

Hidden Cross

- Creation Sunday
- Testing Evolution
- The Bible and Creation
- What Jesus Believed
- The 7 Bigs of Evolution
- Feathers – Evolved?
- Better Dead than Owned

Creation Sunday

Some of you may have heard of Evolution Sunday, one of the outcomes of the Clergy Letter Project. It may surprise some of you that in Owatonna, Minnesota, we have at least 3 pastors who have signed the Clergy Letter and at least 1 church that held Evolution Sunday, where the pastors preached the goodness of Darwin and evolution.

It may also surprise you that at New Beginnings Church the topic of origins was also spoken on. However, instead of praising Darwin and evolution, New Beginnings Church praised God and creation. I, being a member of New Beginnings, was asked to speak on the topic of evolution, and I gave the Crash Course in Evolution presentation. It's the first time at New Beginnings, and from what I hear, it's going to become an annual event. That is exactly the type of event I had hoped to start for some time, and now I have it.

Folks, there are two problems to deal with for the compatibility of evolution and the Bible. First, is evolution true? If not, why corrupt the Bible with it? Second, is that what the Bible teaches? If not, why corrupt the Bible with it? If either of those tests fails, then no clergy should be allowed to preach on it. Guess what – both tests fail. I will address each of these issues in the following articles: **Testing Evolution**, **The Bible and Creation**, and **What Jesus Believed**.

Testing Evolution

Russ Miller of Creation, Evolution & Science Ministries (CESM) has put forth the best information on this. He says that in just 7 seconds evolution can be refuted. This is how:

The DNA Code Barrier + Gene Depletion + Natural Selection =
Evolution is impossible

The DNA Code Barrier – one kind only has the genetic information to produce more of it's kind, where evolution says that they will change into something else. For this to happen, new and beneficial genetic information has to be added.

Gene Depletion – Contrary to the new and beneficial genetic information that evolution requires, all evidence shows that the genes are losing information. Every adaptation or mutation is actually a sorting or loss of genetic information, not the addition of information as evolution requires.

Natural Selection – The weaker organisms are removed, and it happens to be that the weaker organisms are the mutants, the very ones that evolution would require to be the stronger ones.

And that is certainly not all. The Laws of Biogenesis, Thermodynamics, and Conservation, and many more, all stand against evolution – it is scientifically impossible. As Ian Juby says, “The theory of evolution is neither scientific nor natural. It is scientifically invalid.”

The Bible and Creation

How does the Bible handle the creation event? Does it treat it as a literal event or a figurative one? Let’s take a look.

Creation is referenced:

As the foundation for Laws	Exodus 20:9,11
As happening instantly by God’s command	Psalms 104:30
As the thing that distinguishes God from false idols	Psalms 96:5, Jeremiah 10:11-12
As the reason for God to receive glory, honor, and power	Revelation 4:11

If the creation is false, that means:

There are no foundations for the Laws of God

God was powerless

God is no different than a dumb and powerless idol

God should receive no glory, honor, or power

God is a liar (because He tells us, in His word, that He is the Creator)

The entire Bible is based on Genesis 1. Every book of the Old Testament is based, directly or indirectly, on Genesis, and Genesis is based on its first chapter. And every book of the New Testament references Genesis. Indeed, if the Creation is wrong, then all of Genesis is wrong, and every book based on it is wrong, which means that every single book in both testaments – every single book of the Bible – is incorrect. There are dire consequences for believing in evolution.

What Jesus Believed

In John 3:12, Jesus said that people who did not believe Him about earthly things could not believe Him about heavenly things. In John 5:46-47, He said that Moses wrote of Him, and He asked the question, essentially, “how will you believe me if you didn’t believe what he wrote”. What did Moses write? The Pentateuch, the first 5 books of the Bible, including Genesis.

The real heavy hit is Matthew 19:4 and Mark 10:6, where Jesus clearly says that humans were created male and female in the beginning. This leaves us just three options:

- (1) Jesus was correct, and there was a literal creation just as the Bible says
- (2) Jesus didn’t know any better, therefore proving that he was not omniscient, and therefore was not God. This means that His death upon the cross is not really enough to save anyone from their sins.
- (3) Jesus knew better, and decided to intentionally lie to the people listening to him. In this case, he would be a liar, guilty of sin, and would not be an unblemished lamb. This also makes Christ’s sacrifice for naught, as a blemished sacrifice has never been acceptable.

Which will you choose? Scientists, in shining white lab coats, or God, in shining white righteousness?

The 7 Bigs of Evolution

The theory of evolution is a long and very complicated theory with an equally long and somewhat confusing timeline. In an attempt to simplify it, I have developed the 7 “bigs” of evolution. We will look at each of these individually.

Big Bang

The first big of evolution is the Big Bang. Most everyone has heard of this one. The Big Bang says that sometime between 13 and 20 billion years ago there was a gigantic explosion which caused the formation of the universe.

Big Time

The second big of evolution is Big Time. Remember that the Big Bang, the start of the universe, is supposed to be some 13 to 20 billion (13,000,000,000 to 20,000,000,000) years ago. That is a very long amount of time, almost beyond understanding.

Big Rock/Big Ocean

This is one step that can go by either Big Rock or Big Ocean. Talking about how the earth formed and summing up what the evolutionary textbooks say, Russ Miller says, “A big rock formed and it rained on the rock”. A big rock with rain causing a big ocean – the third big of evolution.

Big Molecule

Evolutionists argue that the precursor to the first cell had to be a macromolecule. A molecule is a collection of atoms (for example, a molecule of water had 2 hydrogen atoms and 1 oxygen atom), and the prefix ‘macro’ literally means ‘big’, so they are arguing for a big molecule, the fourth big of evolution.

Big Change

Starting with a macromolecule and coming to every plant, animal, bacteria, virus, fungi – even human beings, the greatest being in all existence – would require a massive amount of change, hence the fifth big of evolution: big change.

Big Ego/Big Pride

The greatest beings in all existence – humbling, right? No. This view of the human race is a very ego-stroking, pride-inflating view. Labeled as either Big Pride or Big Ego, this is the sixth big of evolution.

Big Mistake

The previous step inflates the egos and enflames the pridefulness of man. God is the greatest being in all existence, and according to evolution we human beings are the greatest beings in all existence, therefore we human beings must be gods. This egomaniacal self-

proclamation among anti-creationists leads to the idea that we determine what is right and what is wrong. Why accept the Laws of God when we ourselves are gods? The Bible says that every man does what is right in his own eyes (Proverbs 21:2), but what does the Bible know? If human beings are gods, then whatever man writes is holy writ, and even the most slovenly scribble sacred. Why, therefore, should one god submit to Another? And if gods submit to a God, then why not He submit to us? And how, if we do that which is right in our own eyes, can we have done wrong? And if we have not done wrong, we need no Savior lest some Judge be unjust. This entire mindset makes up the seventh and final big of evolution – Big Mistake.

In closing, let me say only this – creation or evolution? Which shall you choose? They are most certainly not the same – there's only a Hell of a difference between them.

Feathers – Evolved?

As the founder of the Young Earth Creation Organization and the owner of YoungEarthCreation.org, I sometimes get questions sent to me about specific matters. Most of the emails I get are specific questions about the site or articles I have on there, but sometimes someone asks a question about which I had not written anything. It is this kind of question I most enjoy answering for two reasons: 1, I get to help someone out, and 2, I enjoy the challenges and the feeling of overcoming them. The following is the question I received about the evolution of feathers.

Hi Brock,

I've got a problem and I don't know who to ask, so I turn to you. Here's the text from wikipedia:

As Darwin elaborated on in the last edition of The Origin of Species, many complex traits evolved from earlier traits that had served different functions. By trapping air, primitive wings would have enabled birds to efficiently regulate their temperature, in part, by lifting up their feathers when too warm. Individual animals with more of this functionality would have left more offspring, resulting in the spread of this trait.

Eventually, feathers became sufficiently large that they enabled some individuals to glide. These individuals would leave more offspring, resulting in the spread of this trait because it served a second function, that of locomotion. Hence, the evolution of bird wings can be explained by a shifting in function from the regulation of temperature to flight.

Is there any way to debunk this statement or is the statement in itself a fine hypothesis and just lacks empirical evidence? Since I'm trying to debunk evolution on every level possible, this is something I need to face as well. If you don't have time for this, you can point me to any page that would explain why this can't happen.

I would be grateful if you could help me. Thanks again.

And I responded with this email:

I'll take a shot at it, but I'll also try to find some good websites for you, too.

My best argument is this - how did the feather get there in the first place? If evolution can't explain that, then the rest of their argument falls flat.

Now evolutionists will argue with you and say that, on the feet of a chicken where scales usually grow, they got feathers to grow, proving that scales and feathers are similar enough to produce each other. What's the problem with that? Simple - the chicken merely took the information on how to grow a feather from elsewhere in its body and copied it down to one place on the foot. I've seen the pictures of a 5-legged bull with a leg hanging out of its shoulder/back area - does this prove that legs are essentially the same as backs? NO! If they really wanted to prove that scales and feathers are the same, why not take a lizard and make it grow feathers? They couldn't - the information isn't in the system. At most what they could do is take the information from another source with feathers (eagles, chickens, etc) and attempt to transplant it into a reptile. And this still leaves them with this problem - sure, they could theoretically demonstrate such a transplant, but that does not explain how the information for forming a feather got there in the first place.

The argument here with feathers is similar to the argument made by evolutionists about the bacterial flagellum. They claim that it came from the TTSS system, but actually the TTSS system is a deteriorated form of the flagellum. In other words, instead of something getting stronger and better, something got very, very bad and the organism was able to find another use for it so it wasn't completely useless.

Here are some websites:

<http://www.creationministries.org/showpage.aspx?page=14> has an at home science project (more for kids and such, but it's still good information) that is called "The miracle of the feather" or something like that. Some good points there.

<http://creationwiki.org/Feather> is also good - two good quotes and some nice pictures.

Also, I interviewed Ian Juby of www.ianjuby.org on Sagadii Radio... Anyway, I believe it was March 6th and March 13th where I interviewed him. He talks about some of the same things I included here.

I also highly recommend the interviews I had with Russ Miller. Russ really knows his stuff.

Ian has several videos on YouTube, as does Russ. Ian's username is Wazooloo, and Russ's is creationministries. Check out their videos for more information. In particular, look at Ian Juby's The Complete Creation, part 16 and the opening part, God's Little Creation. He doesn't speak specifically on the formation or evolution of feathers, but he talks on related subjects there.

And let me just say this - "*many complex traits evolved from earlier traits*" has absolutely no proof for it. It is most likely the opposite - complex traits and features becoming so degraded that they could no longer serve their original purpose, but in many cases I would argue that they were made that way. I could go on, but really those two options - they were made that way or they

degraded to that point - are the best explanations from the creation viewpoint.

Thanks again for asking me. I'll do everything I can to help you.

Brock

Not confident that I had appropriately answered the question, I asked Ian Juby to comment. He said this:

- > The quote from wikipedia is wild speculation, absolutely nothing more. It
- > is a fairy tale dressed up in a pretty suit to sound convincing. There is
- > not one shred of evidence for it. Saying something as a fact does not
- > make it a fact.
- >
- > In fact, the closing statement:
- > "Hence, the evolution of bird wings can be explained by a shifting in
- > function from the regulation of temperature to flight." Makes me laugh!
- > Unbelievable! This is very much the equivalent of a frog turning into a
- > prince. They're welcome to believe it, just please don't call it science.
- > Science requires evidence, and the evidence here isn't just desperately
- > lacking, it's NONEXISTANT.
- >
- > Ian

There you have it. Feathers did not evolve, and could not evolve. If you have any further questions, check www.youngearthcreation.org for an upcoming page on feather evolution.

Better Dead Than Owned

The United States government under Obama is going to be working on universal healthcare sponsored by the government. What does this mean? The government will be putting it's money into people. When it did this with the banks, it declared that it owned the banks or a portion of them. Therefore, if they put money into a person through medical care, they would then own that person.

The government will not hesitate to use what it owns. If someone needs medication, and the government wants that person to move, what will they do? Simple – deny til they comply. The government will deny them medication until they comply with whatever governmental demands may be made of them.

Many justify abortion by saying that the baby is a burden, and that it is the woman's body and the woman's choice. What, then, will happen if the government puts money into your body, meaning it owns you, and you become a burden? Bye bye burden – government's body, government's choice.

The statement I am about to make might be considered unpatriotic, only because I am denying the government their opportunity to buy me. I would rather be dead than property of the US government. Perhaps I should have a medical alert bracelet made up that says, "Do not

resuscitate if paid for by the government”. The government owns what it puts money into – will you let the government put money into you?

One more aspect of this is the nationwide medical library where all of your files will be available for anyone to access. If only there were an opt-out option, I would sign it immediately. No one has any right snooping through my medical files. The ultimate end of this will be as a trial system for the entire world. What for? The implantation of the mark chip will be a medical procedure, and this system will enable the government to easily, rapidly determine who has not received the mark of the beast, so that larger forces may be used to pressure them, or kill them.

Questions? Comments? Suggestions?

E-mail me

And while you are on the net, check out the following websites:

Ianjuby.org
nbcowatonna.com
Livingdinosaurs.com
Omniology.com
Creationministries.org