

Hidden Cross

July 2008

Dinosaurs and the Bible Update

Last time I said that about 40 minutes were completed. Almost half of those minutes had to be undone because they could not be used. But even without them, the new total is around 80 minutes. Just a few weeks ago, episode 4 became the first episode to cross the half-way point, and now is beyond that.

Creationists—Jellos or Concretes?

I was recently talking with my new friend Henry, and he said that I as a young creationist must speak boldly and confidently. I quickly cut him off and said, “Of course. Anything less would be an insult to God.”

I then related to him that most Christians I knew were jello creationists—atheists come along and give them a slap, and they start wiggling all over with “well, maybe it took a long time” or “well, maybe God used evolution”.

And then I told him I was more like a concrete creationist, because when atheists do the same to me, they end up hurt because I refuse to bend. Not only do they get insulted, they get furious.

When it comes to the Creation, are you an unbeliever, a jello believer, or a concrete believer? A true Christian is a concrete creationist or is insulting God with their doubts and spinelessness. Or that person may be no Christian at all.

Page 1—Special Notice

Page 1—How Life Began Rebut

Page 4—It’s Evolution Time!

Page 5—Coelacanth: Evidence of Evolution?

Page 7—Christian Quiz

Special Notice

Because of a special circumstance, some of the planned articles for this issue had to be replaced to allow for a formal rebut of the lies perpetrated by the History Channel’s new special on the origins called How Life Began. Because of this change, the new article layout is meant to argue against the deceptions of evolution that were purported by that show. For a full argument against evolution, see my college paper “The Scientific Problems with Evolution”, which was serialized in this publication in the Evolution articles parts 1-4. Back articles always available upon request at vertisai [at symbol] hotmail.com.

How Life Began on History

How Life Began was touted as this great new show that would answer the question of origins. Below are 21 problems with the thing. So, here they are:

1. They set up to mislead by talking about organic molecules becoming life. This is a misleading thing because most people hear 'organic' and think 'life'. This is not true, because in chemistry any molecule containing carbon is an organic molecule. Carbon

monoxide and carbon dioxide are both considered organic because they contain carbon, but they are not living.

2. They show computer graphics images of molecules and DNA and amino acids being assembled. However, they never address how difficult it is for these things to come together properly nor do they explain that one wrong molecule or a single one in the wrong place means the entire group is useless.

3. They use smoke and mirrors. Part of the video is a man going through a 'life factory', and for part of it, he stands in front of a red curtain and says life is created right behind it, but that because of security reasons we can't look behind the curtain. It's right there, man. Don't you believe?

4. 'Emergence' - greater than the sum of the parts. Emergence is then the all-powerful thing, neither good nor bad. According to the show, 'it is not some magical force, nor a conscious energy...'. No, I agree - that's because it is part of the creation. The Creator who made it is the conscious thing that set up the system.

5. They jump around so much as to disorient the viewer. Even I had a problem following some parts of it, and I have already studied the facts, so I of anyone should be able to keep up because I don't need to learn new terms.

6. They attribute thoughts and actions to single-celled creatures, such as 'changing their environment'. Of all life on earth, only humans do that. This is an attempt to identify - 'they do that, and we do that, so we are not that different from them'.

7. Jargon - some terminology that is used is not thoroughly explained. I believe they play on the possible confusion this would cause to normal viewers, because if they are confused, they can't refute it.

8. They claim copying errors were the source of the successes that moved from microbes to men. Of course, in the real world errors (mutations) are eliminated. DNA is not only self-replicating, it is self-repairing. If the copying errors are the source of evolution, why does our DNA repair itself? Doesn't that mean that the DNA is actively opposing evolution?

9. The Cambrian explosion is literally shown with computer graphics as having creatures just pop out of nowhere into existence. Oh yes, that's scientific. Cause, you know, there is that one theory that things were just created out of nothing, and...no, wait, that's Genesis.

10. There was a catholic person, an astronomer at the Vatican observatory, that said there was no need for a 'Designer' because nature is self-designing! But there was a beginning!!!!!!

11. It explicitly states that Genesis should not be read as a 'blow by blow account', but instead as stating that nothing happens outside the will of God.

12. It uses circular reasoning about half way through. Paraphrasing: 'We have evolved to the point to where we can discover how we evolved'. Wow!

13. Outright lie - 'We are willing to examine everything' - Except creation.

14. Dismisses spontaneous generation as a myth, but fails to explain that all non-creation origin theories must come to spontaneous generation eventually.

15. 'If not spontaneous generation, then how?' The fact is, at any time when life arises from non-life, that is spontaneous generation by definition. Therefore, the only non-Spontaneous Generation theory for origins is Creation.

the fathers fell asleep, *all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.*”

They run from God the Creator, and unwittingly run straight into God the Judge. They can deny it now, but there will be a time as surely as we exist that we will all stand before the Just Judge of the universe and, as sinners, what will we say? One day, my evolutionist friend, you will not be able to run any more, and you will have to give account. What then? Do not wait – turn from your sins and trust in Jesus Christ completely before it is too late.

The Coelacanth: Evidence of Evolution?

Many textbooks and science teachers teach that the coelacanth proves evolution. Does it? Evolutionists who write the text books and curriculum for those classes often claim that the coelacanth, since it can be traced back 450 million years, is a very good example of direct descent with modification. They also claim that finding coelacanths alive allowed them to prove their relationship to tetrapods (the first land animals).

Let’s look at some real evidence that disproves this.

First, about the coelacanth showing direct descent – yes, it does. The problem is that there is no modification like evolution calls for. The skeletons of the fossil and living coelacanths are so similar that it is far more like reproduction after its kind than evolution. Wouldn’t it be amazing if there were a book where a God-like entity created the creatures of the sea (like the coelacanth) to reproduce after their kind. Oh, wait! There is a book that says that. It’s the Bible – specifically Genesis 1:21.

Second, there has never been 450 million years. Charles Lyell, the first geologist to really push forward the theory of uniformitarianism based those claims on what we now know was a faulty assumption. He based his calculations on a the Niagara Falls that was eroding a gorge, and he assumed that it was eroding at 1 foot per year (despite reports it was actually eroding around 3 ½ feet a year), and at roughly 35,000 feet long, that would make the earth 35,000 years old. However, it was later calculated to be eroding at about 4 to 5 feet per year, bringing the first estimate from 35,000 years old to between 7000 and 8750 years old. This assumes that its erosion rate has stayed the same throughout history, an idea which is shot down well in Ian Juby’s video series “Complete Creation”, specifically part 5. Click below.

http://www.godtube.com/view_video.php?viewkey=cfed843b1b71c6a1b350

Third, before the coelacanth was discovered alive, the evolutionists claimed that lobe-finned fish, as the coelacanth is, walked along the bottom of the ocean floor. Then, one day, the lobe-finned fish just kept walking and walked right up on land to evolve into the first tetrapod. When we were able to study the living coelacanths, we discovered that they did NOT walk on the ocean floor. They swam, just like any other fish.

And, additionally, the idea that a coelacanth would evolve into a tetrapod poses added difficulty. Notice that the coelacanth has 6 main fins in 3 sets (3 sets of 2 = 6 fins), and a tetrapod has 4 legs (tetra means 4, and tetrapod means 4 feet or legs in sets of 2). So, how did a coelacanth (3 sets of 2 = 6 fins) turns into a tetrapod (2 sets of 2 = 4 legs)? How did it just lose a set of appendages? And how did it determine which ones it would lose? And, if it lost things, wouldn’t that inherently be the opposite of increasing information like evolution claims? Wouldn’t 6 legs have been a greater advantage than 4? The questions completely overwhelm the argument.

Is the coelacanth evidence of evolution? To the contrary – it is proof of creatures reproducing after their kind, just like Creation predicts and proves.

Christian Quiz

What animal are the following things describing?

1. Herbivorous
2. Very strong, with a large and powerful belly
3. Tail like a large cedar
4. Strong bones
5. Spends time in the reeds and swamps, and also in the high trees

Which of these does the description best fit?

Water buffalo

Elephant

Rhinoceros

Brachiosaurus

These things are found in Job 40:15-24. The first three animals may meet every one of those descriptions except one—the tail like a cedar. All of those other animals have a very tiny tail, much more like a small twig than a great cedar. Anyone who really thinks that the Behemoth of Job 40 is one of those other three animals, or any non-sauropod dinosaur, is a fool, and is suppressing the truth, most likely in unrighteousness.

Questions? Comments? Suggestions?

E-mail me at Vertisai [at symbol] hotmail.com

If you have a story you think should be included, or would like to volunteer as a writer, your willingness to help would be appreciated.