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# It is supposed to be spring time, but old man winter seems to be hanging on. We hope you are well and warm this early March. This month’s Communiqué contains articles examining Old Earth Creationism and its major proponent, the organization Reasons to Believe. We also have an article detailing the creationist belief in the ancient supercontinent of Pangaea. We have a story of a bill in Congress praising Darwin and essentially making it federal policy that Darwinism is true. As always we have a complete update of creation activities and seminars available in the greater San Antonio area. We hope you are well and blessed whenever spring comes to us.

# http://m-27.com/wp-content/lol/oldearth.jpgOld Earth Creationism – Is it an Oxymoron?

I recently attended a conference here in San Antonio held by mega church Community Bible Church featuring Astronomer Dr. Hugh Ross and biologist Dr. “Fuzz” Rana. In their three day seminar they espoused a total disbelief in macro-evolution and a total belief in the inerrancy of scripture. However they also espoused a belief in a universe that is 13.79 billion years old and an old Earth believed to be 4.566 billion years old. In this article I will detail much of what was said and analyze it both scripturally and scientifically.

First, let’s acknowledge the good of what was presented. Dr. Ross tells of there being over 200 places in the Bible where the Bible shows God’s knowledge of science thousands of years ahead of man’s discovery of these same scientific truths. This is strong evidence for the Bible’s Godly inspiration and attests to the Creator as its writer. Further, Dr. Ross’ research cites 14 places where the Bible agrees with modern scientific observations as to how the universe works and how it started. No other creation account of the more than 300 creation accounts around the world agrees with modern science in more than 2 of those 14 places.

“Dr. Rana in his presentations used almost nothing which I could not use in similar presentations. His presentation on intelligent design in living cells was both exceptional and spot on scientifically (although some of it may have been above the heads of his audience). His material on DNA and information theory was also exceptional, but again was above the heads of much of his audience. His later presentation on races was analogous to a presentation AIG, ICR, CMI or we at SABBSA might give. All of what he presented was strong evidence for design in living systems and damning for evolution.

Now about the bad and questionable things that were said. Dr. Ross is a proponent of a “large local flood” for Noah’s Flood. To do this he plays some very intriguing games with scripture, words and interpretations. He says that the flood covered the known world, but this does not include the whole world, just that part of the world where men lived around the Middle East.

To this end he reinterprets the “whole world” as being covered by water as the Bible attests to mean all of humanity and not the entire land surface. To do this he uses a secondary interpretation of “whole world” and makes the very questionable assumption that man had not spread beyond the Middle East.

This theology of his probably is the weakest of all of his interpretations. When asked about scripture describing the mountains being covered to 15 cubits (22 feet) across the world he again reinterprets world as only the human region and uses the tertiary meaning of the Hebrew word used for mountains to interpret them as only rolling hills or mounds.

He has similarly smooth, but unsatisfactory answers for the challenges of how a local flood could last for a year or for biblical references to plate tectonic actions caused by the flood. His answer that the rain, the fountains of the deep, snow melt in the regions (from where if there were only mounds and not mountains) and the unleashing of huge lake whose walls burst are grossly insufficient to explain how an isolated area could be flooded for a year without spreading to the entire world.

He believes the last ice age was pre-flood, in spite of great evidence from Michael Oard and others that the ice age was the result of the flood and thus post-flood

Dr. Ross puts no dinosaurs on the Ark and says they died out 65 million years ago as do conventional science. This claim of course flies in the face of the overwhelming evidence for man’s living with dinosaurs from cave art, South American burial stone art, Cambodian building sculptures, European art and dragon mythos, Paluxy River artifacts and more.

He further minimizes the number of animals on the Ark to just a few hundred by saying that only “soulish” animals (animals with a “soul” like “Nephesh” quality designed to interact with humans) were included on the Ark. This is an extraordinary claim which is not backed up by scripture which says that representatives of all animal kinds were on the Ark.

Implicit in both Dr. Ross’ Ark arguments and his creation interpretation is the reinterpretation of our life and the “soulish” animals as soul life and he claims that only this life was affected by man’s sin in the garden some 100,000 years ago. This interpretation is counter to Romans where it says “the whole creation groaneth..” from the effects of the curse. He further states that death of other animals occurred for billions of years before man and this not only contradicts scripture, but makes Christ’s coming and dying for us irrelevant. This one point is why so many other creation organizations are at odds with Dr. Ross and his organization “Reason to Believe.”

Along the way, Dr. Ross makes other claims which he states as factual, but are really highly debated in conventional science. He claims that our existence and our solar system are the product of three generations of star production. This claim is counter to the fact we really do not have a viable model for star formation. Of the five theories on how stars form, you cannot get stars to form without other stars already being in existence. This problem is only solved with the injection of the highly controversial and unsubstantiated existence of “dark matter.”

Even granting him dark matter and star formation, current research shows that you still will not get the formation of all the heavy elements needed for our existence. Dr. Ross waves off such arguments when I discussed them with him and said that “dark matter” or “exotic matter” as he prefers to call it is proved by 25 observations in science and no longer a debate topic in science. This is not only vastly overstating the case for dark matter, but it reveals a trend for the weekend that I found disturbing. That is the repeated claims that science has given us definitive answers of truth. In fact science almost never gives us definitive truth, but through science we make conjectures and rules based on our observations which best fit what we see. These rules about what we think we know are constantly being changed, updated and replaced as new observations and data become available. The strength of Dr. Ross’ presentations is to make people feel that we have most of the answers and they are known facts. Science does not deal in such certainties, and to make such claims is at best foolish.

Another example of this type of talk is when Dr. Ross talked of science verifying the existence of 10 dimensions to our universe. While this construct for the universe has been theorized, it is far from verified or even a widely accepted theory in astrophysics.

One of the “Reason s to Believe” crowd’s strongest questions is about the length of Day 6 as described in the Bible. Genesis Chapter 1 verses 24 – 30 describe the creation of all land animals on Day 6 and the creation of man and woman. Genesis Chapter 2 starting in verse 7 describes the planting of trees, shrubs and the garden, the creation of man outside the garden then being placed there, the naming of all the livestock, beasts of the field and birds by Adam and the creation of Eve. Dr. Ross asserts that all of this could not have occurred in a single 24 hour day and he asserts that the Bible does not say it does. By their account it would take at least 6 months and perhaps years for all that is ascribed for Day 6 to have occurred.

To say this Dr. Ross reinterprets the use of the Hebrew word “yom” from its first meaning of 24 hour day to its fourth meaning of “period of time.” This he does in spite of the Bible defining each of these days as “evening and morning” and hence 24 hour Earth days. His response to this is that they are days only in God’s time frame and not ours.

One of Dr. Ross’ favorite citations is that when Adam first saw Eve in the Bible in Genesis 2:23 he used a word from Hebrew which could loosely be interpreted as “at long last.” Most translations (King James, New International and others) interpret this word as “now”, but again Ross opts for a secondary interpretation which better fits his narrative and implies Adam had been searching for a very long time to find a mate.

In fact all of the events ascribed to Day 6 in the Bible could have occurred in just 24 hours. If God spoke the whole universe into being on Day 1, then he also could have done the same with the creation of the land animals on Day 6 and essentially instantaneously. The naming of all the animals by Adam is no problem when we realize how many animals we are really talking about. To name all of the “livestock, beasts of the field and birds of the air” as described in the Bible would entail naming somewhere between 800 and 2500 kinds depending on your definition of kind. Allowing Adam, who was not a fallen being and could use 100% of his brain capacity, unlike us who can use only a fraction of our brains it would be no problem. In fact he could have named each animal in 6 seconds each as they were paraded before him at God’s direction, taken 5 minutes off each hour and accomplished the task in between 90 minutes and 5 hours. This time frame leaves the full afternoon for God to put him to sleep and form Eve. Dr. Ross’ scenario not only questions the veracity and inerrancy of scripture, it reinterprets scripture in ways the context says it should not and implies God has limits on what He can do.

Also of great interest to Reasons to Believe advocates is the fact that of all the days of week described in the Bible, the seventh day alone does not bear the definition of “evening and morning.” They take this to mean in a long day/age interpretation of scripture that the seventh day is still going on today in one of God’s extremely long days. This day by our standards has been going on for the last 100,000 years or more. This framework hypothesis of putting long time frames into days of the Bible along with Dr. Ross’ denial of evolution and acknowledging that the fossil record shows all animal types coming into the fossil record fully formed means God had to come back every few million years and create new forms in a framework we call Progressive Creationism. This framework forces long ages into the clear reading of the context of 6 days of creation as described in the Bible and calls into question the ability of anyone with less than three advanced degrees in Hebrew, astrophysics, and biology from being able to correctly interpret scripture. It seems completely implausible that this was the intent of the Creator, that only Dr. Ross and a select few would be in position to correctly interpret scripture. That only now, 3400 years after the Bible was written, and only extreme academics are the only ones God wished to fully understand His words and their true meaning.

Dr. Jonathan Sarfati of Creation Ministries International has written a book addressing the Progressive Creation framework as proposed by Reasons to Believe. The book is called “Refuting Compromise” and it was written to answer and counter the claims made by the theology and scientific interpretations of Dr. Ross and his Progressive Creation theology framework.

One thing I did learn from this conference was about the history of the five races theory for man as some evolutionists espouse. It was put forward by the twentieth century scientist Carlton Coon. Coon said that there was 2-million years of parallel development of homo-erectus species in Australia, Asia, Europe, the Americas and Africa which leads to the current races we have. As Dr. Rana details, the fact that these supposed races of men are now just 0.08% different in terms of genetic makeup puts the lie to this thesis. We are all one race with variations generated by genetic drift (the random mix of genes and DNA code in the ancestors which migrated to a certain local) and adaptation to an environment.

Rana cites the same “Eve Syndrome” mitochondrial DNA data we do to show that we all came from one primordial woman and the same analogous “Y chromosome” data to show that we all came from one primordial man. This gives further proof against the five races theory. Conventional science calls this data the “Out of Africa” model signaling evidence that man came from a single location and a single lineage (as does the Bible!). The target area for this data seems to be eastern Africa and thus in an early Earth with a Pangaea continent, this data is very confirming of a lineage back to a congealed Middle Eastern origin.

One place Dr. Rana and I differ is on his debate with the inclusion of Bible genealogies as being essentially useless. Tracking of the names of the offspring of Noah after the flood in Genesis 10’s “Table of Nations” yields startling evidence. Most of these names can be tracked in secular records to the areas the Bible ascribes to them after the dispersion. For example Gomer can be traced in Germanic records to the Balkans; Chad is mentioned in Ethiopian records and mythos, Meshesh in western Russian records and so on. This dovetails very well with DNA dispersion patterns which confirm an out of East Africa or out of the Middle East dispersion for man to all parts of the world just as the Bible says. The only difference is that conventional interpretations o this data put it into a 100,000 year time frame due to their under estimation of the mutation rates of DNA. When corrected to current known rates of mutation this DNA dispersion data confirms dispersion of man across the world in just the last few thousand years. This is data Rana chooses to overlook because it does not fit into an Old Earth paradigm.

Linguistic development patterns of people across the world show this same dispersion pattern from the Middle East. Thus, there is ample DNA, historical and linguistic development data which all coincide to tell the same story as the Bible of the dispersion of man after Babel. For more on this story attend this month’s SABBSA meeting which will feature a documentary on this topic of Babel and the dispersion.

In conclusion I would have to say that the efforts of Reasons to Believe were a mixed bag. There was much good data and much bad interpretation of scripture presented over the weekend. Many people came to Christ over this weekend and many I talked to were emboldened in belief because of what they heard. However, I cannot shed the fear that what they got was false belief in an Old Earth paradigm which is doomed to fall apart in light of future discoveries. Dr. Ross’ belief in an Old Earth seems to be imbedded in a mix of misplaced faith in conventional science, twisting scripture to make the two harmonious and a yearning to have his interpretations “fit in” with conventional science. Young Earth advocates have the Bible and more than 20 scientific clocks showing the world to be less than 20,000 years old which is why five of the seven international creation groups espouse a Young Earth. When this Old Earth paradigm is challenged in the future it could be disastrous to the fragile faith of those choosing to believe that both worldly beliefs and the Bible can be harmonized with each other.

Further, I am disturbed by the Rev. Emmet’s comment that he would not allow a Young Earth creationist equal time to present our side. This response was predicted by Bruce Malone, head of “Search for Truth Ministries” when I told him Reasons was coming. I believe their theology implies limits on God and his scripture which can undermine the gospel message and yet we are not allowed to counter such claims at this mega church in the future.

 Finally, I am very suspicious that in spite of the decisions for God this weekend, what was learned by most there was that they could not trust their own straight forward interpretation of scripture and must rely on academics to interpret scripture for them. This sets up Reasons to Believe as a new priesthood for which modern evangelicals are to ascribe to see what they are to believe. That is a very dangerous and compromised position for Christianity in the future.

# Flood, Ice Age and Tectonic Movements

A person recently emailed us a question. She said, Genesis 10:25, "To Eber were born two sons: the name of the one was Peleg, for in his days the earth was divided, and his brother's name was Joktan." If you consider how close in time the birth of Peleg would have been to the flood & how it was pairs of "every" living creatures that came & entered the ark, should it not be surprising that the earth was one big land mass prior to the flood otherwise not all of the creatures would have been able to make the journey to the ark?

Good observation and as usual there are two schools of thought on that. First, it is standard creationist belief that the world before the flood had all the land collected into one super continent as both the Bible alludes to and science seems to confirm.

Modern scientists call this super continent "Pangaea." They then believe that it split into first two super continents called "Laurasia" and "Gondwanaland" and then those two split into the continents we have today. The modernists believe this division occurred over billions of years.

The creationists also believe in this same division, but in a much shorter time frame. Creationists Dr. Walter Brown, Dr. Carl Baugh and many others believe that due to the release of the waters of the deep that the continents actually hydroplaned on top of the mantle and shifted most of the way from Pangaea to their current locations all underwater and at the time of the flood (in a single year). Other creationists debate this and contend that it may have started at the time of the flood, but that the total division took up to 500 years after the flood, but was started by the flood event. They note that the Bible says that at the time of Peleg the "earth shook" signaling a great amount of possible tectonic activity (continents moving) and that if the division occurred all in one year the heat produced by the friction of such a colossal movement would have boiled the oceans and killed all ocean life.

If the second group is right, then it was possible for the one super-continent to possibly have allowed for the animals off the Ark to get to their present day locales. However, if the movement had already occurred or was occurring it is still possible due to now under water land bridges. One product of the flood was a great ice age which probably lasted about 500 years after the flood. This ice age tied up so much of the world's water in glaciers and land covering snow that it lowered the water level of the oceans by as much as 300 feet. Such a lowering of the oceans today would completely uncover the Bering Strait between Asia and the Americas, uncover a land bridge from Asia to Australia and even a bridge from South America to Antarctica. Thus, it is quite possible that the division of the continents did occur for the most part before the animals got off the Ark and they still could have been dispersed to their current locales via these land bridges.

# Defeating Darwin in four easy steps

**What was most instructive about last month’s debate between Ken Ham and Bill Nye over the issue of origins was Nye's blanket admission of total, abject ignorance on the most important questions of the evening.**

Where did the atoms that made up the Big Bang come from? Nye has no idea. Where did man's consciousness come from? Nye has no idea. How can matter produce life? Nye has absolutely no idea. This surely is all one needs to know to recognize the utter bankruptcy of the theory of evolution.

Now it's helpful for us who believe in creation science not only to be able to point to this abysmal ignorance of evolutionists on the most important questions, but also to have a clear template to use in discussing and defending our convictions, a template that includes the best in science. ..

What follows is a straightforward, four-step refutation of the theory of evolution. The steps are easy to remember, and make a nice little cadence when spoken with a little rhythm: First Law, Second Law, Fossils and Genes. Armed with this truth, go forth and conquer.

Before we even start, we ought to notice that, if evolution is true, there would be no way to know it. Because evolution teaches that everything that exists is the product of the random collision of atoms, this logically includes the thoughts I am thinking about evolution. But if my thoughts are the product of the random collision of atoms, there is no reason to think that any of them are true – they just are.

No one "random collision of atoms" can be said to be truer than another, any more than one randomly generated Rorschach inkblot can be said to be more correct than another.

As J.B.S. Haldane famously observed, "If my mental processes are determined wholly by the motion of atoms in my brain, I have no reason to suppose that my beliefs are true and hence I have no reason for supposing my brain to be composed of atoms."

All right, here we go.

**First Law of Thermodynamics.** This law (note: not a theory but a scientific law) teaches us that matter and energy can neither be created nor destroyed. In other words, an honest scientist will tell you that there is nothing in the observable universe that can explain either the origin of energy or matter. By logical extension, then, matter and energy had to come into being by some force outside the universe.

What this means, then, is that science simply has no explanation for the most basic question that could possibly be asked: why is there something rather than nothing? Creationists and Intelligent Design advocates have an answer to this question; evolutionists do not.

When you see a turtle on a fence post, what's the one thing you know? Somebody put him there. When you see a world hanging in space, what's the one thing you know? Someone hung it there.

It's futile to resort to the big bang theory, as some evolutionists are wont to do. They say they have an explanation for the origin of the universe: it began when a ball of incredibly dense matter exploded and flung the universe into existence. Okay, fine. Now: where did that incredibly dense ball of matter come from?

Even Aristotle saw that behind the existence of the universe had to be what he called a Prime Mover or an Unmoved Mover. If everything is the result of secondary causes, nothing would ever actually happen. Some great power had to be a primary cause of life, motion, energy, and existence.

If you walk into an office and you see one of those toys with the steel balls swinging left to right, right to left, virtually endlessly, the one thing you will know for an absolute certainty is that some force outside that toy had to start the whole thing by lifting the first ball and releasing it to clack against the others. The process you observe could not possibly have started all by itself. Creation Science and Intelligent Design theory offers a Prime Mover, evolution does not.

**Second Law of Thermodynamics.** This law (note: not a theory but a law) teaches us that in every chemical or heat reaction, there is a loss of energy that never again is available for another heat reaction. This is why things break down if left to themselves, and why scientists tell us that the universe is headed toward a heat death.

This law teaches us, then, that the universe is headed toward increasing randomness and decay.

But what does the theory of evolution teach us? The exact opposite: that the universe is headed toward increasing complexity and order. You put up a scientific theory against my scientific law; I'm going to settle for the law every time, thank you very much.

Plus, this teaches us that the universe had to have a beginning. If you see a watch winding down, one thing you know with absolute certainty is that somebody wound it up. Intelligent Design theory offers not only a Watchmaker but a Watch-winder; evolution does not.

**Fossils.** Realize that the fossil record is the only tangible, physical evidence for the theory of evolution that exists. The fossil record is it. There is absolutely nothing else Darwinians have they can show you.

As Yale University's Carl Dunbar says, "Fossils provide the only historical, documentary evidence that life has evolved from simpler to more and more complex forms." But if Darwin's theory is correct, that increasingly complex life forms developed in tiny little incremental and transitional steps, then the fossil record should be littered with an enormous number of transitional fossils.

Darwin himself said, "The number of intermediate and transitional links must have been inconceivably great."

But, sadly for Darwinians, after more than 150 years of digging in dirt all around the world, there are still no transitional fossils at all – not one! The most famous paleontologist in the world, Harvard's Stephen Jay Gould, said, "The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology." (Note" "extreme rarity" is Harvard-speak for "nada, zilch, zippo.")

Colin Patterson of the British Museum of Natural History agrees with Gould that "there are no transitional fossils," not even a single one "for which one could make a watertight argument." In other words, people who study fossils for a living know there are no transitional forms but they don't want you and me to know it, because it might prompt us to stop imbibing the swill of evolution.

Gould developed an absurd theory called "punctuated equilibrium," a theory that evolution happened so fast, in such rapid bursts, that it left no trace in the fossil record. Imagine that: the only evidence he has for his theory is the total absence of any evidence whatsoever! And this guy taught at Harvard!

What the fossil record teaches us, in contrast to the theory of evolution, is that increasingly complex life forms appear fully formed in the fossil record, just as if they were put there by a Creator. This is especially true of what is called the "Pre-Cambrian Explosion," the vast, overwhelming, and quite sudden appearance of complex life forms at the dawn of time. Evolutionists are at a total loss to explain the Pre-Cambrian Explosion.

The biblical record indicates quite clearly that all things, including increasingly complex life forms, came fully formed from the hand of God. Thus the fossil record is a powerful argument for the existence of a Creator or Intelligent Designer while at the same time being fatal for the theory of evolution. Creation Science … has an explanation for the fossil record; evolution does not.

**Genes.** The only mechanism – don't miss this – the only mechanism evolutionists have to explain the development of increasingly complex life forms is genetic mutation. Mutations alter DNA, and these alterations can be passed on to descendants.

The problem: naturally occurring genetic mutations are invariably harmful if not fatal to the organism. Rather than improve an organism's capacity to survive, they invariably weaken it. That's why the phrase we most often use to refer to genetic mutations is "birth defects."

If scientists are some day able to engineer beneficial genetic mutations in the lab, that will simply prove our point: we told you it takes intelligence and design.

Catch these two quotes. First, evolutionary microbiologist James Shapiro of the University of Chicago: "There are no detailed Darwinian accounts for the evolution of any fundamental biochemical or cellular systems, only a variety of wishful speculations."

And this from University of Bristol scientist Alan Linton: "Throughout 150 years of the science of bacteriology, there is no evidence that one species of bacteria has changed into another. None exists in the literature claiming that one species has been shown to evolve into another." (Note: "none" means "none, nada, zilch, zippo.")

And if it's never been observed in the simplest of all organisms, it shouldn't come as a surprise that it's never been observed with more complex forms. Says Linton, "There is no evidence for evolution throughout the whole array of higher multicellular organisms." (Note: "no evidence" means "no evidence, nada, zilch, zippo.")

So honest Darwinians will tell you that evolution – by which we mean the transition of one species into another – has never, not ever, been observed by anyone at any time. In other words, they believe in something that nobody has ever seen. Hmmm... And they accuse us of a blind leap of faith!

It turns out that creationists are the ones who believe in science. In fact, it's clear that creationists believe in science and evolutionists do not. If they did, they wouldn't be evolutionists, now, would they?

Bottom line: the easiest verse in the Bible to believe is the very first one of all: "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth."

Bryan Fischer is director of issues analysis for the American Family Association. He hosts "Focal Point with Bryan Fischer" every weekday on AFR Talk from 1:00 - 3:00 p.m. (Central).

Excerpts from OneNewsNow printed with permission. See more at: http://onenewsnow.com/perspectives/bryan-fischer/2014/02/05/defeating-darwin-in-four-easy-steps#sthash.TaNLrA1b.dpufDems in Congress questioned about quest to 'lionize' Darwin

**The next debate over the theory of evolution may not be in scientific circles or the classroom.**

The raging debate over evolution verses creationism has been ongoing since Charles Darwin published his "The Origin of the Species" in 1859. Now, three members of Congress have introduced a resolution to pay homage to Darwin, who was born February 12, 1809.

Meyer

Atheists and humanists celebrate his birthday as "Darwin Day."

Stephen Meyer of the Discovery Institute says the congressmen intend to declare Darwin's theory of evolution and natural selection "basically right, and they're just going to declare that in the bill." Darwin

In a story about the resolution, The Christian Post reported H.R. 467 reads in part:

Charles Darwin's theory of evolution by the mechanism of natural selection, together with the monumental amount of scientific evidence he compiled to support it, provides humanity with a logical and intellectually compelling explanation for the diversity of life on Earth.

The resolution was introduced by Rep. Rush Holt of New Jersey with two co-sponsors, Rep. James Himes of Connecticut and Rep. Mike Honda of California. All three congressmen are Democrats.

The resolution also states that the theory is "strongly supported by the science of genetics," says Meyer, whose own studies of cell structure, particularly DNA, point to a designer. Meyer's newest book, "Darwin's Doubt," suggests the origin of life suggests an intelligent designer.

Meyer suggests Congress has better things to do, like budgets, and wonders why some on Capitol Hill believe Darwin is a "guy we ought to lionize." He also suggests the resolution infers its federal policy that Darwin's theory is true. "The resolution represents a clear example of ideological posturing and congressional overreach," Meyer says.

- See more at: <http://onenewsnow.com/politics-govt/2014/02/06/dems-in-congress-questioned-about-quest-to-lionize-darwin#sthash.c21QLgxp.dpuf>

**Creation Series at Castle Hills First Baptist Church**
We wish to thank Castle Hills for hosting us for the last 4 weeks and allowing us to share the wonders of God’s creation with them. The four part series was well received with good audiences of 70 to 90 people each night.

**Science Workshops at FEAST in 2013 - 2014**

The **FEAST Science Workshops** will continue on the 4th Monday of each month at 6:30 pm at the **Family Educators Alliance of South Texas**. Below is the schedule of multimedia presentations we will present for the home school community this school year.

Each one of these titles represents a multimedia presentation with embedded films and pictures to enhance each presentation. We will offer a companion young children's program to go along with the youth and adult's program described. We had great and enthusiastic crowds for the first four presentations this year!

March 24, 2014 - **What If God Wrote the Bible?**
April 28, 2014 – **The Discovery of Genesis in Chinese**

Synopses of each of these presentations are available on our resources page.

**Humor Corner**

**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. See our special article about this month’s meeting at the top of the previous page.

**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**

**Dave & Mary Jo Nutting** are the Directors of Alpha Omega Institute. They were college math and science instructors when they first grappled with the problems of evolution and became convinced of the evidence for Creation. Their personal contact with students convinced them of the importance of the issue, not only in science, but in evangelism and Christian growth. Since founding AOI in 1984, they have spoken extensively throughout the USA and overseas to young and old alike.

Last Month’s topic: **Bio-Inspiration**

Dave gave us multiple examples of how man continually copies designs in nature because God has already worked out problems we wish to solve today in engineering, medicine and many other fields, and God has done so far better than our best attempts and far beyond our abilities to duplicate at times. Design in nature points to an Intelligent Designer, not random chance and accidents. These fascinating examples from the living world support the claim that **"The evidence cries out: Creation!"**



**Next SABBSA Meeting:
Tuesday, March 11, 2014, at 7 pm**

**Coming to SABBSA in March
Do you know how Babel points to Jesus Christ?**

An exciting new video **"The Tower of Babel: Can the “Story” be trusted today?"** answers the most important questions about the Tower of Babel in Genesis and the intriguing topics related to it and we will present it in March.

Many Christians—including many theologians and academics—believe the events the Bible describes at Babel are myths or legends, and need to be reinterpreted. They attack the account, saying it cannot possibly be based on fact. But are these assaults on the Bible warranted? Apologetics expert Bodie Hodge says the Bible is accurate and answers such questions as:

•Who built the Tower of Babel?
•What did it look like?
•Who was Nimrod and what was his part in the rebellion?
•Did the continents split at the time of Babel?
•Why did God confuse the people with multiple languages?
•By what means did the people travel?
•Where did all the different people initially go?
•Why the sudden decrease in longevity?
•What do extra-biblical sources say of a language split?
•How does Babel point to Jesus Christ?
•And many more!

The Babel account can be trusted as written, and it is a key to understanding evangelism and the lands and people of the world today!

Please join us on March 11 for this insightful program, good food and warm Christian fellowship! As always we meet at the Jim’s Restaurant at the corner San Pedro and Ramsey. We hope to see you there!