DEBATINES ...presenting the nature of creation

The "God Particle" and The "Sharing Gene"

There are many articles about origins that find their way into my office. Some are interesting, some are boring, while yet others are just downright ridiculous. Some are humorous while others intrigue me. A nice variety. Well, let me share with you the essence of two recent ones...

One was titled *Finding the Origins of the Universe*. Good! I always wanted to know how it came into being. Now, please understand --- I'm not a scientist, so I don't pretend to understand things too wonderful for me. So, I read the article three times to try to gain somewhat of an understanding of what's being proposed. Here it is:

Scientists know that matter is made up of elements, elements are made up of atoms, and atoms are made up of electrons, protons and neutrons (well, in the case of the atoms in my own brain, there must be a host of morons, too). Anyway, scientists have also identified sub-atomic particles. Some of these particles come together to form electrons, protons, and neutrons. Still others particles carry "force". These are called "bosons". Supposedly, scientists have discovered five of these, but there is only one that has never been observed, and it's called the "Higgs boson". Ah, now we're getting into the meat of the issue, because scientists suspect that this elusive Higgs boson could contain the very essence of existence. In other words, without these particles, atoms would have no integrity, so there would be no chemical bonding, and therefore, no stable structures like liquids or solids. So they are the bond that holds everything together. And supposedly, the discovery of this particle will help us to understand how everything came into being, at the beginning, in a trillionth of a second! Some scientists, therefore, have referred to them as the "God particles".

(Are you asleep yet? If you've reached this far, you might as well keep reading; there's not *that* much left...)

OK, so I found the article at least intriguing. Let's say that these scientists are correct, and that the universe had a VERY rapid beginning, expanded to what we have today in a time frame of less than the blink of an eye, and that subatomic particles exist that are the "glue" that holds the parts of an atom (and therefore, all matter) together. My response would still be the same – "Hmm. Sounds like creation to me!" For starters, the origin of all of these various particles is still not explained. Unless you're God, you can't make something from nothing, whether it's a monkey, a cell, or a Higgs boson. Where did these particles come from, and how did they get their unique properties? (assuming that the scientists are right about their existence and purpose). You *still* have an origins issue to discuss. Secondly, this would only support the biblical model anyway since the Bible has always taught a sudden beginning to the universe, and that God himself holds all things together (whether He uses a Higgs boson to do it or not!) Maybe that's why they call it the "God particle". I guess that's about as close as they want to get to admitting the truth.

I read that first article with interest. Here's another one that I found wildly amusing, if not ridiculous. Someone gave me a magazine from their (secular) *alma mater* that was concentrating on Darwinism last summer. It featured the studies of a professor of anthropology who has been going to Nicaragua since 2004 conducting research among tribal people to learn about "the evolutionary implications of their everyday lives. Focusing mainly on their hunting and food sharing, he has been able to test hypotheses derived from evolutionary ecology". OK, take a moment and digest whatever that's supposed to mean!

So, his last trip was a year long, and he concentrated his studies on game acquired through hunting and other means. Now, here's where it gets funny --- remember, this is serious, college-level research --- he discovered that a hunter was more likely to share the wild boar with family members rather than with people he doesn't know or is not closely related to. (!!) This amazing research, according to the article, confirms an evolutionary theoretical model known as "kin selection".

Wait for it, though. The main punch line is still coming...

This "kin selection" theory takes note of the fact that if a hunter shares his wild boar with someone else, it reduces his likelihood of survival and reproduction because he now has less to eat (forget the fact that he can go shoot another pig). So therefore (here's the amazing conclusion).....he **must possess the "sharing gene**". The anthropologist noted that, "In my field of study, the flow of meat went from households that had a lot of meat to closely related households who had little, which is exactly what kin selection predicts. It's a matter of helping relatives who need it." Are you kidding me? Kin selection! The sharing gene!

This man is paid to do this research. He's paid *money*! Here's my proposal: If the university will pay me, I will personally provide evidence for the "steak selection theory", which notes that "the flow of meat will go from my grill into my mouth". Furthermore, I will share it with my family (and anyone else) and it won't have a thing to do with "evolutionary processes" or the "sharing gene". □

Amazing discovery!

MISSION:

After years of research, the scientist discovered that a hunter "*was more likely* to share the wild boar with family members rather than with people he doesn't know or is not closely related to."