**To: aron ra**

**From: neo**

**Date: 3/19/10**

**Subject: your web page / recent activity / "why does the bible**

 **mention unicorns?"**

**As your comment states, yes, it was well presented - as are many slick creationist apologetics. Like every apologist before him, he presented a one-sided, dishonest defense of scripture. When dealing with people who will "lie for Jesus" the key is not so much what they say - but what they don't say.**

**I watched his video twice and I am certain that he implied that the word unicorn first appears in Webster's 1828 dictionary. That is why he said you cannot apply the term to the King James Bible written in 1611. He even shows a graphic where he draws a line from the period, between 1828 and the present, all the way back to 1611, and says it is "illogical" to apply that definition to the Bible.**

**Now go to Wikipedia (unicorns) and you will see a painting of a unicorn done in 1602 by Zampieri. That doesn't look like any rhinoceros I have ever seen. In fact, it looks exactly like the horse that the apologist shows at the start of his video when he calls it a mythological creature.**

**It is obvious that the word unicorn (a "horse" with a horn) did not begin in 1828 with Webster as the apologist implied. Webster was apparently using the scientific definition and ignoring the common understanding. But as the painting proves, the public understood a unicorn to be a horse - and that was 9 years *before* the 1611 version of the King James quoted by the apologist.**

**As for the creature that Ken Ham believes is a unicorn, which this apologist gladly accepted, there is one tiny problem. It died out 126,000 years ago (see: elasmotherium) - so it could not possibly have been known to the ancient Bible writers; nor could it have existed during biblical times.**

**Like every apologist before him, this one has presented only the arguments that support his belief in the supernatural. Any evidence to the contrary was ignored and hidden from the viewers. With all the researching this apologist obviously did, it is impossible to believe that he did not come across these things that I found with little effort.**

**This example perfectly illustrates the result of irrational thinking - not only does it lead to wrong conclusions, but it forces people to be dishonest in order to convince others to accept their beliefs.**

**Creationists still await the discovery of that one bone that will disprove Darwin - I still await the discovery of that one apologist, with one bone in his body ... that is honest.**

**...**

**...**

**...**

**...**

**It's what I do.**