **With life, form arises from the soul to inform matter so that it becomes a specific this rather than an amorphous that**. This is the teaching of the Catholic Church promulgated by the ecumenical Council of Vienna (1311-1312):

"We reject as erroneous and contrary to the truth of the catholic faith every doctrine or proposition rashly asserting that the substance of the rational or intellectual soul is not of itself and essentially the form of the human body

We openly profess with holy mother church that the only begotten Son of God...assumed in time in the womb of a virgin the parts of our nature united together,...namely the human, passible body and the intellectual or rational soul truly of itself and *essentially informing the body*" (Decree One: Kolbe's Greatest Books, emphasis added).

In summary:

- **Wherever living matter is found, DNA is always found**
- **Wherever DNA is found, living matter is always found**
- **Wherever non-living matter is found, DNA is never found**
- **Wherever DNA is found, non-living matter is never found**

It is only when nonliving matter becomes part of a living organism that DNA is found. It is never found in inorganic (non-living) matter except when inorganic matter acquires life.

If DNA arose by chance occurrence it should, after millions of years, be all over the place*. Instead, it is only found in living beings (and decaying body parts that were once part of living organisms) with which it is intimately associated. **DNA ADHERES EXCLUSIVELY TO LIVING SUBSTANCES** and not to anything else, **which explains how the soul, in addition to life, also imparts form to matter**.

Thus, wherever the soul is found as life force, DNA, as manifestation of form, is also found. The

two are positively correlated because they arise from the same source, the spiritual soul. If DNA is more associated with life and the spiritual soul than it is with the physical body, then it is necessary to know more about the soul. In this, I agree with Aristotle: “Clearly, the student of politics must know somehow the facts about the soul” (Book I para 41) if he wants to be more correct in his analysis of the human person, which is antecedent to his study of politics.

If the scientists would work closer with the philosophers and theologians and conversely, if the theologians and philosophers would work more closely with the scientists and learn from them necessary information about the body (which they tend to misunderstand and ignore) these issues might be better understood by all sides and harmoniously resolved to the benefit of everyone.

In his address to the Pontifical Academy of Science (2006), Pope Benedict XVI recognized the inherent limits in the empirical method and the need to integrate the sciences with philosophy and theology for a successful future:

The scientific method itself, in its gathering of data and in the processing and use of those data in projections, has inherent limitations that necessarily restrict scientific predictability to specific contexts and approaches. Science cannot, therefore, presume to provide a complete, deterministic representation of our future and of the development of every phenomenon that it studies.... Denying that transcendence in the name of a supposed absolute ability of the scientific method to predict and condition the human world would involve the loss of what is human in man, and, by failing to recognize his uniqueness and transcendence, could dangerously open the door to his exploitation.

Consequently, the pope states,

Philosophy and theology might make an important contribution to this fundamentally epistemological question by, for example, helping the empirical sciences to recognize a difference between the mathematical inability to predict certain events and the validity of the principle of causality, or between scientific indeterminacy or contingency and causality on the philosophical level, or, more radically, between evolution as the origin of a succession in space and time, and creation as the ultimate origin of participated being in essential Being.

It seems as if the philosophers are on to something; there is need of a metaphysical science to account for the unexplained origin of life and for the complex set of code that is found imbedded in all living matter but nowhere else in the physical or material world.

Life does not arise spontaneously but from a source with the ability to confer it. For almost three thousand years, philosophers have recognized this life giving power and named it the “soul.” If the philosophers are right about this, then maybe they are right about Homo sapiens being a thinking animal in search of wisdom, which they say is not only an empirical phenomenon but also a metaphysical power that, when understood more deeply, helps to classify man as a separate species different in degree but also different in kind from any other creature in the animal kingdom.

Although we have quite a way to go before we can identify a difference of kind, these facts bring us closer to this conclusion: The genome is empirically verifiable and the presence of the soul is logically demonstrable and also observable in its effects, viz., non-living

things do acquire life and all living things contain a complex set of genetic information necessary to direct matter into a particular form with specific functions, which it lacked before it acquired life. **Every time matter acquires life, it also acquires a new and more complex form.**

Since we do not know how the DNA became imbedded in matter in the first place, we might even hypothesize that it got there the same way the life did; they are certainly positively correlated, viz., wherever you find one you find the other and whenever one ceases the other ceases too. Every social scientist knows, or should know, that positive correlation is not necessarily causation, but, at a minimum, they should be studied together.

This scientific correlation when further studied in unison with the light of a little philosophic logic and then confirmed theologically by the teaching of the Church helps demonstrate **that life and form are not only correlated but have a common origin in the soul as both animator and form of the body.** As stated above, it would be inconsistent to provide the one without the other, a futile exercise. **If life is conferred to a cell, to have any meaning or purpose, the cell must also be informed.** This is presumably the reason we see DNA logically associated with life more than it is with matter; it has its origin with form in the soul. **As a result of the atheists' misunderstanding life, they also misunderstand form; the two always go together** (form is the first act of being and anything that acts is alive; if it is not alive, it is acted upon) **and are among the first demonstrations of the soul's existence, an existence which they abhor almost as much as they abhor the idea or reality of a Creator.**

DNA Like Life Gives Signs of Having Spiritual Origins

DNA is the material medium through which immaterial form communicates itself to matter. **If this is true, DNA should show signs of this origin; it should have a spiritual dimension manifesting its cause and a physical dimension manifesting its effect.**

It was stated in chapter two, that DNA is both a storage medium and simultaneously a repository of genetic information. DNA and genetic data occupy the same space and are made of the same molecular ingredients. It consists of two separate linear strands composed of sugars and phosphates joined by strong ester bonds. Nucleic acids (A-T-C-G) appear in vertical order all along these TWO strands. Remember that A is attracted to T and C to G like horizontal rungs of a ladder (base pairs) that bind the two separate linear strands together to form the well known double helix known as DNA.

These chemical base pairs are like individual letters that are grouped together into sets of three along a strand of DNA or a chromosome. A set of three base pairs is referred to as a codon or chemical code (word) that stands for a particular amino acid. Amino acids are used to make complex proteins. A gene is simply a segment of nucleic acids or chemical base pairs (A-T; C-G) along a strand of DNA that contains instructions for the combining of amino acids to make proteins.*

* Proteins are needed for virtually every activity performed by the body; they make up our heart and liver, enzymes and saliva, hair, fingernails and every bodily part. All proteins are made of the same amino acids. The same amino acids used to manufacture hair are used to manufacture bones and teeth not only in humans but in all animals. Human cells manufacture over 60,000 different proteins based on the way in which they combine amino acids under the direction of the code contained in the DNA. Different words result from simple rearranging of letters; the same letters can be used to spell dog and god, but dog and god are very different things. Similarly, the same individual nucleic acids can be arranged to create different three letter amino acid words and the same amino acids words can be arranged to form different proteins because each set of amino acid has unique properties when divergently combined. Some perform well in water, others dislike water. Amylase, a protein found in saliva, can break down carbohydrates but cannot break down fats. Pepsin can break down proteins but is not good for breaking down carbohydrates etc.

As stated in the previous chapter, "the genetic data is not written **on** the DNA (like notes are written on paper) but is actually part of the DNA itself. Ultimately, the genetic information **in** DNA consists of an ordered code consisting of four chemical bases (ATCG). Significant notice must be given to the fact that

- **Without the nucleotides (the chemical bases) binding the separate sugar-phosphate strands into a double helix, DNA would cease to exist; however, without the DNA Double Helix genetic data would also cease to exist.**

That is, if the nucleotides are removed not only does the Double Helix fall apart, the genetic data is also lost. On the other hand, if the phosphate-sugar backbone is removed, not only does the genetic data (the ordered nucleotides) fall apart, the DNA Double Helix is also lost. Take away either one and the other simultaneously disappears.

Although the DNA is one thing and the genetic code (the ordered nucleotides) along the DNA is another, both things are so interdependent as to actually coexist as a single unit. This interesting phenomenon illustrates just how complex and absolutely unique genetic information is; there is nothing else like it in the entire material world. In fact, **it is this unique phenomenon that provides insight into the spiritual origin of the genetic information embedded along the double helix.**

The Spiritual Nature of DNA

DNA is a hybrid, that is, it has spiritual origins that are expressed in matter. Thus, **it is not a purely spiritual nor a purely physical thing but a combination of both spirit and matter.** Consequently, we find evidence of both spirit and matter within the DNA under the premise that a cause is known by its effects.

When spiritual beings communicate information to each other, such as angelic spirit to angelic spirit, **the communication is purely spiritual; there is no evidence of anything material because nothing material is involved or needed.**

However, when a spiritual being communicates within the material plane, such as an angelic apparition to children or spiritual form to concrete matter, **there should be evidence of both planes of existence, i.e. the spiritual (its origin or cause) and the material (its product or effect).** Matter is needed because matter is involved. Clearly, DNA has material properties; it is made of matter. The spiritual properties are a little more difficult to discern, but they are clearly present. To see them it helps to look at information originating from a material source, such as from another human being who necessarily uses a material medium to communicate a message.

In the process of human communication two media are involved; one to communicate the message and another to receive it. Since the communicator and communicate are both bound in matter the message always consists of two material layers or dimensions, one for the message itself and another for its reception. For example, chalk (one medium) on a chalk board (second medium), ink/lead on paper, or binary digits on a floppy disk. The chalk is used to communicate thoughts from the communicator and it is communicated via a material medium, the chalkboard, which receives the message. **The two media are capable of being separated from each other;** the chalk from the board, the lead from the paper, and digits from a floppy

disk by erasing. However, when they are separated THE DATA (the first medium) DISAPPEARS, BUT THE SECOND MEDIUM (chalkboard, paper, or disk) ON WHICH THE DATA IS COMMUNICATED CONTINUES TO EXIST.

That is, information written on a chalkboard can be erased but the chalkboard remains; ink and lead can be erased but paper remains, binary digits can be deleted but a computer disk still remains. This is what happens in the material plane of existence; one material medium is imposed upon another material medium. Communication in the material plane always involves two layers or dimensions of matter: matter on matter.

DNA HOWEVER, AND ITS INHERENT GENETIC CODE HAVE ONLY ONE DIMENSION OF MATTER, NOT TWO. They occupy the same plane or dimension; one is not imposed on the other. When the genetic data is erased the storage medium (DNA) also disappears. The storage media (DNA) is material; the communication of information (ordering of nucleotides) from a spiritual source, since it occurs in the material plane, requires a material carrier.

The genetic information, therefore, contains evidence of its metaphysical origins, viz., (1) IT EXISTS IN ONLY ONE PLANE OF MATTER, THE DNA, AND (2) IT CANNOT BE SEPARATED FROM THE DNA WITHOUT LOSING BOTH THE GENETIC INFORMATION ITSELF AND THE DNA. Genetic information (or spiritual informed matter) exists in only one dimension of matter; whereas all other communication of information necessarily involves two dimensions of matter (one to communicate the message and the other to receive it), with one imposed on the other. In effect, **DNA has the unique property of having two planes, one to contain the information** (the DNA backbone itself) **and another for its expression** (the genetic code), **united into one dimension whereby information is communicated.**

In this regard, the East German scientist, J Peil (1973) writes, "Information is neither a physical nor a chemical principle like energy and matter, even though the latter are required as carriers." However, in this case, I am not talking about or focusing on the information itself, as Dr. Peil cogently does but rather on its SOURCE and its RECEPTION OR MANIFESTATION in the material realm. **The communication of information from a material source will differ from communication of information originating with a spiritual source; that is, it is not the information itself that is spiritual but rather, its source!**

All information communicated on the physical plane (even when it originates from a spiritual source) requires a physical carrier as Peil suggests. Information and matter intersect. When the source is physical, two planes of matter are always required one for the communication (chalk) and another for the reception (board). However, when the intersection involves a spiritual source in the material plane only one plane of matter is required, AS WITH DNA. Because a human being has a physical body it is necessary to use a physical device to originate communication and another physical device to receive the communication. A spirit has no such body, but when it MANIFESTS ITS INTENTIONS IN THE MATERIAL PLANE, IT MUST SOMEHOW INTERACT WITH MATTER.

Thus, when there is a correspondence between spiritual and physical, as

- (1) When a soul as a life force imparts life to the body or
- (2) When a soul as form imparts information (DNA) to the body,

the physical media necessary for communicating information are reduced from two to one: none

for its spiritual origin but one for its reception in matter.

Moreover, information shared from such a source (spiritual soul to physical body) is lost when the media is removed or conversely the media is lost if the information is removed. These two characteristics,

- (1) Communication using only one plane of matter and**
- (2) Loss of information as well as the medium on which it is communicated when either is removed, are *sui generis*.**

They are not found anywhere else in the physical-material world, which always requires two media for communication and the retention of one, (the receiver-blackboard, paper etc.) when the information is removed.

Please pause for a moment and consider this: to complement chapter two wherein was demonstrated a correlation between the **life of a cell** and a **spiritual cause** (soul), an interconnected correlation between **information within the cell** (DNA) and a **spiritual cause** (soul), that empirically and logically demonstrates what the philosophers mean by the soul and what the Catholic church teaches, has just been made to compliment and complete the former. That is, the soul is, inter alia, both:

- Life Force and
- Form

"The unity of soul and body is so profound that one has to consider the soul to be the **'form'** of the body: i.e., it is because of its spiritual soul that the body made of matter becomes a **living**, human body." (Catechism of the Catholic Church, 365).

In conclusion, if DNA is associated with the life force or soul (where you find one you find the other) as demonstrated, and if it is also associated with the spiritual soul as expression of its form in matter there should be evidence of:

- (1) The hypothesized uni-plane of data rather than the bi-plane associated with human or physical communication.
- (2) The loss of medium when the data is removed

When examined, there is confirmation of these two hypotheses that warrant further examination:

Hypothesis #1 Uni Plane of Data

Genetic information is correlated with a life force, which is spiritual as discussed above; that is, wherever life is found DNA is also found and wherever life is not found, DNA is not found etc. Since life is a spiritual power, DNA, a physical medium should give evidence of a physical-spiritual relationship. This is exactly what we find when we analyze genetic data. Genes, as we have said, are nucleic acids that are the bonds that hold DNA together; their unique sequence also determines the information necessary to build proteins. If they are out of order, all that will exist is a bunch of meaningless nucleic mishmash that will produce nothing. To build a human body, three billion nucleic acid base pairs spanning 23 different chromosomes inside the cell

nucleus must be sequenced in an exact order. DNA provides the backbone that keeps the base pairs in place and allows them to combine; however, both the DNA backbone and the genetic information are constructed in such a unique way that both share only one dimension or plane of matter, not the two associated with all other communication of information in the physical plane.

In the physical world, genetic data is one of only two exceptions to this rule (the other will be explored in a later chapter) and it, along with the one to be explored, is the only information that we know of that originates from and is communicated by or associated with a spiritual source. It therefore partakes of a spiritual dimension or attribute, non-matter. **A spiritual source manifested in a physical world involves a necessary reduction in density of matter.** This is not a miracle, it can be explained; a spiritual being with a real physical body possessing all the density of matter such as the resurrected body of Jesus would be a miracle.

Because a spirit does not have matter, but can communicate through matter, material quantity is **not** increased when a spiritual substance communicates within the physical plane, as it is when the information originates in matter, consequently, when a spiritual being communicates only one medium is involved, viz., the matter required as a receptor of the information. Humans write with a physical hand on a physical medium; a spiritual being writes with a non-physical spiritual hand on a physical medium. So when the later imparts information there is only one physical dimension.

The communication of information of spiritual and physical beings can be summarized as such:

1. Spiritual to spiritual being = zero matter
2. Physical to physical being = two physical dimensions and
3. Spiritual to physical being = one physical dimension

DNA contains information necessary to construct physical bodily parts communicated on a physical medium by a spiritual source. If it has a physical connection, we should see a physical dimension. If it has a spiritual connection, we should expect to see evidence of this. This is exactly what is seen and it is only one of two places in the physical world where this unique phenomenon is found.

Hypothesis # 2 Loss of Data and Medium versus Retention of Medium

This distinction between communication carrier (ink, digits, paint) and communication receiver (paper, disk, canvas) such that the removal of the former does not affect the latter does not hold when communication of information involves both the spiritual and the physical plane. In this case, loss of data results in loss of medium as well. Take away the one and the other disappears too. This unique phenomenon is not repeated anywhere else in the physical world; not even in such an ethereal transfer of information as the spoken word.

Images and sounds can be erased from the human mind by hypnosis or other means; however, the brain itself, the storage medium, is retained like every other physical medium used for the storage or communication of information originating in the physical plane.

A spiritual being cannot manifest itself physically except by (1) a miracle whereby it actually receives a body of its own (Incarnation) or by (2) possession whereby it controls a body not its own or by (3) interacting with matter in accord with the laws that govern physical and material

bodies but in such a way as to reduce the density of matter into one plane such as a (a) hologram or light or some other medium interacting with matter to form what appears to be a body or (b) DNA.

Except for a miracle, a spiritual being does not **acquire** matter when it manifests itself in the physical plane, but it does **use** one dimension of matter (presumably interacting with light) to communicate its presence. This is why after the resurrection Jesus exhorted Thomas to,

"Reach here with your finger, and see My hands; and reach here your hand and put it into My side; and do not be unbelieving, but believing" (John 20:27).

Since only God can perform a miracle (suspend the laws of nature) Jesus must be God because He has flesh and therefore cannot be a ghost who cannot perform a miracle and therefore cannot manufacture a living body with flesh. "A ghost does not have flesh", but the resurrected Jesus does:

While they were still talking about this, Jesus himself stood among them and said to them, "Peace be with you." They were startled and frightened, thinking they saw a ghost. He said to them, "Why are you troubled, and why do doubts rise in your minds? Look at my hands and my feet. It is I myself! Touch me and see; a ghost does not have flesh and bones, as you see I have" (Luke 24: 36-37).

We see the same association of spirit and matter when the Archangel Raphael (who cannot perform a miracle) visited Tobias; **EVEN THOUGH RAPHAEL APPEARED TO HAVE FLESH, HE DID NOT**. After explaining to Tobias who he actually was (Tobit 12:19) he adds, " All the time that I was visible to you I neither ate nor drank anything. *I only appeared to do so*" (emphasis added).

Raphael is a spiritual being, and thus when manifesting himself in the physical plane had only one dimension of rarest ethereal matter, something like what the new agers call ether or some other light-substance. No angel, not even an archangel, can perform a miracle and create a real human body. For an angel to acquire a body requires either possession or mimicry induced by supernatural angelic knowledge of nature which it uses to make an image that is somehow projected and appears to be real. In fact, in such mimicry there is no density of matter apparent to the human sense of touch although it appears to be flesh to the eyes. Jesus being God could perform a miracle; thus to prove He was not a ghost, He had the apostle touch his hands and side to verify his divinity through the very real resurrection of His physical body. He used theological knowledge of spiritual beings manifesting in the physical plane, known even to the apostles, to prove his authenticity.

DNA is not a miracle; it operates within the realm of the laws of nature. Thus, when the soul communicates form to a body it does so through a physical medium without taking on matter itself. The soul itself is a created being; it operates within time and space and adheres to their laws. When those laws are suspended, we are dealing with a miracle, such as the resurrection or the incarnation. **DNA, as stated, is not a miracle and thus is subject to the laws of time, space, energy, and matter. However, since the origin of the data contained in the DNA is spiritual only one dimension of matter is necessary for its manifestation.** Thus, when that one dimension is removed, as when nucleic acids are removed from DNA, nothing remains but the unorganized matter used to manifest the data or the image, "it all goes up in smoke" so to

speak.

The genetic code is actually in the matter; it is not on the matter. Thus, to inform (when speaking of a **spiritual source**, such as the soul), means, as previously stated, to place form "**WITHIN**" (in form), but when speaking of a **material source** (chalk on chalkboard) to inform means to place information "**WITHON**". Not only is genetic code marvelously contained "**WITHIN**" the DNA; it also found "**WITHIN**" the nucleus, the deepest recess of a cell where it is contained as one of the supreme physical mysteries associated with the origin of life and the human body. We shall explore the deepest spiritual mystery embedded in matter, even greater than the spiritual origin of DNA in chapter seven on the theology of the body.

In conclusion, all verifiable information in the material plane consists of two separate material dimensions, one for expressing the information and another on which it is expressed. Moreover, when data is removed the underlying medium on which it is expressed always remains. The only exception to these observable and therefore empirically verifiable observations is genetic information and DNA; they are two things (information and the medium on which it is expressed) that share only one material dimension. Moreover, unlike all other information communicated in the material plane, when the genetic data is removed the underlying medium in which it is expressed also disappears.

In addition, because DNA is (1) associated with life more than it is with matter and (2) because it has been shown that genetic information has spiritual affinities that correspond with what philosophers have for over two thousand years called "form" by which the soul directs indeterminate matter to become a specific determined thing by informing or putting information into it, it is concluded that genetic data "within" DNA has a spiritual origin.

Moreover, since DNA is associated with life and contains information with spiritual properties, which are useless without life, it is also concluded that genetic information, like life itself, also has its origin in the soul, which is the source of both life and form as confirmed by logic, observation, and the magisterial authority of the church (fides et ratio).

As stated above, without life form is useless (form by itself without life would be static information incapable of fulfilling its potential); it would be mere potency without actualization. On the other hand, life without form is meaningless (life by itself without form would be amorphous with no function, structure, or unified design); it would be mere existence without essence, nothing more than a blob of amorphous potential that could never be realized. Thus, the soul of necessity must, in addition to conferring life, be able to confer form. It would be inconsistent to provide the one without the other, a futile exercise. **If life is conferred to a cell, to have any meaning or purpose, the cell must also be informed.** This is presumably the reason we see DNA associated with life more than it is with matter, viz., it has a spiritual origin.

Importance of the Soul for Politics and Social Science

My emphasis on the existence of the soul is related to the realization that its non-existence (and thus, the non-existence of normative and prescriptive science) reduces politics to a utilitarian calculus of power thereby resulting in relationships of dominance and subordination characterized by deceit and recurring struggle to redress inevitable grievances. Environments of this type serve as incubators for Machiavellian calculus whereby astute politicians endeavor to

appear good while behind the scenes, if truth were told, another reality is taking place. Modern political wisdom counsels every hopeful office holder to "avoid every appearance of impropriety", not impropriety itself, but only its appearance; private affairs and those conducted under the veil of secrecy are another matter altogether. Without a rational power, such as the human intellect, capable of discovering objective moral norms, human beings cannot establish a universal moral standard (that is one that is free of arbitrary power calculus and equally applicable to all men and women regardless of their status or social position) by which to judge human actions and to establish a foundation on which to build a just society.

If such a thing as a human soul does exist, it not only makes possible the discovery of such values, it also provides a standard by which human action can be judged by impartial criteria based on a rule of law known by reason. Without objective moral criteria associated with the human soul, right and wrong, good and bad are inevitably determined by blind will power and calculated self-interest. Historically such tendencies have been successfully resisted by recourse to the moral authority of natural law, which, for example, provided the rational justification for the American Revolution clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence.

The natural moral law either exists and is discoverable by human reason or it does not exist and thus cannot be known. If it does not exist, no one can rightly complain about injustice in human affairs. Injustice may be lamented, but it cannot, in this eventuality, be critiqued as good or bad right or wrong. If there is not a natural moral law discoverable by reason (and a free will to adhere to it), there can be no such thing as injustice. It does not suffice to say that in the absence of natural law, a violation of civil law can be interpreted as an injustice. This does not follow. There is nothing inherently necessary or just about a civil law; oppressive power (democratic, monocratic, or aristocratic) used to draft it can also amend and change it whenever necessary. Whereas the precepts of the natural law, like the Ten Commandments in which they are stated, transcend human caprice, in a sense, they are written in stone.

Since the natural law is neither innate nor instinctual but rather KNOWN BY HUMAN REASON, it is necessary to demonstrate that the human mind differs not only in degree but also in kind from that of an animal. So far, we have not been able to discover such a difference. **Life and form are certainly profound and unique characteristics, but they are common to all living things not just to human beings, and therefore are only differences of degree.** If a mere difference of degree is all that there is, human beings are simply amoral animals determined by instincts, innate drives, and primitive impulses, which are regulated only by fear or self-interest necessary for survival and pleasure. Consequently, if there is only a difference of degree, men and women are capable of becoming the most cunning and amoral political animals adept at betrayal and deceit, which become the expected and "normal" mode of behavior (at least among those "smart" enough to realize that they must control themselves enough to escape detection). People on all sides of the political spectrum acknowledge, in one form or another, these unfortunate verities.

"Man when perfected is the best of animals but when separated from law and justice, he is the worst of all; since armed injustice is the more dangerous, and he is equipped at birth with arms, meant to be used by intelligence and virtue, which he may use for the worst ends. Wherefore, if he have not virtue (intellectual and moral), he is the most unholy and most savage of animals, and the most full of lust and gluttony" (Aristotle, Politics, Book I, Part II, Para 10, Kolbe's Greatest Books).

To rescue human dignity, assure the possibility of justice, promote the common good, and the

right to pursue happiness, there must be a difference of kind between human nature and animal nature that raises human beings above the physical instincts and unregulated primitive passions of beasts. At the same time, since human beings have a physical nature subject to passions and desires, there must be a way to understand the relationship between passion and intellect. Moreover, this relationship must be a harmonious one that makes it possible for man to become the "best of animals", something he could not become if straddled with personality disorders associated with interior division, which would be the case if the passions of the body and moral reason of the soul could not be harmonized.

Thus, it is necessary to demonstrate that there is something about human nature that is fundamentally different from animal nature. Something so fundamentally different that it enables human beings to unite their lower physical being to their higher spiritual being and rise through a process of becoming whereby they develop all the latent potential of their innate human faculties. This must be a species characteristic so fundamentally and completely different and far reaching that it leads to the conclusion that human beings possess an attribute which no other animal has at all, not even in the slightest degree. This is known as a difference of kind.

Those who argue for a difference in degree accept the fact that species possess different capabilities and powers; however, they argue, the difference is only quantitative. That is, diverse animals have the same or similar capabilities and powers but differ only in the amount or degree in which they possess them. For example, chimpanzees can communicate with each other, so too can humans. Therefore, they both possess the ability to commune, which if not examined more closely can be mistakenly interpreted as a mere difference of degree.

A difference in kind, on the other hand, is a *sui generis* difference, one that it is so unique that it is possessed by only one species and not in any way at all by any other. For example, human beings possess a form of communication, human speech, that is totally unique to them; although other animals communicate, none do so through the spoken word to any degree at all. Human speech is a difference of kind, which will be explained in detail in chapters five and six.

If there is a difference of kind, anatomical differences of degree (such as brain size, genomes and other physical artifacts), in spite of their importance, can be subordinated to a study of these more significant differences. Animals that differ in kind can have many differences of degree but one will have at least one characteristic that the other lacks completely. Differences in degree between human beings and higher primates (such as a spiritual mental faculty of reason versus a physical mental faculty of memory) do not become differences in kind in the process of evolution; **this would require a quantum leap from physical to spiritual by means of the physical**, which is a logical absurdity believed only by atheists and gnostics who mistake demonic possession and consequent Christian pogroms for spiritual evolution*.

*For example consider this quote from new age matriarch Barbara Max Hubbard's "Manual for Co-Creators of the Quantum Leap", pp. 55-57, which was given to her by her higher spiritual voice:

"Humanity will not be able to make the transition from Earth-only to universal life until the chaff has been separated from the wheat. The great reaper must reap before we can take the **quantum leap** to the next phase of **evolution**. No worldly peace can prevail until the self-centered members (Christians and men of good will) of the planetary body either change or die. That is the choice. The red horse is the destruction during the birth process of those who refuse to be born into God-centered, universal life...

This act is as horrible as killing a cancer cell. It must be done for the sake of the future of the whole. So be it: be prepared for the selection process which is now beginning. The second seal revealed a red horse ridden by the one with the power to take peace from the Earth. It stands for the necessity of the selection process which shall rip apart the old order and destroy those who choose to remain self-centered remnants of the past." Those of you who know what is happening -- the one-fourth who are now listening to the higher self -- are to be guides for the rest who will be panicked and confused." (pp 60-61).

All reconstruction of man's ancestors from fossil remains, usually jaw bones and teeth reveal anatomical, physiological, and biological differences of degree. Thus, they may indicate physical evolution of the body, but these differences, as interesting as they are, are irrelevant. **Philosophers are looking for a difference of kind; advocates of abiogenesis are looking for a difference of degree.** The issue therefore, resides in the psyche, not in the body, but evolution is or, at least, has been a theory based on a body of physiological evidence (until Panentheism made it primarily a spiritual process of the mind). For our purposes, biological research proves very little; anatomical differences are differences of degree; we are looking for differences in kind.

Biological differences of degree (such as seeing and hearing ability) do not preclude study of a potential psychological difference of kind between man and the great apes. Since the possibility for a difference of kind potentially resides in the psyche, it must be studied further. This is the reason I have insisted on recourse to study of psychology prior to further studies in politics per se.

Otherwise, we are placing the cart in front of the horse, in which case we are going nowhere except, perhaps backwards. **If there is a psychological difference of kind, the study of politics without an ancillary study of psychology places us in the unenviable position of attempting to construct a society for human beings, without knowing what a human being is.** If we continue like that, we are likely to construct a social system more fit for animals led by pigs and dogs than for humans led by virtuous and enlightened leaders.

This is the scenario found on Orwell's Animal Farm where the ruling pigs and their guardian dogs, being animals (or underdeveloped human beings who, because of their underdevelopment, act like animals), treat their subjects the only way they knew how, that is, like animals. Of course, when mistreated subjects are mistakenly taken for and consistently treated like animals they tend, like animals, to revolt. To avoid such a gross error, degradation and "pulverization" of human dignity and the subsequent social unrest that impedes human development, it is essential to properly identify human nature as something distinct from animal nature and then to build a just society upon this anthropological foundation; this requires finding a difference of kind between the two.

Identification of a difference of kind must be followed by a proper analysis of this difference and a precise definition of human nature. It should be clear that the issue rests squarely in the psychological domain and not in an analysis of physiological parts, jaw bones, teeth and the like, because these physiological characteristics are merely expected **differences of degree that** will not rescue humanity from the dog's teeth or the pig's sty.

Scientists, philosophers and educated people who understand the point realize that the real issue of difference between man and primates is a psychological issue and thus, they focus on animal and human cognitive abilities and processes. **The argument over biological evolution is perhaps interesting but for the most part irrelevant. We are not interested in how humans beings evolved but with what, in fact, they are.** ONLY WHEN WE HAVE ANSWERED THE QUESTION ABOUT WHAT THEY ARE WILL WE BE IN A POSITION TO HANDLE THE QUESTION ABOUT WHAT THEY CAN BECOME. **The solution to the problem lies in the mind not in the body; it is primarily a psychological issue not a physiological one.** That is why Charles Darwin devoted chapters three and four in The Descent of Man to showing continuity of mental development between animals and humans; he was endeavoring to establish an evolutionary argument for the human mind thereby proving that

mental differences, although significant, are mere difference of degree not differences of kind. He therefore concludes chapter four by saying that, "The difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind" (Darwin, 2002).

On the other side, philosophers, beginning with Aristotle who, like Darwin, was a biologist, argue for a difference of kind. Aristotle could have looked for the difference between man and animals in the body, but he, like Darwin, realized that finding similarities and dissimilarities in the body was irrelevant; the crux of the issue resides in the mind and is more of a psychological than a biological phenomenon. **Homo sapiens is not defined by a bodily part but by a mental process and power.** Human beings are the only species that have enough intelligence to acquire wisdom by which to choose and determine their own development, **and this, as we shall see, is a psychological difference of kind involving the soul.**

If the difference is only one of degree, we are in a pickle. We will not be able to answer the normative questions about politics, human development, and happiness because mere quantitative differences of degree reduce human nature to deterministic biological and physiological processes. If humans are merely well developed animals possessing more complex brains and bodies than other animals, there is no need for an integrated social science and we can continue the study of human physiology and behavioral psychology as the sole criteria for understanding human nature. The resultant psychological therapies such as stimulus-response, classical conditioning, and operant conditioning that work so well on animals can be used to establish complex social control mechanisms to manipulate consumer demand and to serve the interest and ideological benefit of those with power as Pavlov did for Lenin and the Central Committee and Watson/Skinner have done for Adam Smith and Wall Street.

Either way, (the **atheistic materialist approach** of the communists or the **hedonistic materialist approach** of the classical capitalists) human psychology is reduced to an analysis of physiological and deterministic processes resulting in the dumping of human psycho-spiritual development and normative moral judgments necessary to promote justice and domestic tranquility. **Both forms of materialism (atheistic and hedonistic) manifest (although one more than the other) a built in tendency to treat human beings like impersonal reflex dominated creatures** having no other purpose except the maximization of pleasure and the related avoidance of pain. Portraying and forming human beings this way eases political control and maximizes multi-marketing of products and ideas through stimulation and manipulation of physical emotions and primitive passions that constitute a significant part, albeit not the only part, of human nature.

Although one ideology over emphasizes the individual (classical liberal capitalism) and the other the community (atheistic communism), they both are grounded in a materialist conception of man in which physiological processes (hormonal release, conditioned responses, maximization of pleasure and avoidance of pain among others) are the key to social control and to psychological manipulation (likes and dislikes through association paired with images and emotions) because, for them both, the difference between men and animals is thought to be merely one of degree. **Either way, man is mistreated because he is misunderstood.** As we shall see in chapter seven, the two (individual and social) cannot be artificially bifurcated or divided without irremediably damaging both.

If there is no such thing as human nature distinct from animal nature, there can be no such thing as human happiness or higher human purpose distinct from animal pleasure or impulse; there can be no moral virtue or objective norm for determining good and bad or right and wrong.

Consequently, human society must be mistakenly constructed from principles of power, domination, self-interest, and survival of the fittest, rather than upon justice, virtue, love, and solidarity even though such resplendent ideas continue to be used by materialists as shibboleths for political rhetoric intended for the unenlightened who become the enslaved.

There must be a difference of kind or the study of politics as a uniquely human science must end. Rather than being an integrated empirical and philosophical enterprise capable of imparting understanding of social phenomena and prescribing change for the common good, politics becomes an appendage of biology and a hegemonic study of power, dominance, and subordination guided by the self-interest of rulers pretending to act for the good of others while they cunningly seek their own self advantage.

This historic scenario is most likely to repeat itself in the "panentheistic new humanity", which in the distorted name of "self-less service", places the most "evolved", spiritually mature and enlightened adherents ("world-servers", "adepts" and "men of goodwill") of the New Age into leadership positions and eliminates all **counter-evolutionary forces** who, due to their allegiance to traditional values and forms, are a lag on development as evidenced by their disagreement with the Avatars, initiates, and group of world servers known as disciples. That is, all will be free who agree with those possessing political power; the rest will either in Rousseau's terms, be "forced to be free", prevaricate or be necessarily replaced as part of a natural evolutionary process to reduce "cultural lag" that inhibits the "actualization" of human potential. As New Age matriarch Barbara Max Hubbard poignantly states,

"We, the elders, have been patiently waiting until the very last moment before the quantum transformation, to take action to cut out this corrupted and corrupting element in the body of humanity. It is like watching a cancer grow; something must be done before the whole body is destroyed...the self-centered members must be destroyed. There is no alternative. Only the God-centered can evolve....We will use whatever means we must to make this act of destruction as quick and painless as possible to the one-half of the world who are capable of evolving" (Hubbard, pp 60-61).

Unfortunately, the so called "God-centered" are the most self-centered and narcissistic people in existence. In fact, they make a God out of the self and, as we shall see, they dump the "person" and honor the "individual"; you cannot get more self-centered than that. In this, the Panentheistic Program is little different than the Communist Program, which was used (for the "good of humanity" and of the "workers") to rid the world of all "**counter-revolutionary forces**" acting as a lag on social progress, when, in fact, the people who suffered most in this paradigm were the workers who bled at the hands of those who claimed to have the light necessary to set them free. **The only "cancer" was the so called "Enlightened" Central Committee leaders who** once in power, **unleashed a social program** (more correctly, social pogrom), supposedly for the good of the people, based upon a materialist conception of man and of human history **by which every conceivable social evil it was meant to cure was exacerbated.** The only difference in the Communist and New Age paradigms is this time instead of a false materialist conception of man; it emanates from an exponentially worst spiritual misconception.

A social program, Liberalism, Communism or New Age Panentheism that is built upon a flawed/false anthropology will result, in spite of all its propaganda to the contrary and in spite of all its boldly professed and progressive human/community rights and spiritual values, **in degradation and human enslavement.** The genuine starting point for the social question and

the key to an authentic new man and a sustainable new humanity is a demonstrable and well-articulated understanding of human nature that contains a difference of kind from which an authentic human spirituality and social program for the future can be derived.

Old hard line communist dictators of the proletariat and purveyors of conflict and division; morally underdeveloped classical capitalist advocates of unregulated competition, self interest, survival of the fittest and spiritual evolution wedded to philosophical, psychological and empirical models of man rooted in materialist ideologies, stimulus-response mechanisms, and biological determinism **are a vanishing breed, holdovers from the past who are unable to provide a satisfying answer about human nature and the dignity of the human person necessary for the future.**

According to the Pope John Paul II:

As a result, the theories of evolution which, because of the philosophies which inspire them, regard the spirit either as emerging from the forces of living matter, or as a simple epiphenomenon of that matter, are incompatible with the truth about man. They are therefore unable to serve as the basis for the dignity of the human person" (1996).

Because these "philosophies" are rooted in materialist ideologies that are increasingly becoming a thing of the past, they cannot serve as anthropological starting points for the type of social construction for an Era of Peace that awaits us in the future. Because they do not tell the entire truth about who he is, they are unable to serve as the basis of the dignity of the human person. Consequently, it is not necessary to spend precious time engaging them on the battlefield; they will fall of their own inertia and inner contradictions. What is necessary is to spend time with men and women of good will unfolding a viable plan for the future based upon the integral truth about man acquired by humble, honest research conducted with a pure motive. If this type of cooperation is continually fostered, we will soon see a,

New generation of competent global minded leaders, advocates of peace driven by a desire for justice informed by charity and integral science infused with spiritual values, in short, "craftsmen for a new humanity where brothers and sisters — members all of the same family — are able at last to live in peace " (Pope John Paul II, 2001).

Summary and Conclusion

In short, empiricism, positivism, and materialism have had their day as guiding paradigms in the human sciences. They have reached their zenith and their incompatibility with the complexities of human nature is becoming increasingly apparent; the modern world is moving in a different direction. **Modern people want more than physical satiation; they desire community, authentic human relationships, and self-direction manifest in increasing social and political participation, and ultimately, the authentic development of human potential and unlocking of the interior depths that have welled up against centuries of repressive ideological warfare hostile to the human person and keeping him from giving an authentic gift of himself for his own good and that of humanity.** The central problem of the modern world as articulated by Pope John Paul II,

"Consists in the degradation, indeed in a pulverization, of the fundamental uniqueness of each human person."

THUS, BEFORE ALL ELSE, THE FUTURE RESTS ON THE ARTICULATION OF A NEW

ANTHROPOLOGY, one which secures the objective truth about man and thus helps secure his integral development as a human person.

Modern man is becoming increasingly uncomfortable with the pervasive materialist reduction that has pulverized human dignity and inhibited broad human advancement. This materialist reduction has even been extended to questions dealing with the origin of life. **This question, in the hands of ideologues, has resulted in an obfuscated, complex, illogical, and non-verifiable hypothesis presented to an uneducated public as if it were the truth.** It is clear that empirical science cannot satisfactorily answer the question of human origins, but **it is necessary to know something about where a being comes from and to define what it in fact a human being is before there can be adequate talk about where he/she is going or how to get there.**

To answer the question of human origins by recourse to chemical evolution of non-living elements to a living cell is naive and incredulous; there is no logical necessity for such a beginning other than the limits of empirical science. Unfortunately, rather than accepting the limits of their methodology and having logical recourse to philosophy, many empirical scientists committed the error of attempting to reduce a metaphysical question into a physical one by subjecting it to a laboratory experiment as if empirical science could defy logic and create life; nothing remotely satisfactory has been forthcoming. **As a consequence, we have been bamboozled into developing an anthropology that begins its faulty analysis with a mere material contingent cause without an explanation of its ultimate cause as if this were a legitimate starting point.**

Scientists have spent too much time trying to explain the process of evolution without adequate knowledge of the origin of life on which it depends. The theory about derivation from chemical evolution and its corollary hocus pocus life is an unreasonable starting place. THEORIES ARE SUPPOSED TO HELP EXPLAIN AND TO PROVIDE SOME DEGREE OF CLARITY; **this theory begins with an unobservable and an illogical first principle and, therefore, from the outset, engenders significant controversy and confusion before it ever takes its first step.** Why should I, or anyone else, listen to any one about anything they have to say on a controversial topic when there is monumental and justifiable disagreement about the validity of their very first premise (abiogenesis). Such an assumed, unexplained, and spontaneous existence of a living being is neither *a posteriori* (based on observation) nor *a priori* (based on self-evidence). **Since these are the only type of logical first principles that exist, spontaneous generation is illogical.** How then can proponents of a theory that is supposed to bring some degree of clarity and provide some predictive power expect fair minded people to bear with them if their very starting point is itself inexplicable? It certainly is a spectacular claim.

Perhaps if they had better understood the mystery of the human soul, they could have been in a better position to understand further mysteries contained in the human body, mysteries we shall explore in CHAPTER SEVEN. Perhaps if they had cooperated with philosophers and theologians rather than harassed and tortured them, they could have developed a more sustainable social system. Living cells and complex genetic codes do not just spontaneously evolve and pop out of nowhere. Cells are multifaceted and mysterious living organisms containing complex sets of data which came from somewhere. **If there were more respect for the mysterious question of the origins of life, there might be more respect for the human beings that resulted from this mysterious process.** To know man, we must better understand his origins. **Dealing with questions pertaining to evolution without first ADEQUATELY answering questions pertaining to origins of life involves an adroit but unfortunate sidestep of the most fundamental and essential question** and, as a consequence, imprudently running headlong into the deep waters of theory formation without an adequate life preserver, in fact, without any life preserver at all. It is fair to say that this is not only

theoretically unwise, it is practically foolish and imprudent.

There is no *a priori* knowledge necessary for philosophical demonstration nor any *a posteriori* evidence necessary for empirical verification that enables me to accept the propositions that:

- (1) Incomprehensible data arises spontaneously by the remotest chance from dumb dirt and chemicals or
- (2) That a living organism rises from an indemonstrable dead cause.

If a cause is dead, "it is not worth fighting for." It is time to speak plain old English: Stupid things, that is, things like dirt, which lacks intelligence, cannot confer wisdom nor can non-living things confer life. Wisdom and life can only arise from a living being that possesses these qualities and therefore is capable of conferring them on others.

Now, this is logical and in accord with common sense; every objective observation about the cause and effect of anything confirms the logic: dogs from dogs, cats from cats, heat from fire and light from light not dogs from pigs, cats from birds, cold from fire or dark from light. These things are not demonstrable and are as illogical as life from non-life and intelligence from non-intelligence. On the other hand, **life from life and information from intelligence are absolutely logical, and moreover, they are universal and empirically verifiable.** Once we get this straight, we can proceed to a more adequate understanding of what in fact it means to be a human being and then to the question of constructing a society fit for human beings.

We have spent so much time on the question of the origin of life and DNA that it is beginning to appear that chemical evolution is the most important issue in our study of integral psychology and the human soul. Important as it might be, we do not want to fall into the elusive trap in which we spend all of our time arguing about a point that distracts us from the real work of building a solidaristic social system for the Era of Peace. **The real issue is not how the human species evolved on this planet but what, in fact, it means to be a human being, what in fact a human being is.**

Pope Benedict XVI is focused on the central issue. As Cardinal Ratzinger, he wrote a commentary on Genesis, In the Beginning, A Catholic Understanding of the Story of Creation and the Fall, in which he states:

"We cannot say: **creation or evolution**, inasmuch as **these two things respond to two different realities.** The story of the dust of the earth and the breath of God does not in fact explain how human persons come to be (that is, give knowledge of the process involved) but rather **WHAT THEY ARE** (emphasis added). It explains their inmost origin and casts light on the project that they are. And, vice versa, **the theory of evolution** seeks to understand and describe biological developments. But in so doing it **cannot explain where the 'project' of human persons comes from, nor their inner origin, nor their particular nature**" (Ratzinger, 1995, p 50).

As my friend Patsy would say, "Ah! That's the rub." It is more important to know what a human being is than it is to know the process by which he or she biologically evolved. **To better understand human nature, we need knowledge of human origins, and knowledge of the human soul, which cast light on what "they are."** In this process, an integrated methodology utilizing philosophy, theology, and empirical science that thoroughly examines both the spiritual and physical dimensions of man is

recommended. Ratzinger (1995, p 50) recognizes that, "We are faced here with two complementary -- rather than mutually exclusive -- realities." That is, "The inner unity of creation and evolution and of faith and reason." These two realms of knowledge are complementary, not contradictory.

Such an approach utilizing science, faith, and reason requires a deeper and integrated account of the human body and soul. Since this is increasingly being realized, the ideological ground is shifting; the shift is a subtle move closer to the truth about man manifest in the renewed emphasis on moral and spiritual development including the unfolding of human potential beyond mere physical satiation to higher levels of human consciousness and untapped potential of the human mind in union with the human body, which together constitute the human person. **Both Panentheism and Personalism are moving in this direction**, but the way in which they understand human origins and the human person, differ considerably; consequently so to do their respective programs for human and social development, albeit with many similarities, congruities and agreement in both the individual psychological sphere and broader socio-political sphere.

John Paul II, by introducing Personalism and Trinitarian Theology into Catholic thought and social theory adroitly positioned the church as a champion in the global arena. **Personalism is the 21st century banner under which the Catholic and Orthodox Church, united in East and West** with its newly emerging theologies, (such as the theology of integral humanism coupled with theosis, the theology of the body, and the theology of work) **is being developed and positioned as sole competitor able to meet Panentheism on the international post-modern playing field from which the victor will lead humanity to either a Marian Era of Peace or to a Panentheistic New Age.**

The issue of the origin of life and its correlated information are best answered by recourse to a Creator, even Panentheists admit and advocate an ineffable spiritual first cause from which the physical universe, "emanates as energy". The spiritual nature of DNA is a component of an increasing spiritual awareness connected to an evolving theology of the body as is cellular life; both argue for the existence of a spiritual life force with intelligence and, as we shall see in chapters six and seven, also reveal additional mysteries involving the communion of inter-personal relationships within the Holy Trinity and of man made in the Trinitarian image of God.

In this chapter, the relationship among the soul as life force and as form of the body and DNA has been established. Nonetheless, further study is necessitated by the fact that the evidence linking the life and form of the body to the soul, interesting as it is, yields only a difference of degree. That is, all animals, plants, and humans are animated by a life force and all have DNA. As profound as these subjects might prove to be, they do not solve our quest to find a difference of kind. **For such a difference, we must move beyond the study of the body to a study of the mind.** After a foray into this territory we will return to the theology of the body for some additional insights about the image of God in man before arriving at the sought for definition of human nature. Onwards.

End Notes

1. Earth's Early Atmosphere: Repeated verbatim from the website:
http://www.truenews.org/Creation_vs_Evolution/origin_of_life.html

The atmospheric conditions proposed by Oparin, Haldane and Urey were radically different from what exists today. Because oxygen destroys the chemical building blocks of life, they speculated that the early earth had an oxygen-free atmosphere. However, in the last few decades, evidence has surfaced that has convinced most atmospheric scientists **that the early atmosphere contained abundant oxygen.**

In the 1970's Apollo 16 astronauts discovered that **water is broken down into oxygen and hydrogen gas in the upper atmosphere when it is bombarded by ultraviolet radiation.** This process, called photo dissociation, is an efficient process which would have resulted in the production of large quantities of oxygen in a relatively short time. Studies by the astronauts revealed that **this process is probably a major source of oxygen in our current atmosphere.**

The assumption of an oxygen-free atmosphere has also been rejected on theoretical grounds. The ozone layer around planet earth consists of a thin but critical blanket of oxygen gas in the upper atmosphere. **This layer of oxygen gas blocks deadly levels of ultraviolet radiation from the sun.** Without oxygen in the early atmosphere, there could have been no ozone layer over the early earth. **Without an ozone layer, all life on the surface of planet earth would face certain death** from exposure to intense ultraviolet radiation. Furthermore, the chemical building blocks of proteins, **RNA and DNA, would be quickly annihilated because ultraviolet radiation destroys their chemical bonds.** It doesn't matter if these newly formed building blocks are in the atmosphere, on dry ground, or under water.

So (chemical) evolutionists have a major dilemma. The chemical building blocks of life would be destroyed if oxygen was present, and they would be destroyed if it wasn't! This "catch 22" has been noted by evolutionist and molecular biologist Michael Denton: "What we have then is a sort of 'Catch 22' situation. **If we have oxygen we have no organic compounds, but if we don't we have none either.**" Even if the building blocks of life could survive the effects of intense ultraviolet radiation and form life spontaneously, the survival of any subsequent life forms would be impossible in the presence of such heavy ultraviolet light. Ozone must be present to protect any surface life from the deadly effects of ultraviolet radiation from the sun.

Finally, the assumption that there was no oxygen in the early atmosphere is not borne out by the geologic evidence. **Geologists have discovered evidence of abundant oxygen content in the oldest known rocks on earth.** Again, Michael Denton: "Ominously, for believers in the traditional organic soup scenario, there is no clear geochemical evidence to exclude the possibility that oxygen was present in the Earth's atmosphere soon after the formation of its crust."

All of this evidence supports the fact that there was abundant oxygen on the early earth. However, with or without oxygen, evolution is in a no-win situation. **Spontaneous generation could not have occurred either with oxygen—or without it!**

2. Virus: Before reading the note below a little overview will help.

A virus is simply a piece of DNA/RNA and perhaps some proteins with a protective coating; that is all it is, period. A raw piece of RNA is known as a viroid. Some viroids are covered by a simple **protein coat or capsid.** Other viruses in addition to the capsid are also **enveloped,** meaning that the **capsid is coated with a lipid membrane** or viral envelope.

Cells are very selective as to which viral DNA/RNA is admitted across the cell membrane into the cell's cytoplasm. That is, **the cell has to recognize the virion** (name of a virus before it enters a cell and is replicated by the cell) **before admitting it.** Once admitted into the cell's cytoplasm **the cell acts on it like it would a piece of its own RNA** released from the nucleus into the cytoplasm. The cell does not have a brain; it simply follows the material/physical laws that govern its operation and does what cells do: **use the RNA to make a protein by following its instructions.**

Some viruses are RNA based others are DNA based. If it is RNA based, it enters the cytoplasm whereby the cell manufactures proteins using the viral RNA as a template. **If it is DNA based it can be taken into the nucleus where it is integrated into the host genome.** There is a type of RNA virus known as a **retrovirus** which is converted to DNA and inscribed into the host DNA in the nucleus. **RNA viruses** that are used to make proteins in the cytoplasm are known as **riboviruses.**

Wendell Stanley was awarded the Nobel Prize in chemistry (1946) for demonstrating that viruses were a mixture of nucleic acids and proteins that used cellular organelle for reproduction. Stanley established the "fact" that a chemical substance (a virus) while itself not alive, could behave as if it were thereby **supposedly** demonstrating that non-living atoms and molecules could combine in an increasingly complex manner and evolve to a point where they mimicked life itself.

Of course, **the only problem is that Stanley manifests the human propensity to reify non-living things by projecting aspects of living things onto them.** In short, **he presented the evidence (and everyone accepted it) as if the virus was doing the**

work inside of the cell, WHEN IT IS MORE LIKELY THAT IT IS THE CELL ITSELF THAT IS DOING THE WORK. Atheistic scientists like to say that a virus is "**technically non-living**." In fact, they are "**absolutely non-living**" nor **are they on their way to life**; technically implies there is an exception or a catch 22; there is no exception; viruses are not living NOR ON THEIR WAY TO LIFE in any way at all. **The atheist also like to say that viral DNA is capable of replication inside the cells of living organisms" (as if it suddenly and magical came to life once inside the cell)**, when most likely, it is the cells themselves that are replicating the viral DNA/RNA.

Moreover, if a virus is replicated inside a cell, and this is always seen to be the case, (we have never found one replicated outside of a cell) than, logically speaking, the cell must be equal to or older than viruses themselves. A virus could not replicate without a cell and thus would degrade. Since this is necessarily the case a virus is not evidence of chemical evolution as some of the atheists maintain; the cell is as old or older than the virus itself. Thus, a virus did not evolve into a cell as the atheists often argue.

Viruses cannot be precursors to living organisms because viruses cannot be replicated without living organisms; they lack the metabolic and reproductive powers provided by an already living organism or host cell. Again, to propose a virus as an example of an evolving self replicating molecule increasing in complexity and slowly evolving toward becoming a living cell in some primordial environment is pushing the boundaries of honesty and scientific integrity. In fact, it is again beyond the pale. **A virus cannot exist without a cell so it could not have evolved into a cell; it presupposes a cell for its own existence.**

Here we go again, the chicken and the egg; virus first, cell first. The idea just does not work. **The facts, when known, clearly demonstrate the opposite of that intended by the ideologues.** So they come up with THE IDEA OF "REGRESSIVE EVOLUTION" or reverses evolution (something that, like its cousin spontaneous generation, has never been seen or verified), which maintains that instead of a virus evolving into a cell, a cell devolved into a virus.

This is another example of imagination run wild. **They try to have it both ways** contrary to all available evidence known to science: **anti-entropy outside of cells and entropy inside of cells.** There saying that outside of cells things build up and inside they tear down contrary to all available evidence. The whole thing is an imaginary construct (which means, it is "made up").

They are forced into this questionable logic because the empirical facts do not suit their imagination; they can find no evidence so they imagine it and call it a theory. **No one has ever seen a living cell devolve**; living cells **decompose** when they die or alter their DNA through mutations, but they do not devolve in a process where every organelle and life support mechanism is progressively removed until all that is left is DNA/RNA.

MOST LIKELY, THE REASON A VIRUS IS NOT CONSIDERED A LIVING THING IS BECAUSE IT IS MERELY A REMNANT OF A LIVING THING IN A STATE OF DECOMPOSITION FOLLOWING DEATH.

Where do Capsids and Viral Envelopes Come From?

Capsids are not acquired through a process of chemical evolution; like the virus itself, the capsid is dependent on the living cell for its manufacture. Although a virus provides the genetic instructions for the formation of a capsid, nothing happens without the cell; the cell provides the sophisticated organelle mechanisms to manufacture the capsid from the genetic instructions. As part of the cellular capsid assembly process a mechanism is also developed to package the viral DNA/RNA into the manufactured capsid (Newcomb, Homa and Brown, 2005).

Thus, both the virus and its capsid are dependent upon the cell for their manufacture. Neither the DNA nor the capsid "evolve" outside of the cell. **The virus does not, as the atheists maintain, "invade" (reification) and "take over" (reification) the cell for its own purposes; raw data cannot have a purpose**; it is not alive and it does not have a brain nor is an integral part of a biological system that does. This is another defense mechanism, known in psychoanalyses as reification accompanied by projection: projecting life qualities onto things that DO NOT HAVE LIFE. We expected to believe that dead DNA just popped into life. That is what we are told when it is said over and over again that DNA invades and takes over a cell. Rather, the cell controls and achieves the whole process from replication to expulsion.

Like the capsid, the viral envelope is acquired FROM THE CELL through acquisition of one of several membranes, such as the golgi membrane, nuclear membrane or outer cell membrane in a process known as budding. Budding occurs after a virus has been replicated inside of a cell. Following replication, the virus is released from the cell, (probably because it is recognized as a dangerous foreign body) "this is achieved by extrusion (budding) of the particle through the membrane, during which process the particle becomes coated in a lipid envelope derived from the host cell membrane and with a similar composition" (Cann, 2005).

For a virion to enter a cell it must be recognized by the cell membrane and be permitted entrance through a cellular receptor molecule that recognizes and subsequently interacts with a part of the virion known as the virus attachment protein. One possibility for this process of cellular recognition of a virion is that the cell membrane recognizes proteins or lipids found on the viral envelope or capsid which are able to communicate with cell membranes and initiate entrance into the cell. **Once inside everything else is academic.** Another possibility is the similarity among DNA across species; the atheists insist that a monkey's DNA is 97% similar to a humans. If that is the case, many non-human bits of DNA can cross the cell membrane and result in damage when the genetic code contained in them is used by the cell to make proteins that are detrimental to the organism and therefore expelled.

Again the ideologues would believe and have us believe that the virus under its own power leaves the cell. The facts are probably more like this: it is replicated by the cell using the cell organelles and it is rejected by the cell because it is foreign. For the facts to be

different something miraculous would have to happen, viz., the viral DNA/RNA would have to presto come to life once inside of the cell.

Why engage in faulty reification when we know that the cell is already alive and regularly manufactures proteins from its own DNA/RNA all of the time. The cell merely interprets the DNA/RNA as its own and goes to work building proteins. This is the logical conclusion. But if a person is ideologically committed to an unverifiable idea he/she has to engage in imaginary processes, projection, reification and assorted defense mechanism to protect the fantasy. Usually they are very crafty at getting others to accept the idea too; their often narcissistically involved in their own fantasies, and being narcissists, they cannot understand why others do not share their musings.

If a virus could self replicate its DNA then why has a virus NEVER been seen to assemble outside of a living cell. If it could, why would it ever enter a cell in the first place, to what purpose would an organism that could self replicate depend on another organism for replication to complete the process of its own evolution? THIS WOULD BE A STEP BACKWARD NOT FORWARD. It conveys no survival advantage and, in fact, cellular replication severely confines and limits the virus because viruses are rejected by most cells; only certain cells permit a limited range of viruses entrance across the cell membrane; it would be much more efficient to reproduce outside of a cell.

However, this is impossible, because a virus is nonliving and thus can do nothing outside of a cell but decompose; this is presumably the reason why NO VIRUS OVER A FEW THOUSAND YEARS HAS EVER BEEN FOUND. THERE IS NO FOSSIL EVIDENCE FOR VIRUSES; there is fossil evidence of organisms infected with a virus but no evidence of the virus itself. **This is most likely the case because DNA degrades rapidly.**

The DNA molecule, although stronger than RNA, has a limited lifespan estimated at 10^4 years in most geological settings (Poinar, 1998). Before proceeding, consider the mega point just stated. NO VIRUS HAS BEEN FOUND OVER A FEW THOUSAND YEARS, THERE IS NO FOSSIL EVIDENCE FOR VIRUSES EXCEPT FOR ORGANISM INFECTED WITH A VIRUS. When this is coupled with the fact that DNA DEGRADES WITHIN TEN THOUSAND YEARS, WE HAVE A LOGICAL SOLUTION. VIZ., VIRUSES ARE MERELY DECOMPOSING FRAGMENTS OF DNA OR RNA TRANSMITTED BY A VECTOR (something that helps the DNA enter the blood stream).

DNA and RNA are routinely released into the soil and atmosphere as dead organisms and bacteria decompose. It is found in abundance in sperm, eggs, and all decomposing tissue and even bone fragments. **In short, it is all over the place. There are millions and millions of different viruses because viruses represent every known species of plant and animal, they all die.** Because all animals and plants die and decay and because they excrete fecal mater and other bodily fluids, DNA/RNA is ubiquitous. It is no surprise that some viral particles come into contact with living cells and occasionally get taken in and, when DNA IS OF THE SAME OR SIMILAR SPECIES, even gets copied into the host genome. There is nothing unusual in any of this.

The only unusual thing is the ideological speculation that a virus spontaneously arose from the self-assembly of molecules into complex genetic code contained in bits of DNA and RNA and then further evolved into a mega-complex and living cell. **Why would I accept such a unverified claim when it is logical, clearly demonstrable and a regular observable occurrence that DNA and RNA are routinely manufactured inside of living cells and routinely released into the atmosphere by decomposing dead cells?**

In addition, viral DNA and RNA (the vast majority of viruses are RNA that are replicated in the cell cytoplasm, viral DNA is replicated in the cell nucleus) are spread in other ways including sap sucking (aphids) and blood sucking insects (ticks, mosquitoes, fleas) known as vectors. Viruses are also spread by coughing and sneezing by fecal material that comes in contact with the mouth such as through food, water or sexual perversion. They are also transmitted by sexual contact due to exposure of the mucous membrane or the bloodstream to a body liquid such as semen, blood, vaginal fluid or by abuse of hypodermic needles. In short, DNA AND RNA ARE ALL OVER THE PLACE and in all these cases, they are transmitted from one living being to another or as a result of decaying cellular matter that is introduced into the mucous membrane or blood stream by food, drink, air contagion or any other possible way. **THE IDEA OF CELLULAR EVOLUTION IS AN ATHEISTIC DEFENSE MECHANISM, ANOTHER INSUFFICIENT ATTEMPT TO PROMOTE CHEMICAL EVOLUTION.**

Moreover, in genetics laboratories throughout the world scientists regularly induce the formation of new medicines and antibodies by purposefully introducing bits of DNA or RNA into a cell so that a cell can do the work of creating proteins based on the artificially implanted DNA. In this observable genetic practice, **it is clear that a cell is doing the work of building the proteins; the inserted DNA is merely providing the instructions used by the cell to do the work. I have not heard a research scientist claim that the inserted DNA is alive or "taking over" the cell into which it has been inserted.** The scientists merely take bits of existing DNA, inset it into a living cell, and let the cells do the rest as they do with viral bits of DNA. If viral DNA could evolve, why don't the lab scientists help it to do so; it would be a lot more efficient. **No, when the rubber hits the road, when fantasy must give way to reality in the real world where dollars and cents demand prudence and logic, we let the living cells do the work on dead matter (DNA/RNA) and no one claims that the DNA is coming to life inside the already living cell.**

Thus, reason, common sense and empirical observation all support the idea of cellular decomposition as the origin of viruses. The atheists cannot accept this clear evidence because it would destroy one of their favorite arguments for chemical evolution. **Viral DNA/RNA is not evidence of chemical evolution; we have much better explanations that do not require entrance into the realms of illogical imagination. Imagination is a powerful and necessary scientific tool, but when it becomes illogical, it is no longer imagination but fantasia.**