



## **ANY LIFE ARISES FROM THE "KNOWLEDGE"** **AND NOT FROM MATTER**

If knowledge uses the matter, like support to give life, if "knowledge" is not incorporated in this material, this one cannot generate the life. It may be forgotten by those who advocate this accident of nature as source of life, and wrongly say of them Darwinists? This knowledge, we all talk about frequently without even noticing it, is called Genetics.

If we dare to speak thus of some "Darwinists" who deny the existence of God, this is certainly not to contradict the writings of Charles Darwin<sup>1</sup> same, but rather in order to provide some clarification necessary for the comprehension of many. Darwin, who had studied theology, has not sought indeed to question the existence of God, unlike many of those who use the comparisons he made on natural selection to assert the nonexistence of God to the profit of chance, which would be, according to them, the author of life on earth. Acting on behalf of Darwin these people sow doubt among many believers who have no knowledge, but discredit this one in whose name they say they speak, as some fanatical Christians can sometimes discredit God.

**Charles Darwin** becomes hostage to these people, as was the case of Galileo (name of the Italian Galileo Galilei) in his time, when he demonstrated that the earth revolved around the sun and that the Universe does not revolve around of earth. Which Christian would agree now with the twaddle of fundamentalists of this time, which supported whereas the earth was the center of the world and that the sun turned around it? But it is for this reason, and by fundamentalist Christians there are fewer than four hundred years, Galileo was sentenced to life imprisonment, even if that sentence was commuted to life in house arrest given his recantation by which recognized the lie for truth.

**The same applies to Darwin who would for a long time be excommunicated by the most fanaticized Christians, although they are sometimes the most erudite in religious knowledge,** whereas he did nothing more than demonstrate the unquestionable connection between species, and relations that can be done between plants and animals, or animals between them. We do not seek primarily to defend Darwin and the veracity of all his theories, because we think it is better to linger over our own soul-searching daily than on our origins. We must however remain impartial in our judgments and look to the wisdom that Darwin showed, in never wanting to go further than agnosticism that refuses to enter the absolute in which he never ventured. In this absolute of any first life that he left to God, he always refused to be devil's advocate, as many of "hazardous" who followed him did in his name. Because of this wisdom he expressed, we might almost say that the tree of life he represented as a common denominator of life on earth, would have inevitably led him to the conclusion of the existence of God, if he could deal with the problem without the limits it had set itself. His writings were unfortunately taken again by negationists (deniers, revisionist) of the existence of a creator, in favor of mere chance, like the biblical writings are used by the most fanatical in proving the existence of spontaneous generation by means of Adam and Eve as opposed to what "of Darwinism chance, "without taking into account certain facts, even biblical.

The Bible is clear for that which wants to read it without a priori nor bias, because if everyone knows the description that God made on creation of Adam and Eve, much forget to further read some lines, after the murder perpetrated by Cain on Abel. See Genesis 4-9/17 addressing God said "anyone find me will kill me," then God answered and said, "If anyone kills Cain, Cain would be avenged sevenfold," after Cain is finally gone live in the land of Nod, east of Eden, it is said

**"Cain knew his wife."** In this passage the three underlined words clearly prove the existence of other human beings in the environment of Adam and Eve, which does not make the first human beings on earth, except if we consider that we must see as human being, only those about which one speaks like having had "relations" with God. Adam and Eve were without doubt, the first to have this connection with God, which does not mean they were the only ones of their race, according to the assertions of a majority of **creationists** supporting the theory of spontaneous generation from Adam and Eve.

We thus find there a thesis quite as hypothetical as that of "Hazardous", who make a Darwinism anti-God from chance. If we examine the why and the need for the theory of chance, what may be its purpose; if not to cast doubt on the existence of a creator we call God, because of a level quite higher than ours? What does they brought moreover to science? Others still, in order to push back the principle further from a creator, imagine that the life could, us to come from the cosmos in which cells could circulate... Why not? But what that would change with the fact that the genetic writing contained in these cells should be introduced whatever the origin? **Chance is actually a good opportunity to try to better support the hypothesis that there is no God, but inevitably leads to the worship of man and the humanism "king", in which the carnal nature of the man is regarded as sufficient to manage all our planetary conflicts. It is to forget that the carnal nature is precisely the origin of these conflicts and it is a logic of dressage, to see from breaking, not a logical of love his neighbor as the one that God wants to establish in the human.**

If we want to begin again at this stage, the idea of the creationists since Adam and Eve only, we could then associate the theory that without the baptism of the Holy Spirit, human becomes human only as from the moment when its logic of action and reaction is renewable by God, but then at which stage of revival should do we push back the limits of the human being? At this one of Jesus! There is thus nothing astonishing that weakest in the faith as a God are affected.

That's why we invite everyone who will read these explanations on the early stages of **procreation of the human race**, to ask whether, given the mass of data in the two basic cells that are the egg and sperm, it is logical to attribute the structure to a happy accident of nature, not the work of a creator as we perceive ourselves. **This is not because, which has existed on this earth appeared us as an evolution of life, it was not generated by a 'creator', and this isn't because a creator have not explained us everything of our origins, that go beyond our understandings, that He don't exist.** If a creator exists, why we would withdraw to him, his right to an adjustment of races, or the freedom to tell us, only what we are able to understand and apply? This is what happens to car manufacturers for example, from one model to another, without necessarily all the details observed in a design office, are given on to each user. The universe is far too vast and goes so much further than the only human knowledge, it would be presumptuous for anyone to suggest otherwise, since it is impossible to prove a thesis more than the other. **Only our lived experiments** indeed enable us to be convinced of the existence of God but more especially the cogency to follow Him. **Our bodies and our carnal logic are quite incapable, and that's why God sees man only as a man from the moment he began reveal Himself to him, and that every human was therefore capable to follow Him.**

That humans are or are not the final objective pursued by God, or they are a step in the evolution, does not withdraw from the question, how would God have created man before he creates a stable universe conducive to its survival and multiplication? We now know that the first forms of life quite summary, almost rudimentary, were more or less located between the organics and mineral, but these lives were however essential to generate our current universe of life. One important thing also weighs in favor of a creator and no the chance, this is the prohibition that genetics itself generates to create a form of extra life to the existing ones, making impossible the procreation of a being endowed with a new form of life, coming from two different species that would make the attempt. How this genetic, born from chance, could it generate prohibited another future coincidence?

**The specificity of the races tends to prove the existence of this Creator that is God, even if He would have used common sources to generate life on similar bases. This is why in front of any adversity, we must remember that nothing is born, which already has in him the knowledge of what to become, and this remains true in the renewal of the Spirit, since the**

**base is written in our genes, and not in our intelligence.** If the earth has indeed become an environment for growing plants, water and adequate heating are not less essential, but it's not because we will sprinkle the earth of our flowerpots or our planet, a plant will come out if we do not place a seed.

**It is what this seed will have preserved of knowledge of what it must become, which will enable it to generate a plant if it is placed under good conditions.** If this seed was not placed sufficiently quickly under the conditions necessary to the survival of this knowledge, that it is wheat grain, female ovum, or spermatozoon, even it preserves its form in vain and its components during a more or less long time, it will not generate progeny. **This proves that it is the retention time of this genetic knowledge is important for procreation and not the matter of support used to preserve this knowledge.**

**If procreation comes from the knowledge itself, it can not come from simple materials juxtaposed in good conditions for thousands of years, if the ones have not previously received this said "knowledge" of "The One" that we call our creator. Indeed, if this knowledge can disappear from the elements which got it beforehand, without can be reincorporated with these same not degraded elements, how could it appear in similar elements juxtaposed between them, but which would never have received it? Because these elements would be juxtaposed by chance, that would give them the ability to generate all the logic necessary to create life? No! That is why a creator is undeniable, whatever the means used by him to generate life!**

In order to render unto Caesar what which is Caesar's, and because we have somewhat highlighted the wisdom of Darwin, because of never have agreed to enter the field of God, in relation to his comments, we need to make to the creationists the same homage, since nothing makes them deviate their convictions not to be granted to the man, or at the chance, what belongs to God.

We therefore reiterate our belief of a pressing need to work together, avoiding all these wars, which always discredit God instead of giving the attraction.

Beyond the call to unite in a common effort, we are pursuing a parallel purpose through this booklet, that of giving to the Christian world a supplementary force to behave well under the guidance of God, by a simple documentation of **the human reproduction**, including the few first days of fertilization. We indeed believe that many internal conflicts could be avoided in young mothers subject to contradiction to respect the will of God, but also subject to the temptation of abortion in the circumstances of involuntary pregnancies.

We do not want to add at all fanatical speeches on the subject, but as we try to do in all our writings, bring open-mindedness or a complementary knowledge that will enable each one being in a difficult situation, to be more open to God's will by a better knowledge of its own body. Indeed we must never lose sight of all the hormonal upheaval that occurs in women, at the same time a pregnancy, even in the early days of it. Any human intervention unnatural therefore produces in it an upheaval against equally brutal, a little as a tidal wave can occur at the time of a marine earthquake. This tidal wave can quickly become a strong tsunami if guilt gets involved, and can leave the woman in a mentally unsuspected feeling of insecurity and condemnation of herself, which often lead to an unintended self-protection to counteract a form self-destruction.

In spiritual circles, this self-destruction is also often called the spirit of death. This designation is in no way contradictory to the scientific findings because the impact of tsunamis is usually very deep in the subconscious and not in the conscious part of our brain. It's more a concession of the conscious portion of learning located in **the upper part of the brain (neocortex)** to the benefit from the spirit **of self-protection**, which can go up indeed to give death to avoid some considered insurmountable suffering, **itself formed before birth and at the level of our limbic brain**. This self-protection granted by our analysis, going against the awareness contained in our genetics, will come so diminish our ability to balance throughout our lives, as well in our reactions than in our analyses, especially if the procedure is performed in a traumatic context and that it is located before the age of 25 years, age at which **the brain is considered adult**. If it was not the case, and that the impact is located only at the level of our conscious (our heart), the person could then make the relationship of cause and effect in the other parts of its life in which this mechanism appears then inevitably. **Read Boomerang Effect, the personal links.**

These analyses highlight the biblical claims which denounce sin as being in first committed against God, since the interpretations of our needs, which lead us to sin, go against our genetics, itself rooted in our [very first zygote cell](#) by our Creator. It should come as no surprise that God has given the rules of life conducive to mental stability of the human person, even if the material difficulties caused by some pregnancies may initially seem insurmountable. That which makes them particularly impassable elsewhere generally are not God's rules, but too often the way these rules are managed by us humans. That is why, beyond any personal conviction, it is not for we to blame anyone by imposing rules, even if they are right, but getting them to get back to God, that 'they can with his help, so that they can with his assistance, to take themselves the good decision in all good faith in front of God.

We hope in that each one could be consolidated by the achievement of the will of God in its life, without the culpability not falling down on anybody who would have reacted differently and who knows but God, *who so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. (John 3-16/17).*

1) Raised in a nonconformist background, Charles Darwin however made his theology, to become pastor of the Anglican Church. He kept the Christian faith in a benevolent God until the age of forty two years, but was badly shaken in this faith by the death of his daughter Anne Elizabeth, known as Annie, in 1851. As from this moment it did not however sink in an attitude anti-God, but is strengthened in [agnosticism](#). (Doctrine that regards the absolute is not accessible to humans, and which refuses all metaphysical solution to resolve any problem). We can extremely well understand his attitude towards all the combat which he had to carry out against the religious obscurantism of the time, but never he presented him as being atheistic. **Charles Darwin thus advanced never the assumption of the appearance of the life as being due randomly of nature, as on its behalf a good amount of detractors of the existence of God did it. To use the name of Darwin to support conclusions on a subject which he never wanted approached; it is to make use of a name recognized for the accuracy of its work, in order to make admit a hoax without base, to the uninformed majority. Thus it him is allotted theory of man going down from the ape, whereas they are his religious detractors who introduced such sarcastic remarks, in order to best discredit him in the opinion of the ignorant majority.**

[Documentation Wikipedia Charles Darwin](#)