

An Implicit Vital Truth

José Corral Lope * **Presentation**

The first thing I should say is that I'm an atypical commentator. Some of you already know. Fernando has included me amongst the speaking professors, but I have to clarify that I'm a professor in commerce. My training has been in economics and my trade, banking.

My sole merit to be here is having had an idea, having *uncovered* a truth I think important within the bigger Truth. This truth is implicit in professor Segura's book and I'll address this later but I'd like to make some remarks on the book as whole first.

Global Commentary

I'm not an expert in the matters treated in the book but I've read it slowly and carefully and I believe I "got" almost all of it, thank the author for that. It's a scholarly book, and very interesting. It looks like prof. Segura, while investigating on Truth, has added to his knowledge on philosophy, all the knowledge of all the other sciences: mathematics, biology, anthropology... This way he has picked up, from the *lot* of partial truths, the ones he thought better for his goal. So he has shaped them and put them in order with love and dedication to try and reflect some of the Truth, in capital letters, which gives the title to the book. He, undoubtedly, has achieved his goal and I congratulate him wholeheartedly.

As I've said before, I'm in no place to technically judge the contents of the book. On the other hand, to try and add some value to the mix, I've read it through the glasses of my idea and my probable objective truth to see if it was made explicit in any of its 551 pages. It's not, but implicated it is. In around 118 pages. I'll later cite and comment some of the most significant paragraphs.

In any case, I'm grateful and praiseworthy of the work of prof. Segura. I'm making my idea explicit for what is worth to the ongoing investigation.

Stating my implicit truth

As I've already stated, my reading was a selfish one. Sixteen years ago, I had an idea, or found out a possible truth, which I thought of the utmost importance. So much so that I was surprised I hadn't seen it already published. I've been looking for anybody who might have seen it as well since, but haven't found it yet. So, I'm still in doubt of it being an undiscovered truth or just my truth and no one's as a result. I enunciate it, in any case so someone might be able to incorporate it to the truths collected in the book, as a part of the ongoing investigations.

The idea can be put together as follows: *like all other known species of living beings, our species Homo sapiens has, from the beginning, the prime objective to survive and the vital imperative to try.* Other transcendent goals notwithstanding.

This idea, so elementary sounding, contains two concepts already out in the open separately, but never explicitly put together before, as far as I know.

The **first concept** would be to consider all species as evolutionary units, meaning active subjects and objects of their own action. Historically, since Darwin, classic evolutionists have considered individual organisms as *units* of evolution, namely that genetic changes occur on individuals, which are the one who evolve. There's been other hypothesis: Dawkins considered genes, others thought the subject of survival was Life, with a capital L. Still others talk about carbon or even pure consciousness.

It's possible all or some of these *subjects* are entities whose survival is important, but I'll not get into it further than I need to in order to develop my idea. These are very interesting and ample questions and already pretty well studied and discussed, yet *they* are not to be mixed up with the main concept at hand.

I focused on species, I believe intuitively, as Popper say happens. Also, I'm part of a species and are interested in them, particularly my own. The election of the subject/object is key, as is not changing it during the process of the investigation.

Species haven't been considered evolutionary subjects until very recently and even today, most of biologists, including the self-called socio-biologists (Wilson, Ruse), keep on working with individual organisms despite its eusociality. It's only natural, biological changes happen and are appreciated in individuals.

As far as I know, the first to consider the species as evolutionary subjects were Mayr, Dobzhansky and, more recently, Gould (Corral, 2016:33-34) and, by know, I believe it's a widely recognized hypothesis, individuals being the main subjects of investigation notwithstanding.

I think I must include here doctor Ayala, recently made *honoris causa* by the University of Comillas, and a friend and disciple to Dobzhansky. Ayala was not a specialist in these matters and I believe he posed too much importance to the difference between individuals and species. As a biologist, he worked mainly with individual organisms and, as a humanist, he commented on the individual morality.

My intuition, confirmed as I said before by reading Mayr, Dobzhansky and Gould, is that, species have the *capability* to evolve to try and survive, and this is one of the currently accepted truths in science.

The other truth is that all known species, including ours, have primarily pursued this capacity, meaning they all have as their main vital objective to survive. To that effect, each species has developed different strategies, physical and behavioural. They do so as to adapt to an ever changing environment and keep on living, even though only around 2 per cent have made it: two million species known and as many yet to be discovered.

There's also differences about what could be the goal or objective for each subject. It's been considered that the prime natural objective is evolution itself, reproduction, progress...Also, as it relates to men, happiness, wellness, peace, dignity...

To my theory these are partial objectives and, generally speaking they are means to the purpose or main objective of survival. We then have two concepts that seem true: the species as subject/object and survival as prime vital objective empirically deduced by historical causation.

This objective of survival, for our species, is an objective for the man as a living being, the part he has in common with the rest of living creatures, as St Thomas put it, or the creatural part as monsignor Ladaria would say. K. Rahner would call it the *residual concept*. All of it without denying any other transcendental objective.

This basic idea completes the theory of evolution by *discovering* a cause, or initial mandate, which anchors the evolutionary process; and a final cause, or vital objective, which prevents the naturalistic fallacy from happening and gives sense to the idea of progress. Although the few evolutionists non-believers I've talked to about the idea, didn't like the thought of a cause or mandate or previous imperative because it looks as if there's an external Agent. Whomever wants to, can prescind of it, but the imperative is there, and when something happens, it's because there's a cause: internal or external. This question of Agency might have been one of the reasons why scientists didn't see the basic idea.

Even if not expressed properly, it seems as if the idea or hypothesis is been proven this way and meets the Popperian condition of being falsable, haven't been refuted when it could have been.

Scholia

From my meagre knowledge I think, once enunciated, the idea can also be proven by applying a deductive principle: given that the species exists, it'll priority tend to keep existing if we draw from..." the profound conviction that being is good, meaning: being is preferable to not being". I read it on T. de Chardin (Science and Chris, page 62). Food for thought for philosophers, there's many precedents. I've watched and interview by doctor Caamaño in this university to Francisco Quesada on the philosophical anthropology of Hans Jonas who made Man responsible of survival, precisely for being a living being. I would have loved for Jonas to know my ideas, as he worked so hard to justify our responsibility. There's no need for justification, really: we carry inside the mandate to survive. End of the scholia.

As I've said, this idea I call basic, it's implicit in the book we are commenting. Every time the words man, person, species, life, surviving, nature, conscience... appear referring to man as a living being, the basic idea on the survival of the species is pulsing underneath. Now, before showing some examples of this, I would like to address the other idea that goes along this first, *altruism*.

I came across the basic idea in September of 2000 and, like Darwin's disciples, I thought that one way to get the species to survive is to improve its individuals. I understood Galton's and Huxley's eugenics and, the few times I talked about my ideas and about these methods to improve man, my interlocutors, with good reason, would freak out. I did too. And that was the main reason for me not to try and develop the idea any further, for I found it to be true and necessary but morally perverse and wrong.

That was until, in 2003, I discovered altruism. **Broad altruism**, as it is defined by the DRAE in the first part of its first meaning: *diligence in procuring other people's wellbeing*, and then, *even at the expense of oneself*. Both are good to me. In my description I include the instinctive altruism of the Hymenoptera, the reciprocal one of primates, and the selfless one of men. I consider altruism everything given, done or omitted for the good of others, despite the intention. Be it materially retributed or not, at any time: productive work, commerce, education, cooperation, invention, discovery, cohabitation, aid, love unto others...all that facilitates and improves others and their cohabitation. In my idea, altruism is always rewarded: materially, immaterially or morally.

Altruism/love (not to be confused with love/desire) is the best of altruisms, as it self-reimburses, does not run out and self-feeds the implicit ethic norms. It also makes its practitioners happy, as wise men and saints know.

The idea of altruism it's been abundantly talked about, but not in its broader sense, mostly it's been the individual or genetical one that gets discussed. Altruism is always of the group, and it's essential in social species. Without altruism there's no society. It's already clear the most altruistic groups are the most efficient, and effective. That's why those groups and societies tend to be the dominant ones. The two typical examples would be ants (Wilson 2012) and men (keeping an eye in history, current events and the future).

Altruism as an efficient tool for survival was already dealt with by Darwin in *The origins of man*. He wrote it twelve years after *The origins of the species* and he dedicates the first part of the book to study man as a social and moral being. He says *happy species live and survive better and: man owns his superiority (...) to his social habits which lead him to help and defend his fellow man*. His disciples paid no mind to this soft idea, probably because the *hard* one, fighting, was a better seller. And so it keeps happening nowadays.

But the reality is we got here by being altruistic in wider circles each time. First, the family, then the pack, the clan, the tribe, the nation, the federations...Now is humanity's time. Internal group altruism favours the most practitioner of collectives, even though fighting and competing still exist amongst groups according to the other law of survival of the fittest.

Man is group oriented and brotherly. Humanity will be composed of groups that get along with each other. A brotherhood of many and varied *physical and spiritual villages*, where the individuals feel close to his neighbour and are able to exert, in each and every

group and collective the broad group altruism. Man tends to live in a family setting, even though he knows to be (and aspires to) a member of a brotherly humanity.

Going back to the second idea, it could be enunciated as follows: *broad altruism (instinctive, reciprocal, selfless, selfish, pure...) has been and is the most efficient and effectual element to try and keep the vital imperative.* And so, our species has adopted it as the best way to survive *co-living*.

The vital imperative and a possible universal ethical principle. With this second truth, also implicit within the big Truth, I dared disseminate my basic idea and to preach his universal usage by saying that: *the priority vital objective is to survive, our inexcusable duty is to try and the most efficient and effective way to do so is through altruism/love.*

These two biological truths are the basis to natural law, implicit in all men as social living beings. They can be rationally translated to our moral language made explicit by a *universal ethical principle* that says, more or less: Is good/better that which made altruistically, is good/better for the survival of the species. Altruism could be removed from the equation as it's already implicit in *doing what's best* for survival, but the importance of the means it's clearer this way. As an individual objective it could be equal to: *love and do as you will.*

As you might have guessed, the two biological truths I consider certain and proved, coincide with the two mandates from the Old and New Testament: Genesis's "*Be fruitful and multiply*" said to Man and animal alike, and the "*love unto each other*" from the Gospel.

Scholia. I would like to quote here again to the Jewish erudite Hans Jonas who, with his call to responsibility, reminds us the charge of Genesis to man on caring for creation. Also Edgar Morin, a communist and an atheist who recommended talking shamelessly about love and said "*Love wishes to overflow the sphere of private life unto the species and the world*".

I think one of the virtues of my ideas is that, from them believers and non-believers can build a universal code of ethics, *avoiding relativisms*, as, if true, they are so *veluti Deus daretur* and *etsi Deus non daretur*. In fact, from my part, I had abandoned the project to spread them until I read the document of the International Theological Commission on the natural law as basis to a universal ethic code in 2013, and the urgent summon of Benedict the XVI. An urgency and importance Monsignor Ladaria, Secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, remembers and reproduces in Tomas Trigo's edition for EUNSA in 2010 titled: *Searching for a universal ethic. A new way of looking at the natural law.*

The vital implicit truth

Once *my truths* are made explicit, I quote and comment some of the many paragraphs from the book *Truth* where I believe them to be implicit, specially what I refer to as the basic truth or idea:

The introduction already announces them, as is the relationship with the main theme of the book. **The fourth point**, titled "*The truth, prerequisite for survival*", says: "*if by truth we understand primarily reality in all its dimensions, it's impossible for a human being to sneak out of finding out what's true*". Further on: "*Acknowledging our current reality, of common sense and science, allows us to get it right: getting it right means staying alive*". And then: "*the depth in the investigation allows us to assure even more our survival and the improvement of the quality of life*".

Still on: "*Therefore truth is the simplest thing in the world: whatever leads to life is true, whatever prevents, perturbs or destroys, is false*".

In **the fifth point** he adds to the scientific and individual common sense, the moral common sense which: "*...consists on knowing how to link the demands of our conscience in relation to ourselves and the rest of the humans*". And then: "*The human species has survived thanks to its orientation in the World, setting bridges of cohabitation with others and with the environment...*".

And, finally, point 7 of the argument says: The issue of truth has occupied humans all through the ages because it's directly linked to the survival of the species.

If my ideas are true, man has arrived here thanks to them. They have guided him, allow him to success, lead them to life and allow him to survive. We cannot wriggle out of finding the truth about them because if they are and we use them rationally, they will guide us, help

This idea, so elementary sounding, contains two concepts already out in the open separately, but never explicitly put together before, as far as I know.

The **first concept** would be to consider all species as evolutionary units, meaning active subjects and objects of their own action. Historically, since Darwin, classic evolutionists have considered individual organisms as *units* of evolution, namely that genetic changes occur on individuals, which are the one who evolve. There's been other hypothesis: Dawkins considered genes, others thought the subject of survival was Life, with a capital L. Still others talk about carbon or even pure consciousness.

It's possible all or some of these *subjects* are entities whose survival is important, but I'll not get into it further than I need to in order to develop my idea. These are very interesting and ample questions and already pretty well studied and discussed, yet *they* are not to be mixed up with the main concept at hand.

I focused on species, I believe intuitively, as Popper say happens. Also, I'm part of a species and are interested in them, particularly my own. The election of the subject/object is key, as is not changing it during the process of the investigation.

Species haven't been considered evolutionary subjects until very recently and even today, most of biologists, including the self-called socio-biologists (Wilson, Ruse), keep on working with individual organisms despite its eusociality. It's only natural, biological changes happen and are appreciated in individuals.

As far as I know, the first to consider the species as evolutionary subjects were Mayr, Dobzhansky and, more recently, Gould (Corral, 2016:33-34) and, by know, I believe it's a widely recognized hypothesis, individuals being the main subjects of investigation notwithstanding.

I think I must include here doctor Ayala, recently made *honoris causa* by the University of Comillas, and a friend and disciple to Dobzhansky. Ayala was not a specialist in these matters and I believe he posed too much importance to the difference between individuals and species. As a biologist, he worked mainly with individual organisms and, as a humanist, he commented on the individual morality.

My intuition, confirmed as I said before by reading Mayr, Dobzhansky and Gould, is that, species have the *capability* to evolve to try and survive, and this is one of the currently accepted truths in science.

The other truth is that all known species, including ours, have primarily pursued this capacity, meaning they all have as their main vital objective to survive. To that effect, each species has developed different strategies, physical and behavioural. They do so as to adapt to an ever changing environment and keep on living, even though only around 2 per cent have made it: two million species known and as many yet to be discovered.

There's also differences about what could be the goal or objective for each subject. It's been considered that the prime natural objective is evolution itself, reproduction, progress...Also, as it relates to men, happiness, wellness, peace, dignity...

To my theory these are partial objectives and, generally speaking they are means to the purpose or main objective of survival. We then have two concepts that seem true: the species as subject/object and survival as prime vital objective empirically deduced by historical causation.

This objective of survival, for our species, is an objective for the man as a living being, the part he has in common with the rest of living creatures, as St Thomas put it, or the creatural part as monsignor Ladaria would say. K. Rahner would call it the *residual concept*. All of it without denying any other transcendental objective.

This basic idea completes the theory of evolution by *discovering* a cause, or initial mandate, which anchors the evolutionary process; and a final cause, or vital objective, which prevents the naturalistic fallacy from happening and gives sense to the idea of

progress. Although the few evolutionists non-believers I've talked to about the idea, didn't like the thought of a cause or mandate or previous imperative because it looks as if there's an external Agent. Whomever wants to, can prescind of it, but the imperative is there, and when something happens, it's because there's a cause: internal or external. This question of Agency might have been one of the reasons why scientists didn't see the basic idea.

Even if not expressed properly, it seems as if the idea or hypothesis is been proven this way and meets the Popperian condition of being falsable, haven't been refuted when it could have been.

Scholia

From my meagre knowledge I think, once enunciated, the idea can also be proven by applying a deductive principle: given that the species exists, it'll priority tend to keep existing if we draw from..." the profound conviction that being is good, meaning: being is preferable to not being". I read it on T. de Chardin (Science and Chris, page 62). Food for thought for philosophers, there's many precedents. I've watched and interview by doctor Caamaño in this university to Francisco Quesada on the philosophical anthropology of Hans Jonas who made Man responsible of survival, precisely for being a living being. I would have loved for Jonas to know my ideas, as he worked so hard to justify our responsibility. There's no need for justification, really: we carry inside the mandate to survive. End of the scholia.

As I've said, this idea I call basic, it's implicit in the book we are commenting. Every time the words man, person, species, life, surviving, nature, conscience... appear referring to man as a living being, the basic idea on the survival of the species is pulsing underneath. Now, before showing some examples of this, I would like to address the other idea that goes along this first, *altruism*.

I came across the basic idea in September of 2000 and, like Darwin's disciples, I thought that one way to get the species to survive is to improve its individuals. I understood Galton's and Huxley's eugenics and, the few times I talked about my ideas and about these methods to improve man, my interlocutors, with good reason, would freak out. I did too. And that was the main reason for me not to try and develop the idea any further, for I found it to be true and necessary but morally perverse and wrong.

That was until, in 2003, I discovered altruism. **Broad altruism**, as it is defined by the DRAE in the first part of its first meaning: *diligence in procuring other people's wellbeing, and then, even at the expense of oneself*. Both are good to me. In my description I include the instinctive altruism of the Hymenoptera, the reciprocal one of primates, and the selfless one of men. I consider altruism everything given, done or omitted for the good of others, despite the intention. Be it materially retributed or not, at any time: productive work, commerce, education, cooperation, invention, discovery, cohabitation, aid, love unto others...all that facilitates and improves others and their cohabitation. In my idea, altruism is always rewarded: materially, immaterially or morally.

Altruism/love (not to be confused with love/desire) is the best of altruisms, as it self retributes, does not run out and self feeds the implicit ethic norms. It also makes its practitioners happy, as wise men and saints know.

The idea of altruism it's been abundantly talked about, but not in its broader sense, mostly it's been the individual or genetical one that gets discussed. Altruism is always of the group, and it's essential in social species. Without altruism there's no society. It's already clear the most altruistic groups are the most efficient, and effective. That's why those groups and societies tend to be the dominant ones. The two typical examples would be ants (Wilson 2012) and men (keeping an eye in history, current events and the future).

Altruism as an efficient tool for survival was already dealt with by Darwin in *The origins of man*. He wrote it twelve years after *The origins of the species* and he dedicates the first part of the book to study man as a social and moral being. He says *happy species live and survive better and: man owns his superiority (...) to his social habits which lead him to help and defend his fellow man*. His disciples paid no mind to this *soft* idea, probably because the *hard* one, fighting, was a better seller. And so it keeps happening nowadays.

But the reality is we got here by being altruistic in wider circles each time. First, the family, then the pack, the clan, the tribe, the nation, the federations... Now is humanity's time. Internal group altruism favours the most practitioner of collectives, even though fighting and competing still exist amongst groups according to the other law of survival of the fittest.

Man is group oriented and brotherly. Humanity will be composed of groups that get along with each other. A brotherhood of many and varied *physical and spiritual villages*, where the individuals feel close to his neighbour and are able to exert, in each and every group and collective the broad group altruism. Man tends to live in a family setting, even though he knows to be (and aspires to) a member of a brotherly humanity.

Going back to the second idea, it could be enunciated as follows: *broad altruism (instinctive, reciprocal, selfless, selfish, pure...) has been and is the most efficient and effectual element to try and keep the vital imperative*. And so, our species has adopted it as the best way to survive *co-living*.

The vital imperative and a possible universal ethical principle. With this second truth, also implicit within the big Truth, I dared disseminate my basic idea and to preach his universal usage by saying that: *the priority vital objective is to survive, our inexcusable duty is to try and the most efficient and effective way to do so is through altruism/love*.

These two biological truths are the basis to natural law, implicit in all men as social living beings. They can be rationally translated to our moral language made explicit by a *universal ethical principle* that says, more or less: Is good/better that which made altruistically, is good/better for the survival of the species. Altruism could be removed

from the equation as it's already implicit in *doing what's best* for survival, but the importance of the means it's clearer this way. As an individual objective it could be equal to: *love and do as you will*.

As you might have guessed, the two biological truths I consider certain and proved, coincide with the two mandates from the Old and New Testament: Genesis's "*Be fruitful and multiply*" said to Man and animal alike, and the "*love unto each other*" from the Gospel.

Scholia. I would like to quote here again to the Jewish erudite Hans Jonas who, with his call to responsibility, reminds us the charge of Genesis to man on caring for creation. Also Edgar Morin, a communist and an atheist who recommended talking shamelessly about love and said "*Love wishes to overflow the sphere of private life unto the species and the world*".

I think one of the virtues of my ideas is that, from them believers and non-believers can build a universal code of ethics, *avoiding relativisms*, as, if true, they are so *veluti Deus daretur* and *etsi Deus non daretur*. In fact, from my part, I had abandoned the project to spread them until I read the document of the International Theological Commission on the natural law as basis to a universal ethic code in 2013, and the urgent summon of Benedict the XVI. An urgency and importance Monsignor Ladaria, Secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, remembers and reproduces in Tomas Trigo's edition for EUNSA in 2010 titled: *Searching for a universal ethic. A new way of looking at the natural law*.

The vital implicit truth

Once *my truths* are made explicit, I quote and comment some of the many paragraphs from the book *Truth* where I believe them to be implicit, specially what I refer to as the basic truth or idea:

The introduction already announces them, as is the relationship with the main theme of the book. **The fourth point**, titled "*The truth, prerequisite for survival*", says: "*if by truth we understand primarily reality in all its dimensions, it's impossible for a human being to sneak out of finding out what's true*". Further on: "*Acknowledging our current reality, of common sense and science, allows us to get it right: getting it right means staying alive*". And then: "*the depth in the investigation allows us to assure even more our survival and the improvement of the quality of life*".

Still on: "*Therefore truth is the simplest thing in the world: whatever leads to life is true, whatever prevents, perturbs or destroys, is false*".

In **the fifth point** he adds to the scientific and individual common sense, the moral common sense which: "*...consists on knowing how to link the demands of our conscience*

in relation to ourselves and the rest of the humans". And then: "The human species has survived thanks to its orientation in the World, setting bridges of cohabitation with others and with the environment..."

And, finally, point 7 of the argument says: The issue of truth has occupied humans all through the ages because it's directly linked to the survival of the species.

If my ideas are true, man has arrived here thanks to them. They have guided him, allow him to success, lead them to life and allow him to survive. We cannot wriggle out of finding the truth about them because if they are and we use them rationally, they will guide us, help

This idea, so elementary sounding, contains two concepts already out in the open separately, but never explicitly put together before, as far as I know.

The **first concept** would be to consider all species as evolutionary units, meaning active subjects and objects of their own action. Historically, since Darwin, classic evolutionists have considered individual organisms as *units* of evolution, namely that genetic changes occur on individuals, which are the one who evolve. There's been other hypothesis: Dawkins considered genes, others thought the subject of survival was Life, with a capital L. Still others talk about carbon or even pure consciousness.

It's possible all or some of these *subjects* are entities whose survival is important, but I'll not get into it further than I need to in order to develop my idea. These are very interesting and ample questions and already pretty well studied and discussed, yet *they* are not to be mixed up with the main concept at hand.

I focused on species, I believe intuitively, as Popper say happens. Also, I'm part of a species and are interested in them, particularly my own. The election of the subject/object is key, as is not changing it during the process of the investigation.

Species haven't been considered evolutionary subjects until very recently and even today, most of biologists, including the self-called socio-biologists (Wilson, Ruse), keep on working with individual organisms despite its eusociality. It's only natural, biological changes happen and are appreciated in individuals.

As far as I know, the first to consider the species as evolutionary subjects were Mayr, Dobzhansky and, more recently, Gould (Corral, 2016:33-34) and, by know, I believe it's a widely recognized hypothesis, individuals being the main subjects of investigation notwithstanding.

I think I must include here doctor Ayala, recently made *honoris causa* by the University of Comillas, and a friend and disciple to Dobzhansky. Ayala was not a specialist in these matters and I believe he posed too much importance to the difference between individuals and species. As a biologist, he worked mainly with individual organisms and, as a humanist, he commented on the individual morality.

My intuition, confirmed as I said before by reading Mayr, Dobzhansky and Gould, is that, species have the *capability* to evolve to try and survive, and this is one of the currently accepted truths in science.

The other truth is that all known species, including ours, have primarily pursued this capacity, meaning they all have as their main vital objective to survive. To that effect, each species has developed different strategies, physical and behavioural. They do so as to adapt to an ever changing environment and keep on living, even though only around 2 per cent have made it: two million species known and as many yet to be discovered.

There's also differences about what could be the goal or objective for each subject. It's been considered that the prime natural objective is evolution itself, reproduction, progress...Also, as it relates to men, happiness, wellness, peace, dignity...

To my theory these are partial objectives and, generally speaking they are means to the purpose or main objective of survival. We then have two concepts that seem true: the species as subject/object and survival as prime vital objective empirically deduced by historical causation.

This objective of survival, for our species, is an objective for the man as a living being, the part he has in common with the rest of living creatures, as St Thomas put it, or the creatural part as Monsignor Ladaria would say. K. Rahner would call it the *residual concept*. All of it without denying any other transcendental objective.

This basic idea completes the theory of evolution by *discovering* a cause, or initial mandate, which anchors the evolutionary process; and a final cause, or vital objective, which prevents the naturalistic fallacy from happening and gives sense to the idea of progress. Although the few evolutionists non-believers I've talked to about the idea, didn't like the thought of a cause or mandate or previous imperative because it looks as if there's an external Agent. Whomever wants to, can prescind of it, but the imperative is there, and when something happens, it's because there's a cause: internal or external. This question of Agency might have been one of the reasons why scientists didn't see the basic idea.

Even if not expressed properly, it seems as if the idea or hypothesis is been proven this way and meets the Popperian condition of being falsable, haven't been refuted when it could have been.

Scholia

From my meagre knowledge I think, once enunciated, the idea can also be proven by applying a deductive principle: given that the species exists, it'll priority tend to keep existing if we draw from..." the profound conviction that being is good, meaning: being is preferable to not being". I read it on T. de Chardin (Science and Chris, page 62). Food for thought for philosophers, there's many precedents. I've watched and interview by doctor Caamaño in this university to Francisco Quesada on the philosophical anthropology of Hans Jonas who made Man responsible of survival, precisely for being a

living being. I would have loved for Jonas to know my ideas, as he worked so hard to justify our responsibility. There's no need for justification, really: we carry inside the mandate to survive. End of the scholia.

As I've said, this idea I call basic, it's implicit in the book we are commenting. Every time the words man, person, species, life, surviving, nature, conscience... appear referring to man as a living being, the basic idea on the survival of the species is pulsing underneath. Now, before showing some examples of this, I would like to address the other idea that goes along this first, *altruism*.

I came across the basic idea in September of 2000 and, like Darwin's disciples, I thought that one way to get the species to survive is to improve its individuals. I understood Galton's and Huxley's eugenics and, the few times I talked about my ideas and about these methods to improve man, my interlocutors, with good reason, would freak out. I did too. And that was the main reason for me not to try and develop the idea any further, for I found it to be true and necessary but morally perverse and wrong.

That was until, in 2003, I discovered altruism. **Broad altruism**, as it is defined by the DRAE in the first part of its first meaning: *diligence in procuring other people's wellbeing*, and then, *even at the expense of oneself*. Both are good to me. In my description I include the instinctive altruism of the Hymenoptera, the reciprocal one of primates, and the selfless one of men. I consider altruism everything given, done or omitted for the good of others, despite the intention. Be it materially retributed or not, at any time: productive work, commerce, education, cooperation, invention, discovery, cohabitation, aid, love unto others...all that facilitates and improves others and their cohabitation. In my idea, altruism is always rewarded: materially, immaterially or morally.

Altruism/love (not to be confused with love/desire) is the best of altruisms, as it self retributes, does not run out and self feeds the implicit ethic norms. It also makes its practitioners happy, as wise men and saints know.

The idea of altruism it's been abundantly talked about, but not in its broader sense, mostly it's been the individual or genetical one that gets discussed. Altruism is always of the group, and it's essential in social species. Without altruism there's no society. It's already clear the most altruistic groups are the most efficient, and effective. That's why those groups and societies tend to be the dominant ones. The two typical examples would be ants (Wilson 2012) and men (keeping an eye in history, current events and the future).

Altruism as an efficient tool for survival was already dealt with by Darwin in *The origins of man*. He wrote it twelve years after *The origins of the species* and he dedicates the first part of the book to study man as a social and moral being. He says *happy species live and survive better* and: *man owns his superiority (...) to his social habits which lead him to help and defend his fellow man*. His disciples paid no mind to this *soft* idea, probably because the *hard* one, fighting, was a better seller. And so it keeps happening nowadays.

But the reality is we got here by being altruistic in wider circles each time. First, the family, then the pack, the clan, the tribe, the nation, the federations...Now is humanity's time. Internal group altruism favours the most practitioner of collectives, even though fighting and competing still exist amongst groups according to the other law of survival of the fittest.

Man is group oriented and brotherly Humanity will be composed of groups that get along with each other. A brotherhood of many and varied *physical and spiritual villages*, where the individuals feel close to his neighbour and are able to exert, in each and every group and collective the broad group altruism. Man tends to live in a family setting, even though he knows to be (and aspires to) a member of a brotherly humanity.

Going back to the second idea, it could be enunciated as follows: *broad altruism (instinctive, reciprocal, selfless, selfish, pure...) has been and is the most efficient and effectual element to try and keep the vital imperative*. And so, our species has adopted it as the best way to survive *co-living*.

The vital imperative and a possible universal ethical principle. With this second truth, also implicit within the big Truth, I dared disseminate my basic idea and to preach his universal usage by saying that: *the priority vital objective is to survive, our inexcusable duty is to try and the most efficient and effective way to do so is through altruism/love*.

These two biological truths are the basis to natural law, implicit in all men as social living beings. They can be rationally translated to our moral language made explicit by a *universal ethical principle* that says, more or less: Is good/better that which made altruistically, is good/better for the survival of the species. Altruism could be removed from the equation as it's already implicit in *doing what's best* for survival, but the importance of the means it's clearer this way. As an individual objective it could be equal to: *love and do as you will*.

As you might have guessed, the two biological truths I consider certain and proved, coincide with the two mandates from the Old and New Testament: Genesis's "*Be fruitful and multiply*" said to Man and animal alike, and the "*love unto each other*" from the Gospel.

Scholia. I would like to quote here again to the Jewish erudite Hans Jonas who, with his call to responsibility, reminds us the charge of Genesis to man on caring for creation. Also Edgar Morin, a communist and an atheist who recommended talking shamelessly about love and said "*Love wishes to overflow the sphere of private life unto the species and the world*".

I think one of the virtues of my ideas is that, from them believers and non-believers can build a universal code of ethics, *avoiding relativisms*, as, if true, they are so *veluti Deus daretur* and *etsi Deus non daretur*. In fact, from my part, I had abandoned the project to spread them until I read the document of the International Theological Commission on the natural law as basis to a universal ethic code in 2013, and the urgent summon of

Benedict the XVI. An urgency and importance Monsignor Ladaria, Secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, remembers and reproduces in Tomas Trigo's edition for EUNSA in 2010 titled: *Searching for a universal ethic. A new way of looking at the natural law.*

The vital implicit truth

Once *my truths* are made explicit, I quote and comment some of the many paragraphs from the book *Truth* where I believe them to be implicit, specially what I refer to as the basic truth or idea:

The introduction already announces them, as is the relationship with the main theme of the book. **The fourth point**, titled "*The truth, prerequisite for survival*", says: "*if by truth we understand primarily reality in all its dimensions, it's impossible for a human being to sneak out of finding out what's true*". Further on: "*Acknowledging our current reality, of common sense and science, allows us to get it right: getting it right means staying alive*". And then: "*the depth in the investigation allows us to assure even more our survival and the improvement of the quality of life*".

Still on: "*Therefore truth is the simplest thing in the world: whatever leads to life is true, whatever prevents, perturbs or destroys, is false*".

In **the fifth point** he adds to the scientific and individual common sense, the moral common sense which: "*...consists on knowing how to link the demands of our conscience in relation to ourselves and the rest of the humans*". And then: "*The human species has survived thanks to its orientation in the World, setting bridges of cohabitation with others and with the environment...*".

And, finally, point 7 of the argument says: The issue of truth has occupied humans all through the ages because it's directly linked to the survival of the species.

If my ideas are true, man has arrived here thanks to them. They have guided him, allow him to success, lead them to life and allow him to survive. We cannot wriggle out of finding the truth about them because if they are and we use them rationally, they will guide us, help

Considering what he's already said about being a good person and about assimilation of the principles of religion and natural morals I think that implicitly, he's enunciating the universal ethical principle: it's good that which, when done altruistically, is good for the survival and wellbeing of the people, humanity and Man.

Nothing less can be expected of a good and wise man. Although he hasn't made explicit what I call the basic idea or truth, he has had the intuition of it. And has left it implicit as part of the Truth in many pages of the book. This possible truth, now made explicit, can be one more step for the ongoing investigation in search of the Greater Truth.