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**May, 2015**

We at SABBSA hope you are enjoying this wet and cool spring we are having. This month’s **Communiqué** contains two articles of a very different nature. The first tells us the history of what are supposed to be the two most pivotal events in the creation evolution debate and how they have been portrayed historically as wins for the evolutionists when they were in fact wins for the creation side.

The second article, by a prominent TV talk show host, imparts to us how so much of what is being found in astronomy is being portrayed in the media as proof of evolution, is in fact great evidence of God’s creation and His existence! Of course we have full run down of the creation events going on in and around San Antonio for the next month. We hope you enjoy this newsletter and find it useful.

**Two wins = Loss?**

**The stories of the Wilberforce – Huxley Debate and the Scopes Trial.**

Among other things, I am a teacher of mathematics. It is not lost on me that the title of this piece is bad math, but unfortunately it is also reality. Few people realize that it was widely thought by observers and by Darwin himself that Bishop Wilberforce made the better points and won his famous 1860 debate against Darwin’s staunchest supporter, Thomas Huxley. Why then is this event seen as the “watershed event” for the acceptance of evolution and the start of the discrediting of the Genesis account?

Similarly, few people understand that John Thomas Scopes was convicted in the “Scopes Monkey Trial” and thus biblical authority and the right to teach creation in the public schools was affirmed. How then is this trial seen as the pivotal event which marked the downfall of Biblical Creation being taught in public schools and the bringing in the era of only evolution being allowed in the public arena? To understand how this could be we need to examine the histories of both events.

The pictures below and the following history are from Wikipedia.

The famous Huxley-Wilberforce debate took place in the Oxford University Museum of Natural History, on June 30, 1860, seven months after the publication of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*. Several prominent British scientists and philosophers participated, including Thomas Henry Huxley, Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, Benjamin Brodie, Joseph Dalton Hooker and Robert FitzRoy. The debate is best remembered today for a heated exchange in which Wilberforce supposedly asked Huxley whether it was through his grandfather or his grandmother that he claimed his descent from a monkey.

Huxley is said to have replied that he would not be ashamed to have a monkey for his ancestor, but he would be ashamed to be connected with a man who used his great gifts to obscure the truth…

The encounter is often known as the **Huxley–Wilberforce debate** , although this description is somewhat misleading. Rather than being a formal debate between the two, it was actually an animated discussion that occurred after the presentation of a paper by John William Draper of New York University, on the intellectual development of Europe with relation to Darwin's theory (one of a number of scientific papers presented during the week as part of the British Association's annual meeting). Although Huxley and Wilberforce were not the only participants in the discussion, they were reported to be the two dominant parties. No verbatim account of the debate exists, and there is considerable uncertainty regarding what Huxley and Wilberforce actually said.

Word spread that Bishop Wilberforce, known as "Soapy Sam" (from a comment by Benjamin Disraeli that the Bishop's manner was "unctuous, oleaginous, saponaceous"), would speak against Darwin's theory at the meeting on Saturday June 30, 1860. Wilberforce was one of the greatest public speakers of his day and, according to Bryson, "more than a thousand people crowded into the chamber; hundreds more were turned away." Darwin himself was too sick to attend.

The discussion was chaired by John Stevens Henslow, Darwin's former mentor from Cambridge… The main focus of the meeting was supposed to be a lecture by New York University's John William Draper, "On the Intellectual Development of Europe, considered with reference to the views of Mr. Darwin and others, that the progression of organisms is determined by law". By all accounts, Draper's presentation was long and boring. After Draper had finished, Henslow called on several other speakers, including Benjamin Brodie, the President of the Royal Society, before it was Wilberforce's turn.

In a letter to his brother Edward, the ornithologist Alfred Newton wrote:

In the Nat. Hist. Section we had another hot Darwinian debate ... After [lengthy preliminaries] Huxley was called upon by Henslow to state his views at greater length, and this brought up the Bp. of Oxford ... Referring to what Huxley had said two days before, about after all its not signifying to him whether he was descended from a Gorilla or not, the Bp. chafed him and asked whether he had a preference for the descent being on the father's side or the mother's side? This gave Huxley the opportunity of saying that he would sooner claim kindred with an Ape than with a man like the Bp. who made so ill a use of his wonderful speaking powers to try and burke, by a display of authority, a free discussion on what was, or was not, a matter of truth, and reminded him that on questions of physical science 'authority' had always been bowled out by investigation, as witness astronomy and geology.

A lot of people afterwards spoke ... the feeling of the meeting was very much against the Bp.

According to Lucas, "Wilberforce, contrary to the central tenet of the legend, did not prejudge the issue", but he is in a minority on this, as Jenson makes clear. Wilberforce criticized Darwin's theory on ostensibly scientific grounds, arguing that it was not supported by the facts, and he noted that the greatest names in science were opposed to the theory. Nonetheless, Wilberforce's speech is generally only remembered today for his inquiry as to whether it was through his grandmother or his grandfather that Huxley considered himself descended from a monkey…

Huxley rose to defend Darwin's theory, finishing his speech with the now-legendary assertion that he was not ashamed to have a monkey for his ancestor, but he would be ashamed to be connected with a man who used great gifts to obscure the truth. Again, later retellings indicate that this had a tremendous effect on the audience, and Lady Brewster is said to have fainted.

More reliable accounts indicate that although Huxley did respond with the "monkey" retort, the remainder of his speech was unremarkable. Balfour Stewart, a prominent scientist and director of the Kew Observatory, wrote afterward that, "I think the Bishop had the best of it."  Joseph Dalton Hooker, Darwin's friend and botanical mentor, noted in a letter to Darwin that Huxley had been largely inaudible in the hall:

Well, Sam Oxon got up and spouted for half an hour with inimitable spirit, ugliness and emptiness and unfairness ... Huxley answered admirably and turned the tables, but he could not throw his voice over so large an assembly nor command the audience ... he did not allude to Sam's weak points nor put the matter in a form or way that carried the audience.

It is likely that the main point is accurate, that Huxley was not effective in speaking to the large audience. He was not yet an accomplished speaker and wrote afterward that he had been inspired as to the value of oration by what he witnessed in that meeting.

Next, Henslow called upon Admiral Robert FitzRoy, who had been Darwin's captain and companion on the voyage of the *Beagle* twenty-five years earlier. FitzRoy denounced Darwin's book and, "lifting an immense Bible first with both hands and afterwards with one hand over his head, solemnly implored the audience to believe God rather than man". He was believed to have said: "I believe that this is the Truth, and had I known then what I know now, I would not have taken him [Darwin] aboard the Beagle."

The last speaker of the day was Hooker. According to his own account, it was he and not Huxley who delivered the most effective reply to Wilberforce's arguments: "*Sam was shut up—had not one word to say in reply, and the meeting was dissolved forthwith*"  Ruse claims that "everybody enjoyed himself immensely and all went cheerfully off to dinner together afterwards".

It is said that during the debate, two Cambridge dons happened to be standing near Wilberforce, one of whom was [Henry Fawcett](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Fawcett), the recently blinded economist. Fawcett was asked whether he thought the bishop had actually read the *Origin of Species*. "Oh no, I would swear he has never read a word of it", Fawcett reportedly replied loudly. Wilberforce swung round to him scowling, ready to recriminate, but stepped back and bit his tongue on noting that the protagonist was the blind economist. (See p. 126 of Janet Browne (2003) *Charles Darwin: The Power of Place*.)

Notably, all three major participants felt they had had the best of the debate. Wilberforce wrote that, "On Saturday Professor Henslow ... called on me by name to address the Section on Darwin's theory. So I could not escape and had quite a long fight with Huxley. I think I thoroughly beat him."  Huxley claimed "[I was] the most popular man in Oxford for a full four & twenty hours afterwards." Hooker wrote that "I have been congratulated and thanked by the blackest coats and whitest stocks in Oxford.” Wilberforce and Darwin remained on good terms after the debate.

(Pictured at right) A stone pillar marking the 150th anniversary of the event stands outside the Oxford University Museum of Natural History.

Summary reports of the debate were published in *The Manchester Guardian*, *The Athenaeum* and *Jackson's Oxford Journal*. Both sides immediately claimed victory, but the majority opinion has always been that the debate represented a major victory for the Darwinians, but why if so many including Darwin thought that Wilberforce made the better arguments and caused Darwin to address Wilberforce’s questions in his second book?

The answer maybe in the words of Oxford academic Dr Diane Purkiss who said the debate "was really the first time Christianity had ever been asked to square off against science in a public forum in the whole of its history".

Many of the opponents of Darwin's theory were respected men of science: Owen was one of the most influential British biologists of his generation; Adam Sedgwick was a leading geologist; Wilberforce was a Fellow of the Royal Society..

The debate has been called "*one of the great stories of the history of science*" and it is often regarded as a key moment in the acceptance of evolution. However, at the time it received only a few passing references in newspapers, and Brooke argues that "the event almost completely disappeared from public awareness until it was resurrected in the 1890s as an appropriate tribute to a recently deceased hero of scientific education". Note also that the contemporary accounts of the participants were largely replaced by a somewhat embellished version (see the much later insertion of Huxley's remark to Brodie, for example). The great popularity of the anecdote in the 20th century was largely due to shifting attitudes towards evolution and anachronistic re-interpretation of the actual events.

The debate marked the beginning of a bitter three-year dispute between Richard Owen and Huxley over human origins, satirized by Charles Kingsley as the "Great Hippocampus Question", which concluded with the defeat of Owen and his backers. It seems that the real event here was that society had come to such a state of rebellion before God, that it was becoming both acceptable and common place to question the authority of His word and that veracity of the Genesis account. The results of the debate were not as important as the shift in society which was occurring all around this debate and set the stage for it.

The following history also uses large excerpts form from Wikipedia

The **Scopes Trial**, formally known as ***The State of Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes*** and commonly referred to as the **Scopes Monkey Trial**, was an American legal case in 1925 in which a substitute high school teacher, John Scopes, was accused of violating Tennessee's Butler Act, which made it unlawful to teach human evolution in any state-funded school. The trial was deliberately staged in order to attract publicity to the small town of Dayton, Tennessee, where it was held. Scopes was unsure whether he had ever actually taught evolution, but he purposely incriminated himself so that the case could have a defendant.

Scopes was found guilty and fined $100 (equivalent to $1,345 in 2015), but the verdict was overturned on a technicality. The trial served its purpose of drawing intense national publicity, as national reporters flocked to Dayton to cover the big-name lawyers who had agreed to represent each side. William Jennings Bryan, three-time presidential candidate, argued for the prosecution, while Clarence Darrow, the famed defense attorney, spoke for Scopes. The trial publicized the Fundamentalist–Modernist Controversy, which set Modernists, who said evolution was not inconsistent with religion, against Fundamentalists, who said the word of God as revealed in the Bible took priority over all human knowledge. The case was thus seen as both a theological contest and a trial on whether modern science regarding the creation–evolution controversy should be taught in schools.

The trial revealed a growing chasm in American Christianity and two ways of finding truth, one "biblical" and one "evolutionist (scientific)." Author David Goetz writes that the majority of Christians denounced evolution at the time.

Author Mark Edwards contests the conventional view that in the wake of the Scopes trial a humiliated fundamentalism retreated into the political and cultural background, a viewpoint evidenced in the movie *Inherit the Wind* and the majority of contemporary historical accounts. Rather, the cause of fundamentalism's retreat was the death of its leader, Bryan. Most fundamentalists saw the trial as a victory and not a defeat, but Bryan's death soon after created a leadership void that no other fundamentalist leader could fill. Bryan, unlike the other leaders, brought name recognition, respectability, and the ability to forge a broad-based coalition of fundamentalist and mainline religious groups to argue for the anti-evolutionist position.

The trial escalated the political and legal conflict between strict creationists and scientists to influence the extent to which evolution would be taught as science in Arizona and California schools. Before the Dayton trial only the South Carolina, Oklahoma, and Kentucky legislatures had dealt with anti-evolution laws or riders to educational appropriations bills. After Scopes was convicted, creationists throughout the United States sought similar anti-evolution laws for their states.

By 1927, there were 13 states, both in the North and South, which considered some form of anti-evolution law. At least 41 bills or resolutions were introduced into the state legislatures, with some states facing the issue repeatedly. Nearly all of these efforts were rejected, but Mississippi and Arkansas did put anti-evolution laws on the books after the Scopes trial that would outlive the Butler Act.

In the Southwest, anti-evolution crusaders included ministers R. S. Beal and Aubrey L. Moore in Arizona and members of the Creation Research Society in California. They sought to ban evolution as a topic for study in the schools or, failing that, to relegate it to the status of unproven hypothesis perhaps taught alongside the biblical version of creation. Educators, scientists, and other distinguished laymen favored evolution. This struggle occurred later in the Southwest than elsewhere and persisted through the Sputnik era after 1957 when it collapsed, as the national mood inspired increased trust in science in general and support for evolution in particular.

The opponents of evolution made a transition from the anti-evolution crusade of the 1920s to the creation science movement of the 1960s. Despite some similarities between these two causes, the creation science movement represented a shift from overtly religious to covertly religious objections to evolutionary theory — sometimes described as a [Wedge Strategy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wedge_Strategy) — raising what it claimed to be scientific evidence in support of a literal interpretation of the Bible. Creation science also differed in terms of popular leadership, rhetorical tone, and sectional focus…

The Scopes trial had both short and long term effects in the teaching of science in schools in the United States. Though often upheld as a blow for the fundamentalists in the form of waning public opinion, the victory was not complete.Though the ACLU had taken on the trial as a cause, in the wake of Scopes' conviction, they were unable to find any volunteers to take on the Butler law and by 1932, the ACLU gave up. The anti-evolutionary legislation was not challenged again until 1965 and in the meantime William Jennings Bryan's cause was taken up by a number of organizations including the Bryan Bible League and the Defenders of the Christian Faith.

The immediate effects of the trial are evident in the high school biology texts used in the second half of the 1920s and the early 1930s. Textbook publishers paid close attention to the trial to gauge what the public wanted or would tolerate in biology textbooks. Of the most widely used textbooks after the trial, only one included the word "evolution" in its index; the relevant page includes biblical quotations. The fundamentalists' target slowly veered off evolution in the mid-1930s. As the anti-evolutionist movement died out, biology textbooks began to include the previously removed evolutionary theory. This also corresponds to the emerging demand that science textbooks be written by scientists rather than educators or education specialists.

In 1958 the National Defense Education Act was passed with the encouragement of many legislators who feared the United States education system was falling behind that of the Soviet Union due to the launch of Sputnik. The act yielded textbooks, produced in cooperation with the American Institute of Biological Sciences, which stressed the importance of evolution as the unifying principle of biology. The new educational regime was not unchallenged. The greatest backlash was in Texas where attacks were launched in sermons and in the press. Complaints were lodged with the State Textbook Commission. However, in addition to federal support, a number of social trends had turned public discussion in favor of evolution. These included increased interest in improving public education, legal precedents separating religion and public education, and continued urbanization in the South. This led to a weakening of the backlash in Texas, as well as to the repeal of the Butler Law in Tennessee in 1967.

Thus, it was not the scopes trial which in any real way fostered the demise of biblical creation being taught in the public schools of the U.S. Instead, it was the launching of Sputnik which put the whole country into a panic state believing that we had fallen behind the Soviet Union in science and that widespread change had to occur. This event, not Scopes triggered the widespread inclusion of evolution teaching in the U.S. public schools as we see it today. In reality Scopes was a victory for the fundamentalists which spawned decades of laws and public feeling that we were still giving God’s word its proper place of authority. Like in the Huxley-Wiblerforce debate however, it was the result of the trial so much as a thermometer of how society was moving away from biblical beliefs and would be ripe for widespread change when the true trigger of Sputnik came along.

How do two sins equal a loss? Such bad math only occurs when the historians who rewrite history frame it so and when society and man who have rebellious since we were expelled from the garden are ready to allow such reinterpretations of history to stand because they too wish to be in rebellion of the creator!

**Editor’s Note: The following article was written by Eric Metaxas who is an American author, speaker, and TV host. This article first appeared in the Wall Street Journal on December 25, 2014. We thank both the author and the wall Street Journal for allowing us to reprint this fine article.**

# Science Increasingly Makes the Case for God

## The odds of life existing on another planet grow ever longer. Intelligent design, anyone?

By  **ERIC METAXAS** Dec. 25, 2014 4:56 p.m. ET Wall Street Journal

In 1966 Time magazine ran a cover story asking: Is God Dead? Many have accepted the cultural narrative that he’s obsolete—that as science progresses, there is less need for a “God” to explain the universe. Yet it turns out that the rumors of God’s death were premature. More amazing is that the relatively recent case for his existence comes from a surprising place—science itself.

Here’s the story: The same year Time featured the now-famous headline, the astronomer Carl Sagan announced that there were two important criteria for a planet to support life: The right kind of star, and a planet the right distance from that star. Given the roughly octillion—1 followed by 27 zeros—planets in the universe, there should have been about septillion—1 followed by 24 zeros—planets capable of supporting life.

With such spectacular odds, the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence, a large, expensive collection of private and publicly funded projects launched in the 1960s, was sure to turn up something soon. Scientists listened with a vast radio telescopic network for signals that resembled coded intelligence and were not merely random. But as years passed, the silence from the rest of the universe was deafening. Congress defunded SETI in 1993, but the search continues with private funds. As of 2014, researchers have discovered precisely bubkis—0 followed by nothing.

What happened? As our knowledge of the universe increased, it became clear that there were far more factors necessary for life than Sagan supposed. His two parameters grew to 10 and then 20 and then 50, and so the number of potentially life-supporting planets decreased accordingly. The number dropped to a few thousand planets and kept on plummeting.

Even SETI proponents acknowledged the problem. Peter Schenkel wrote in a 2006 piece for Skeptical Inquirer magazine: “In light of new findings and insights, it seems appropriate to put excessive euphoria to rest . . . . We should quietly admit that the early estimates . . . may no longer be tenable.”

As factors continued to be discovered, the number of possible planets hit zero, and kept going. In other words, the odds turned against any planet in the universe supporting life, including this one. Probability said that even we shouldn’t be here.

Today there are more than 200 known parameters necessary for a planet to support life—every single one of which must be perfectly met, or the whole thing falls apart. Without a massive planet like Jupiter nearby, whose gravity will draw away asteroids, a thousand times as many would hit Earth’s surface. The odds against life in the universe are simply astonishing.

Yet here we are, not only existing, but talking about existing. What can account for it? Can every one of those many parameters have been perfect by accident? At what point is it fair to admit that science suggests that we cannot be the result of random forces? Doesn’t assuming that an intelligence created these perfect conditions require far less faith than believing that a life-sustaining Earth just happened to beat the inconceivable odds to come into being?

There’s more. The fine-tuning necessary for life to exist on a planet is nothing compared with the fine-tuning required for the universe to exist at all. For example, astrophysicists now know that the values of the four fundamental forces—gravity, the electromagnetic force, and the “strong” and “weak” nuclear forces—were determined less than one millionth of a second after the big bang. Alter any one value and the universe could not exist. For instance, if the ratio between the nuclear strong force and the electromagnetic force had been off by the tiniest fraction of the tiniest fraction—by even one part in 100,000,000,000,000,000—then no stars could have ever formed at all. Feel free to gulp.

Multiply that single parameter by all the other necessary conditions, and the odds against the universe existing are so heart-stoppingly astronomical that the notion that it all “just happened” defies common sense. It would be like tossing a coin and having it come up heads 10 quintillion times in a row. Really?

Fred Hoyle, the astronomer who coined the term “big bang,” said that his atheism was “greatly shaken” at these developments. He later wrote that “a common-sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super-intellect has monkeyed with the physics, as well as with chemistry and biology . . . . The numbers one calculates from the facts seem to me so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost beyond question.”

Theoretical physicist Paul Davies has said that “the appearance of design is overwhelming” and Oxford professor Dr. John Lennox has said “the more we get to know about our universe, the more the hypothesis that there is a Creator . . . gains in credibility as the best explanation of why we are here.”

The greatest miracle of all time, without any close seconds, is the universe. It is the miracle of all miracles, one that ineluctably points with the combined brightness of every star to something—or Someone—beyond itself.

Mr. Metaxas is the author, most recently, of “Miracles: What They Are, Why They Happen, and How They Can Change Your Life” (DuttonAdult, 2014).

**Prayer Needs and Praises!**

**John Morris**is recovering from a stroke as he continues a long term battle with MS. John is the long time President of the Institute for Creation Research, a PhD Geological Engineer, and one of the most prominent writers, researchers, and leaders in creation science. Pray for miraculous healing! Dr. Morris is also giving up his post as President of ICR due to his health and we ask for prayer for the leadership ICR as they go forward.

**Sue Stepanek** is battling cancer. Surgery went well but recovery is slow due to her also having Celiac Disease which was discovered only after surgery. Sue is the wife of Richard Stepanek who speaks for Alpha Omega Institute. Pray for complete recovery.

**Answers in Genesis** and their Ark Encounter project have come under intense political attack and the state of Kentucky has now rescinded their rights to tax incentives provided to all tourist attractions such as them. Please pray that God will restore these tax incentives to Ark Encounter.

**Dr. Carl Williams** Dr. Williams and his wife Cindy are board members with SABBSA. Dr. Williams has learned of the return of his prostate cancer which had been in remission for the last four years. Please pray for healing and support for this brother and his family.

**Alpha Omega Institute (AOI)** is in dire need of funds to finance their speaker and support staff salaries, sponsor their summer programs and college seminars, as well as to support the “kick off’ of their new training institute. We ask that you both pray for their needs and the success of their ministry as well as pray as to whether you need to be one to support them financially.

**Biblical Creation Seminar at Cibolo Valley Baptist Church**

**SABBSA President Scott Lane** is in the midst of conducting a four month seminar on **Biblical Creationism at Cibolo Valley Baptist Church, each Sunday afternoon at 4:30 pm** and continuing through May. This seminar makes it clear science and the Bible support one another as we would suspect since God spoke both into existence! Below is the remaining schedule this spring.

May 17 - **What you aren't being told about Astronomy - Our Created Solar System (video)**

May 24 – **Choice of “Our Created Galaxies and Universe” video or “Distant Starlight and Time” presentation**

**SABBSA at Community Bible Church and RTB**

Scott Lane will be giving our premier presentation of **“What if God Wrote the Bible?”** at Community Bible Church on Friday, May 15 at 6:30 pm in room C139/141. This presentation is free to the community and all are invited to come for this highly evangelical and inspiring presentation showing the authority of God’s word! This presentation is being hosted by the local “Reasons to Believe” chapter and we thank them and CBC for their gracious invitation. A pot luck dinner will be had at 6 pm in the same room followed by the multimedia presentation at 6:30 pm. We hope to see you there!

**Coming to SABBSA on June 9th: Richard Stepanek with AOI**



We are proud to host **Richard Stepanek with Alpha Omega Institute** at our June meeting. Richard will be a presenting a fascinating talk on “**The Waters in Genesis 1**”. This is a presentation I heard from him in Colorado two years ago and we have been working to get him down here to give it to us ever since.

**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.

**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.

**The Last Two Months at SABBSA**

**"Thousands or Billions: Which is it? Why does it matter?"**

**A 6000+ year Timeline for the Bible with Dr. Carl Williams**

Dr. Carl Williams gave us a great beginning to our three month investigation as to the evidence for varying timelines which fit both the biblical text as well as historical and scientific data in March. Dr. Williams' presentation showed the wide variety of "traditional" interpretations of biblical timelines which can vary by as much as 3000 years! He also gave us a look at the differences between the several manuscripts from which our Bible was constructed and how they agreed and disagreed with one another on dates and ages which scholars have depended upon to arrive at their timelines for Earth history.

Dr. William's talk was both evangelical and informative. He made the point that our focus should be on the Creator and His plan for Christ and not debatable things as scripture warns us of. But, also he makes an interpretation point that the Hebrew word "yalad" from the Old testament cannot be interpreted as descent from an ancestral father but must be strictly interpreted as meaning "bore" or "to bear" insinuating that it must be from the seed of the true father.

Dr. Daniel Harris debated these points in his April presentation. In part I of his presentation Dr. Harris showed many instances were “yalad” is not translated as “directly bore.” He started to make a case for the lineages of the Bible show only the “major players” or major Patriarchs in these lineages and thus we may allow for far more time to be inserted into a Biblical timeline that the traditional 6000 years. Dr. Harris will complete his presentation in our May meeting.

****

**Next SABBSA Meeting:
Tuesday, May 12, 2015, at 7 pm**

**Concluding the series at SABBSA in May**

**A 12,000 year Timeline for the Bible, Part II**

by Dr. Daniel Harris

Creationists have debates within their own ranks. One of those is just how young is the earth? Does the Bible give us any hints as to whether a strict 6000 year time frame is implied or whether a somewhat longer time frame could be reasonably applied to the text? To bring this discussion into sharp view, our March meeting focused on the 6,000 year time frame while April’s and May’s meeting will investigate a longer discussion of this topic.

This month, at our regular meeting on May 12, Dr. Daniel Harris will give us more on his views on how a 12,000 year timeline better fits scientific data, historical records and the Bible's text. This follows a great presentation on March 10th by Dr. Carl Williams who espouses a more traditional 6000+ year time frame for the Earth and Bible history.

Please join us in May for the conclusion of this fascinating series which will focus on one of the more controversial topics in creation science. As always, we will meet at the Jim’s Restaurant at the corner of San Pedro and Ramsey at 7 pm. Please join us for good food, fellowship and impactful Christian apologetic teaching.