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Greetings from SABBSA . We are in the teeth of summer now and we hope you are well and possibly vacationing with family! This month’s **Communiqué** follows up on our discussion of two months ago in our monthly meeting we hen we explored the best and worst arguments against evolution.

We have a lead article which describes many of the arguments creationists should not use since they are out dated, disproven or consist of urban legends rather than true facts. Our brother group in Houston devoted an evening to watching Jonathan Sarfati’s video on this topic last month and we have been developing this article for some months. While not all of the “arguments” mentioned in this article are wrong or disproven, many of them are so controversial and so weak in their data support, that we suggest that they may not be used and instead focus upon the very powerful arguments we discussed at our May meeting.

We also have an article describing a new poll which shows that in spite of all of the evolutionary indoctrination our society, school systems and universities are filled with, the bulk of Americans still believe God created us and that we are not an accident of nature! Our message is getting out and is bringing fruit!

We hope you are having a great summer and find this information edifying.

**Wives tales, urban creation myths and creation arguments not to use**

This article covers a wide breadth of creationist stories and arguments which probably should not be used today. Some of them once seemed to have great validity, but subsequent data and research have left them wanting. Some of these stories are pure wives tales and urban myths and are to be patently avoided. The blue links give articles from the Creation Ministries International website from which most of this material was gleaned (about 90% of this material are direct excerpts from CMI). The Answers in Genesis website has an analogous article with many such links as well.

**“**[**Darwin recanted on his deathbed**](http://creation.com/did-charles-darwin-recant)**”.** Many people use this story, ..however, it is almost certainly not true, and there is no corroboration from those who were closest to him, even from Darwin’s wife Emma, who never believed in his evolutionary ideas. Also, even if true, so what? If a prominent creationist recanted Creation, would that disprove it? There is no value to this argument whatever.

**“**[**Moon-Dust thickness proves a young moon**](http://creation.com/moon-dust-argument-no-longer-useful)**.”** For a long time, creationists claimed that the dust layer on the moon was too thin if dust had truly been falling on it for billions of years. They based this claim on early estimates—by evolutionists—of the influx of moon dust, and worries that the moon landers would sink into this dust layer. But these early estimates have now been supplanted by new data which shows that micrometeoroid bombardment of the moon is much slower than first thought. I find it questionable how this new data so neatly fits into the evolutionary time scale and suspect there may have been some “cherry picking” of the data to arrive at the new numbers. Still, we have better arguments which are not open to such debate and we should use them rather than this one. See also [Moon Dust and the Age of the Solar System](http://creation.com/moon-dust-and-the-age-of-the-solar-system)(Technical).

**“NASA computers, in calculating the positions of planets, found a missing day and 40 minutes, proving Joshua’s ‘**[**long day**](http://creation.com/has-nasa-discovered-a-missing-day)**’ and Hezekiah’s sundial movement of Joshua 10 and**[**2 Kings 20**](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/2%20Kings%2020)**.”** Not promoted by major creationist organizations, but a hoax in wide circulation, especially on the Internet.   
  
Essentially the same story, now widely circulated on the Internet, appeared in the somewhat unreliable 1936 book The Harmony of Science and Scripture by Harry Rimmer. Evidently an unknown person embellished it with modern organization names and modern calculating devices.   
  
Also, the whole story is mathematically impossible—it requires a fixed reference point before Joshua’s long day. In fact we would need to cross-check between both astronomical and historical records to detect any missing day. And to detect a missing 40 minutes requires that these reference points be known to within an accuracy of a few minutes. It is certainly true that the timing of solar eclipses observable from a certain location can be known precisely. But the ancient records did not record time that precisely, so the required cross-check is simply not possible. Anyway, the earliest historically recorded eclipse occurred in 1217 BC, nearly two centuries after Joshua. So there is no way the missing day could be detected by any computer. See also [Has NASA Discovered a ‘Missing Day’?](http://creation.com/has-nasa-discovered-a-missing-day) for historical and scientific documentation that this alleged discovery is mythological.   
  
Note that discrediting this myth doesn’t mean that the events of Joshua 10 didn’t happen. Features in the account support its reliability, e.g. the moon was also slowed down. This was not necessary to prolong the day, but this would be observed from Earth’s reference frame if God had accomplished this miracle by slowing Earth’s rotation. See [Joshua’s long day—did it really happen?](http://creation.com/joshuas-long-day)

**“**[**Woolly mammoths were snap frozen during the Flood catastrophe**](http://creation.com/the-extinction-of-the-woolly-mammoth-was-it-a-quick-freeze)**.”** This is contradicted by the geological setting in which mammoths are found. It’s most likely that they perished toward the end of the Ice Age, possibly in catastrophic dust storms. Partially digested stomach contents are not proof of a snap freeze, because the elephant’s stomach functions as a holding area—a mastodon with preserved plant material in its intestine was found in mid-western USA, where the ground was not frozen. See also [The extinction of the woolly mammoth: was it a quick freeze?](http://creation.com/the-extinction-of-the-woolly-mammoth-was-it-a-quick-freeze)

**“**[**NASA faked the moon landings**](http://creation.com/exploring-the-heavens-michael-tigges-nasa-interview#moonhoax)**.”** This NASA hoax claim is an example of where CMI reminds readers that we are pro-Bible rather than anti-establishment for the sake of it.   
  
First, it is biblical to trust multiple eye-witnesses (cf. [Deuteronomy 19:15](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Deuteronomy%2019.15)), and one impeccable witness is the late James Irwin, who was a staunch biblical creationist and walked on the moon. Also, Australia must have been in on the alleged hoax; the huge 64-metre radio antenna at Parkes Observatory, New South Wales, was used to relay the signals from the moon, since it was the best telescope and it was on the Australian not the American side of Earth (cf. the Australian film *The Dish*, 2000). We can also shine powerful lasers to *certain* spots on the moon and detect reflected light of the laser frequency, possible only if someone had been to the moon and *laid out retro-reflectors in those spots*…

**“The Castenedolo and Calaveras human remains in ‘old’ strata invalidate the geologic column.”** These are not sound examples—the Castenedolo skeletal material shows evidence of being an intrusive burial, i.e. a recent burial into older strata, since all the fossils apart from the human ones had time to be impregnated with salt. The Calaveras skull was probably a hoax planted into a mine by miners. For the current CMI view on human fossil stratigraphy, see [Where are all the human fossils?](http://creation.com/images/pdfs/cabook/chapter15.pdf)

**“Dubois renounced Java man as a “missing link” and claimed it was just a giant gibbon.”** Evolutionary anthropology textbooks claimed this, and creationists followed suit. However, this actually misunderstood Dubois, as Stephen Jay Gould has shown. It’s true that Dubois claimed that Java man (which he called Pithecanthropus erectus) had the proportions of a gibbon. He therefore said his find “was more gibbon like”, not that it was a gibbon. This was said not only to fit into his unique evolutionary scheme, but also to counter others who wanted to lump his find in with “Peking Man” as just another home-erectus. But Dubois had an eccentric view of evolution (universally discounted today) that demanded a precise correlation between brain size and body weight. Dubois’ claim about Java man actually contradicted the reconstructed evidence of its likely body mass. But it was necessary for Dubois’ idiosyncratic proposal that the alleged transitional sequence leading to man fit into a mathematical series. So Dubois’ gibbon claim was designed to reinforce its ‘missing link‘ status. See [Who was ‘Java man’?](http://creation.com/who-was-java-man)

**“The Japanese trawler Zuiyo Maru caught a dead plesiosaur near New Zealand.”** This carcass could have been a rotting basking shark, since their gills and jaws rot rapidly and fall off, leaving the typical small ‘neck’ with the head. This has been shown by similar specimens washed up on beaches. See [Live plesiosaurs: weighing the evidence](http://creation.com/live-plesiosaurs-weighing-the-evidence) and [Letting rotting sharks lie: Further evidence that the Zuiyo-maru carcass was a basking shark, not a plesiosaur](http://creation.com/letting-rotting-sharks-lie). See also [A ‘tail’ of many monsters](http://creation.com/a-tail-of-many-monsters) and [Parkie: a new ‘pseudoplesiosaur’ washed up on the Nova Scotia coast](http://creation.com/parkie-a-new-pseudo-plesiosaur-washed-up-on-the-nova-scotia-coast).

**“**[**The 2nd Law of Thermodynamics began at the Fall**](http://creation.com/the-second-law-of-thermodynamics-answers-to-critics#fall)**.”** This law says that the entropy (‘disorder’) of the Universe increases over time, and some have thought that this was the result of the Curse. However, disorder isn’t always harmful. An obvious example is digestion, breaking down large complex food molecules into their simple building blocks. Another is friction, which turns ordered mechanical energy into disordered heat—otherwise Adam and Eve would have slipped as they walked with God in Eden! A less obvious example to laymen might be the sun heating the Earth—to a physical chemist, heat transfer from a hot object to a cold one is the classic case of the Second Law in action. Also, breathing is based on another classic Second Law process, gas moving from a high pressure to low pressure. Finally, all beneficial processes in the world, including the development from embryo to adult, increase the overall disorder of the universe, showing that the Second Law is not inherently a curse.   
  
Death and suffering of nephesh animals before sin are contrary to the Biblical framework above, as are suffering (or ‘groaning in travail’([Rom. 8:20–22](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Rom.%208.20%E2%80%9322))). It is more likely that God withdrew some of His sustaining power ([Col. 1:15–17](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Col.%201.15%E2%80%9317)) at the Fall so that the decay effect of the Second Law was no longer countered. It is however possible that the Second Law was modified in some way at the Fall, we simply do not know.

**“If we evolved from apes, why are there still apes today?”** In response to this statement, some evolutionists point out that they don’t believe that we descended from apes, but that apes and humans share a common ancestor…   
  
However, the main point against this statement is that many evolutionists believe that a small group of creatures (apes) split off from the main group and became reproductively isolated from the main large population, and that most change happened in the small group which can lead to allopatric speciation (a geographically isolated population forming a new species). So there’s nothing in evolutionary theory that requires the main group to become extinct.   
  
It’s important to note that allopatric speciation is not the sole property of evolutionists—creationists believe that most human variation occurred after small groups became isolated (but not speciated) at Babel, while Adam and Eve probably had mid-brown skin color. The quoted erroneous statement is analogous to saying ‘If all people groups came from Adam and Eve, then why are mid-brown people still alive today?’   
  
So what’s the difference between the creationist explanation of people groups (‘[races](http://creation.com/racism-questions-and-answers)’) and the evolutionist explanation of people origins? Answer: the former involves separation of already-existing information and loss of information through mutations; the latter requires the generation of tens of millions of ‘letters’ of new information.

**“Women have one more rib than men.”** We have long pointed out the fallacy of this statement, which seems to be more popular with dishonest skeptics wanting to caricature creation. The removal of a rib would not affect the genetic instructions passed on to the offspring, any more than a man who loses a finger will have sons with nine fingers. Any skeptic who tries to discredit the Bible with this argument must be a closet Lamarckian, i.e. one who believes Lamarck’s thoroughly discredited idea of inheritance of acquired characteristics! Note also that Adam wouldn’t have had a permanent defect, because the rib is the one bone that can regrow if the surrounding membrane (periosteum) is left intact. See [Regenerating ribs: Adam and that ‘missing’ rib](http://creation.com/regenerating-ribs-adam-and-that-missing-rib).

**“**[**Archaeopteryx is a fraud**](http://creation.com/archaeopteryx-unlike-archaeoraptor-is-not-a-hoax-it-is-a-true-bird-not-a-missing-link)**.”** Archaeopteryxwas genuine (unlike [Archaeoraptor, a ‘Piltdown bird’](http://creation.com/archaeoraptor-phony-feathered-fossil)), as shown by anatomical studies and close analysis of the fossil slab. It was a true bird, not a ‘missing link’. In fact by evolutionary dating, we find evidence of other fully formed birds in strata much deeper than archaeopteryx, and thus is could not be transitional since the grandson cannot predate his grandfather!

**“There are no beneficial mutations.”** This is not true, since some changes do confer an advantage in some situations. Rather, we should say, ‘We have yet to find a mutation that increases genetic information in ways needed for microbes-to-man evolution to be feasible (what I call “positive speciation”). Even in those rare instances where the mutation confers an advantage they almost always cause loss of information.’ For examples of information loss being advantageous, see [Beetle Bloopers: defects can be an advantage sometimes](http://creation.com/beetle-bloopers), [New eyes for blind cave fish?](http://creation.com/new-eyes-for-blind-cave-fish) and [Is antibiotic resistance really due to increase in information?](http://creation.com/is-antibiotic-resistance-really-due-to-increase-in-information)

**“No new species have been produced.”** This is not true—new species have been observed to form. In fact, rapid speciation is an important part of the creation model. But this speciation is within the ‘kind’, and involves no new genetic information. What you get into with this argument is a semantic argument on what is a species from a naturalistic and biblical view and the two worldviews cannot be meshed so that you get good agreement. I can tell you from experience that this is an argument you cannot come to any agreement with an evolutionist on so don’t try.—see [Q&A: Speciation](http://creation.com/speciation-questions-and-answers). Fixity of species was actually taught by [Darwin’s anti-biblical mentor Charles Lyell](http://creation.com/charles-lyell-free-science-from-moses).

**“Earth’s axis was vertical before the Flood.”** There is no basis for this claim. Seasons are mentioned in [Genesis 1:14](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Genesis%201.14)before the Flood, which strongly suggests an axial tilt from the beginning. Some creationists believe that a change in axial tilt (but not from the vertical) started Noah’s Flood. But a lot more evidence is needed and this idea should be regarded as speculative for now. Furthermore, computer modeling suggests that an upright axis would make temperature differences between the poles and equator far more extreme than now, while the current tilt of 23.5° is ideal. The Moon has an important function in stabilizing this tilt, and the Moon’s large relative size and the fact that its orbital plane is close to the Earth’s (unlike most moons in our solar system) are design features.

**“**[**Paluxy tracks**](http://www.icr.org/index.php?module=articles&action=view&ID=255)**prove that humans and dinosaurs co-existed.”** Some prominent creationist promoters of these tracks have long since withdrawn their support, others faithfully stand by them. This is a controversial topic and with all the other evidence we have may be best left aside. There is a need for properly documented research on the tracks before we would use them to argue the coexistence of humans and dinosaurs. however—see [Human and dinosaur fossil footprints in the Upper Cretaceous of North America?](http://creation.com/human-and-dinosaur-fossil-footprints) But this does not mean that there isn’t good evidence that dinosaurs and humans co-existed—see[Q&A: Dinosaurs](http://creation.com/dinosaur-questions-and-answers).

**Archaeologists have found skeletons (and footprints) of giant human beings.**This claim has been circulated through the Internet for years, but in reality the images associated with it were manipulated in Photoshop. An article on the Snopes site, which fairly analyses urban legends and internet claims, explains the provenance of each of the most common photographs attached to these emails (snopes.com/photos/odd/giantman.asp). In reality, greatly scaled up humans would be anatomically impossible for simple mathematical reasons—the square-cube law means that a human scaled up four times would have a skeleton and muscles 16 (4²) times stronger, but these would have to cope with a mass 64 (4³) times greater. So a greatly scaled up human would collapse under his own weight without many physiological and skeletal (thus genetic) changes to cope with the added mass. See the classic 1928 essay “On Being the Right Size” (irl.cs.ucla.edu/papers/right-size.html) by J.B.S. Haldane (a prominent evolutionist, but on this matter he here makes very good points). There have also been some claims of giant footprints, but see [The ‘giant footprint’ of South Africa: Firewalking giant or fortuitous weathering?](http://creation.com/giant-footprint) which shows the problems with this particular identification. Also, some take remains of giants as proof of the Bible’s account of the *Nephilim* in [Genesis 6:4](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Genesis%206.4), but this word should not be translated “giants” but “fallen ones”—see [Who were the “sons of God” in Genesis 6?](http://creation.com/images/pdfs/articles/sons-of-god-genesis-6.pdf)

**Darwin’s quote about the absurdity of eye evolution from Origin of Species.** Citing his statement at face value is subtly out of context. Darwin was talking about its seeming absurdity but then proceeded to describe in his book an imagined way that the eye could be built step-by-step (in his opinion, with which we obviously disagree) so he first called the whole idea absurd, then proceeded to tell us how it might have happened! How conflicted can you get! —see [Darwin v The Eye](http://creation.com/charles-darwin-vs-the-eye)and [An eye for creation](http://creation.com/an-eye-for-creation-george-marshall-interview)).

**“Earth’s division in the days of Peleg (**[**Gen. 10:25**](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Gen.%2010.25)**) refers to catastrophic splitting of the continents.”** Commentators both before and after Lyell and Darwin (including Calvin, Keil and Delitzsch, and Leupold) are almost unanimous that this passage refers to linguistic division at Babel and subsequent territorial division. We should always interpret Scripture with Scripture, and there’s nothing else in Scripture to indicate that this referred to continental division. But only eight verses on (note that chapter and verse divisions were not inspired), the Bible states, ‘Now the whole earth had one language and one speech’ ([Gen. 11:1](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Gen.%2011.1)), and as a result of their disobedience,‘the LORD confused the language of all the earth’ ([Gen. 11:9](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Gen.%2011.9)). This conclusively proves that the ‘Earth’ that was divided was the same Earth that spoke only one language, i.e. ‘Earth’ refers in this context to the people of the Earth, not Planet Earth.   
  
Another major problem is the scientific consequences of such splitting—another global flood! This gives us the clue as to when the continents did move apart—during Noah’s Flood—see below on [plate tectonics](http://creation.com/arguments-we-think-creationists-should-not-use#tectonics). Dr. Daniel Harris of SABBSA disagrees with most of these interpretations however, and even suggests that the supposed problems of continental divide after the flood is in fact mitigation for the huge heat necessary for all continental division to have happened during the flood. He will be happy to talk to you any of our meetings about his theories or email us at [www.infor@sabbsa.org](http://www.infor@sabbsa.org) for more information.  
  
For more information, see [‘In Peleg’s days, days the earth was divided’: What does this mean?](http://creation.com/in-pelegs-days-the-earth-was-divided) …

**“Jesus cannot have inherited genetic material from Mary, otherwise He would have inherited original sin.”** This is not stated in Scripture and even contradicts important points. The language of the NT indicates physical descent, which must be true for Jesus to have fulfilled the prophecies that He would be a descendant of Abraham, Jacob, Judah and David. Also, the Protevangelium of [Gen. 3:15](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Gen.%203.15), regarded as Messianic by both early Christians and the Jewish Targums, refers to ‘the seed of the woman’. This is supported by [Gal. 4:4](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Gal.%204.4), ‘God sent forth His Son, coming (genomenon) from a woman.’ Most importantly, for Jesus to have died for our sins, Jesus, the ‘last Adam’ (1 Cor. 15:45), had to share in our humanity ([Heb. 2:14](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Heb.%202.14)), so must have been our relative via common descent from the first Adam as [Luke 3:38](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Luke%203.38) says. In fact, seven centuries before His Incarnation, the Prophet Isaiah spoke of Him as literally the ‘Kinsman-Redeemer’, i.e. one who is related by blood to those he redeems ([Isaiah 59:20](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Isaiah%2059.20), uses the same Hebrew word goel as used to describe Boaz in relation to Naomi in [Ruth 2:20](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Ruth%202.20), [3:1–4:17](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Ruth%203.1%E2%80%934.17)). To answer the concern about original sin, the Holy Spirit overshadowed Mary ([Luke 1:35](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Luke%201.35)), preventing any sin nature being transmitted. See also [The Virginal Conception of Christ](http://creation.com/the-virginal-conception-of-christ) for a defense of this foundational doctrine and further discussion of these Biblical passages.

**‘Light was created in transit.’** Some older creationist works, as a solution to the distant starlight problem, proposed that God may have created the light in transit. But CMI long ago pointed out the problems with this idea.   
  
It would entail that we would be seeing light from heavenly bodies that don’t really exist; and even light that seems to indicate precise sequences of events predictable by the laws of physics, but which never actually happened. This, in effect, suggests that God is a deceiver.   
  
For example, when a large star explodes as a supernova, we see a neutrino burst before we see the electromagnetic radiation. This is because most neutrinos pass through solid matter as if it were not there, while light is slowed down. This sequence of events carries information recording an apparently real event. So astronomers are perfectly justified in interpreting this ‘message’ as a real supernova that exploded according to the laws of physics, with observations as predicted by those same laws.   
  
This is very different from creating Adam as fully grown, looking like a 20-year-old (although incredibly youthful looking), say, although he was really only a few minutes old. Here, there is no deception, because God has told us that He created Adam from the dust, not by growing from an infant. But God has also told us that the stars are real, and that they are signs ([Genesis 1:14](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Genesis%201.14)), not just apparitions from light waves.   
  
In answering the distant starlight question, first point out that [big bangers have their own problem with light travel time](http://creation.com/2002); second, point to relativistic time dilation, as first proposed by [Dr Russell Humphreys](http://creation.com/d-russell-humphreys-cv), and extended by [Dr John Hartnett](http://creation.com/dr-john-hartnett-cv) with Carmelian Cosmological Relativity. See the [Creation Answers Book](http://creation.com/store_redirect.php?sku=10-2-505), [Chapter 5: How can we see stars in a young universe?](http://creation.com/images/pdfs/cabook/chapter5.pdf" \t "_blank), as well as Dr Hartnett’s new book [Starlight, Time and the New Physics](http://creation.com/store_redirect.php?sku=10-3-505).

**“Geocentrism (in the classical sense of taking the Earth as an *absolute* reference frame) is taught by Scripture and Heliocentrism is anti-Scriptural.”** We reject this dogmatic geocentrism, and believes that the Biblical passages about sunset etc. should be understood as taking the Earth as a reference frame, but that this is one of many physically valid reference frames; the centre of mass of the solar system is also a valid reference frame. See also [Q&A: Geocentrism](http://creation.com/solar-exoplanet-qa#geocentrism), Faulkner, D., [Geocentrism and Creation](http://creation.com/geocentrism-and-creation),TJ**15**(2):110–121; 2001.

**“**[**Ron Wyatt has found Noah’s Ark**](http://creation.com/special-report-amazing-ark-expose)**”** This claimed Ark shape is a natural geological formation caused by a mud flow.

**“**[**Ron Wyatt has found much archaeological proof of the Bible**](http://creation.com/has-the-ark-of-the-covenant-been-found)**”** There is not the slightest substantiation for Wyatt’s claims, just excuses to explain away why the evidence is missing…

**“Missing solar neutrinos prove that the sun shines by gravitational collapse, and is proof of a young sun.”** This is about a formerly vexing problem of detecting only one third of the predicted numbers of neutrinos from the sun. Also, accepted theories of particle physics said that the neutrino had zero rest mass, which would prohibit oscillations from one ‘flavour’ to another. Therefore, consistent with the data then available, some creationists proposed that the sun was powered one-third by fusion and two-thirds by gravitational collapse. This would have limited the age to far less than 4.5 billion years. [See subsequent article [‘Missing’ neutrinos found! No longer an ‘age’ indicator](http://creation.com/missing-neutrinos-found-no-longer-an-age-indicator) Ed.]   
  
However, a new experiment was able to detect the ‘missing’ flavours, which seems to provide conclusive evidence for oscillation. This means that neutrinos must have a very tiny rest mass after all—experimental data must take precedence over theory. Therefore creationists should no longer invoke the missing neutrino problem to deny that fusion is the primary source of energy for the sun. So it cannot be used as a young-age indicator—nor an old-age indicator for that matter. See Newton, R., Missing neutrinos found! No longer an ‘age’ indicator, TJ**16**(3):123–125, 2002. Dr. Harris of SABBSA can be very helpful in answering questions on this topic.

**‘Einstein held unswervingly, against enormous peer pressure, to belief in a Creator.’** However, in the normal meaning of these terms, Einstein believed [no such thing](http://creation.com/einstein-the-universe-and-god). See also [Physicists’ God-talk](http://creation.com/physicists-god-talk).

### What arguments are doubtful, hence inadvisable to use?

* **Canopy theory.** This is not a direct teaching of Scripture, so there is no place for dogmatism. Also, no suitable model has been developed that holds sufficient water; but some creationists suggest a partial canopy may have been present. For CMI’s current opinion, see [Noah’s Flood—Where did the water come from?](http://creation.com/images/pdfs/cabook/chapter12.pdf).
* **“There was no rain before the Flood.”** This is not a direct teaching of Scripture, so again there should be no dogmatism. [Genesis 2:5–6](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Genesis%202.5%E2%80%936) at face value teaches only that there was no rain at the time Adam was created. But it doesn’t rule out rain at any later time before the Flood, as great pre-uniformitarian commentators such as [John Calvin](http://creation.com/calvin-said-genesis-means-what-it-says) pointed out. A related fallacy is that the rainbow covenant of [Genesis 9:12–17](http://biblia.com/bible/esv/Genesis%209.12%E2%80%9317) proves that there were no rainbows before the Flood. As Calvin pointed out, God frequently invested existing things with new meanings, e.g. the bread and wine at the Lord’s Supper.
* **“The speed of light has decreased over time”** (c decay). Although most of the evolutionary counter-arguments have been proven to be fallacious, there are still a number of problems, many of which were raised by creationists, which we believe have not been satisfactorily answered. CMI and AIG currently believes that both Dr Russell Humphreys’ and Dr John Hartnett’s cosmologies (both involving relativistic time dilation) provide viable solutions for the distant starlight problem. It’s a healthy situation to have multiple working hypotheses at the moment because there are so many unknowns in astronomy and cosmology. However, neither we, Dr Humphreys nor Dr Hartnett claim that either of these models are infallible. See [How can we see distant stars in a young Universe?](http://creation.com/images/pdfs/cabook/chapter5.pdf) from the [The Creation Answers Book](http://creation.com/the-creation-answers-book-index)…
* **“Plate tectonics is fallacious.”** CMI believes that Dr John Baumgardner’s work on Catastrophic Plate Tectonics provides a good explanation of continental shifts and the Flood. See [Q&A: Plate Tectonics](http://creation.com/geology-questions-and-answers). However, we recognize that some reputable creationist scientists disagree with plate tectonics.
* **“Creationists believe in microevolution but not macroevolution.”** These terms, which focus on ‘small’ v. ‘large’ changes, distract from the key issue of information. That is, particles-to-people evolution requires changes that increase genetic information (e.g., specifications for manufacturing nerves, muscle, bone, etc.), but all we observe is sorting and, overwhelmingly, loss of information. We are hard pressed to find examples of even ‘micro’ increases in information, although such changes should be frequent if evolution were true. Conversely, we do observe quite ‘macro’ changes that involve no new information, e.g. when a control gene is switched on or off. Importantly, the term microevolution will be seen by many as just a ‘little bit’ of the process that they think turned bacteria to people. In other words, it implies that simply given enough time (millions of years), such ‘micro’ changes will accumulate to amount to ‘macro’ changes. But this is not so; see [The evolution train’s a-comin’: (Sorry, a-goin’—in the wrong direction)](http://creation.com/train).  
  Interestingly, even high profile evolutionists (e.g. Mayr, Ayala) disagree with the idea that the observed small changes in living things are sufficient to account for the grand scheme of microbes-to-mankind evolution.
* **“The Gospel is in the stars.”** This is an interesting idea, but quite speculative, and many Biblical creationists doubt that it is taught in Scripture, so we do not recommend using it.

**For much more on all of these topics go to**

From http://creation.com/arguments-we-think-creationists-should-not-use

From https://answersingenesis.org/creationism/arguments-to-avoid/

**Poll shows half of Americans believe in a Creator**

Bob Kellogg (OneNewsNow.com) Wednesday, June 18, 2014

A **leading defender of the Genesis account of Creation is encouraged by the latest Gallop poll that says nearly half of Americans believe God created mankind.**

The annual Gallup poll, which began 30 years ago, shows that 42% of Americans still believe God created man and woman in their present form and within the last ten thousand years. Ken Ham is president and CEO of Answers in Genesis, and he finds this a very encouraging indication of the impact made by Christians.

“When you think of the intense evolutionary indoctrination in this nation, the fact we still have statistics the way we do tells you, I believe, that Christians that are involved in aggressively being out there combat this intense indoctrination,” he says. “I believe their efforts are working.”

Ham says, despite the efforts of atheists and secularists to keep creation out of public schools, only 19% polled believe man evolved over millions of years.

“And yet, they’re the ones who have really been able to take over the education system and take over the secular media in many ways in their attempts to throw God out of culture,” Ham adds.

The survey results have been rather consistent over the years. In 1982, the year the survey began, 44% of Americans believed God created man. The number peaked at 47% in the late 1990s.

- See more at: http://onenewsnow.com/culture/2014/06/18/poll-shows-half-of-americans-believe-in-a-creator#sthash.pHHDethg.dpuf

**Humor Corner**

**GET YOUR OWN DIRT**

One day a group of scientists got together and decided that man had come a long way and no longer needed God. So they picked one scientist to go and tell Him that they were done with Him.

The scientist walked up to God and said, "God, we've decided that we no longer need you. We're to the point that we can clone people and do many miraculous things, so why don't you just go on and get lost."

God listened very patiently and kindly to the man and after the scientist was done talking, God said, "Very well, how about this, let's say we have a man making contest." To which the scientist replied, "OK, great!"

But God added, "Now, we're going to do this just like I did back in the old days with Adam."

The scientist said, "Sure, no problem" and bent down and grabbed himself a handful of dirt.

God just looked at him and said, "No, no, no. You go get your own dirt!"

**Around Texas**

**Houston:**   
The **Greater Houston Creation Association** (**GHCA**) meets the first Thursday of each month. They meet at Houston's First Baptist Church at 7 pm, in Room 258. After the presentation, there will be refreshments, fellowship and creation science materials for all to enjoy. For more information go to [www.ghcaonline.com](http://r20.rs6.net/tn.jsp?llr=bztaencab&et=1103662222545&s=545&e=001xF-6WOYzM5Yyre44Ea_qUjH5EOT_fFIGjrfpfa5h-rD53IlUVbz3Vc0Dp47_VEwW3iQQ6F1b6K0EtKc_vUxYKpzN_8V2upXFbsOScvUeD92nJdUTjDIFeg==).

**Glen Rose:**   
Dr. Carl Baugh gives a “***Director’s Lecture Series***” on the first Saturday of each month at the Creation Evidences Museum just outside Glen Rose, TX. The new and improved museum is also a great and beneficial way to spend any day. Presentations are at 11 am and 2 pm. For more information go to [www.creationevidence.org](http://www.creationevidence.org)

**Dallas-Ft Worth:**   
The Metroplex Institute of Origin Science (MIOS) meets at the Dr. Pepper Starcenter, 12700 N. Stemmons Fwy, Farmers Branch, TX, usually at 7:30 pm of the first Tuesday of each month.

**Lubbock Area (Crosbyton):**   
All year: Consider a visit to the Mt. Blanco Fossil Museum, directed by Joe Taylor. The Museum is definitely worth the visit if you live near or are traveling through the Panhandle near Lubbock. If you call ahead and time permitting, Joe has been known to give personal tours, especially to groups. For more information, visit [http://www.mtblanco.com/](http://r20.rs6.net/tn.jsp?llr=bztaencab&et=1103662222545&s=545&e=001xF-6WOYzM5bqqt6T1G_CwJWJosrOSIhLAagtnP0Z504J-gEROEBe22S3gq720x6ofjFVqK-AfJcsjrsuQyRtoepYiAQVVUFC-cF56fLwwBJ0SQ-44KlLmw==).

**Greater San Antonio area:**

Listen to **Answers with Ken Ham** online at the address below. (No nearby station for this broadcast). <http://www.answersingenesis.org/media/audio/answers-daily>

To hear program from the **Institute for Creation Research**, listen online at this address. <http://www.icr.org/radio/>

Also, tune in KHCB FM 88.5 (San Marcos) or KKER FM 88.7 (Kerrville) for **Back to Genesis** at 8:57 AM Mon-Fri, then **Science, Scripture and Salvation** at 1:30 AM, 8:00 AM and 4:30 PM on Saturdays.

**Last Month at SABBSA**

**Evidence for Creation Seminar, Part I**

Beginning in June we started the three part **"Evidence for Creation Seminar”** by creationist **John Heffner** (pictured here with his wife).

John is a career mathematician and committed Christian. He is currently head of the math department at Kilgore High School. He teaches Trigonometry and Pre-Calculus. John also serves on the adjunct math faculty at Kilgore College. John participates in numerous research trips and excavations annually. He has presented hundreds of seminars in churches and schools explaining scientific evidences in light of Biblical teaching. He has appeared on several international TV broadcasts discussing creation.

For more on John’s ministry go to <http://www.fbclibertycity.com/heffners>

Session 1 of this series contained a wealth of "meat and potatoes" creation science shown in one of the most concise and well presented creation talks we had ever seen!

Session 1 included such topics as: **"Science plays catch up with the Bible"; "The 6 days of creation"; "Giant animals of the pre-flood world"; and "Human population statistics"**

**Next SABBSA Meeting:   
Tuesday, July 8, 2014, at 7 pm**

**Coming to SABBSA in July   
Evidence for Creation Seminar, Part II**

In July we will continue the three part **"Evidence for Creation Seminar"** by **John Heffner**. Don’t worry if you missed Session 1, as each session has self contained topics.

We found Session 1 of this series to be one of the most concise and well presented creation presentations we had ever seen!

Session 2 focuses on evidence for the recent demise of dinosaurs and for men coexisting with dinosaurs. This session includes such topics as: **"Dinosaurs all over the World", "Dragon Legends", "Human Footprints in Stone", "Incredible Artifacts", "Excavations in CO, WY, UT and TX" and "Indian Petroglyphs."**

Please join us on July 8 for this thought provoking program, good food and warm Christian fellowship! As always, we will meet at the Jim’s Restaurant at the corner of San Pedro and Ramsey.