

# Logic, The Trinity, Naturalism and the Bible

Robin Calamaio Copyright 2012

[freelygive-n.com](http://freelygive-n.com)

## Introduction

If one chooses to be a thinking person, a lot of decisions are required on a lot of matters. One decision must be about the nature of all things around us. Was energy and matter always in existence? Then, did the universe, our sun, this planet, and the environment upon it, develop by random forces? Then, did this inorganic incubator have part of itself ... come alive? And did this inorganic planet birth something alive ... that at the same time had a fully operational reproductive system?

And what about [the development of meiosis](#) ("Evolution's First Male ..." - 4<sup>th</sup> work in list on male and female reproduction)? How could an asexual, fission-reproducing life-form give rise to another life-form ... that then reproduced with a cell containing just half the DNA? And when this "happened," and the very first male came into existence, so what? The engine of evolution for that creature was axed in two ... unless a first "she" mutated in the same locale, with ... an egg. "Hers" was the mirror opposite (half the DNA, too), but this half-breed cell had to be able to ingest (eat?) his half-breed sperm cell. Therefore, full chromosome level was again attained. Wow! This almost seems cannibalistic on a microscopic level. Yet, absent this mirror mutant ... when our first little man died, "his" life line would have simply vanished (Actually, without "her," I don't know if you could call the original mutant a "he" anyway. "It" would have just been a freak of nature.). So, these two mutants - and we are here - were infinitely more than just "a new species." Macro-evolution on steroids you might say. And she then birthed ... only a he or she.

Of course, if the egg came first (thus, the first meiosis mutant was a female) ... same problems.

So, the primary decision: "Do I opt for Naturalism (atheistic evolution), or is there a Creator?" This is a big decision. In a bit, I will refer you back to these paragraphs.

But, let's leave the physical realm and discuss some intangible realities in which we function. What are emotions? Are they some kind of sophisticated chemical reaction? What about intelligence? Is that just the fruit of some organic chemistry mix? To refine this more, what about actual thinking process? Is it just pathways of firing synapses? Well, if you are familiar with any of my work, you already know I have long abandoned the theory of evolution. All these things listed above have been created by the Author of the Bible. But for our purposes here, I now want to discuss one small sliver of our thinking process ... logic. Is this just a natural function or is logic itself ... a created "thing"?

"Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, and the One who formed you from the womb, 'I, the Lord, am the Maker of all things ...'" (Isa 44:24).

## Logic

... is a created thing. If this was somehow intrinsically a part of God's make-up, He would never be found contrary to it. But, He is - for example ... the Trinity. The Bible teaches over and over there is but one God. "The Lord, He is God in heaven above and on the earth below; there is no other" (Deut 4:39). "Before Me there was no God formed, and there will be none after Me. I, even I, am the Lord and there is no savior besides Me" (Isa 43:10, 11). "Is there any God besides Me, or is there any other Rock? I know of none" (Isa 44:8). "I am the Lord, and there is no other. Besides Me there is no God" (Isa 45:5). "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is One" (Deut 6:4). I have heard an exposition of this last verse that says "God" is plural here and "one" means "one collectively." Even if this is accurate, the Bible does not call us to two Gods or three. There is but one God. And yet, when creating man we have the first clue something else is afoot. "Let Us make man in Our image according to Our

*likeness*” (Gen 1:26).

## **The Son and the Trinity**

In many passages Jesus is clearly declared as God. I could spend pages on all the references, but I want to keep this brief. My main point is to get to a discussion on logic. So, bear with these next paragraphs as I point out a few things.

### **“I AM”**

When Jesus was contending with the Pharisees, they challenged an assertion He made involving Abraham. His response? *“Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham came into being, I AM.”* The Jews immediately understood this claim. *“I AM”* was the designation God gave Himself at the burning bush. *“Therefore, they picked up stones to throw at Him”* (Jn 8:58,59). Some time after that, the Jews *“gathered around Him, and were saying to Him, 'How long will You keep us in suspense? If You are the Christ, tell us plainly.'”* Jesus stated that His works demonstrated the answer, but they still did not - would not - believe. He then concluded, *“I and the Father are one. The Jews took up stones again to stone Him. Jesus answered them, 'I showed you many good works from the Father. For which of them are you stoning Me?' The Jews answered Him, 'For a good work we do not stone You, but for blasphemy; and because You, being a man, make Yourself out to be God”* (Jn 10:24-33).

### **Accepted Worship**

After a particular healing, the people of Lystra wanted to offer sacrifices to Paul and Barnabas (worship them). These two undertook an aggressive campaign to stop this. It was *“with difficulty”* they were able to restrain them (Ac 14:8-18). Peter corrected Cornelius as he *“fell at his feet and worshiped him”* (Ac 10:25,26). Apostle John, on two occasions *“fell down to worship at the feet of the angel”* who had shown him Revelation's material. Both times this powerful angel said, *“Do not do that! I am a fellow servant of yours ... worship God.”* (Rev 19:10 and 22:9). When Satan tempted Jesus in the wilderness, the final temptation was to end with Jesus worshiping him. Christ's response? *“Begone Satan! For it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God and serve Him only'”* (Mt 4:10). So, how did Jesus respond when the healed man, who had been blind from birth, *“worshiped Him”*? Jesus accepted the worship and then pronounced a great spiritual truth over it (Jn 9:35-39).

### **“Thy Throne, O God ...”**

Hebrews chapter 1 is exceedingly clear on several matters. For one, there is a clear distinction all through that chapter between the Father and the Son. Second, the angels are commanded to *“worship Him”* - Jesus. The angel that corrected John in The Revelation ... is among that number. And then, if any doubt exists about the Son's *“being”* we have this declaration: *“of the Son, He (the Father) says, 'Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever ...'”* (Heb 1:6,8). Jesus is God.

### **The Holy Spirit and the Trinity**

Personally, I do not see a tremendous amount of material on this - but enough to profess this as true. To begin, I want to point out something about the original New Testament texts that you may not know. The Koine Greek contained no spaces between words and no punctuation marks. In our translations, we have added spaces, all kinds of punctuation marks (commas, periods, exclamation points, colons, semicolons, parentheses, etc.), as well as all verse numbers, paragraph breaks, and even the titles for each *“book.”* For example, Paul did not entitle *“First Corinthians”* as *“First Corinthians”* ... after all, that was his second letter to them (See 1Cor 5:9). In fact, if you pick up a

current day Greek New Testament, you will find all these additions to those texts as well.

But there is one other thing about the New Testament text. When it was written, the only letters that existed were upper case (capital) letters. The lower case did not exist until [the Middle Ages](#). Of course, Paul and Luke and the rest of the New Testament writers would not have said they wrote in upper case (capital letters) because those were the only ones that existed.

Now here is where it can get a bit confusing. When lower case was invented, copyists began using it. Their first manuscripts were entirely in this new lower case with no upper case letters anywhere - not even for proper names. Even the word translated, “*God*” was in lower case. So, all the early New Testament copies were either entirely upper case or entirely lower case - with no mixture of the two types of lettering. So, any translation that has both (or a Greek New Testament with both), is already interpreting the text. The point for our discussion is this: when you see “*Holy Spirit*” (Ac 1:5) or “*Spirit of the Lord*” (Ac 5:9) or “*Spirit of God*” (Ro 8:14) or “*Helper*” (Jn 16:7) - these capitalized words are an interpretation - like a Proper Name. See how much different Proper Name looks from proper name? That is not to say such capitalization is automatically incorrect. But this knowledge does cause me to read my English translation (or Greek New Testament) with more caution. By the way, the originals contained ... no red letters. “*All scripture is inspired by God*” (2Tim 3:16). The only thing that makes any part of God's word weightier than any other part is the content of the words.

### **Text for the Holy Spirit as God**

In my mind, the strongest reference to the Holy Spirit being God is Acts 5:3,4. “*But Peter said, 'Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit, and keep back some of the price of the land? While it remained unsold, did it not remain your own? And after it was sold, was it not under your control? Why is it that you have conceived this deed in your heart? You have not lied to men, but to God.'*”

Normally, it is dangerous to build a doctrine on one verse. It is best to find several colluding “*witnesses.*” But is also true that God only has to say something one time - and the matter is eternally settled. One reason I can rest on one passage in this instance is because of the stated purpose of the Holy Spirit. In this age, He points us to the Father and to the Son - not Himself. Therefore, information about Him will be necessarily scant. Concerning the Father, The Holy Spirit works in us so we “*cry out, 'Abba Father!'*” (Ro 8:15). Concerning the Son, Jesus said, “*He will glorify Me; for He will take of Mine and will disclose it to you*” (Jn 15:14). The Holy Spirit knows that in this age we need to know the Father and the Son as this “*is eternal life*” (Jn 17:3). He is not directing us to Himself.

In this present age, even though He is extremely active, the Holy Spirit is, at the same time, in many ways ... “*faceless.*” I mean, just look at the name we have for Him: “*Holy Spirit.*” The word, “*Holy*” simply means, “*set apart.*” But all of God is already “*set apart*” from this world or anything else He has ever created, or ever will create - so this doesn't really give us much new information. The word, “*Spirit,*” it is from, “*pneuma.*” You can already see what words we derive from that - pneumatic tools are air tools. So it means, “*wind*” or “*breath.*” So, even though He is in us (1Cor 6:19), helps us (Jn 16:7) leads us (Ro 8:14) and gifts us (1Cor 12:11), He Himself, as far as His person is concerned, is still somewhat hidden to us. “*Holy Spirit*” is about as generic (faceless) a name as one could possibly come up with ... and yet be adequate in identifying the third person of the eternal Creator. There is no telling who He is and what types of activities He has been involved in prior to this creation and what we will find out about Him in the ages following this “*present evil age*” (Gal 1:4).

### **The Father and the Trinity**

Normally this “*person*” of the Godhead is referenced first. I am doing otherwise for one main

reason. By addressing the Father first, we always rank superiority with that - at least subconsciously. I mean, when addressing the Trinity have you ever seen the Holy Spirit listed and discussed first? God is God and all that means. If it is indeed true that this One God is somehow inexplicably three persons, there is no superiority between them. There may be different roles in any given work, but different roles does not mean superiority.

When addressing the Trinity, there is old adage that seems pretty accurate. *“The Father made the plan, the Son executed the plan, and the Holy Spirit applies the plan.”* But even this statement at least subconsciously establishes *“a pecking order”* in the Godhead. It is hard to break 1, 2, 3 from first, second, third. You know, it is possible that other enterprises God may create (or has already created) will be formulated as follows: *“The Holy Spirit made the plan, the Father executed the plan, and the Son applied the plan.”* Or, *“The Son made the plan, the Holy Spirit executed the plan, and the Father applied the plan.”* Eternity past and present is a mighty long time for our Creator to do ... a lot of things. There is no telling what we are heading into. Get right with Him.

For those who teach *“Jesus only”* - that He is both the Father and the Son - it is here I will impose ... some logic ... to a matter that is primarily beyond it. So, do what you will. To be sure, there are passages which may seem to point to such a teaching. For example, *“a child will be born to us, a son will given to us, and the government will rest on His shoulders. And His name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace. There will be no end to the increase of His government or of peace, on the throne of David and over his kingdom ...”* (Isa 9:6,7). It is almost universally agreed in Christian circles, this references Jesus. And then in John, Jesus said, *“I and the Father are one”* (Jn 10:30 ... but I don't know how they reconcile John 14:28, *“the Father is greater than I”* with their teaching).

Concerning the Isaiah passage, one preacher, pointing to the original Hebrew, said this should be translated, *“the father of the everlasting”* instead of *“Eternal Father.”* I do not know if this is valid or not. Concerning John 10:30, the word for *“one”* is *“hen”* - a cardinal number (neuter). It sometimes means *“one and the same”* and at other times is used metaphorically for *“one in concord or purpose.”* Translators can legally pick either. That is why it is important to put all related scripture together in order to figure out which translation option is the valid one. In this case, if one decides this is a cardinal number - *“one and the same”* - I guess they also believe ...

- At His baptism, **Jesus** spoke *“with a voice out of heaven, saying, 'This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased'”* (Mt 3:17).
- **He** spoke to the disciples from out of the cloud at The Transfiguration (Lk 9:35).
- When foretelling His death, He concluded with, *“Father, glorify Your name.' There came a voice out of heaven; 'I have both glorified it and will glorify it again.'”* (Jn 12:27-33).  
Ventriloquism?
- He fervently prayed **to Himself** in Gethsemane (Mt 26:36-46, Mk 14:32-42, Lk 22:42-44).
- He crushed **Himself** on the cross (Isa 53:10).
- He asked **Himself** to pardon those who were involved in crucifying Him (Lk 23:34, assuming those are the ones for whom He was actually asking pardon). Also other requests to the Father while on the cross ... were requests to Himself (Mk 15:34, Lk 23:46).
- When all things are finally subjected to Him, He will subject Himself **to Himself** (1Cor 15:27,28).
- He sits next to **Himself** in glory (Col 3:1, Heb 1:3,13, 8:1, 10:12, 12:2).

I could go on and on. You get the idea. But here is another point. When Jesus declared, *“I am*

*the light of the world*" - the Pharisees challenged Him on procedural grounds. "You are bearing witness of Yourself; Your witness is not valid." Jesus then corrected them by making two points. Let's skip to the second. "Even in your law it has been written that the testimony of two men (persons) is admissible. I am He who bears witness of Myself, and the Father who sent Me bears witness of Me" (Jn 8:12-18). He is making a legal case that rests on the grounds that He and the Father constitute two persons. If they are actually only one ... He destroys His own argument and it would be error to have presented this. Of course, ... neither are the case. He and the Father ... are two persons.

## **Terminology**

The Son, The Holy Spirit, and The Father are usually called the three "persons" of the Godhead. I do not know what is the proper terminology for referring to God - "person," "being," "entity"? I think His essence itself - what He is - cannot be captured by any word or description - as such things are themselves created. That is probably why when Moses asked for some kind of "title" or descriptive handle so he could tell his fellow Israelites who was sending him, God instructed, "I AM has sent me ...". Some feel a better translation is, "I EXIST has sent me ..." (Ex 3:14). No wonder the Jews wanted to kill Jesus when He applied this designation to Himself.

## **It Is Reasonable**

... for this entire subject to be one with which a thinking person would wrestle. I have only touched upon some of the various arguments and contentions. But, my biggest alarm for those who settle on "Jesus only" is Romans 8:14-17. When one is born again, there is an internal, **subjective**, experiential change that is relevant here. An instinctive cry, "Abba Father" arises for the first time (Ro 8:15). God - is **our Father**. I can not explain this other than to say that when "He delivered us from the domain of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of His beloved Son" (Col 1:13), when He adopted us as a son or daughter (Gal 4:5), this innate, eternal, relational understanding was implanted. "I will be a Father to you and you shall be sons and daughters to Me, says the Lord Almighty" (2Cor 6:18). Concerning any "Oneness" doctrine Jesus said, "And this is eternal life, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent" (Jn 17:3). We can't be in error about this ... and be okay.

Then, on the other side of the ledger, are those who insist that Jesus is not God. At the Judgment, everyone who looks at Him and says, "You aren't!" ... His response will be, as it has always been, "I AM." But I actually doubt such an exchange will take place. His physical presence alone, coupled with the sinner being found on His home turf, will instantly overwhelm any opposition. Eternity will be in full view. "(T)o Me, every knee will be bow, every tongue will confess ... All those who go down to the dust will bow before Him, even he who did not keep his soul alive" (Isa 45:23 and Ps 22:29).

## **My Relationship With This One**

I might as well just blurt this out. I primarily pray to the Father through Jesus Christ. Jesus is my mediator (1Tim 2:5). Based upon His blood (Ro 5:4) and His righteousness (Ro 5:17) which were granted my account at conversion, I can humbly, yet boldly, enter The Most Holy Place and set my requests before the Father and His throne of grace (Heb 4:14-16 and 10:19-22). But there are times I can be found praying ... to the Mediator. When Stephen was being stoned to death, he said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit! ... Lord, do not hold this sin against them!" (Ac 7:59, 60). These requests were not misfires. There is no hint Stephen was rebuked for this. The Christian only prays to God. He alone is our Savior and Deliverer (Isa 43:11). There is no other. Christians know this. It is an innate, implanted knowledge. Actually, the fact that Jesus receives prayer is itself another evidence of His

Divinity. And I must tell you, every once in a while I do say, “*Thank You*” to the Holy Spirit for His help (Jn 14:16-17, 26 and Jn 16:7-11). But somehow ... I never think I am praying to two or three Gods. He is One - yet three persons. Is this logical? Well, it sure **does not** seem so to me.

### **The Violation of Logic**

So, ... what do we call it when logic is violated/abandoned/nixed? It seems to me there are three categories for a “*non-logical*” position. It is either illogical, or it defies logic, or it is beyond logic. In my mind, “*illogical*” implies a breakdown in reasoning. It is irrational thinking. It is ill. To “*defy logic*” conjures the picture of an adversarial competition. In this contest, the defying position is “*sticking it to*” logic. It is like the rebellion ... of a teenager. “*Beyond logic*” is a totally different construct. It is not ill and it is not in competition with, or rebelling, against logic. It is beyond it. It is not even necessarily superior to logic ... just some reality that exists beyond logic's reach. This material about One God existing in three persons is beyond logic.

### **Why I Have Never Stumbled Over This**

By the time I began a serious look into the matter of the Trinity, I had already worked through other claims God made about Himself that had me in places “*beyond logic.*” For example, He informs us ... He is alone and has always been. He is uncreated - with no beginning and no end. “*Even from eternity, I am He*” (Isa 43:13. See Isa 43:10-13, Isa 44:8, Isa 45:5,6,18,21,22, Isa 46:9). He does not change, has never learned, and has always existed in all His fulness (Mal 3:6, Isa 40:14). He declares He knows everything, can do anything He chooses and speaks into existence anything He wants (Gen 1:3, 8, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, 26, Ps 33:6-11, Heb 11:3). He asserts nothing can stop Him from His choices (Isa 43:10-13, 46:8-10) and no contention against any of His values or actions will ever prevail (Ti 1:2, Heb 6:18, Pr 21:30, Isa 40:13, 14, 28). And He informs us ... He cannot lie (Num 23:19, Ti 1:2 and Heb 6:18). So, in these claims, logic ... is where? His origin (which never was), as well as declared abilities (of which we know but a few), have decimated logic as a valid exercise when applied to His Person long before this Trinity talk. His origin, abilities and capabilities are already incomprehensible. To be informed this One God is a three person “*Being*” - yet, is One - is just pile on.

### **So, Does God Abandon Logic ...**

... and are we to abandon it as well? Fortunately, the answer is, “*No.*” In fact, God demands we use it. “*Report to Me; let us argue our case together. State your cause, that you may be proved right*” (Isa 43:26). “*Come, let us reason together*” (Isa 1:18). Logic is on the table in these “*discussions.*” And know that our intellect, our evidences, our arguments, our contrary views on any matter toward His revealed declarations do not intimidate Him, alarm Him, or cause Him to cower. He is willing and able to field any and all scientific arguments, philosophical contentions, moral objections, or ethical complaints anytime, anywhere, anyplace with anybody. But though He may be willing to operate within the parameters of something He has created – logic - it is an entirely different matter for Him to be imprisoned by any created “*thing.*” He will not be “*boxed in*” by logic for He Himself ... is beyond it. This, to me, is itself ... logical.

### **Stated Another Way**

God is not in “*a struggle*” against anything He has created. He simply uses, or interacts, with His created things as He sees fit ... with His own agenda at the fore. He is infinitely superior to, and beyond, anything He has ever, or will ever, create - physical or metaphysical. This has always been, and will always be, the case.

## **The Way I Think of This**

Our goal, my goal, is to apply logic toward the things of God as far as possible, and, at the same time learn when and where it must be released. I tenaciously hold to it as long as I can. Indeed, the bulk of my writings are founded primarily upon the logical handling of His Word (deductive reasoning) so as to properly understand His positions on varied subjects. So, logic should be employed in every nook and cranny of the physical and metaphysical orders - but "*it*" is not God. Logic does not define Him - He defines it. It is not Lord over Him - He is Lord over it. Logic serves at His pleasure and though He may choose to operate inside its boundaries in the normal course of things, sometimes He reveals materials that demonstrate its limits and subservient nature. The Trinity is one such exercise.

So, the atheistic evolutionist believes ... what?

## **The Logic of Naturalism**

Probably one of the greatest promises of atheistic evolution, or Naturalism, is its boast about logic. Everything can be explained by natural processes - logically. All mysteries do have logical explanations. The unknown can, and will, be known. At some point, science will provide the logical explanation as everything is simply a series of effects that do have causes. So, a category of "*beyond logic*," as asserted above, is ridiculous. There is no supernatural activity, no magic, no hocus pocus. Also, the category, "*to defy logic*," is another unacceptable notion. Such a posture is akin to denial. If one looks at a tree and says, "*You are not there*" that denial will have no impact on the tree being there. And if ones decides to prove it is not there by running through it, thus defying its reality, the "*defier*" will end up splattered on the tree. So, for the atheistic evolutionist, there exists but two categories under logic: logical and illogical. And all illogical embraces are the fruit of some flawed metaphysical exercise. The atheistic evolutionist sees himself/herself as calling humanity to sanity ... to logic.

## **A Problem**

So, let's begin looking at the logic of the atheistic evolutionist. His/her very first assertion is that matter ... is eternal. Whatever it was, before it "*banged*" ... always was just there. The atheistic, evolutionary, naturalist looks us straight in the eye and with a straight face asserts ... this is logical. This ... we must discuss.

Everything we observe ... has come from something. Galaxies, their stars, any planets around those stars, and every single thing on those planets, inorganic or organic, has come from previous material. Nothing simply appeared out of thin air (Well, even thin air is something ... so, I suppose something might be able to pop out of it.) But logic tells us nothing pops out of a void because there's nothing there. Yet, the dense blot of matter at the center of the Big Bang, the atheistic evolutionist declares - was always there ... in a void - which no longer makes it void. Still, the logical atheist, asserts this eternal blot of matter was always just hanging there, or sitting there, or whatever posture an eternal blot of matter might find itself in ... in a void. I started to say, "*in the middle of a void*," but that would imply a void has an edge somewhere - thus giving substance to something that is nothing. And should this void be called "*a void*" which implies there might be others, or just call it "*void*"? If you opt for "*the void*," the word, "*the*" is a definite article, which semantically gives substance to something that is nothing. So we are told an eternal blot of matter resided in an eternal void of nothing until it blew up ... into that nothing.

## Speaking of Eternity ...

Any way you want to explain, defend, or advocate this, one thing is certain: such a belief is an eternal abandonment ... of logic. That means the very bedrock of the theory of evolution rests entirely upon an assertion they themselves would classify as illogical if anyone else came up with it. To believe matter has always been (whether subatomic or the “*God particle*” - it matters not: [icr.org](http://icr.org) search, “God Particle”), when every scientific observation that has ever been made, or ever will be, has some previous cause - is not logical. But as the entire theory is erected upon this platform, it is obvious the atheist is capable of believing anything he/she wants. It makes one wonder why they would have a problem with someone else asserting that it is the Creator who is eternal rather than matter and a void, the void - whatever it was/is - as eternal (But since void is nothing, how can it be said to exist ... eternal or not?). Bottom line: evolutionists simply have ... a different faith.

## The Atheistic Evolutionist's Call to Scientific Logic ... Revisited

If the Naturalist can readily embrace an illogical foundation (using Naturalism's own definition about logic), as difficulties arise on the journey to explain our presence, is it reasonable to suspect the embrace of other illogical positions?

## Our First Paragraphs ... “*Read It Again, Sam*”

If one chooses to be a thinking person, a lot of decisions are required on a lot of matters. One decision must be about the nature of all things around us. Was energy and matter always in existence? Then, did the universe, our sun, this planet, and the environment upon it, develop by random forces? Then, did this inorganic incubator have part of itself ... come alive? And did this inorganic planet birth something alive ... that at the same time had a fully operational reproductive system?

And what about the development of meiosis (male and female reproduction)? How could an asexual, fission-reproducing life-form give rise to another life-form ... that then reproduced with a cell containing just half the DNA? And when this “*happened*,” and the very first male came into existence, so what? The engine of evolution for that creature was axed in two ... unless a first “*she*” mutated in the same locale, with ... an egg. “*Hers*” was the mirror opposite (half the DNA, too), but this half-breed cell had to be able to ingest (eat?) his half-breed sperm cell. Therefore, full chromosome level was again attained. Wow! This almost seems cannibalistic on a microscopic level. Yet, absent this mirror mutant ... when our first little man died, “*his*” life line would have simply vanished (Actually, without “*her*,” I don't know if you could call the original mutant a “*he*” anyway. “*It*” would have just been a freak of nature.). So, these two mutants - and we are here - were infinitely more than just “*a new species*.” Macro-evolution on steroids you might say. And she then birthed ... only a he or she.

Of course, if the egg came first (thus, the first meiosis mutant was a female) ... same problems.

So, the primary decision: “*Do I opt for Naturalism (atheistic evolution), or is there a Creator?*”

## Random Development

The atheistic naturalist was not present at any of these events - and yet believes they all happened randomly ... as well as billions of other similar “*happenings*.” Actually, zillions. For example, that eternal blot at the center of the Big Bang is believed to contain myriads of latent properties. Once it exploded, all the laws that would govern its organization also travelled along. The other choice is that all those organizing physical laws were just dormant in the eternal void waiting for the blot's bang. Our blot got real lucky if that was the case. But then, logically, the void would not really ... be void. It would be full of laws in every nook and cranny of it - even though, as a void ... it

doesn't have any nooks and crannies. But the laws would fill it, even though, as a void, nothing is there. So far, this is all pretty logical to the atheist. I am still hung up on the existence of a void which is nothing.

But, just as important, the atheistic evolutionist also professes as logical that this eternal inorganic blot of matter was endowed with the innate capability to make part of itself ... come alive. Those physical laws were latent in the blot. Otherwise the void held the laws to make part of the blot come alive. But, it's void. So, from eternity, the blot held the laws to make part of itself start breathing with no additional elements. It was just waiting for the proper conditions to be made ... a feat, which from eternity past, also latently resided in itself. By the way, it seems to me that the atheist does need to decide "who" had the eternally latent physical laws resident in it - The Void or The Blot. I think even they would consider it a bit far-fetched for both of them to possess our governing physical laws ... and all those laws "happened" to harmonize. But, who knows, maybe their "logic" does say, "Both."

Boy, with these unknowns, it is difficult for me to hurriedly reduce myself to The Void or The Blot. But, ... that is how the atheistic evolutionist sees himself/herself. I am not sure where Carl Sagan eventually came down on this matter of the origination of the physical laws we live in - if he ever did (toward end of God Particle article at [icr.org](http://icr.org)). With his death, his atheist cohorts believe he was reabsorbed back into this post blot system ... which resides in the void. But, as a young earth, "Naive Literalist" (the Systematic Theology designation which I happily hold), I know ... he knows now. So, in these matters or origins, the atheistic evolutionist, is operating in science ... and its logic? Here comes a big point. Really big.

### **Cosmology Versus Cosmogony**

Have you ever heard of this? Honest scientists make a sharp distinction between these two disciplines. It is their responsibility to alert their audience when they have passed from one to the other. So, ... what am I talking about? In an article by James J.S. Johnson, J.D., Th. D., "Genesis Critics Flunk Forensic Science 101" ([Institute for Creation Research](http://icr.org), "Acts and Facts" - March 2012, pg 9), he explains that cosmology is the study of the cosmos (our universe) by means of repeatable, observable experimentation and measure. Results are available and verifiable to everyone and leads to scientific fact. Cosmogony, on the other hand, studies the origin of things in the cosmos that were one time events ... not observed and not repeated. For example, I know of no atheistic evolutionist who professes two Big Bangs, or that our galaxy formed twice, or our sun formed twice, or our earth formed twice. At least I don't know of any.

These things happened once. Cosmogony therefore necessarily traffics in assumption, hypothesis and speculation. The goal is to stay within some semblance of scientific grounding. It is here (in this example, cosmogony) that young earth, six day, Biblical creationists and all longevity model adherents contend. Stated another way, arguments are not over, let's say, the presence of stars and light and its speed - cosmology studies. All sides agree that stars exist and light from them travel at a certain speed. But, disagreement arises over the origin of those stars, their age, and if the light they emit has always traveled at 186,283 miles per second - cosmogony contentions.

### **No One Was There**

We study - to secure facts. So, let's just look at one star, our sun. No of us were present when it actually was "birthed" and no one was available to measure the speed of its light at that time. That is a fact. Just in this singular instance, atheistic evolutionists make a mountain of assumptions. Not only do they believe our sun is the fruit of a Big Bang, but they also believe the ensuing random laws we know and experience uniformly governed our sun's formation and subsequent functioning for eons. Such an assumption is as big ... as the Bang itself. Yet, ... no one was there. Still, all evolutionists believe these

things. These are positions ... of faith.

### **No One Was There?**

Well, the Author of the Bible says ... He was. The same One who “cannot lie” (Ti 1:2) recounted in broad strokes what He did in six days. Discount this, rewrite this, and strip it of historical merit at your own peril. We are told it is impossible for Him to lie (Heb 6:18) and this reads as a historical account. Its historical accuracy is even the foundation for one of Jesus' arguments and two of Paul's (Mt 19:4-12, Ro 5:12-21, and 1Tim 2:11-15). I once heard this statement from a Creation Scientist. It went something like this. “*The Bible is not a science book ... but what it does say about science is accurate.*” There is a group of six day, Creation Scientists at [icr.org](http://icr.org). They analyze past and current data in all the varied scientific disciplines and present alternative propositions as to how that material might harmonize with a literal rendering of Genesis - both the six day creation account and the universal flood of Noah's time. Their “*ogony studies*” are scientifically cutting edge.

### **Sunogony, Earthogony, Biogony ...**

So, in scientific consistency, let us now parse the first paragraph of this article. I will make up some words that are not scientific, but conceptual. That is my sole aim. We already know cosmology and cosmogony distinctions. So, ...

If we call the study of the sun, sunology, then the study of its formation is sunogony. Our sun did not form twice.

If we group all the earth sciences under one umbrella (geology, oceanology, atmospheric, core studies, topography, etc.) and call it earthology, then the actual formation of this incubator is earthogony. This incubator did not develop twice.

If all life sciences are biology, then the formation of life from inorganic materials with a fully operational reproductive system is biogony. Spontaneous generation, with or without this fully operational reproductive system, has never been observed ... even once. “*Mother Earth*” should be mothering somewhere.

If the study of heterosexual reproduction is called meiosology, then the study of the formation of this ability is meiosogony. No life form that reproduces by mitosis has ever been observed mutating half breed cells for reproduction. Never.

### **“Ogony” Studies: The Atheist's Metaphysical Pollution Travesty**

Biblical Creation scientists, referenced above, are immersed in all of these “ogony” studies ... and more. To prohibit them, their findings, and their challenges from participation in “ogony” discussions is an intellectual and scientific travesty. But that is exactly the situation in American public “education” - and probably most of the worldwide science societies. Creation scientists are shut out. This corrupts true science and is motivated by various metaphysical pollutions. What an oxymoron ... atheistic evolutionists dominated by “*metaphysical pollutions.*” This is hypocrisy of the highest order. Atheistic evolution, as a theory, boasts itself as being free of anything metaphysical. Everything is natural with a logical, physical explanation. Yet their own “*metaphysical pollutions*” of ego, fear, bias, close-mindedness, etc., dominate their work. For example, did you know that soft tissue samples have been discovered in Tyrannosaurus Rex? The existence of soft tissue collagen, red blood cells and other tissues in these dinosaurs (and others) is a bombshell. According to scientists, secular or otherwise, soft tissue can not survive a million years - much less 60 or 70 million or more. Bones become mineralized but soft tissues turn to dust. Many evolutionary scientists even admit 10,000 years as an outer limit for possible soft tissue preservation. Here are a few articles on this. There are more - and more on the way as such discoveries are multiplying. You might put these in a search address bar and see what you find:

[icr.org/article/4628/](http://icr.org/article/4628/)  
[icr.org/article/4130/](http://icr.org/article/4130/)  
[icr.org/article/devastating-issue-dinosaur-tissue/](http://icr.org/article/devastating-issue-dinosaur-tissue/)  
[icr.org/article/dinosaur-soft-tissue-issue-here-stay/](http://icr.org/article/dinosaur-soft-tissue-issue-here-stay/)  
[icr.org/article/fresh-tissues-from-solid-rock/](http://icr.org/article/fresh-tissues-from-solid-rock/)  
[smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/10021606.html](http://smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/10021606.html)

All scientific fact should be on the table without hesitation. Anything less is evidence of some form of inner metaphysical pollution. Yielding to this can only lead to error, propaganda, and ... mythology. If you are an atheistic evolutionist and simply gloss over these discoveries you are demonstrating your own metaphysical pollution. You are a hypocrite.

### **And Speaking of Fossils ...**

... let's talk logic. That Tyrannosaurus Rex was born, grew up, and died in a tropical (or, at best, subtropical) environment. To support animals of this size, those areas had to be huge. So how did he (or any other cold-blooded dinosaur) turn into a fossil? I live in the Temperate Zone. At the end of winter, when the bugs start hatching, a journey into the woods out back ... is to be eaten alive. And if something dies back there, the feast is on. But, those newly hatched insects are not the only diners. Scavengers of all kinds are rampant - from air, land and from out of the dirt. And all that time there is a continuous assault by an incalculable number, and variety, of microbes. Even plants, awakened from winter, ingest the dead. The assault does not end - until the carcass is gone. And this is in an area where winter kills off a lot of these munchers. In locations where it never freezes, the war to avoid being eaten alive - just by insects - is constant. Have you seen the size of some of those fossilized bugs? But even in today's, comparatively tame, tropical areas ... explain to me - in scientific, physical, naturalistic logic - how an animal that dies there ... can become tomorrow's fossil. Or how could some insect, or leaf, fossilize? That Tyrannosaurus Rex Mary Schweitzer discovered the soft tissue in - became that fossil ... how? This atheistic evolutionist was pouring her acids upon a femur, whose very presence she can't explain - soft tissue or not! She is blind with eyes wide open. She is not alone.

You would be well served to take a close look at the account of Noah's flood. Just read it. Then, let it's record stand on its face and do some scientific hydrology investigation. The power of water in a global flood can produce the physical environment for the formation of the fossils we find and the varied sedimentary layers). Explain to me an alternative physical environment - that is scientifically logical - that would fossilize anything. Remember, thinking people need to make a lot of decisions on a lot of things. Fossils in tropics? Think ... or go there, sit down, and think. You won't sit there for long.

### **Recalibration**

I am not against adjustments in thought when working on a theory. Indeed, as a theory, when a hypothesis is investigated with the hope of proving it, recalibration is the norm. The path to fact is not always a straight arrow, and unexpected results ... are to be expected. So, when confronted with the absence of missing links in the fossil record, I have no problem with the hypothesis of a "*Bush Theory*." When it becomes irrefutable that complex biological systems could not have mutated incrementally, I have no problem with forwarding a macro-evolution hypothesis. And I actually have no problem with the hypothesis that aliens "*seeded*" life on this inorganic sphere. That is an acknowledgement that life is too complex to have spontaneously generated and developed randomly and logically lead to you ... sitting there reading this. But the question is how far can you keep moving the goal posts before you fall off the field? There is a point when a team can too readily violate its own standards and disqualify itself from the game. Some atheistic evolutionists ... agree with me on this.

### **A Third Rail: The Intelligent Design Movement**

There are secular scientists who are now questioning Naturalism's position of random development. They are Intelligent Design scientists. They do not want to be confused with, grouped with, or aligned with Biblical Creation scientists. To boil this down to its essence, Intelligent Design scientists have simply become convinced that what they are studying could not have developed by chance. There is intelligent design involved. I am also fairly certain that computer generated statistical probability studies are beginning to overwhelm many of them. And this will only increase with time. Bottom line: they believe there is intelligent design (thus, logically, some Designer?) somewhere behind the physical reality they are studying. I imagine this movement is much deeper and wider than we know. I suspect many are "*in the closet.*" There are several reasons for this. Here are a couple.

### **To Come Out From Behind That Door Will End in Being Shown the Door**

If a secular scientist wants an early end to his/her career, Intelligent Design is probably the ticket. The reason is really quite simple. When they open that closet door, it opens to the supernatural. Why does it open to that? These now *agnostic* evolutionists are pointing to some designer or designers. In order to adhere to an entirely naturalistic stance, some have tried to turn to the idea of advanced aliens being involved in designing the physical realities in which we find ourselves. But how could they design the physical laws that govern matter and energy? How could they design the laws that lead to themselves when they did not exist so as to design them? But a problem just as big as this - that now accosts our Intelligent Design agnostic ... is time. Even at 14 billion years (deep time) - that is just not enough time for much more than, say ... us. Certainly not enough time to get back to some super race who popped out of the Big Bang and somehow designed a bunch of this. So lack of time, and the impossibility of superior races being able to design much of anything (compared to how much is now being professed as designed), means ... one soon runs into "*God.*" Maybe not the God of the Bible - but some kind of "*God.*" This, for the hard-core, metaphysically polluted, atheistic naturalist, is just not an option. Therefore, Intelligent Design scientists ... are shown the door. End of career. That is why I suspect most of them will not come out of the closet until after they retire and pensions are secured and grant money is no longer needed. Such is the state of "*science.*"

### **Why the Intelligent Design Movement is Doomed**

In a word, money. No grants, no teaching posts, no pensions, no tenure, no health insurance - plus peer ridicule and disdain ... equals doom. Of course, it is theoretically possible Intelligent Design scientists will be able to create their own forum and secure the needed funding. I guess it all depends on how valid they believe their work. Biblical Creation scientists are doing this, so maybe, they can too. That way they can, as one example, continue their work in revealing "*irreducibly complex*" biological systems which, they profess, point to design. If they step up, they will be able to continue compiling statistical probabilities studies that challenge the feasibility of macro-evolution as a viable alternative for the development of these complex biological systems. Also, since these Intelligent Design secular scientists are found in more than just the life sciences, they will be able to re-write the first few paragraphs of this article in a variety of ways ... filled with questions from their own field of expertise. These alternate introductory paragraphs - for the thinking person who must make a lot of decisions on a lot of matters - I welcome and look forward to reading.

### **Logic ... is Not Problem Free**

Just because something seems logical, that does not mean the arrived at deduction is correct.

For example, it might seem logical that the natural laws we live and work under (and discover and quantify) have always governed our universe. But this logical assumption may indeed end in grave error. I am of the conviction that the pre-fall creation in Genesis is wholly different from our current physical reality. Indeed, all the miracles in the Bible may simply be injections of laws that governed our world and universe prior to Genesis chapter 4. Also, following the flood of Noah's day, though our physical laws did not change, the environment (atmosphere) was dramatically altered (Gen 2:6, 9:12-17). So, the uniformitarianism of atheistic evolution *may seem* logical, yet be catastrophic error to the entire theory. It is obvious I am convinced this is the case. An error at this point affects every tenet of the entire theory. I have referred to this in some of my other writings as "*the mother of all errors.*" And this error produces offspring full of her "DNA." And it's bad DNA. Mutants all.

### **The Plague of Mythology**

Everyone, with even a cursory knowledge of human history, knows that man has been plagued by adherence to myths. There have been, and are, myths in religion, philosophy, and politics. Zeus, tabula rosa, innate Aryan superiority - mythology is part of, and an affliction to, the human experience. And then there is science, which also has its history of mythology. At one time, scientific consensus declared the earth ... as flat. Then some doubter proceeded to sail toward the edge but did not fall off. To be sure, to this day there remains a [Flat Earth Society](#) - many of whom, curiously, reside in The New World. I will let you enter into the logic of these folks. At a minimum, it appears that once a myth takes root, it is hard to excise regardless of contrary evidences. Flat-earthers proselytize to this day.

### **Naturalism ... A Myth**

I am not "*calling*" atheistic, evolutionary Naturalism a myth. It is a myth. Its own system of scientific logic, declares its own bedrock as illogical (matter is eternal) as well as its bridges of spontaneous generation, fossilization, and macro mutations forming irreducibly complex biological systems (not the least among the feats being sexual reproductive capability). Evolution is a theory built upon, and riddled by, illogical assertions according to its own definition of logic. It relegates itself by means of its own valuation system ... to mythology. But I do not expect the hard core, atheistic evolutionist to ever acknowledge that any more than I expect a Flat-earther to acknowledge the photos of earth from the moon as anything but doctored photos. For them, a real photo would show all the continents on that saucer. Also, it is not an incidental observation that evolutionists engage in the exact same behaviors as other mythology holders. They consolidate their turf and quickly excise any contrarian. They engage in internal politics, information suppression, peer ridicule and/or censorship - in other words, the metaphysical pollutions referenced earlier. Oh, ... they also are sure they are too intelligent to be myth-holders. It is everyone else, outside their circle, plagued by the malady. All who cling to myths believe that about themselves. Evolutionists are no exception.

### **The Bible - a Myth?**

I know everyone who read the last few sentences thought, or said, "*All that could be said of you, too! You are convinced you are right and are the only one not clinging to a myth!*" Such a contention is completely correct ... except for one thing. You see, I know I am capable of believing a myth. I have personal proof - that I do not readily forget. Fortunately, the myth I embraced, I started examining more closely. I exposed myself to contrary material. I weighed the evidences and arguments against my position, and then weighed them again. And I kept re-weighing both sides against the other. I am one of those fortunate people who once believed a myth, but was then extricated from it. I am sure glad I lived long enough to do this.

By the way, the myth I was fortunate enough to abandon was ... [the theory of evolution](#) (2<sup>nd</sup>

work listed there).

### **So Who Am I Trying To Reach With This Article?**

Well, if you are breathing, I hope to influence you. If you are a Christian, I want you to know that the category of “*beyond logic*” is a valid one, a reasoned one, and a reasonable one. The God of the Bible declares He is eternal, unchanging and creates out of nothing. What He wills, He speaks into existence anytime, any place and in any form He desires. For His own “*Being*” to be outside any created thing - beyond it - is sensible. In fact, probably imperative. Otherwise, dominion over the created thing, in my mind, would come into question. Those who reject that the One eternal God can exist in more than one “*person*” are bent on making the Creator imprisoned to logic. But if logic is indeed a created thing, then it does have limits. It really should be expected that He, in His essence, would be found beyond it.

As far as a six day creation event, such a feat is child's play when stacked against the very first verse of the Bible. “*In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth*” (Gen 1:1). “*By 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). The New Testament informs us that “*in Him (Jesus) all things were created, both in the heavens and on earth, visible and invisible ... all things have been created through Him and for Him. And He is before all things and in Him all things hold together*” (Col 1:16). To exclude this information from any “*ogony*” study is to immediately assign one to a narrower mind.

### **And the Atheistic Evolutionist? An Attempt at Vision Improvement**

Well, three points. First, don't concern yourself with what I believe ... or don't believe. I want you to look more closely at what **you** believe - and what you are presenting to thinking people who must make a lot of decisions about a lot of things. Start by using your own standard of logic - **naturalism's** logic - that everything is the result of natural processes and has a natural, scientific explanation. There is **no** supernatural, unexplainable activity at any time, at any place, under any circumstance. All can be explained with scientific discovery. From the inorganic blot to the organic reasoning creature reading this - the pathway is paved by causes and effects - including billions of profitable organic mutations once the inorganics had began respirating - having burst on the scene with a fully operational reproductive system. And all the laws governing this random organic development were naturally latent in the eternally existing inorganic Blot ... or somehow filled The Void outside The Blot. Don't **talk about** the logic of Naturalism - **apply it** as objectively as you possibly can to your own “*ogony*” declarations. And try to avoid jumping to any alternative scenario on the given point ... like Intelligent Design or Biblical Creationism. Blot that out of your mind (no pun intended ... well, that may not be entirely true)) and focus solely on your atheistic evolutionary assertions and apply Naturalism's logic. So, at this point you have achieved Tunnel vision.

Second, realize that every one of the Intelligent Design scientists came from your ranks. They applied the logic of Naturalism to their chosen scientific discipline and have concluded that natural forces and chance could not have produced the structures they study. You will find them in organic, and inorganic, fields. And keep in mind the tremendous professional penalties they are willing to incur (or currently bear), by publicly announcing their conclusions about this. Don't you owe it to yourself to expose yourself to their work for which they are willing to be moved into “*the penalty box*”? Such an effort on your part will then progress you from tunnel vision ... to peripheral vision.

Third, if you can move to the second point above, you know what I am about to say. The work by Creation Scientists, particularly the ones at [The Institute for Creation Research](#), is just phenomenal. You might think you are smarter than these scientists, ... but you aren't. They actively work with the

materials presented by atheistic evolutionists *as well as* Intelligent Design scientists and weigh that in *with their own research*. The result is the greatest of breadth because everything that has indeed been confirmed as scientific fact is incorporated into their presentations.

I bet you thought I was going to say you will then have progressed to 20/20 vision. No, I wasn't going to say that. I was going to say .... 20/10.

## Conclusion

So, the choice for the thinking person is between a Creator who created logic, but whose personal being is beyond it, or to embrace naturalistic, atheistic evolution, which, by its own definition of logic, is itself ... illogical. And it is not an option for them to devolve to an embrace of anything “beyond logic” for their own system as that would destroy their entire theory. As a thinking person, I hope you make a good, and logical, choice.

\*\*\*\*\*

Robin Calamaio - Christian in 1977.

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

For [definitive info on the Tithe](#),  
or [the Bible's position on Abortion](#) ...  
Find these and MUCH more at [freelygive-n.com!](http://freelygive-n.com)  
Listen, learn, live!