

# Natural Man and Neshamah

Hi Kirk and Terri,

These are very thoughtful questions. You probably noted my hesitation when Craig linked entropy to genetic deterioration and from that how evolution could have progressed from very simple animals to us. As you can see below there is a lot of conflicting information that caused me to hesitate. The presence or absence of intermediates can, in fact be explained but only by a detailed explanation that would be too long here. The problem is there are some intermediates (see below) such as archaeopteryx - but they are few -giving some credibility to microevolution directed by natural selection. Clearly there is nothing like archaeopteryx around today but there are very ancient 'living fossils' that are. For example, the coelacanth is a fish from the time of the Devonian period, identical fossils of which are found in the rocks. So how did it survive without changes over millions of years?

We have a Wollemi pine growing in our garden. Tree ferns are older, cycads are of the same age and they both exist today. Fossils of the Wollemi pine date from the Jurassic period 200 million years ago.

At the end of the Permian period (marking the end of the Paleozoic era) the greatest ever extinction event occurred in which 96% of all marine species disappeared along with insects and 70-80% of land animals. Some species up to the level of family and genera were lost. This was 252 million years ago. (The precision of radiometric dating is very good.) Yet life recovered to become - even after the Cretaceous extinction event - the vibrant life we find on earth now. Yet there are no fossils of anything from the cenozoic (where we are now) found in the ancient rocks of the Cambrian, Ordovician, Silurian, Devonian, Carboniferous, and Permian periods. All life back then as far as we can tell was multicellular but changing from 'simple' creatures such as trilobites (looking a bit like a large cockroach but behaving more like a crab) in the Cambrian to large lizards in the Permian. It was as if life were climbing a ladder from relatively simple to increasingly complex with time. Indeed, that would be reflected in the biochemistry. The creatures of the Cambrian were cold-blooded but by the time of the Triassic we have large animals like dinosaurs, some members of which were warm blooded (there is considerable evidence for this). Warm blood requires a different biochemistry and hence DNA.

This upward progression which is undeniable could be due to the creator trying new life forms like an experimenter in a laboratory. Even the few intermediates would be explained in this way.

On the other hand, there is the evolutionary development by natural selection which at first blush appears to contradict the laws of the thermodynamics but as Mike Gene shows when combined with front-loading of DNA that itself can adapt to a changing environment, a carefully designed biochemistry that also can adapt to the environment much of the above can also be explained.

Extinction events – there were a lot – is a problem for evolution in that there may not have been enough time for life to recover. This is particularly true for the Permian extinction.

If we accept the alternative – that the creator is a very hands-on Guy, always present adjusting the DNA parameters to prevent total loss of life, allowing some species to disappear so that new 'improved' versions can come on the scene then what I called microevolution can't be

true. Variation within species is not only possible but obviously true but this does not dispense with creation.

Why would the creator allow regular extinction events? It may have been His way of eliminating unwanted designs to create new ones.

What about the pre-Cambrian life? The archaeobacteria that cleared the atmosphere? Why didn't their genomes deteriorate to uselessness under entropy over the billions of years they were around? They could have been refreshed by the creator or with their very high turn-over rate could have produced sufficient viable cells to survive.

With a creator who produced the Torah, we may in fact with the story of life on earth see a metaphor for the creation and protection of life.

I'm in two minds about this but I am leaning towards Yah being the hands-on Guy. I'll have to do some more study and write it up. To do it justice it will likely be very long so as I've some hospital visits I must make as a patient this month plus a wedding to attend I won't be able to even start it until February.

In the mean time you might like to consider the following:

*Primitive life that existed millions of years in the past is now extinct. The Burgess shales*

*More advanced life such as during the Mesozoic is now mainly extinct. Dinosaurs.*

*Some ancient forms of life still exist today: examples the Wollemi pine and the coelacanth fish. Both of these examples are quite different in morphology from fish and pine trees we find today. Archaeobacteria still exist in the same morphological form today, surviving billions of years. Fossils of intermediates between dinosaurs and birds exist. The fossils clearly are combinations of both, having bony 'beaks' with teeth and claws on the ends of partially feathered wings. The 'feathers' are not like those of today's birds. Australian Geographic, 83, 52–53. [pdf](#)*

*The earth today is teeming with life. Cold blooded and warm blooded animals are everywhere, together with birds, insects and fish of all kinds.*

*Very ancient rocks such as the Burgess shales (Paleozoic) do not contain fossils of advanced creatures from the Cenozoic.*

*Rocks of the Mesozoic era do not contain fossils of advanced creatures from the Cenozoic.*

*The older the rocks the less likely that fossils in those rocks represent all that was happening at the time i.e. the fossil record becomes sparse as we get to older rocks.*

*All genomes deteriorate over time due to the laws of thermodynamics.*

*Radiometric dating of rocks is very accurate as is most stratigraphy.*

*The continents have been in continuous movement for as long as we can tell, changing the climate and environment.*

*Multiple extinction events have occurred, the worst being the Permian extinction. (Was this satan's fall?)*

*No abiogenesis implies a creator.*

When we come to humans we have a different problem – the nesamah

I think the point of the nesamah is that it is a two-edged sword. It confers the ability to know the creator but it also confers the ability to know the adversary. This is why we must choose. For the former we who have the nesamah can't understand the thinking of the latter and vice versa. Like a psychopath, to those with a nesamah and an attachment to the adversary what they do is to them quite normal. There is no conscience as we would call it and no remorse. If you've ever dealt with a psychopath you will know what I mean. They have all the characteristics of their father – satan – as we (will) have the characteristics of our father – Yah. In fact, if all the non-nesamah population has either been killed off by those with a nesamah (Noah's time) or bred out then some of satan's minions can easily be identified. Psychopaths tend to gravitate to 'leadership' positions because their callous ruthlessness allows them to 'get things done'. So they are in politics, the judiciary, the media, academe, and the various religions. They are all satan's boys and girls with no conscience and ruthless enough to do whatever is necessary to do the will of their father.

Where is their conscience? How do people who appear straight and law abiding with morals do such despicable acts? Because, like true psychopaths, they don't have a moral compass or a conscience, neither are they law abiding. They just appear to be to get what they want. Until they reveal themselves you can't pick them from Yah's children. This is why Yahowsha told us to look at what they do, not what they say.

Cain would have had the nesamah from Adam. He made a choice to align with the adversary. His nesamah was then passed to his offspring by normal mendelian means. These offspring may have been hybrids but some or all of them would have had the nesamah depending on whether Cain was homozygous or heterozygous for the nesamah. I suspect homozygous, hence all his offspring to the non-nesamah female would be heterozygous but still with a dominant and therefore active nesamah. Since they grew up in a satanic environment they would also become satanic.

Your last question is interesting. I think the answer lies in how violent the non-nesamah folk were. I think they would have all the instincts for survival so they would have been able to kill but they wouldn't have the satanic input that a nesamah could give so they wouldn't be genocidal for the fun of it. Survival and reproduction would have been the only overarching consideration. When teamed with the nesamah they would, by definition, be a hybrid but a much more dangerous one such as we see now in this time of Noah 2.

Roy Goodman <v.good@bigpond.com>