

ORIGINAL SIN: A NEW HISTORICAL-EVOLUTIONARY VIEW

Hypothesis based on historical, sociological, anthropological and scientific-philosophical data

Rosendo A. Yunes¹

Introduction

Original sin has been considered fundamental to the Christian understanding of existence. Out of its perspective, the universality of Jesus' revelation is meaningless. However, it is a scandal for Modern Thought, and an obstacle to believing.

The most well-known interpretation of the dogma of the Original Sin is that of St. Augustine, which was suitable for the fifth century, the time when he proposed to explain this biblical passage before the Manichaeans and Pelagians. The Manichaeans considered that there were two opposed and irreducible principles: Good and Evil associated with light and darkness, respectively. According to them, the spirit of a man belongs to God, while his body belongs to the Demon. The Pelagianism, however, denied the existence of the Original Sin. They considered it to be only of Adam. Moreover, they denied the necessity of grace for the salvation of mankind. Every individual begins his/her story either innocent or guilty before God. Saint Augustine made of the Biblical report a real historical fact, stressing out the freedom of Adam and Eve; a thought that is challenged in our times from the scientific point of view.

An important aspect of the traditional doctrine is that it is based on a static view of the world. It is a concept of evil and of human nature in a fixed universe. Evidently, it is not in concordance with a world in evolution, as scientifically demonstrated. This fact stimulated theologians to rethink Augustine's explanation, especially during Darwinism's validity as a scientific conception of biological evolution. Darwinism showed that for science, Adam and Eve were not directly created by God, but by an evolutionary process; and this caused many problems: if it was a man or a group, how was it transmitted; if the characters acquired under Darwinism theory were not transmitted etc. We can see all these problems in the book of J. Arnould "*Theology after Darwin*" (2001), in which the author, after pursuing a well-based interpretation, came to the following conclusion: '*Nothing makes sense in biology except at light of developments*' - Theodosius Dobzhansky stated several decades ago. "*That statement is not meaningless whatsoever, not even in its provocative dimension; it continues to urge theologians to dialogue with scientists. If we were expelled from the Paradise, it was to be invited to a journey that is far from an end.*"

Teilhard de Chardin (1955) answered the question of whether evolution was a theory, a system or a hypothesis. As it follows: "*By no means of being only that, it is much more than that: a general condition which must be bent, so that all theories, all hypotheses, all systems are possible and true.*"

¹ ryunes@msn.com

A light that establishes all facts; a curvature to which all details must conform, here is what Evolution is.” This is our guide in this paper.

Joseph Murray Hill SJ (2014), in his dissertation in FAJE on the doctrine of original sin, to the light of the theory of evolution, in Teilhard de Chardin and Karl Rahner, writes in his general conclusion: *“In general words, this study answered one question, and had five others at its end”*. At least we can end it on a positive note: *“The great task of the theologians of the last century, in this case, Teilhard de Chardin and Karl Rahner, was to address problems with the doctrine of original sin, to which they responded with loyalty and creativity. His writings have left us a solid foundation for our research in order to find an interpretation of the Christian faith for today’s world.”*

Duquoc (1977) defines three concepts that theologians establish to make the doctrine of original sin more adequate to our time:

- i) One should perform a symbolic reading, thereby to make the historicity of Adam and Eve and the previous heavenly status to sin fade away;
- ii) one must assign an archaic character transmission of original sin per generation;
- iii) one should reject the question about the origin of evil. The evil in the world is broader than the problem of original sin, and Christianity does not have a tranquilizer to this question that crosses History.

Similarly, Duquoc indicates two major axes that guide, and guided us in the renovated interpretation of dogma:

- 1) The replacement of the notion of original sin by *“sin of the world”*, the latter determines the complexity of responsibilities and faults in which their reciprocal interdependencies constitute human reality and make it deaf to calling that comes from God;
- 2) The transformation of historical antecedence into eschatological dynamics - what is first is what is at the end. Humanity aspires to Christ, the last one.

Teilhard de Chardin (1955) wrote in the appendix of his book, *The Human Phenomenon*: *“(...) the quantity and the wickedness of evil ‘hic et nunc’ scattered around the world does not betray a certain excess, inexplicable to our reason, if this normal effect of evolution does not add the extraordinary effect of some catastrophe or fundamental deviation.”*

De Chardin (1955) thought that the human being and all beings, in the process of unification, feel as if they are always shattered between the appeal of the One and a threatening multiplicity.

In a previous paper (Yunes 2016) showed how all living beings of earth, air the sea converge for an infinite source of information, to One, within plurality of ecosystems.

Pierre Grelot (1967) concludes that the theology of original sin is a matter in continuous work, because the origin of humans and the interpretation of Biblical texts are constantly changing. However, for Grelot, the doctrine of original sin retains an important place in Christian synthesis, although it focuses on the fundamental problems of human existence and freedom.

In order to formulate a new historical-evolutionary concept of original sin, it is necessary to consider studies that demonstrate a historical and sociological reality, different from those that were well known. Also, it is necessary to consider especially an anthropologic conception, and all new

philosophical scientific paradigms that are completely changing our conception of universe, life, evolution and man.

1. A new vision of human history

The very first reason that made us think about a new concept from the scientific-philosophical perspective, (the theological part, which is more complex, is for theologians), was the theory completely documented and clearly defined by Steve Taylor (2010) in his book “*La Caida*”, which mentions that about six thousand years ago, humanity experienced a drastic change. He considers that change as more pathological than anything else, in different areas of the planet, because of a sudden climate change which caused extreme aridity that pushed the homo sapiens - who had overcome several glacial eras – into undergoing a psychological and sociological transformation that affected their relationship with nature and their peers.

According to Taylor, this transformation originated what we call civilization. It was, however, the result of a morbid hypertrophy of the I individualist, which isolated people and led to fight each other, thus, increasing violence on the pursuit for domination and possession of territories that were originally considered of common use.

But, in order to further clarify the thought of Taylor, we must carefully observe two important points he made: the war as an obscure side of human history and a sociological view of the pre-fall era.

a) War as the dark side of human history

We are the most violent and destructive species on the planet. For most historians, history starts with the Egyptian and Sumerian civilizations 4 to 5 thousand years b.C. This whole history of 4 or 5 thousand years was a catalogue of wars to settle frontiers, to conquer slaves, to attach territories, to steal resources, to oppress people, etc.

In the animal kingdom, war is completely unknown. Animals manifest a war conduct if they see their habitat, or their natural way of life being threatened. Taylor (2010) writes: “*JMG van der Dennen in his book ‘The Origins of War’ said ‘Genocide, wars, massacres, cruelty, and sadism are practically unknown in the animal kingdom.’*”

According to studies carried out in recent decades, there is ethnographic and archaeological evidence that show that war is a relatively recent event in the human species. Thus, currently, there is an agreement between experts that the “*primitive man*” not only was unaware of the intergroup aggression, but also he was unaware of interindividual aggression.

The anthropologist Richard Gabriel (1990) is very clear in stating that during the first 95 thousand years “*...between the appearance of the Homo sapiens and the Stone Age, there is no evidence that men had warred with each other in any way, much less in degrees which requires organized group violence.*”

Wars seem to have emerged around 4000 b.C. Between the years of 1740 and 1897 there were 230 wars and revolutions in Europe. The decrease of wars during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is due to the impressive technological potential that greatly increased the rate of mortality and endangered the very existence of mankind.

b) A sociological view of pre-fall era

- Hunters and gatherers societies

For thousands of years, more or less until 8,000 b.C. humans used to live as hunter-gatherer, that is, they used to feed themselves with hunted animals and foregathered of wild plants, seeds, fruits, and vegetables.

They were small communities of a few dozen people who moved from one place to another since food was scarce in the area. Studies show that in the period from 40,000, almost near the emergence of the current human being, until 10,000 years b.C. there were no signs of violence, wars and a significant number of weapons were not found (Chapman 1999).

During that period, patriarchy and social stratification did not exist at all. Taylor writes: "*The anthropologist Knauff points out that hunters and gatherers were characterized by extreme social and sexual equality.*" Besides, before the European colonization and conquest, the indigenous peoples were matrilineal (Graham Harvey 2000). This means that the indigenous peoples traced the descent and carried the inheritance of property via the maternal branch of the family, which is a sign of high status of women.

Many anthropologists, cited by Taylor, emphasize that no other way of life of human beings allows putting an emphasis so great on equality, to the point of not passing unnoticed by Carlos Marx, who called it "*primitive communism*".

Taylor (2010) emphasizes that according to Lenski's statistics (1978), only 2% of hunting-gatherer societies has a class system, but 89% are completely unaware of the system of private property, which is rare in the other 11%. In those societies, no individual can accumulate more than they are capable of carrying. Everyone feels compelled to share.

About the political aspect of those societies, Taylor explains that "*Most societies have leaders of some kind, but generally their power is very limited and, in the event that the rest of the group does not agree with its leadership, it can be deposed at any time.*"

- Horticultural companies

Approximately in 8000 b.C., societies in the Middle East began to cultivate plants, instead of foraging them. Also, they left hunting behind for the domestication of animals. There is a certain consensus that this fact was produced by a demographic increase, that made the primitive lifestyle not suitable for the population's needs.

This kind of life forced human groups to locate themselves in fixed places. This fact started in the Middle East and spread throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa. The so-called Neolithic revolution was a process that took thousands of years.

Apparently, the first phase of the Neolithic 8000-4000 b.C. was of great peace and harmony. In contrast to the arguments that interpret the agricultural revolution and the creation of cities as causes of war, Taylor shows that, for example, Catal Hüyük, that flourished between the years 7,000 and 5,500 b.C. with an estimated population of 7 thousand inhabitants, has no evidence of changes caused by wars and there is no evidence of interindividual violence. The uniform size of houses and tombs suggests that there were few social differences. Taylor indicates that some Neolithic cultures had a degree of development that challenges the traditional view, that civilization began in Egypt and Sumer.

Reiner Eisler (1996) indicates that elderly Europeans never intended to sit in high places, hills with difficult to access. In addition to that, the absence of large fortifications and offensive weapons strongly suggests that people were peaceful. The same type of constructions is found in China, Japan, etc.

Taylor (2010) points out that: *“The hunter-gatherers peoples, like the pure vegetable garden people, related their attitude with nature and their religious life. An important difference between them and those who came later is that they did not established, as it seems, any difference between religion and the rest of their lives. Also, they did not consider divinity as something separate from the world. To them, The Spirit, God, lived in each and every one of the places, reason why they had a profound respect for nature ... it was from the year 4000 BC that people began to conceptualize gods and goddesses”*.

As a summary of the new thinking, we can conclude that primitive peoples had as essential characteristics: peace, social equality, lack of male dominance, respect for nature and no sexual inhibition. We can say that it was the primitive Eden.

- The original monotheism

The idea that human religion was gradually developed from a form of polytheism or animism to monotheism was a predominant interpretation for some time, especially for the Darwinian thinkers. However, currently, it seems to predominate the idea that the original religion was monotheism and which eventually corrupted or degraded in various polytheisms and animisms.

In his book *“In the Beginning God”* W. Corduan (2013) a well-known expert on the study of religions, points out that the theory of original monotheism has never been refuted.

Corduan (2013) analyzes different concepts of experts, the Darwinist EB Tylor, Andrew Lang his critical student, with the proposal of a possible original monotheism, A. Pictet, who proposed the original monotheism and its critics such as John Muir and E. Scherer.

But the most important one refers to Wilhelm Schmidt (2014) with his encyclopedic work (12 volumes), which highlights its method that can be analyzed in his book *“The Origin and Growth of Religion. Facts and Theories”* p. 219, which allows results to be tested and falsified, has. However, been confirmed by the work of ethnologists and anthropologists.

I consider this work to coincide with my hypothesis of emergency and uniqueness of the human being (Yunes 2013) which we will consider and analyze as it follows.

2. A new anthropological vision

In the aforementioned work, it is shown how human evolution was guided by two attractors: i) The denominated instinct of knowledge (Perlovsky 2006) which is the maximization of similarities between the mathematical models and the world, this is the true about reality and; ii) The instinct of self or identity, proposed by the author (Yunes 2005) that would be guided by the principle of identity, maximizing the similarity between the self and the I, and self-reflection.

It was Hofstadter (2007) who stressed out that the mind is an infinitely extensible feedback symbols that present the illusion of being a self. However, for Hofstadter, the self is only feedbacks without any reality.

Nevertheless, a simple representation of the feedback is an oven. Suppose we want to put it at 200°C. A heater will increase the temperature. When it reaches 200°C, a controller will turn off the heater, but the temperature will have reached 201°C because the feedback requires a certain transmission time. Then, the temperature will be back to 199°C. This fluctuation can be improved to the maximum. But, it never will reach 200°C and stabilize at that temperature. Only an instantaneous feedback can produce such effect. And this is what happens in the human mind when we utter I am; subject and predicate are understood simultaneously, instantly, and then, it is a real identity, stable, self-reflective.

According to Kauffman (2009), the world of the observer and the observed is a recursive process of feedbacks. The notion of a fixed object appears through a stabilization process. A process pushed to the limit to know its shape, its reality, as in introspection, in which each step closes the previous spiralling dwindling, in its limit, reaches a point. Mathematically speaking, a dot has no dimensions, has no parts, and thus, it corresponds to what we call infinite.

Therefore, in this feedbacks process in the search for an identity, the human mind comes to contact with an infinite which is the source of “*original*” information of life that can only be the Absolute infinite of a Singer, ie, God, according Cantor (Rucker 1982) that by Reflex Principle, that is, it induces or somehow participates in some of its properties “*image and likeness*” in the human mind. Then, it acquires capacity to decode information of its evolution, and of itself, of its identity, and its real autonomy.

The same process is followed when one pursues the truth of the reality in which we live. It was thought that, from evident axioms and postulates, we could always come to true conclusions. However, Gödel (as cited in Rucker 1982) showed that it could never be shown that, within a single system, if it is coherent or not. Thus, we must expand the system with new axioms and postulates in a sequence that reaches to infinity.

A computer could never solve this contradiction, but the human mind is able to demonstrate the “*non-demonstrability*”. Its power is the product of a position that stands itself at infinity. In order to close Gödel’s spiral, a contact of the human mind with the Absolute infinite is required, the “*image and likeness*” being.

The most important thing is that in this anthropological view the human being has two unconsciousness, two egos, one product from the phylogenetic heritage, which is what I call “*reptilic*”, which is egocentric; aggressive; domineering that derives from vital instincts of conservation and reproduction; the second product from contact with the Absolute infinite, the “*spiritual*” ego that is solidary, friendly, of science, art, and love (Yunes 2016).

This view is based on experimental basis by the Third School of Psychology of Vienna, founded by Viktor Frankl (1981) be the spirituality of Thomas Merton (1978) about the true self and the false self, on St. Paul’s letter to the Romans (Rm 7: 21-24).

What has not been shown in my previous work (Yunes 2016) was the consideration of the theory of neuroscientist Paul D. MacLean, about the triune brain, that gives rise to three mental properties, which is not perfect, but that is a powerful guide for the interpretation of the human being. (Albright and Ashbrook 2001). For this theory, we should consider three cerebral layers; 1- The first one corresponds to reptilian, which appears after the Cambrian explosion 540 to 490 million years (ma) ago, approximately near 375 (ma); 2- The second layer, the mammary one, which goes from 95 (ma) to approximately 50-60 thousand years, in which the Homo sapiens emerges, and finally; 3- the “*spiritual*” ego that corresponds to the third layer, from 50-60 thousand years until now.

We note that the “*reptilian*” layer took 280 million years of evolution, the mamarian 95 million years and the spiritual only 50 to 60 thousand years. The mammary layer, which we did not characterized, is the “*emotional*” layer, that comprises the affection and care for children, the mating, the game, etc.

The antagonistic tendencies exist between the reptilian and spiritual being. The emotional layer is moved according to for the predominance of the reptilian ego; self-centered, individualistic, domineering, aggressive etc. or of the spiritual ego; friendly, communicative, of art, science, and love. It is evident the predominance of the first, reason why Saint Paul, in Romans (7: 14-21) writes: “*It is reported to us that the law is spiritual, but I am flesh, and I am sold to sin. I do not understand what I do, because I do not do what I want, I do what I hate, instead. But, if I do what I do not want, I agree with the fact that the law is excellent. Thus, I am not who execute it, but the sin that dwells in me. I know that in me, that is, in my instinctual life, the good does not dwell. My willing is within my reach, but not doing good. I do not do the good I want, but I practice the evil I do not want. However, if I do what I do not want, but the sin that dwells in me.*” Hence the name “*original*”.

God has given the Earth to men for just being their administrators, not their owner. He gave man his wife to be partners, not their patriarch. God follows the line of the spiritual ego. Let us now observe how original sin entered into this human being.

3. The entrance of sin into the world.

Taylor (2010) cites anthropologists who have shown that primitive hunter-gatherer men spend only 12 to 20 hours a week for the task of finding food (A third or half of what we do today!) and Australian aborigines invested 4 hours per day on the search for food and the rest of their time was dedicated to music, to telling stories, making crafts, or being with family and friends. There was a profound egalitarianism, women occupied an important place in a society model that was

matrilineal; acts of selfishness and possessive domain were punished, and the power of the leaders was limited. A truly paradisiacal life.

Taylor writes that: *“In the year 4000 BC the world population was reduced, it probably did not exceed 100 million people. Horticulture had spread itself through many regions of the Middle East, Europe, Asia and North Africa. The differences between hunter-gatherers and pure horticultural peoples were minimal; they shared essential characteristics: peace, social equality, lack of male domination, respect for nature and sexual disinhibition.”*

In an excellent paper *“A Syntropic World Order (SWO)”* Ulisse Di Corpo (2015) indicated *“Cooperation is one of the key factors of Syntropy. It increases benefits and it is advantageous for all individuals, organizations, societies, and nations involved. The win-win cooperation culture is wide-spread in East-Asia and its roots have been traced back to the rice farming tradition.”*

We may think that in a certain place in the Middle East, in Mesopotamia that archaeologists and historians confirm as a wedge of civilizations the land of the great rivers - the Tigris and the Euphrates, indicated on the Bible. The origin of myths is, sometimes a reality.

Taylor (2010) properly defines what was historically real: *“The memories of the ‘pre-fall era’ must have been passed from generation to generation until they finally became myths and folktales.”* These myths are common to all Sahara-Asians peoples. However, there are similar accounts in some respects in the Greeks, Romans, India, China etc. Taylor interprets the fall as the ego explosion, motivated by environmental desertification.

What creates differences is their interpretation and meaning. This is observed in the Biblical tale in comparison with the story of Gilgamesh, Epic of Sumer discovered in 1849.

In Genesis (1: 29-30) God says: *“I have given to you all the herbs that have seeds and are upon the face of Earth, and every tree in which there are fruits to yielding seed; It all shall be food for you. And all beasts on Earth; all birds in the air, and all reptiles on Earth, that have the breath of life, every green herb will be for your supply”.*

But God orders Adam that could eat fruits from all the trees, except one *“The tree of good and evil knowledge”*. The word knowledge can, hereby, indicate *“conscience”*. The word evil, in the Hebrew language, has the sense of suffering, anguish, pain. That is, eating the fruit from that tree would reveal the consciousness of good and human misery.

However, going deeper in the account, Eve tells the snake she could eat from any tree, except from that one that was in the middle of the garden (Gen 3:3). The serpent said to the woman: *“You shall not be dead at all. But God knows that, in the day you eat that fruit, your eyes will open, and you will become like gods, you will know good and evil”* (Gen 3: 4-5.). Let us interpret what the tree means in the middle of the garden and what the serpent means.

The word *“serpent”* in Genesis is nachash, which comes from a root that means *“hiss”*. It translates something that whispers or seduces to produce a spell of deceit. In our interpretation, it is the reptilic ego that was asleep by the emergence of the spiritual ego that led man to live in a state of original innocence in a haven of peace, human equality, fraternity, and liberty, until about 4000 b.C. The tree in the middle of the garden, in this interpretation, is a tree that does not belong to the community of Adam and Eve. The apple means the food that, was either absent in times of aridity

or was coveted by reptilian ego. Taylor (2010) writes that it was an explosion of the ego, without its nature.

The reptilian ego explodes by a vital necessity or by its greed. In fact, Eve (women of that community) steals the food that did not belong to her. She, then, induces Adam to do the same. Thus, they lost innocence and they rebelled against the true God, and against human brotherhood which required sharing food, not to stealing it. This community was looking to assume their role to define what good and evil is.

Farming communities no longer shared use of things because there were not enough resources for everyone. The lack of food caused the non-acceptance of other groups and so war was the only option. This aggressive, selfish and individualistic ego develops in evolution up to the present; when we observe 5 families of white men who concentrate more wealth than 3,5 billion of the world population. We see that it is a “*sin of the world*” as suggested by Duquoc (1977).

The Garden of Eden refers to a concrete social reality, a concrete historical place where the original reptilian ego, led by greed, mother of all sins, led the human being to rebel against the law of God and against human fraternity.

The story of the flood, which exists in diverse cultures, included the Mayans in America, was proven as real to the region of the Fertile Crescent and covering the whole of the known world of that time.

The sin of the world, assumed by reptilian ego dominance, will require human redemption by Jesus, which can only overcome this ego, with his grace given by Jesus when he gave his body and blood to fortify the spiritual ego.

The Kingdom that Jesus repeatedly calls to build in his Gospel is also a kingdom where only the love of God must reign in a community of brothers all equal in participation, but different in their identities. This is the kingdom that grows as a grain of mustard and that we do not observe because the reptilian ego leads us to think that the blessed ones are the rich, while Jesus said that they were the poor.

Di Corpo (2015) explains: “*Cooperation requires deep personal transformation which are not easy to meet. One is known in China with the word ‘guanxi’ (close relations)*”. The spiritual ego should predominate and this is not easy, we need God’s grace.

We must here, observe and analyze the two possibilities above mentioned: i) “*gradual*” and ii) “*immediate*”.

The “*gradual*” corresponds to human development in cities; to the departing from nature, to the temptation of possession of territories of the individual domain, to the development of self-social hierarchies of reptilian ego. Thus, the social organization began to gratify the selfish behavior, more than altruist ones. Up to Cain, that represents the new cultural model man, according to Genesis (Gen 4:2) “*tilled the soil*”, killed Abel, a shepherd connected to nature, and then, broke the human brotherhood and started a period of wars and more wars to current times.

The “*immediate*” is due to reasons of drought and aridity, produced by climate changes. Taylor (2010) quotes the anthropologist DeMeo, who based on studies conducted by different experts,

“considers a process of drought and desertification affected a large area of the planet which he calls ‘Saharasia’, which covers a huge belt stretching from North Africa, the Middle East to reach Central Asia. This region was fertile by the year 4000 b.C., with woods, green pastures, lakes and rivers, with abundant human and animal life. This climate and environmental change has led to a great social change”.

The anthropologist Eisler (1987) writes about that: *“the great exchange, one exchange so radical and of such magnitude that, in fact, does not like at all what we know of the cultural evolution of mankind.”* However, there have been occasional signs of social violence in the Middle East and Turkey. For example, the city of Catal Hüyük was destroyed around 4800 b.C., and Semitic people coming from the Zagros mountains invaded Syria and Mesopotamia, causing deaths and devastation, so the fortifications in the Middle East began to be built.

Taylor (2010) defines *“Not until the year 4000 b.C., roughly, that social violence, continuous wars, social oppression on a large scale, male domination had become something endemic. As we have indicated, the root that caused this transformation seems to have been environmental.”* The reptilic ego, domineering, aggressive, ritualistic, patriarchal was stimulated and transmitted. Contemporary science has shown that acquired characteristics are inherited to 4th generation, and can affect the genetic at long-term.

In the year 2350 BC, Mesopotamian society was conquered by Sargon, Semitic Akkadian, which was the first to build an empire. His grandson Naram-Sin, who ruled around 2250 BC, demanded to be treated as a living god, calling himself *“God of Akkad”*. After him, pharaohs, emperors followed the same behavior. They were treated as gods or their children were. Thus, it is accomplished what the serpent, reptilic ego, suggested to Eve: *“you will become gods”*.

The development and explosion of universal reptilic ego, produced as a result wars between European countries every two years. Taylor (2010) explains that by the end of eighteenth century, the French government dedicated two-thirds of its budget for spending in military; Prussia almost 90%. Between 1740 and 1897, wars claimed the lives of 30 million people much more in the twentieth century.

4. The primacy of God and the spiritual ego

My analysis completely differs the one done by Taylor (2010) regarding the primacy of the spirit. For Taylor, the concept of God has little meaning in non-fallen primitive peoples, and where He exists, there is a remote and distant figure that is used to explain the creation of the world. It is based to this in Mircea Eliade.

The theories about the fall are based on new *“needs”* motivated by desertification or moving to cities, stimulated by demographic increasing and agricultural production. The need is something that we lack, something missing to the I self-sufficient, according to Levinas (1988), to the reptilic ego, according to our vision. The reptilic ego is bourgeois, essentially conservative, but conservative with *“anguish and concern”* of the unpredictable. This instinct of possession, domination, and imperialism seeks absolute security. We observe in world history the Empires sought eternity, which clearly it is not possible to get in a changing world.

This is the reason why societies with non-individualistic anthropology, as those from East-Asia consider cooperation fundamental.

Di Corpo (2015) explains about the guanxi: “*Guanxi is a system of close interpersonal networks and cooperation that Chinese started building from the first years of their lives and it is a cornerstone in East Asia*”. And he adds: “*When a Chinese allows someone into his/her guanxi, this person becomes like a brother or a sister, or a second father, a second mother. Guanxis is a vital asset for any Chinese and it cannot be improvised. Guanxis is something more than a network, they are one of the most important and fundamental aspects of Chinese culture and are on the basis of the incredible success of China and its economy*”

But humans need and more profound, spiritual ego that wants to transcend, to relate to the other, absolute, absolute beauty, eternity, a personal God, completely trustworthy. Not recognizing this transcendent necessity, the reptilian ego predominates; it is closed, and it is oriented to the pleasure in search of happiness, love, beauty but it exhausts itself, and the back to the ego, with a positive feedback, which is the only one of this ego, to the search for new pleasures.

Here, we must point out that the negative feedback, which corresponds to the cybernetic control of any process, is only property of the spiritual ego, which can, therefore, control every impulse, emotion, action, meditation, and self-analyzing, etc. to proceed in a balanced manner, needed for all biological and spiritual experiences of the human being

However, when the reptilian ego predominates, the human being ends in mere appearances of joy, love, politically the end of history and civilization, the eternal progress, etc. This is the falsehood, “**lie**” of the human being reality and of societies and their system of communication, on which our world rests.

Taylor acknowledges that the “*fallen*” mind with its sense of separation from the cosmos, their lack of awareness of spiritual force, cannot be solved with the utopian state of Marx, nor with the “*maturity*” of Freud. There is a void left by God that some aim at filling with money, fame, drugs, etc. But anything of these satisfies. He suggests spirituality of Buddhism, Yoga or the Sufism. Taylor (2010) believes in the spirit - force that resides in all things and spaces which exists between them is the ultimate reality, and source of all that exists.

Taylor believes this spirit-force renewed a sense of participation that will unite all human beings in a network of empathy and equality that will end oppression, exploitation, competitiveness, inequalities, opening room for cooperation, respect and harmony. A new paradise that eliminates the need of grace of redemption, and transcendent reality, that can never be achieved in this world. In his excellent book “*In the Beginning God*”, Winfried Corduan demonstrates the contradictions of Eliade and he demonstrates in detail that the studies carried out on the basis of data of non-fallen people, and the major world religions demonstrate: a) that the original monotheism proposed by Schmidt and Lang is true, even considering the objections that exist, b) that the God of original monotheism is real and presents the essential attributes required: He is a person to. He created the world, he observes a moral code, he is almighty, he is eternal and kind. Thus, He has all the attributes that corresponds to a Supreme Being.

As a matter of fact, Curdan shows that the original monotheism may correspond to the one indicated in Bible. However, he mentions the case of Allah, the God of the Muslims that derives

from the same God of the Bible, but who is different, and his conception of a triune God, of Jesus as the second person in the Trinity etc.

Curdan says something important: *“This universal monotheism would be ultimately inexplicable without a communication of God from the original monotheism.”* This is consistent with my explanation (Yunes 2013) that we need a contact between the highly evolved brain of the Homo sapiens and God to work the principle reflection that does participate in His *“image and similarity”*. This contact must have been with a real communication purpose.

The permanent act of Jesus in building the Kingdom of God in this world where evil is spread and corruption predominates, led St. Paul to write (Rom. 8, 20:21) *“Mankind was subjected to failure, not for its will, but by the imposition of another one; but with the hope that this humanity will emancipate from the enslavement of corruption to obtain the glorious freedom of the children of God”*.

The Kingdom was installed by Jesus, and through his followers, his true disciples, following the clear concepts of Saint Augustine: *“The only criterion for salvation is the attitude to the poor”* (sermons 389.5) *“The path to the sky is the poor, for they will come to the Father. Start sharing, if you desire not to take the wrong path”* (sermons 300.7). Jesus builds slowly, considering that in our human lives and in our world nothing is purely evil or good, the final victory of love and grace will only occur at the end of the times, where we will actually get to paradise, *“real”*, that long surpasses the earthly paradise from which we miss now.

And here we return to observe the remarkable insights of Teilhard de Chardin. Being God the pure unity, He gave beings the chance to participate in this unity and to always tend to a broader unity, a movement of convergence (see Yunes 2016), to express it in his aphorism *“what goes up, converge”*.

The prominent scientist Simon Conway Morris (2003) writes that the convergences show that there is something analogous to an *“attractor”*, at which the evolutionary trajectories are channeled into stable functional levels. He also points out that the fact of evolution has led to a conscious being, single, with a sense of purpose, goals, that makes consideration of theology from science.

In the thought of De Chardin (1955), in the pursuit of uniting, elemental particles go together into atoms and molecules, these are transformed into living cells, cells forming the body are increasingly diversified, so the complexity of the process continues until the emergence of free people who unite in a super body. In this super organism, people are more people, that is, they emphasize their autonomy.

This process continues in a movement that De Chardin (1955) calls the *“socialization”*. Socialization is a *“return of humanity reflected on itself because the individual man only is the perfect man when arising to the limits for themselves even in a solidarity and for the solidarity with all human past, present, and future. In this socialization, humanity must find joy in life again.”* In a vision of the Kingdom that should be on training through socialization. One Father and all his sons, brothers, equal, participating in life to the full.

We must follow what Di Corpo indicate in his paper *“But do we have to wait for world leaders to decide for us the fate towards happiness and love? No, we can decide! We are constantly faced with decisions!... We can shift our decisions from entropy producing options to syntropic alternatives”*.

Chaos or organization! Our challenge is what we should build now, a syntropic world similar to the not fallen people.

For De Chardin (1955), evil has no future and the victories are of good, socialized society will discover that its destiny is the “*agape*”, that is, an expansion of love that definitely unites our human species, forming a higher unity of spirit and freedom. All this is immersed in transcendence and it receives its meaning. God is the Alpha, source of all being, but also our Omega, the point to which everything tends to. Following St. Paul, Teilhard was justified in hunting behind for the his idea of the cosmic Christ, to propose Chistogenesis. Christ is the meaning of creation, the convergence point and union, who is working on the intimate of his being, especially the poorest ones, the excluded in this world, and all evolution, guiding them to the Father, which will submit and deliver his kingdom.

This new view of original sin rescues the historical reality, the way of transmission, the need for redemption and for transcendence of his kingdom which will only be a total reality in the end times. It is a proposal based on facts, easy to understand, that rescues the essence of Christianity. Nonetheless, it is the view from a historical, especially anthropological and philosophical point of view. Now, theologians must work in this proposal.

References

- ALBRIGHT, C.R.; ASHBROOK, J.B. Where God lives in the human brain. Illinois: Sourcebooks Inc, 2001.
- ARNOULD, Jacques. A teologia depois de Darwin. São Paulo: Loyola, 2001.
- CHAPMAN, J., The origins of warfare in the prehistory of central and eastern Europe. In: CARMAN J.; HARDING A. Ancient warfare archaeological perspectives. Trowbridge: Sutton Pub, 1999.
- CORDUAN, W. In the beginning God: a fresh look at the case for original monotheism. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2013.
- DE CHARDIN, T. El fenomeno humano. Madrid: Taurus, 1955.
- DI CORPO, U. A Syntropic World Order (SWO). Syntropy (2) 25-40, 2015.
- DUQUOC, C. Pecado Original y Transformaciones teológicas. Lumière et Vie, 1977.
- EISLER, R. El cáliz y la espada: la alternativa femenina. Madrid: Martinez de Murguía, 1996.
- FRANKL, V. La presencia ignorada de Dios: psicoterapia y religión. Barcelona: Herder, 1981.
- GABRIEL, R. The culture of war: invention and early development. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.
- GRELOT, P. Faut-il croire au péché originel? Études 327, 231-251, 1967.
- HARVEY, G. (Ed.) Indigeneous religions, Londres: Cassell, 2000.
- HILL J. M. SJ. A doutrina do pecado original, à luz da teoria da evolução. In: Teilhard de Chardin e Karl Rahner Dissertação de mestrado, FAJE, Belo Horizonte, Brasil 2014).
- HOFTADTER, D. I. I am a strange loop. USA: Basic Books, 2007.
- KAUFFMAN, L. H. Reflexivity and Eigen form: the shape of process. Constructivist Foundations 4, 121-136, 2009.
- LENSKI, G. Human societies 2.ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- LEVINAS E. Totalidade e Infinito, trad. J.P. Ribeiro, Lisboa, Ed 70, 1988.
- MERTON, T. The silent life. USA: Sheldon Press, 1978.

- MORRIS, S.C. Life's solution, inevitable humans in a lonely universe. USA: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.
- PERLOVSKYL, I. Towards physics of the mind: concepts, emotions, consciousness and symbols. Physics of Life, Ver 3, 22-35, 2006.
- RUCKER, R. Infinity and the mind: the science and philosophy of the infinity. USA: Birhauser, 1982.
- SCHMIDT, W. The origin and growth of religion: facts and theories. USA: Wythe-North Pub., 2014.
- TAYLOR, S. La Caída, indicios sobre la edad de oro: la Historia de seis mil años de locura y el despertar de una nueva era. 2. ed. D.H: La Llave, 2010.
- YUNES, R.A, The evolution of the human mind and logic-mathematics structures. J. Theor. Biol. 236, 95-110, 2005.
- YUNES, R. A., The logic-mathematics structures and the convergence of cognitive capacities towards the source of this information: the infinity. Syntropy (I), 21-35, 2016.
- YUNES, R. A. The real sate? strange loop: evolution and the uniqueness of the human mind. Psychological Implications. Syntropoy (I) 42-59, 2013.