# On the Duality of Human Existence

In philosophy, it has been considered that Human Beings, as opposed to other Beings, consist of two ontological aspects: the spiritual and the natural. This concept states that we are made up of two uniquely different but intertwined elements. The physical and the metaphysical. When we look at the metaphysical, the non-physical side of the human being, since there is no gradient scale to measure up to science cannot use instrumentation to define it. We must use an ontological argument.

But first, what the hell is ontology? It's a process in how we describe things on a fundamental level. Since the first day that some idiots decided they wanted to examine their existence instead of just doing their damn chores, the process of ontological argument has expanded considerably. Ontological arguments consider aspects that make something unique, different than everything else. Ontology is a field of study within metaphysics that seeks to define those differences. Ontology uses inductive reasoning, which combines inference, analysis, and deductive reasoning.

The physical side of our duality can be studied through scientific and inductive methods—the Being side is not so easy. As our Being develops and interacts with an environment (not just things green), new aspects are revealed not just about the environment but about us and how *we* interact. On the surface, our actions are primarily dictated by the environment in which we exist. But not all human activities are solely based on environmental cause and effect. We have a will, and thru that, we are more than just another interactive piece in nature. In many ways, we disrupt natural chains of causality. More on this later.

One of the problems with defining a human being is that we are inherently analogous. In essence, our Being is so complex it can only be explained by like aspects—or not. Because of this ineffable quality, we need to make an ontological argument to explore our nature. In philosophy, like law, an argument is the act of making a point. It is not meant to be contentious.

Making an ontological argument defines the fullness of a thing on a fundamental level. We can use four basic principles to make our analysis:

1) Study of a thing's makeup: What are the properties of an object? What is it comprised of and the sub-systems (if any) that keep it stable? What properties does it possess that allow it to remain separate from the things around it?

2) Study of evidence: When science types say proof, they mean any reasonable argument derived from verifiable observation. Even if a perceived fact about a thing is later proved inaccurate, it still may be relevant. Reason is not based on some standard of actual truth— or form as Plato would have it—it is based on the evolution of knowledge as new epiphanies occur. Epiphany is a Greek word meaning to reveal. Like any basis of theory, revelations of reality are a big deal because revelation must precede reason. Logic does not create reality—it only attempts to rationalize it by cause and effect.

3) Study of foundational underpinnings or fundamental principle: How do things coexist within an environment? This is important in understanding the nature of a thing. In particle physics, how something reacts to the surrounding environment tells us a lot about its properties. A thing's makeup (see #1) does not always define what that something is. For example, we know that all living things are based on carbon, but not all things based on carbon are alive.

4) Study how a thing fits into our belief commitment: Belief commitment is a pedantic way of describing thought filters. What we believe affects our observations and conclusions. These filters are how we determine reality. If you believe in something you dreamt and act upon it—the action makes it a part of your reality. It has been argued that the absolute truth of our existence is unknowable because of our limitations. Yet, as stated above, even if some fact of our existence proves inaccurate, our reality remains impressive and essential. Only through sane reasoning can we build valuable concepts. What we perceive is what we communicate.

Yeah, rational. A tricky thing to define, right? We define rational behavior by the lack of irrationality because rationality can be highly subjective. Again, when we say something is logical, we simply mean it's reasonable within local cause and effect. There is no such thing as pure logic. Math is logical because it is based solely on two simple relational events. Are we adding or taking something away? When we say something is rational, we allude to its place in a relational context. How does it relate? It's irrational for him to wear a down jacket outside when it's this hot—or— she has learned to develop a rational fear of drunks. From these principles (others add more), we can infer that ontology attempts to define what comprises human uniqueness within our reasonable understanding. The metaphysical Being does not solely operate in a local causality environment.

So, what are the properties of our Being? We know that there are no two human beings alike. Each human is the same in that we are all unique. Basically, through our individual

experiences, we build complex thought filters to interact with our environment—which includes other humans. These filters define us and guide future actions that alter the course of our lives. Although we use these thought filters to express our will within a given environment, our interpretation of events within that environment determines how we'll act upon them. Through these filters, we forge faith, and faith can alter the physical universe. As evidence, witness something called the Placebo Effect.

The Placebo Effect is an odd side-effect of a process called double-blind testing. When testing the efficacy of a new drug, a human subject is given either the actual drug or a placebo, like a sugar pill or a capsule filled with an inert substance. Both the researcher and subject alike are blind as to which is which. In many cases, patients with the placebo receive a beneficial effect, more helpful than the drug itself. Stage-four cancer has gone into remission in some cases because the subject believes in the placebo. People are healed by faith. Suppose the outcome of a causality event like the spread of a disease can be affected by the will. In that case, being must be distinct from the mechanisms of the body.

Thru acts of will, we possess the ability to manipulate the things around us—snatch a leaf on the wind, and you alter a natural causality chain. Humans interact with the universe physically—physics—and non-physically—metaphysics. It is within metaphysics that all thinking and feeling are grouped. The reasoning process is not a physical property but yet it alters our responses or causality chains. The metaphysical property of humans is significant in that all speculative thought arises from it. Einstein once observed that if you merely scratch a scientist, you'll find a metaphysicist underneath.

The maintenance of the human system is indirectly related to the environment. Like most organic systems, it relies on the conditions surrounding it, but not unconditionally. Humans can improve survival conditions like the beaver who dams or a squirrel who stores. But unlike the animal, in the human survival kit, there is a thing called desire. The human ability to desire is an ontological property separate from all other life forms. Other life forms may have cravings, but not like humans. Uncontrollable cravings, addictions, lust, and the odd impulse to vote only for good-looking people, are behavioral traits not passed on genetically. These aspects have been studied meticulously. All attempts to find a bio-systemic connection have failed to produce any logical basis for genetic influence. It is only thru willful action that desire becomes manifest—I want. The degree of willpower was once considered a genetic trait that mentally tough people

only come from tough stock. But how does this work? Not all children from wise parents are intelligent or compassionate. Something else must be going on. Just because a family has great musicians in its past does not preclude a child will be born with that talent. Human development requires both nature and nurture. Nurture aspects are metaphysical: education, discipline, desire, and emotion. While the natural elements are physical: nutrients, clothing, shelter, etc.

Let's look at the ontological aspects of our duality's physical, or natural, side. The physical side of our Being is stable, constructed from—what Aristotle defined as—things of necessity. This encompasses all matter and energy. This basically means that "things of necessity" have rigid causality chains. They have no choice in reacting to an event, making their causality response highly predictable. Without this predictability or chemistry, we would be unable to make any theories or construct any material mechanisms. There would be no physical laws. Of course, this holds true for all biological agents, including humans. Nature, in all of its complexities, is fundamentally consistent. In causality response, our inconsistency is the only consistency we have with other human beings.

As science marches on, collecting evidence on how bio-mechanisms function, we know that all organic substances are comprised of proteins which are highly specific amino acid chains built to a specific order from nucleic acid chains (DNA and RNA). Controlled by the fundamental laws(causality response) of physics on how to interact, these proteins form highly complex systems which combine to form precise mechanisms (organelle, glands, organs, etc . . .). On this planet, all bio-mechanisms interact to keep the environment stable enough for the life cycle to continue. The physical side of humans is no exception. But there are apparent differences in how our part plays out in the global life cycle. The life cycle for all living things is the same: they are born, consumed, and are consumed by bacteria or other life forms. But, unlike other biologicals, humans are not physically compelled to procreate, migrate, or alienate. It is a matter of choice for us—Pavlov's bell does not force every human to salivate.

It's pretty clear from the research that, as was long suspected, neurological mechanisms in humans, including the brain, are subservient to behavior. The body's movement, including autonomic functions, is controlled by the will. Thomas Aquinas once stated: When I tell my hand to do something, it does it; when I tell myself, all I get is argument. This is true of us all. People can literally will their bodies to cease functioning.

Our reliance on the environment is not of integration but of contention. Humans organize food sources and create temporary environmental conditions to lessen nature's more capricious tendencies. We develop alternative systems to draw energy from the environment. While it is true that we can find some examples of this behavior in the animal kingdom, the complex techniques of humans indicate a unique aspect.

Throughout history, it has been recognized that humans are different from all other forms of life. This difference was attributed to genetics and that somehow, as Pierre Teilhard de Chardin once argued, the metaphysical element of conscience emerged. However, conscience does not present itself in the materials that make up bio-organisms—nothing can emerge from nothing. For a trait to appear, it must be present to some degree. In fact, once the cell was first viewed, the cytoplasm was thought to be the very essence of life—then we got better microscopes.

As the existence of DNA was uncovered, it fundamentally changed how we look at ourselves. Today is no different. Many assumptions of human genetic trait-origin have been proven false. Since there is no known genetic coding for moralistic behavior, it is unlikely that someone could be born more compassionate. Bio-research may not tell us everything DNA does, but it can tell us things it cannot do.

Let's take a brief look at the history of how DNA became revealed:

1665 – The first bio-cell is seen microscopically. 150 years *later*, they figured out was it was. Today we understand about a whopping 42% of the mechanisms within the cell.

1856 – A really bored monk named Mendel reveals how the physical characteristics of a living thing can be passed on to offspring. Consequently, the school of Genetics is born.

1869 – This chemist dude named Miescher finds a chemical structure vastly different than the protein structures he'd be examining. He called it nuclein—we call it deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA).

1944 – Oswald Avery makes the first connection that for all heredity expression, DNA is the shit.

1953 – Watson and Crick use solid deductive reasoning to reveal that the DNA structure is actually a double helix. Nobody has a clue as to how it all works yet.

1965 – DNA & RNA code is cracked. And no, it's not an enigma.

1977 – Mapping the specificity of DNA code sequencing begins, and it ain't random, dudes.

1983 – The first genetic disease is mapped. Surprisingly it's not ignorance.

1990 – Project Genome is launched—a herculean effort to chemically map a genome, which is the genetic information all organisms need to function.

1996 – Hello, Dolly. Cloning is achieved. This process involved inserting a different chromosome into a zygote. Literally, they replaced the instructions in a fertilized egg to build something different.

1999 – Chromosome 22 is mapped, containing around 33.5 million bits of chemical code (base pairs). Ah, that would be *specific* code—it all does shit—so no junk DNA. There are 23 chromosomes x2 for each cell and about a trillion cells in the human body. Yeah . . . Right? Stretch them out, and you circle the earth about 2.5 million times.

2003 – Project Genome completes. Human genetic coding is mapped by a bunch of lonely guys, and ironically, chicks are *still* better built.

2005 – DNA storage and transcription mechanisms in the nucleus are mapped—an immensely complex structure in a tiny little package.

2013 – It's discovered that identical twins are not genetically identical. What took that so long?

2014 – 2020's. Leaps and bounds. Mice brains storing retrievable data, viral assassins, bio-industrial medicines, etc . . . In a nutshell, the field of Biomechanics changes our understanding of ourselves. More on this later.

As part of this history, an effed-up idea called eugenics emerged. Eugenics sprang from a misinterpretation of Mendel's work that good and bad *behavioral* traits could be bred. Or worse, less developed humans could dilute the "purity" of a race if allowed to sexually mingle. No evidence supports this. Tons of evidence points to the improbability of any genetically driven

behavioral trait being expressed—let alone passed on as a physical trait—but the perception remains.

The eugenic perception was so widespread that many laws prohibited racial mixing and some enforced targeted sterilization. Countless millions were killed in war and racial cleansing pogroms in the past. Throughout these times, people acted on what they considered the truth—what they perceived. Perception is essential because humans can't know the fullness of truth about anything. This is one reason why ontological argument is necessary. Most of what we understand comes to us outside of our direct personal observation. This is important in an ontological description, especially when the thing being described is ourselves. For example, the very idea that a race could be superior/inferior was considered a foregone reality until revealed truths about DNA pierced this flawed reasoning.

The Bible reveals that God breathed his spirit only into humans. The book of Genesis allegorically states that humans were first formed of clay. The Breath of God—a euphemism for the Spirit of God—gave the second ontological aspect called Being—Being meaning as a willful entity—so human refers to the physical nature, Being is the spiritual nature.

I know, your like: "*Whaaat . . . the Bible?"* That's a faith book, not a science source—for Galileo's sake. The Bible gives no proof of Being; it only reveals the nature of God and his interactions with humankind. The Psalmist states that information in the Bible is so trustworthy that ignorant people can gain wisdom. This means the proof lies in the pudding—gotta eat it to know what it tastes like. It's a causality based on faith—act this way, and these beneficial things will occur. This is the consequence of action, or as the late great RC Sproles would have it—the consequence of ideas for—like any causality—the idea always precedes the act.

When dealing non-theoretically, revelation must always precede reason. It's how we know we are not just imagining something like string theory or multi universes, of which neither can be tested or lead to any measurable prediction. In science, the more predictable a theory is, the more likely the framework of the theory is valid. In experiments, chemical reactions are predictable, and therefore the quantum theory that predicts the reaction is viewed as trustworthy. Even though it still remains incomplete. Many people use chemistry without even a fundamental understanding of the quantum theory it's based on.

Immanuel Kant once observed that science is organized knowledge, and wisdom is organized life. Science uses observation, reason, and association to help us construct our

worldview—it's one reason why science has been given the authority it has. If you can count it, use math. If you know it moves, use physics. Science also tries to weigh in on things that cannot be measured. To define anything that cannot be measured, it uses a process called inductive inference. Inductive inference is a process of achieving or collecting empirical data. It's a cornerstone of the scientific method. Moreover, it is a well-considered truism that all facts we accept, not actually witness, must rely on inductive inference.

> Inductive: an adjective form of the verb induct or bring in.
>
> Inference: means to use supportive argument.
>
> Combined, we get inductive inference: using evidential support to back a conclusion, much like in a court of law.

So now, armed with some clarification, let's look a little closer.

Inductive inference has basically two components: primary and secondary. The primary is based on experience. Experience means what it says: something you have been exposed to, including third-party witnesses. Immanuel Kant correctly points out that most of what we know comes to us *a priori*, meaning we don't directly witness the occurrence of the primary revelation. Like reading history from the Bible.

The secondary component of inductive inference is cumulative. It adds to what is already known. This additive method simply builds on what has already been established as relevant to the new conclusion. We know it's below freezing when water crystallizes. When snow falls from the sky, it's below freezing. These two components of inductive inference ensure that induction stays within empirical knowledge instead of drifting off to the theoretical. They also help distinguish induction inferences from other inference types like deduction or adduction. Even when these are used in an inductive inference. So, armed with this, let's have another go at the metaphysical.

Consciousness is recognized in humans as a defining characteristic. Unfortunately, in many circles, it has been reduced to awareness— it is much more. There is little said about it in western thought before the Hellenic Period when the Greeks first defined it. Stoic philosophers of Greece viewed consciousness as an internal battle over moral behavior. Greek stoics used the word "conscience" as an ethical arbitrator. Plutarch (this intense Greek dude) believed conscience to be the internal voice that judges the self and others. The stoic Greek and Roman philosophers, with some minor adjustments, pretty much all agree on this interpretation. Like the

Judean traditionalists, Hellenistic moralists believed that conscience was of divine origin. This separated them from animists, who thought God was nature. Judean tradition holds that God is the creator and, therefore, separate from the creation. This is an important distinction. We cannot prove either, but we can make an ontological argument to support one.

The writings of St. Paul speak to conscience as a guide to moral behavior where the law of God is written on the hearts of the gentile Christians. Philo and Josephus use the metaphor of conscience as the accuser or witness. Ironically, Satan is spoken of in the same terms in the Book of Job. As Christians spread the Gospel (the good news), pantheism (paganism), and animism diminished, the term conscience evolved into self-conscience, meaning that which governs action. Consciousness is not so easily defined.

Is it safe to say that humans are consciously aware of the need to reason? Is reason proof of consciousness? Descartes thought so in his renowned argument on existence: *cogito ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am). But this is only part of his argument. Inductive inference tells us that there must be some kind of revelation before any reasoning can occur—something to reason about. Descartes gets to his conclusion by his ability to doubt the things revealed to him. He really meant: *dubito ergo cogito, cogito ergo sum* (I doubt, therefore I think; I think therefore I am). Cognizance (noun) is to be aware of something. Cogitate (verb) means to consider or reason something out. His argument implies cogitation is proof of consciousness.

To doubt something, one must be able to judge it. To judge means weighing or comparing to some standard like a ruler or measurable quality. Conscience is the self under trial, by the self. Consciousness is the thing that's doing the judging. How we judge ourselves significantly affects our natural body in ways that seem comparable to any chemically driven genetic response—like a runny nose. But are emotions chemical? Is fear just a genetically derived system response? If so, then what part does emotion play? Humans regularly overcome nucleic-acid preprogrammed genetic action responses like fear/flight or aggressive threat recognition. But emotion? It's been postulated that emotion may be an evolutionary self-preservation mechanism to temper judgment. But judgment assumes an ability to make a moral definition—not just good or bad, but good or bad for what? An old adage states that there are no killers in nature. This implies that animals act out of necessity—not judgment. But with humans, judgment matters. People can grow so opposed to killing they can willfully alter the Omni diet they were born with. This choice is not *natural selection*, like a bacteria's genetically driven

adaptation process, which allows it to adapt to new environments and radically change its food source.

Decisions can significantly affect the natural body, like the ingestion of recreational drugs, fashion starvation, or self-esteem overconsumption. But these choices cannot overpower us. The human body is not ultimately shaped by nature's necessities—things that can't willfully change—but by something else entirely. Not handled correctly, the absence of these "recreational" substances can prove fatal. Substances ingested by will can become necessary to the body, like a third-stage alcoholic who stops drinking too quickly or rapidly withdrawing from opiate addiction. I've heard of similar relationships between women and chocolate, and, from personal experience, I'm pretty sure it's the people *around* her that suffer the most from her withdrawal.

Remember Agustine's observation. If you tell your hand to do something . . .? This illustrates the complex aspect of will in action. Napolean once commented that to do something you want to do is to be a human. To do everything you want to do is to be a god. "Want" is the key operative word. Will is not found in the physical within the spirit or the non-corporeal aspect. When we use the phrase free-will, it means we are free to decide on matters that govern us. Free to express our will or surrender it. Again, for something to evolve, the properties by which it emerges must be present for it to appear and adapt or interact with its surroundings. It is unlikely that will could have emerged from matter. Darwinists like Chardin believed that free will may have evolved in humans. No evidence can be found in nature that supports his theory. As discussed above, the stability and predictability of the physical universe indicate that matter cannot possess will. The holistic theory tells us that the universe works in concert and not independently. Suppose just one electron, or any particle, got too drunk and didn't show up for work. In that case, the very fabric of the universe might unravel. We truncate free agency or our ability to act through our will. Just because you can do a thing doesn't mean you should or will. This reason in action—a function of thought.

Descartes was pointing out the obvious: to think, proves we exist. But it is the ability to express our *will* that differentiates humans from nature, each other, and our dualistic self. Desire gives humans purpose. Our desires are not based on a causality effect but on our innate ability to judge what is best for us, like living in a loving relationship.