

Evolution's First Male and the Bible

Robin Calamaio - Copyright 2010

<http://www.freelygive-n.com>

Introduction

It is a scientific fact there are males in many species. I ... even happen to be one. So, how did evolution produce ... the first male? This is not a small question. Evolution had to cross several very substantive bridges before it got to me - or you - if you, too, are a male. But the investigation is even more basic than this. Evolution had to build these bridges - and then successfully cross them. These are not little matters, as they impact the plausibility of ...

The Theory of Evolution

Evolution is a speculative idea on the origin and progression of life in this biosphere. While different sects do exist (linear progression theorists, bush theorists, punctuated equilibrium theorists, etc.), purists all agree that everything has come into being by purely random natural processes. Thus, supernatural creation, guidance or design is immediately rejected.

Scientific theories are proposals toward a scientific end when, as yet, the science does not exist to make it fact. Theories are visionary and vitally important for scientific advancement. They usually (maybe always) begin with some observable data (or facts) which form the basis of the extrapolated theory. Then the search begins, through accepted procedures, to test the proposal.

As a theory is explored, its validity can move in several directions. Sometimes, investigation soon turns the theory into law. Sometimes, the original theory falters, but it does lead to other discoveries that owe their discovery to the original theorist and visionary. But, at other times, as you might suspect, a theory unravels before the accumulated data and really does not have much redeemable in it. In these cases, science ... just walks away.

Bridges To Evolution's First Male

While myriads of bridges are required to get to evolution's first male, I have chosen four, which in my mind, are huge interstate bridges. Some I have glossed over may actually be ... scientifically bigger. So, here are the ones I have cherry picked.

Bridge 1: Spontaneous Generation

To embrace that living matter (much less a living organism) spontaneously arose from inorganic elements, with the ability to ingest inorganic "*stuff*" around it (e.g., light rays for photosynthesis) and thrive - is, for many of us, a stumbling block of the first order. There is no scientific evidence that evolution built, and then crossed, this bridge. Yet, evolutionist's rapidly traverse it - and cast dispersions on all who halt before it. Life may be, and always remain, a supernatural injection into the inorganic elements (carbon included) of our planet and universe. Life, whatever "*it*" is, may always reside in the domain of "*God*" ... a Creator ... The Creator. "*The Lord ... makes alive*" (1Sam 2:6). Life is a persistent and very real problem for science - and the evolutionist.

We do not contend that evolution stumbles as it gets on this bridge, but that evolution has no bridge to get on ... as it can not build it. Therefore, the evolutionary theory collapses before

getting out of the starting block. So, discussion about subsequent bridges is actually a waste of time. Though I believe this to be the case, I am still going to question evolution's ability to build, and cross, some other necessary bridges before it could produce its first male. After all, ... there obviously was one.

Bridge 2: Spontaneous Generation with a Fully Developed Reproductive System

Maybe "*system*" is too loaded a word. But, reproduction/replication is an immensely complex process that befuddles the most brilliant among us. For evolution to be true, living matter had to arise with a fully operational reproductive/replication capacity. If not, all life would just keep immediately returning to the inorganics ... from whence it came. Evolution requires a life line. To believe living matter spontaneously arose with such an ability ... is an immense faith position. Science has come nowhere close to demonstrating this as a reality - or even a plausibility. And concerning reproduction/replication, even what is referred to as "*simple division*" (amitosis or fission) is anything but simple. But, I guess compared to what's coming ... it is.

But, this second bridge is just the start of the problem. Surely no evolutionist believes the first living thing was some one-celled life form. A single-celled life form is a universe of knowledge in itself. For the scientist, the labyrinth of activity within its cell membrane presents immense, uncharted, complex mysteries of unknown depths. "*How could randomly arising living matter organize itself into a cell - complete with that membrane, a nucleus and all its other components?*" There are myriads of bridges that must be built and crossed before getting to the first one-celled organism. At this point, all I can do is apologize, and ask you to stop thinking about them. If you do not, we will never get to evolution's first male. Suffice it to say, physical science has not crossed either of these first two bridges (or the glossed ones) ... even though the evolutionist has.

When mathematically calculating evolution's plausibility value, the development, and crossing, of this second bridge is not a one-to-one ratio. The mathematics of statistical probability, and hence plausibility, compounds. The coming bridges ... compound what is already compounded.

Bridge Three: Multi-Celled Organisms

I believe most evolutionists opt for the first actual organism to be some type of photosynthesizing plant-like, single-celled life form. But all single-celled life forms today (plant or animal) just give rise ... to other single-celled life. This single-cell does everything that needs to be done for the life of the organism. So, how did multi-celled organisms come into being? The cells of multi-celled life forms can no longer survive as lone life. How did cells surrender independence in life to become specialized and co-dependent with other cells in their survival? White blood cells in my body are pretty impressive little neuters. They travel all through me attacking all kinds of invaders and, at first blush, seem almost independent. But, if I bleed, these white blood cells can not marshal their forces and live on. They rapidly return to the inorganics from whence they originally arose. Yet, ... each one does possess my entire genetic code.

Is there any physical science that can explain how random evolutionary forces built, and then crossed, the bridge to multi-celled organisms? This arches an enormous expanse. And here again, evolutionists rapidly traverse it and head to the next one, while science sits at the foot of yet another bridge ... scratching its head. Evolution, you ask much - with no affirming science. But this next bridge is as stunning as any previous one. The rise of ...

Bridge Four: The Little Half-Breed

From the evolutionist's perspective, there was a time when every cell on the planet had a full set of chromosomes. The number depended on the species. While each one reproduced/replicated by amitosis (or fission - "*simple division*") or mitosis (where nuclei material might have commingled with other cells), each cell continually retained a full set of chromosomes consistent with its species. But then one day, some multi-celled creature mutated a cell ... with half the chromosomes. I call this (affectionately), "*the little half-breed.*" Its only purpose was for reproduction. And it immediately became this creature's sole vehicle for reproduction. Scientists named this entirely new reproductive process, meiosis. And it better work immediately ... or that creature's line would end immediately.

But, just as important, this creature was no longer an "*it.*" "*It*" became "*he.*" All other life before him, and around him, was neuter, asexual, non-sexual, no sex. The producer of this little half-breed became the first real "*him*" - an entirely new type of mutated creature ... evolution's first male. What a mutant he was ... mutating a half-breed cell, meiosis, and gender! But evolution just created, and successfully crossed ...

The Bridge ... To Nowhere

It would be of no value for our first male to keep this half-breed, reproductive cell inside himself. He could do nothing with it. That means our first male also needed to mutate some kind of ejection mechanism for his little half-breed. I realize I am crossing many bridges all at once (again), but let's just stay with our first male as he gets to the end of this interstate bridge. So, he crosses this bridge and ejects his little half-breed ... where?

If you do not understand what I just asked, and the implications for this to be evolutionary reality, it is because you do not want to. This half-breed cell was cast into a hostile-to-life environment, eager to return it to the inorganics from whence it originally arose. How long could it hold out? A few months, a few days, a few hours ... a few minutes? It could not sustain, or replicate, itself - and our first male could not help after its jettison.

So, as an evolutionist, you are telling me I must believe that some other neuter member of our first male's original species (?) ... mutated a half-breed, reproductive *receiving cell* (thus becoming evolution's first female) - at the same time, in the same location? And all the necessary physical apparatus to accept that first male's half-breed cell ... "*she*" simultaneously mutated as well? How stupid do you think I am? I don't think even the most hard-core evolutionist believes this is plausible. And if any part of this unbelievably complex chromosomal matrix would even be infinitesimally messed up, this newly-mutated, meiosis reproduction process would produce ... well, no telling what would explode out of our first female.

Sorry For the Chauvinism

Some evolutionists may want to assert that it was a female that became the first evolutionary creature of gender - thus, she was responsible for the first half-breed cell. That is truly moving chairs around on the Titanic. But, if you want, just print this out and cross out "*male,*" "*he,*" "*him*" and "*his*" - and write in, "*female,*" "*she,*" "*her,*" and "*hers.*" Then, read on!

The Issue of Faith and The Matter of Respect

Whether one opts for evolution or the Genesis' Creation account, faith is required of an

adherent. Any system that calls for faith owes adherents, or potential ones ... respect. Investigation into its claims, and the claims of adversarial arguments, should be more than just permitted - they should be encouraged. Such a mind-set demonstrates confidence the faith-requiring system has towards its own validity. That does not mean the system is required to show feigned respect for the competing system - it is free to demolish it - but it should do its demolition by accurate portrayals the opposition's positions followed by a substantive dismantling.

Ultimately, the issue then becomes the quality of that faith ... specifically, its plausibility. As one honestly examines a system's required beliefs, its plausibility will either increase or decrease. Even "*blind faith*" in something usually has some plausible elements to it. While detractors may have aggressive, and convincing arguments against those elements, it behooves adversaries to acknowledge each one, and afford them their "*day in court*" - not summary dismissal.

Evolution's Faith

Initially, evolution was a blind faith, but with plausible elements. Science was called upon to shine light into its "*blind spots*" - with the hope of providing confirmation of the theory. Science has not cooperated. I have read that Darwin believed his theory would collapse if individual parts of some biological system required incremental development - yet were useless until the entire system "*came online.*" This is precisely what biological science has discovered in system after system. The journey to evolution's first male is filled with such "*problem children.*" To illustrate, it is as though a car engine evolved, but was, in itself, a useless, even puzzling, conglomerate of parts. At the same time, all the other parts of the car simultaneously evolved ... though they too were individually useless. Then everything was assembled - and somehow assembled correctly. But, it wasn't until the ignition key was turned, that for the first time ever, the function of that engine (and car) was realized. This is an exceedingly simplistic illustration as the simplest biological system is far more complex than any automobile.

In light of this, some evolutionists now speculate that evolution occurred in "*jumps.*" Changes occurred in the genetics of a creature which caused great evolutionary leaps - even into entirely new species. This explains the "*sudden appearance*" of the varied species in the fossil record. **Gone** is the need for intermediate creatures or "*missing links.*" **Solved** is the problem of incremental evolution of bio-systems. The original speculation of incremental evolution has now evolved into more evolutionary speculation - "*punctuated equilibrium*" or "*macro evolution*" (See Jeffrey Tomkins, Ph.D., "*Acts & Facts*", Vol. 38, No. 12, December 2009, pgs. 12,13; <http://www.icr.org>). I have two immediate huge problems with this. There are more.

Problem One

Once the realm of neuter animals is left behind, how can such a scenario be possible? If some type of ancient lemur suddenly became some sort of ancient chimp, what would "*he*" do? We are back to the same problem of the first male all over again. He suddenly evolved ... to nowhere. So, another creature had to make the same sudden jump, but as a genetically mirroring female - at the same locale and both survive to adulthood, and ... you get the point. I do not think the importance of this objection can be overstated. Without this new "*her,*" complete with a half-breed egg able to incorporate the half-breed of our new male, our new chimp would be nothing but a freak of nature, soon to return to the dust from whence he came. And if you insist on rearranging the chairs on the Titanic here too, well ... go ahead.

Problem Two

Evolutionists just keep moving from speculation to speculation. In some ways, science is feeding this as it is heavy on observation and description - but light on explanation. For example, how is anything alive? And when I drink a glass of water, take a vitamin, or eat something, once diffused into my system, are these elements and compounds ... now **alive**? Live iron? Live calcium? Live water? If not, then what is alive? How did fission come into being? How did cells become specialized, delegate bio-processes, and lose their capacity as an individual life form? How did some neuter creature develop that first little half-breed? How are these things here?

Because science is so unsettled, and many areas will likely remain so, evolutionists have room to romp. For example, can science definitively prove it is absolutely impossible for living matter to spontaneously generate from inorganic material? Scientists do not even know what life is - so, how can they prove it can not "*pop into being*" if just the right concoction of inorganic elements and forces randomly come together in just the right way?

On the other hand, many scientific discoveries are putting great pressure on evolutionary speculation ... specifically, its plausibility. That is in the background of all my challenges leading to evolution's first male. Dr. Charles McCombs (Associate Professor of Chemistry with the Institute for Creation Research), recently stated, "*As an organic chemist, my entire career was dedicated to studying the process by which things can change. Chemistry is a science that studies the process, but evolution is only a hypothesis based solely on analysis of the end product. As a creation scientist, I want people to realize that evolutionary scientists have never studied the process before claiming that life came from chemicals; they never studied the process before claiming that dinosaurs turned into birds, or before monkeys allegedly turned into humans. If evolutionists had studied their processes, they would have learned that evolution violates those same laws of science their theory is supposedly based on*" (Charles McCombs, Ph.D., "*Acts & Facts*", Vol. 38, No. 12, December 2009, pgs. 5,6; <http://www.icr.org>).

This assessment by Dr. McCombs, concerning chemistry's support for evolution's plausibility, is devastating. His scientific discipline gives evolution no assurance of what it has hoped for ... and the processes of chemistry do not bolster conviction in the reality of this unseen theory. Therefore, what was originally a blind faith, with some degree of plausibility, has devolved into a different type of "*faith*." Evolutionists no longer even enjoy the status afforded by ... blind faith.

But, even when science does settle enough so as to bring evolution's plausibility into disarray, most evolutionists just ignore it, move goal posts, or simply shift to other speculations. By the way, did you know evolutionists have discovered "*soft tissues from the bones of Tyrannosaurus rex and a Brachylophosaurus canadensis (duck-billed hadrosaur)*"? (Jeffrey Tomkins, Ph.D., "*Acts and Facts*", Vol 38, No.10, October 2009, page 13; <http://www.icr.org>). Do you have any idea what this means for all longevity models - and the plausibility of man's coexistence with such animals, as asserted in Job 40:15-24 and Job 41:1-34? Indeed, if science had an audible voice, it would say, "*Do not call me as a colluding witness to the theory of evolution.*"

The Atheistic Irony

So, if science has destroyed evolution's plausibility, why do evolutionists still cling to it? Well, many contend that evolution itself is more religion than science. That would explain its violations of science. Dr. Randy Guliuzza, a National Representative for the Institute of

Creation Research, said evolution “*is more akin to religious philosophy based on academic authority and consensus opinion, rather than real, observable, repeated science.*” He also stated, “*One area of creation research of great importance is writing technical responses to the highly publicized claims of Darwinists. Creationists provide essentially the only independent critical peer review of many evolutionary assertions published in the most prestigious scientific journals. Creationists invariably highlight numerous flaws in evolutionary literature pertaining to methodology, unsubstantiated statements, logical fallacies, and an endless stream of ‘just so’ story telling These types of things would never be tolerated in the scientific journals related to my fields of engineering and medicine. But in the unverifiable world of evolutionary literature, peer reviewers regularly let all of these scientific blunders straight through to publication.*” (“*Acts & Facts*”, Vol. 38, No. 12, Institute for Creation Research, December 2009, pg. 5; <http://www.icr.org>).

When I speak of biochemistry, genetics, or materials from other scientific disciplines - I have never presented myself as a scientist. A few classes, the dissection of a few frogs, and a few labs qualifies no one as such. Yet, I know the remarks by Dr Guliuzza are absolutely correct. This has been my contention all along. Similarly, I have never presented myself as a professional baseball player. Participation in Little League Baseball qualifies no one as such. But, I did learn the rules of the game, and have listened carefully to those in the game. Consequently, I can recognize rule violations and various errors per batter ... per inning ... per game. What’s the difference?

Yellow

I can only imagine the angst of scientists, who know the ethics and protocols of science, when they see evolutionist’s abuses in the name of science. I feel some of that even as a simple frog dissector. But, such is the situation in all disciplines. When any profession is approached with an agenda of preconceived outcomes, the results are “*yellow.*” Ideally, when in training for any profession, the trainers themselves should bring forward common prejudices and preconceptions that can “*yellow*” their work. But even now, the profession that gave birth to the concept of “*yellow*” still produces “*yellow journalists*” - complete with cheap, sensational, poorly-sourced writing that is presented as vetted and authoritative. In my line, many proclaimed theologians are actually “*yellow theologians.*” And much of what passes today as evolutionary science is, in truth, “*yellow science.*” I believe that is the essence of Dr. Gulliazzo’s contention, though he is more articulate, and less profane, than I.

The Bible’s Standard of Faith to its Adherents

When the Author of the Bible calls people to believe its claims (i.e., The Creation Account), a high standard is forwarded. “*Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen*” (Heb 11:1). The Koine Greek word for “*assurance*” is “*hupostasis,*” which means “*to stand under.*” It is a call to take something upon oneself, vouch for it (stand under it) - with the confidence it will not collapse upon you. The word, “*conviction*” is “*elenchos*” meaning, “*a trial in order to proof*” - not **prove**. The claim is solid ... and we test it - not to prove it is true, but that we might see ... it is true. For example, God says He “*formed man from the dust of the ground*” (Gen 2:7). It is not necessary we prove this is true. But, He is willing, and desirous, we test this assertion (or any promises) for proof it is indeed true. Sure enough, science has verified we are made from the dust of the ground ... all 28 elements of us.

God loves for us to discover these things. This is for our personal benefit - assurance, conviction, vigor and joy ... not for His validation. Anything that is true - is true - regardless of any contrary view. But, we have been given the opportunity, through scientific processes, to try many of His assertions. This gives us power to believe other things that will probably never be open to proof. Things like, “(b)y the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and by the breath of His mouth all their host ... for He spoke and it was done; He commanded and it stood fast” (Ps 33:6,9). Persuasion into young earth Creationism, (or any Bible claims) through honest investigation of all relevant materials, is expected - and is, indeed, the call. In regard to this article’s title, you already know what I think of evolution’s first male. So, what about ...

The Bible’s First Male

Concerning man, He simply states, “*male and female He created them*” (Gen 1:27). The word of most importance for our discussion is the word, “*them.*” It is astounding how much science is packed into that one word. Science affirms that meiosis requires the simultaneous presence of a male and female of the same species. It was always plausible that God created “*them.*” But now, when weighed against evolution’s alternative, this assertion is more than plausible. With a careful study of the entire Creation (and Fall) account, this accounting that He created “*them*” (along with other assertions) can be accepted, without reservation, by the Bible’s own definition of faith - “*the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen*” (Heb 11:1). It is also obvious the Author of the Bible is not cowed by the speculations of any evolutionist, or any contrarian, of any age. One suspects He may even be salting the wound, for when it comes to the first male and female humans, He tells us ... “*them*” names.

Before making man, the crown of His created order, we are told that “*out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the sky*” (Gen 2:19). At this point He does not say anything about male and female. But later, in preparation for the universal flood of Noah’s day, God ordered the animals to come in pairs (minimally), “*male and female*” (Gen 6:19). He is making it clear that both of the same kind, in the same place, at the same time, are a necessity for those that reproduce via meiosis. Just one, or the other, will not do. As these various meiosis “*kinds*” were formed before humans (Day 5 and maybe the first part of Day 6), we do not actually know “*who*” was the very first male. But each “*kind*” had to have its own specially created male (and female) anyway, so, there were a lot of “*first males*” in that sense. Evolution can not supply the physical “*them*” necessary for species that reproduce by meiosis. Science itself destroys any assurance of such a hope and such a conviction must be held with closed eyes.

Concerning all other living things, He could have told us how He formed them ... and when He breathed life into those initial life forms, and if He made them male and female or neuter, etc. But that is not the primary reason He authored The Book. Scientifically, He told us what He wanted to tell us.

My Evolution

In my secular scientific studies, The Creation Account in Genesis was never considered. It was religion, and its material - fantasy. I do not even remember attacks against its materials on origins as it was all just scientifically ... irrelevant. The Bible never claimed itself a science text anyway. I was an evolutionist. I believed in it. But, ... things changed. Sometime back, I decided it would be right to give an accounting for why I deserted the theory. This is actually in respect for what was, in some respects, a theory with some plausible elements.

When I was 23, I became a Christian. At that time, the validity (or not) of evolution was not a top-shelf priority. But someone in those early days stated that although the Bible was not a science book, everything it said about science was correct. Not long after that, I went to Genesis and read the Creation Account. To my surprise, it read as a historical account. As I reviewed the creation order, followed by Adam's fall and ensuing judgments, an interesting framework for our present physical reality began emerging. I realized I could not disprove the Bible's claims ... just not believe them. As the Bible had been persuading me of its validity topic by topic, I drew back, and without any forced effort or consternation, I sensed this material was indeed trustworthy. And I knew the science was there. This began an entire reexamination on the science on origins which necessarily included the theory of evolution ... its foundations and assertions.

I have found the scientific efforts meant to validate evolution have unintentionally bolstered the plausibility of the Creation Account of Genesis ... point by point.

For Example

Science confirms (as referenced earlier) we are indeed made "*of dust from the ground*" (Gen 2:7). But this matter of life - how anything is alive - is still as scientifically elusive as ever. So, here is the fuller account about Adam. "*Then the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being*" (Gen 2:7). The phrase, "*breathed into his nostrils the breath of life*" I believe to be an extremely laconic assertion. I am now quite confident that all initial life forms of each "*kind*" (Gen 1:21, 24, 25) were constructed from the elements of the ground before "*life*" - this energy or whatever it is - was injected into them by an outside ... Source. He only chose to inform us of this procedure - with one life form. This stands as a stark alternative to evolution's continued befuddlement. And make no mistake about this - science is baffled - about life. The more that is learned, the greater the shock. I now suspect that one Day everyone will learn (including each evolutionist) that life itself was/is alien to our physical universe ... meaning everything that is alive is - supernatural. So, as far as natural science is concerned, we will be finally proved as ... walking miracles. It may be just that ... simple. Did I say, "*simple*"?

Another Watershed Moment

About 15 years into my Christian experience, I took a two-hour course on Creation Theology at Emmanuel School of Religion, from a Dr. Robert Hull. The assigned reading material presented longevity model theories that mixed evolution with Biblical theology - hybridizations with which I was already mostly familiar. The course required a term paper and I chose to defend the declaration of Genesis 1:31, with an expanded, Hebrew rendering. "*And God saw all that He made, and behold (Stop! Look at this!), it was very good - extremely benevolent - exceedingly pleasant!*" I proceeded to describe evolution's view of earth when its first man appeared ... a world dominated by death and all its carnage, disease, injury, decay and natural disaster - a slaughterhouse. This is the polar opposite of the Genesis declaration. I assumed Dr. Hull was of like mind. He was not. I clearly pushed all kinds of buttons in him, and that term paper returned with more red ink than the original black.

After reading his varied arguments and logic, two things were very clear. First, he had no idea what evolution required one to believe and the inadequacy of the supporting science for it to be plausible. Second, to adhere to whatever longevity model he had obviously opted for, it required the dismissal of great swaths of the Bible - Old and New Testament. The most glaring

dismissal was the Bible's teaching about death - its origin, purpose and destiny. When Adam sinned, here is part of God's pronouncement: "*You are dust, and to dust you shall return*" ... *through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin*" (Gen 3:19 and Ro 5:12). Death is not a free agent. The living Creator has created it and it is He who imposes it. Death is His response toward morally accountable beings who have violated His expectation(s). But they are on the scene **first**, and their sin is the catalyst that draws death, and all its acolytes, into that scene.

All longevity models are built upon death. It is required. They dismiss death as some latecomer injected by God upon Adam - and the biosphere as a whole. But, with Adam's sin, the Bible asserts that the creation itself also took a great hit. "*Cursed is the ground because of you ... the creation was subjected to futility* (passive - acted upon) *because of Him who subjected it ... (and) the whole creation groans and suffers the pains of childbirth together until now* (Gen 3:17, Ro 8:20, 22). The word "*futility*" is "*mataiotes*" which is in a family of words meaning, "*vain, without profit, useless, perverted, erroneous.*" The finished creation, declared, "*very good - extremely benevolent - exceedingly pleasant!*" was not marred, defected, perverted, or dominated by death and acolytes.

Death has a destiny. "*(T)he creation itself also will be set free from its slavery to corruption ... the last enemy that will be abolished is death*" (Ro 8:21 and 1Cor 15:26). Freedom is on the way! I discuss all these matters more thoroughly in my ebook, "***Death and the Bible.***"

Pot Shots

As far as my points about evolution, and its conflicts with creationism, I really consider my work to be "*pot shots.*" I feel this way because I have not devoted my life to any particular scientific discipline. I have only written about evolution when I could no longer tolerate some ridiculous claim by them - or some theological hybridist. That does not mean I consider my points of no value, but recently, the goal for my work has itself evolved. Now, if any of my pot shots score a hit, it is my great hope and desire to down my "*victims*" into the midst of a particular group of Creation scientists. You may have noticed ... I have been quoting from them. If you are familiar with any of my work, you know I rarely quote anybody (just the Bible) as that is not the reason I write (my Master Thesis was a coerced exception). But, I have made another decision about my writing about evolution ...

I Am Retiring

Well, at least I'm pretty sure about that. When I realized this would be my last article on evolution, a sense of excitement overtook me. I have never retired from anything. I have no pension coming from anywhere, and Social Security, which I have paid into my whole working life, is on the ropes. So, to speak of retirement, at 56 years of age, is quite exciting ... even if my exchange of life for money marches forward. There are a couple of reasons I am moving my efforts elsewhere.

The Institute for Creation Research (ICR)

A little over a year ago (2008), I began receiving a monthly publication called, "*Acts and Facts*" from the Institute for Creation Research (ICR). This is a group of scientists and researchers from all the scientific disciplines - geology, genetics, biochemistry, astrophysics, etc. All of them are young earth, Biblical Creationists. It has become clear to me they are not only

thoroughly versed on the positions of their evolutionary peers, but they also unapologetically expose evolutionary bias and excess - and then forward alternative explanations for the same scientific data at hand. They are tremendous.

But, the second reason I am moving on is that the information from ICR is now beginning to so commingle with my own thoughts ... that I am not always sure where mine stop and theirs begin. I have no desire to plagiarize their material, and if they choose to read mine, I apologize for any perceived violations in this regard. The Lord will ferret out any transgressions on my part and grant proper credits. But besides all this, it is quite possible they have already written in great depth about evolution's first male - and eloquently addressed all the bridges I brought up - plus all the ones I glossed over. So, while I would like for you to read the things I have written about evolution ("*Evolution and Homosexuality*" (1999), "*Death and the Bible*" (2004), "*Why I Went From a Believer to an Unbeliever ... in Evolution*" (2005), "*Abortion; How and Why Abortion Resides in the Weakest Form of Human Thought and Valuation*" [especially pages 1-32] (2005), "*Breadth of Mind and the Bible - An Illustrative, Philosophical View*" (2009), and, of course, the rest of this article), if you want to skip my work and move right into the ICR materials - well, that is fine with me.

The ICR Scientists and Their Peers

Evolutionists vary in their reaction to the ICR scientists. Some totally ignore them - and remain willfully ignorant of their alternative theories and hypotheses on discovered data. Others mock, and seek to marginalize them ... with no honest examination of their materials. They also brush aside ICR's challenges of scientific protocol and methodology violations. Others ... fear them.

The Fear Factor

The collapse of evolution means ... a Creator. This opens a vast unknown many evolutionists want absolutely no part of - and is a primary reason they will never abandon their theory ... at least in this age. Theology! Where does one start? There are so many conflicting theologies and religions (and sects in them all) - the time and energy required to pursue such a search - forget it. Even a cursory scan of theologies exposes one to a sea of unsubstantiated, unverifiable claims - populated by charlatans and exhibitionists - complete with financial demands and power grabs. Science promised freedom from all that - and an evolutionist is going to ... devolve? If only they understood - the call is not ... to religion.

So, when fear is the deep chord that is struck, ignoring or mocking these ICR "nuisances" will not do. They must be silenced. But the truth is, when evolutionists entered science, they entered the supernatural. The attempt to reduce the marvels of science to random process is a failure of the first order. While such reductionism is offensive, when one understands the motivations, it is hard to be truly "*offended.*" When I was an evolutionist, my desire to be part of a system free from outside forces helped me overlook science that refuted the theory. But what is offensive is the degree to which evolutionists go to censure opposing views. The theory is not to blame for this. The actors are. The theory never claimed itself as fact. It is just a hypothesis.

Organic Glosses

While I did mention a few of glosses earlier (as I rushed over bridges), I was glossing over more of my objections to evolution's plausibility than I can count. For example, when

discussing the first half-breed cell, I basically stopped at that first one. Well, I did talk about the need for a mirroring, half-breed, receiving cell. But that was about it. Now, let's talk about ... ours. Did you know that our females produce all their little half-breeds while still in their mother's womb? They never make another one. They carry them through childhood and then, at puberty, release one per month. On the other hand, our males are born with **no** half-breeds at all. Of the millions and millions of cells, there is not one 23 chromosome half-breed cell anywhere. Then, at puberty, males begin making these little half-breeds ... **by the millions**. How does evolution explain this? It doesn't. How can random evolution explain this? It can't. Life ... is beyond evolution. All of it.

Inorganic Glosses

I haven't even touched on this subject in this article. I started the bridges to evolution's first male with an inorganic environment already here - ready and able to produce and sustain organic life. That means I glossed over - what - about 13 billion years (according to evolutionists) of inorganic "*evolution*" that randomly produced this astonishing ecosystem ... from a Big Bang? If you study the physical reality of this planet - its atmosphere, orbit, radiation protections, element composition - any scientific area you care to investigate - to actually believe this planet developed randomly is beyond a massive faith. It is fantasy. And to think these same evolutionists accuse young earth Biblical Creationists of living in fantasy land.

Conclusion

Evolution will always remain a theory, because it will never be proven. It can not be proven for a very simple reason - it is not true. Even though science is woefully weak on biological explanations, it is still strong enough, by its discoveries, to demolish the theory of evolution. There is absolutely no way evolution can get to the first male ... yet, here a bunch of us are, and there surely was - a first one. I have commented elsewhere that this theory will not survive the century. But I now believe its demise will come much sooner. Access to information via the internet is changing everything. And even though evolutionists have successfully censured alternative explanations from our educational system, their propagandizing has been met with very limited success. When their captive audience is exposed to contrary scientific arguments and alternative explanations on the same scientific data, it is amazing how easily decades of indoctrination is abandoned. Evolution, you ask too much. You ask way too much.

Now, a note to Hybridists ... you who mix your brand of evolution with your brand of Biblical Creationism. Many of you are not scientists. Most of you are not scientists. In fact, it is quite possible, only a couple of you are ... maybe. You, like me, have just dissected a few frogs along the way. ICR is populated by actual, active, credentialed scientists in all the disciplines. I am asking you to examine their materials on your topic of complaint that has you rejecting the literal six-day, young earth Creation Account in Genesis. Whether radioactive isotopes, punctuated equilibrium, the universal flood and geological sedimentation and tectonics, or "*yom*" ... whatever your issue that has you saying, "*God did not literally create this place in six, twenty-four hour periods*" ... read their take. Study their take. Write to them about their take. Write to them about your take. They have 40 years worth of material waiting for you.

You know, I always knew when Bobby Valentine (former manager of the Texas Rangers) kept his starting pitcher in ... one batter too long. He would hold a conference on the mound, return to the dugout, and then, after the ensuing three-run homer, call for a reliever ...

when it no longer mattered. God has stated some very specific things about this created order that cannot be relegated to metaphor or symbolic language. If you wait until The Judgment to get this right, the three-run homer will have already been hit ... game over. Everyone will know the truth then - sinner and saint - so, it won't matter that you're right then. I want you to hit a grand slam ... now.

I also have a nagging suspicion about something. Eternity is a long, long, long, long time. Do you suppose God is going to allow us to explore, scientifically, His handiwork in the coming ages? He allows it now. I would really like to be a scientist, as one vocation, on that side. Do you think it is possible those "chairs" might be reserved for Christians who handled accurately the word of truth here - when it was a matter of faith - and mattered in a dying world? Reconsider His claims. Proof them. Become God's scientist. If you are faithful to Him, He may retain you as such ... eternally.

If only Bobby had listened to me ... he might still be the Ranger's manager.

* * * * *

Learn more!

Bible position on Abortion: http://www.freelygive-n.com/Abortion_Argument.html

Visual Gospel Presentation: http://www.freelygive-n.com/Gospel_Presentation.html

Find these, or other FREE ebooks and articles at <http://www.freelygive-n.com> !

Robin Calamaio: BA, Bus Admin (Milligan College '90) and Master of Divinity (Emmanuel School of Religion '92).