Communique'

President - Scott Lane 599-7240 Vice President – Ed Salzwedel   
Secretary – Clarence Johnson Treasurer – Carl Williams, M.D.   
[website – [www.sabbsa.org](http://www.sabbsa.org) ] [P.O. Box 34478, San Antonio, TX 78265]

**May 2019**

It’s May in San Antonio and we are feeling the “El Nino” effect in the almost “monsoon like” rain period we opened the month with. We pray that all of you are dry and safe.

This month’s **Communique’** has an article detailing research by Dr. Jerry Bergman on supposed beneficial mutations which are not so beneficial. We also have the latest information on the newest contestant in the **supposed mammal to whale transitional form sweepstakes**. These are always so comical that you must see it to believe that people with doctorates even proposed that these are whale ancestors.

We also have an article giving you a preview of the Institute Creation Research’s new 37-million -dollar **Discovery Center** for Science and Earth History.

We have another installment of our **Genesis Commentary series on Genesis 1:11-13** showing the Bible’s understanding of the biological **Law of Biogenesis** as well as the superior taxological system of “**created kinds**” which the Bible describes. As always, we include a full run down of creation events near and far. We hope you find this material edifying.



**Darwin, Mutations, and Worldview**

Excerpted from an article by [Dr. Jerry Bergman](https://thecreationclub.com/author/gerald-bergman/)

**Evolution assumes rare positive mutations. Knowing this assumption, I did some research to answer the question “Are Beneficial Mutations Common?”**

Dr. jerry Bergman last month published an article on how the supposed proofs of “positive mutations” are not so positive. An example is the seedless grapes we buy and eat. This hybridized strain cannot reproduce and must be reproduced artificially. The mutations in this case are, as always, a loss of information and the loss of the ability of the plant to reproduce. This and other such loss of information and viability mutations led Dr. Bergman to do some research on supposed “positive mutations.” His literature search found very few examples of even claimed beneficial mutations. The results are here:

* Total Mutations documented: 453,732
* Beneficial Mutations: 186
* Percent Beneficial: 0.04
* Total Records Searched: 18,807,786

An evaluation of the 186 examples of ‘Beneficial Mutations’ found in plants and animals showed they were beneficial only for humans, not for the plant or animal. For example, seedless fruit which allows humans to avoid spitting out seeds, but the fruit cannot reproduce normally. Or, the muscle mutation in Belgian Blue cattle. It was considered valuable to beef farmers since they developed 20 to 30% more tender muscle mass that is low in fat. But this was a result of information loss, the deletion of the brakes that prevent excess growth of muscle and causes all kinds of problems for the animal and even farmer.


The classic example of a mutation creating a new species was discovered in 1791 by Seth Wright. He noted a few male sheep had short, bent legs resembling dachshunds. They could not jump high fences, thus saving shepherds time and money. Darwin claimed this example was able to produce a new sheep “breed,” the Ancon sheep. It was touted in textbooks up until 1950 as a solid proof of a mutation producing a new species. It has now been proven to be nothing more than a lethal deformity called achondroplasia. This “breed” went extinct in spite of efforts to save it.

In short, mutations may produce minor advantages, such as the mutation that causes blue eyes, but, rather than building life, “mutation easily breaks or degrades genes, which, counterintuitively, can sometimes help an organism to survive, so the damaged genes are hastily spread by natural selection.

No adaptive mutation producing a specific, new, functional gene aiding adaptation of the organism to its environment has ever been discovered. This would require the construction (by mutations) of a new promoter, intron/exon splice site, and protein processing site to allow the mutant strain to exist. And this we have never observed.

**Editor’s Note- we hear estimates all the time of beneficial or positive mutations being nonexistent or less than 1 in 10,000. I thought that you might like to see real data on the subject rather than conjecture.**

**Peregocetus pacificus, 43-million-year–old walking whale?** Have they finally found the missing link?

 Edited and excerpted from an article by Jonathan Sarfati, CMI,

Schematic drawings of the articulated skeleton of MUSM 3580 showing the main preserved bones, in a hypothetical swimming and terrestrial posture. Stippled lines indicate reconstructed parts and missing sections of the vertebral column Nobu Tamura, Wikimedia Commons, 2008

An international team of paleontologists led by Dr Olivier Lambert, of the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, has discovered a new alleged ‘walking whale’. This creature was Peregocetus pacificus, 4 m (13 ft) long, found in Playa Media Luna on Peru’s southern coast, and ‘dated’ to middle Eocene, 42.6 million yrs. (Ma).

**What was found?**

Nothing like putting the meaning ‘whale’ into a name to push the idea that it was some sort of whale ancestor. Never mind that almost no one looking at such a creature would ever call it a whale.

Like many claims of missing links, we should ask: what was the actual evidence? E.g. the original claims of Pakicetus (‘Whale from Pakistan’) as an aquatic whale ancestor were based on skull fragments only. But finding a more complete skeleton showed that it was a fast-running land mammal (see Not at all like a whale and Whale evolution fraud). This is one reason why evolutionary agitprop (political propaganda) needs to keep claiming to have ‘found the missing link’, apparently hoping that we forget that they have said that before.

But Peregocetus was represented by a fair number of bones, as shown above. This includes the lower jaw (mandible), shoulder and hip girdle, a front and rear leg and feet, and much of the spinal column, especially in the tail (caudal) region.

But it was missing a lot of crucial information as well: the skull for example, so we have no idea what its ear was like, and this is crucial for identifying putative whale ancestors. And while its tail vertebrae showed widening (“expanded transverse processes”), so it could have helped with propulsion in water, it was more like “those of beavers and otters”. There was no evidence for tail flukes as in real whales.

**Evolutionary question-begging**

The name Peregocetus pacificus means ‘travelling whale [that reached] the Pacific’ (the name Ambulocetus, meaning ‘walking whale’, was already taken). Nothing like putting the meaning ‘whale’ into a name to push the idea that it was some sort of whale ancestor. The evolutionary bias is obvious.

Where are the normal diagnostic criteria for cetaceans, such as powerful swimming tail, preferably with horizontal flukes, a blow hole, obligate aquatic body design, and middle and inner ears in a cavity outside the skull not inside it as with terrestrial mammals? (See also Whale evolution?) And it had a well-developed shoulder and hip girdle attached to its spinal column, with well-developed legs. Its feet even had hooves, so it could walk on land.

**Wrong place and time**

It was remarkable, from an evolutionary point of view, that such a fossil could be found so far away from its closest relatives. That’s why the genus name emphasized ‘travelling’. But worse for the evolutionists is the ‘dating’. That is, according to evolutionary dating, Peregocetus is millions of years younger than creatures that are clearly more whale-like, such as Rodhocetus allegedly 4 million years older, and Remingtonocetus 5 million years older and Protocetus 2 million years older.

We see the same problem with the other most-touted evolutionary transition series, dinosaur-to-bird and fish-to-tetrapod. In the former, the definite flying bird Archaeopteryx and the beaked flying bird Confuciusornis are ‘dated’ millions of years older than the ‘feathered dinosaur’ ancestor candidates. In the latter, there are undoubted tetrapod footprints millions of years older than all the supposed intermediates, including the much-touted Tiktaalik (actually, footprints in general are often found in rocks ‘millions of years’ older than any animal that could have made them).

That is, according to evolutionary dating, Peregocetus is millions of years younger than creatures that are clearly more whale-like, such as Rodhocetus allegedly 4 million years older, and Remingtonocetus 5 million years older and Protocetus 2 million years older.

Peregocetus is very different from the aquatic Dorudon and the enormous Basilosaurus, which are dated to 4 million years younger—i.e. a huge amount of change to occur by random mutation and natural selection.

Talking about this problem with the proclaimed dino-to-bird series, its leading evolutionary critic, paleornithologist Dr Alan Feduccia likes to say, you can’t be older than your grandfather! His opponents in particular, and evolutionists in general, when confronted by similar problems, respond that sometimes a grandfather can outlive his grandson. This is correct, but one of the major ‘evidences’ of evolution is how the evolutionary order supposedly matches the fossil sequence. So, the mismatch of claimed order of appearance with claimed phylogeny undermines the evolutionary explanation.

Furthermore, Peregocetus doesn’t seem to have ‘advanced’ beyond Ambulocetus, supposedly 6 million years older, i.e. virtual ‘evolutionary stasis’. But in the other direction, it is very different from the aquatic Dorudon and the enormous Basilosaurus, which are dated to 4 million years younger—i.e. a huge amount of change to occur by random mutation and natural selection. It’s nice that evolution is so flexible in that it can explain such vastly different rates, although we know of no difference in mutation rates or selective pressures. Also, there are problems in substituting so many mutations in such a short time, as evolutionary geneticists have realized (see the discussions about Haldane’s dilemma and the waiting time problem.

**Conclusion**

No, there are no four-legged whales. This should go without saying, by the normal meanings of words. But sadly not, with the dogma of land-mammal–to–whale evolution. This new find, Peregocetus, was certainly four-legged, and could stand and walk on land, but it was equally certainly not a whale. Furthermore, it is ‘dated’ as millions of years younger than some much more ‘whale-like’ creatures, opposite to the claimed evolutionary sequence. And there is too little time for mutations and selection to have evolved Peregocetus into something like a Basilosaurus.

A much better explanation is that God created whales fully formed, and on day 5—a day before He created land creatures, including those of the created kind comprising Peregocetus. This is one of many contradictions in the order of events between Genesis and long-age ideas.

**Editor’s Note: This whole story reminds me of a kid’s “Weekly Reader” article I used to pass around in seminars I did in the late 1980’s. There was a find of a fully modern whale fossil in Central Canada. The “Weekly Reader” told the kids that this meant that this whale fossil actually had legs in place of its bottom fins and was millions of years ago walking from the sea to where it was laid to rest hundreds of miles inland.**

**I found it amazingly farcical at the time that such a clearly wrong interpretation of evidence was hoisted in front of young kids. I am no longer laughing. The farce continues today. In the 1980’s the answer was clear then that at some time in the past Central Canada was covered by water (perhaps during the worldwide flood) and this thoroughly normal whale was buried in a cataclysm to be preserved.**

**Instead this fantastical story with no real proof, but lots of imagination impressed upon young minds from an early age the idea that everything evolved from common descent and the Bible by the way is only telling us nursery rhymes. Is it any wonder we lost that generation to unbelief!**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**The ICR Discovery Center**

On April 17 we were given a “sneak peek” at the Institute for Creation Research’s new37-million-dollar **Discovery Center** for Science and Earth History**.** This state-of-the-art museum, and interactive theme park experience will be a great tool **f**or spreading the gospel and informing future generations of God’s creative works!

The Planetarium and “Founder’s Hall” multi-media presentation rooms have already been completed and we were treated to a short presentation by Dr. Brian Thomas and Dr. Timothy Cleary in the Founder’s Hall. We then got to experience the 20-minute long “Our Young Solar System” presentation. They have a second presentation exploring the wonders in our oceans which is in 3-D! These are only the first of many multimedia experiences planned for this 44-seat planetarium experience.

In addition, the Discovery Center offers fossil displays, and a “Founders of Science” room which begins your tour of the facility. Here you find that the great men in the history of science which used their faith to move science forward.

Subsequent room exhibits are “Origins of the Universe”, “Garden in Eden”, “The Flood”, “Life on the Ark”, “Grand Canyon”, “Beasts of the Earth”, “Dragon Encounters”, “Mount St. Helens”, “Life in the Ice Age”, “Ice Age Theater”, “Tower of Babel”, “Current Research”, and “Life of Christ and The Return”.

Each of these exhibit rooms is fitted with state-of-the-art multimedia displays and interactive devices you could spend a couple of days in just taking it all in. The intricate interactive electronics are all being built into these rooms at this printing and the Discovery Center is scheduled to open to the general public in October 2019.

Located in Northwest Dallas at 1806 Royal Lane, Dallas, Texas 75229, it will be a boon to school groups in the DFW area and much more convenient to us than the Answers in Genesis attractions in Northern Kentucky. We will have pamphlets on the **ICR Discovery Center** at each of our SABBSA meetings over the next few months leading up to their grand opening.

To learn more about ICR’s Discovery Center you can go to <https://www.icr.org/discoverycenter/> To schedule a tour or book a group you can go to email [Events@icr.org](mailto:Events@icr.org) or call 1-800-337-0375. We will have a representative from ICR on the radio with us in September just ahead of their opening.

**Genesis Commentary**

**1:11** Then God said, “Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants yielding seed, *and* fruit trees on the earth bearing fruit **after their** kind with seed in them”; and it was so. **12**The earth brought forth vegetation, plants yielding seed **after their kind**, and trees bearing fruit with seed in them, **after their kind**; and God saw that it was good. **13**There was evening and there was morning, a third day.

Here we first encounter a phrase which will be repeated in Genesis chapter 1 ten times, reiterating that in God’s creation, **everything reproduces according to its kind (in Hebrew “min”. Also used is “baramin” or “created kind”)**. This shows a knowledge of what we call in the field of biology as the **Law of Biogenesis**.

**Biogenesis**

According to the Bible, everything reproduces according to its “**kind**.” In the simplest interpretation of these verses it says that “life always comes from life.” That is a restatement of the “**Law of Biogenesis**” formulated by the work of Louis Pasteur in the 19th century. On the surface, this is just common-sense science and observation. Cows always produce cows. Chickens always lay eggs, which if allowed to hatch reproduce chickens. Every kind reproduces its own kind. We have never throughout the history of man observed a kind which produced another kind of animal or a seed which produced another kind of plant than the one it came from.[[1]](#footnote-1) This is the most verified by observation tenant in biology.

But, that is not what men have thought over the centuries. For most of the history of man, cultures have expressed and repeated a concept of “**spontaneous generation**.” Spontaneous Generation says that at some point nonliving material became alive.[[2]](#footnote-2) Today this idea has morphed into the idea that inanimate material (dirt, rocks, water, etc.) became alive via some strange process. This “life from lifelessness” is called “**abiogenesis**.” [[3]](#footnote-3)

For most of man’s history, multiple superstitions, myths and fables have been told of how different living things “sprang” into existence from lifeless materials.

For more than a millennium, stories were circulated that said they knew how to make mice from lifeless materials. The story went that if you collected a lot of trash in the corner of a barn, that out of that pile of trash a mouse would be produced from nonliving material.

The truth which came to light with prolonged observation (the basic experimental tool of science) was that mice are not produced from the nonliving trash in the barn, but that mice, already alive, already produced as the living offspring of other mice, are attracted to the pile of trash in the corner of barns as they scavenge for food.

Another story said that a frog was produced by just getting some mud, water and weeds together for a period of time. In truth of course, it is not the mud and water which produces the frog, but the mud and water attracts the frog since this is the environment this amphibian is designed to live in. Since the frog lives there, it will lay eggs in the muddy water which will yield tadpoles when the eggs hatch, they will develop in the water and eventually develop into a frog as its DNA is preprogrammed to do.

Another tale said that flies were produced out of decaying dead meat.[[4]](#footnote-4)

A famous set of experiments by the Italian scientist Fransisco Redi demonstrated this was not true in 1668. Redi put some decaying meat into a **closed jar** and no flies were produced. However, he also set out some meat in an **open jar** (a control group), let it decay for days and flies and worms (maggots) appeared on the meat and then flies from those maggots.[[5]](#footnote-5)

What we now know through Redi’s and others scientist’s careful observations is that flies are attracted to meat, they not only land on the meat and eat some, but they lay their eggs in the decaying meat so that when they hatch, the larvae which come out of the eggs (maggots) will have food since they will also dine on the decaying meat. After a time, these maggots will then develop into flies. Again, what scientific observation has demonstrated in these three cases and in all others that we have ever observed is that **life always comes from life.** It never “pops” into existence from a collection of nonliving materials.

The theory of evolution is based on abiogenesis. According to this philosophy, at some point in the far distant past life came from lifeless material. The problem with this thesis is that it has never been observed. Thus, abiogenesis fails in its lack of observable, repeatable, testable and falsifiable testing, which is supposed to be the basis of science, not what we can dream up as stories!

Conversely, the Bible affirms its knowledge of the fact of nature that life always comes from life, in spite of the contrary stories so prevalent in the cultures of the time the Bible was written in. So how did the Bible get this right, when all other sources up to and including modern times told such stories of life from lifelessness?

**Every Animal created according to Its “Kind.” Is that Scientific?**

As previously stated, ten times in the Bible found in the first chapter of Genesis (in Hebrew meaning “Beginning”) it says that every type of animal, insect, fish, plant or insect would reproduce only according to its “kind”.[[6]](#footnote-6) This would seem at odds with the current theory of evolution, which states that every life form on Earth has developed slowly over many millions of years in small steps via adaptation and modification. In fact, a plain reading of the Bible on this point disagrees with the theory of “macroevolution” (the idea that one species varies and changes until it becomes another species, then another, then another till becoming a completely new body form. Another way of saying this is macroevolution theorizes that a first simple cell accidentally formed on this planet and over eons of time it developed into multicellular organisms, then into fish, then amphibians, then reptiles, then mammals and eventually man).[[7]](#footnote-7) The Biblical account is explicitly at odds with such a theory.

Further, a plain reading of Genesis 1 shows a completely different order for the creation than the proposed order of development via the evolutionary process. Let’s look at a few examples of these divergent orders. The Bible says the world was first made of water, then land formed. Evolution says that the Earth first formed as a ball of magma which cooled to dry land and water was added later.[[8]](#footnote-8)

The Bible says that life first appeared on land on Day 3. Evolution says that life first appeared in water in a prebiotic soup.[[9]](#footnote-9) The Bible says the first life on Earth were plants, whereas evolution says it was single celled organisms. According to Genesis 1, the Earth was formed before the sun and stars. Stellar evolution theory says the sun and stars would have formed before the Earth.[[10]](#footnote-10)

The Bible says that birds and fish were both created on the same day. Evolutions says that fish developed many millions of years before birds.[[11]](#footnote-11) The biblical order says that whales were created before reptiles. Evolution of course says the reverse.[[12]](#footnote-12) The Bible says that birds were created on Day 5, while insects (creeping things) were made on Day 6. But, of course, evolutionary theory says that insects developed millions of years before birds.[[13]](#footnote-13)

There are many more of these disconnects between biblical and evolutionary order for creation. Dr. Bill Tierney (then head of the Biology Department at the U.S. Air Force Academy) at a conference I attended in Granby Colorado in 1986 presented this information to me and convinced me that you can believe in evolution or you can believe in biblical creation, but not both. They cannot be compromised together, nor made compatible. And since “evolution” is stated to be a “fact of science”, this proves the Bible is in error, or does it?

Before we proceed, one thing needs to be clarified about the creation model. When the Bible says that everything “reproduces according to its kind” does not mean the Bible says speciation (the changing of a kind of animal from one species to another which is closely related like a terrier and a beagle) does not occur, which it clearly does. What it does say is that one **body form or kind** cannot vary so much as to become a whole new body form or kind. The biblical concept of “kind” roughly equates to the family or genera level of current scientific taxonomy. It allows and in fact demands that a large amount of variation is not only allowed, but programmed into each kind so they can adapt to new environments. For example, it would fit into the biblical creation model of kinds for all dog species, wolves and coyotes we see today to have all developed over time from an original set of generic dogs (the dog kind).[[14]](#footnote-14) This type of variation within the kind was first identified by Edward Blyth in 1835 and many call this microevolution[[15]](#footnote-15), which the biblical model would allow for.

Let’s look at what the Bible says and what data from nature actually says and see which fits better, the biblical concept of kinds or the evolutionary hypothesis of an infinite variation of life forms, one changing into another?

As previously stated, when we look at the rock strata all across the Earth, it is covered by sedimentary layers miles deep with millions of fossils buried in the rock strata, most often arranged in flow layers which suggest they were rapidly covered by water and sediments, which is exactly what you would expect if the Bible was true and a worldwide flood actually occurred.

When we examine these millions of fossils buried in the sedimentary rock layers, we find both current species, variations on current species and extinct species, but, except for a very few debated examples, we find none of the transitions between kinds or differing body forms.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Shrimp fossils have been found which secular scientists have dated at 170 million years old which are exactly like modern shrimp. Fossils of horseshoe crabs, which are supposedly 450 million years old show almost no variation over time. We have found impressions and fossils of stingrays which are dated at 250 million years old, which show no discernable difference between these ancient species and modern rays. Dragon fly impressions dated at between 150 and 300 million years old, show no difference when compared to current species, except some species are larger. These are just a few examples of a wide variety of organisms which some people refer to as “living fossils”.[[17]](#footnote-17) What this data shows is **stasis** (no change) over time, not the infinite variation we would expect if every life form on Earth had developed via evolution.

Perhaps the most revealing of the “living fossils” is the **Coelacanth**. The Coelacanth is a fish which was thought to be extinct until it was discovered to be alive in the deep-water oceans off first Madagascar and then a second species of Coelacanth in the waters off Japan. Before these living examples were found, we had found fossils of Coelacanths and it had been theorized that it was one of those very rare debated examples of “transitional forms” between one biological kind and another. It was believed that the fossils found suggested this was a fish developing a primordial lung, as well as strong bottom fins were developing into “proto-legs”. This was thought of as a transition between fish and amphibians, just what the evolutionary theory would say we would find if evolution were true.

When we got to examine the actual living Coelacanths in nature, we found they were just normal fish. No primordial lungs, but standard gills. No proto-legs, but just standard fins on the bottom of its body, not attached to its spinal column. So, this example not only shows stasis over 450 million years[[18]](#footnote-18), but debunks the idea that it was a transitional form between kinds. This evidence again shows what we would expect from the biblical creation model and not evolution.

Another thing in paleontology which seems to agree with the biblical model and confounds the evolutionary view is what is called the **“Cambrian Explosion”.** The Cambrian Explosion is a deep layer (dated by secular dating at about 530 million years ago) of sedimentary rock strata at which the first complex life first appears on this planet. Below this point there are no complex life fossils. What is stunning, is that in this deep layer we find almost every major body plan (or kind) imbedded in it. This **sudden appearance** of almost every type of life form on Earth is not what is predicted by the evolutionary paradigm, but it is exactly what we would predict to see if the biblical model is true.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Further, everything we have observed and recorded as far back as man has records agrees that everything reproduces according to its kind. It is common sense. A bird lays an egg and out comes a bird of that species or close to it, due to minor variations in the two parent’s DNA. We never get a crocodile or a pony coming out of a redbird egg. When a cow has a calf, it reproduces another cow. We never see a wolf, nor a giraffe coming out of a pregnant cow. Everything does seem to reproduce according to its kind! And, as we spelled out in the previous section, this reproducing only according to its kind is perfectly in concert with the “**law of biogenesis**” which says that life always come from life. Evolution on the other hand says that sometime in an unknown distant past life came from nonliving materials (abiogenesis – life from lifelessness).[[20]](#footnote-20) This has never been observed and is not science, but unproven philosophy.

Some biologists, when asked about this, will claim that they see evolution happen today by observing bacteria change in very short periods of time. Scientists like to observe bacteria because they reproduce rapidly and frequently and can vary between one bacteria and another more than in most species since they can actually trade genetic information with another bacteria via strands of DNA called plasmids.[[21]](#footnote-21) But, with all of this rapid variation, even though we do get a lot of speciation and variation, at the end of the day, or the month, or a year, what we still have is just bacteria! **The body form, the kind, has not changed!**

In light of the apparent stasis, and the fact we cannot really see evolution happening today in front of us, evolutionist’s like the late Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard and Richard Goldschmidt at UC Berkley have theorized that there is very little evolution going on for millions of years (stasis) which is followed by very short periods of rapid evolution between species and kinds which is fostered by unusual periods of solar radiation activity, or other even more exotic temporary factors. This would explain why we find so much stasis in the rock layers, but it leads to a ridiculous reality. What it says is that a reptile is exposed to radiation or new bacteria or something and it lays an egg and produces a badger or wolf in just a generation or two. Goldschmidt’s theory was in fact called the “**hopeful monster theory**”. [[22]](#footnote-22)

Why would respected members of the secular scientific community propose such ridiculously outlandish ideas? It is because they are honest enough to examine the wealth of fossils we have today and recognize that gradual evolution over millions of years is not what it exemplifies. However, instead of relenting to the logical alternative of the biblical creation account, they try to re-invent evolution to a ridiculous extent just so they do not have to admit a supernatural force could have been at work here.

Thus, in spite of the consensus that evolution is true, when we look at the data in the fossil record and nature, we find that the scientific data better fits the creation model, rather than the evolutionary model. Thus, the creation model is a viable scientific alternative, which has not been disproven by science, and in fact, the theory of everything we see being created according to kinds is scientifically supportable.

Also, in verses 11-13 the Genesis Chapter 1, the Bible declares that the first life put on Earth was plant life on land. This is contrary to the evolutionary theory that the first life on Earth was in microbial form in water. This is one of more than twenty disconnects between the biblical account and the order of creation proposed by the theory of evolution. As pointed out to me by one of my mentors’ Dr. Bill Tierney, “you can either believe in evolution or believe in biblical creation, but not both.” The two cannot be successfully compromised, even though many have tried to do so.

We have already given you a partial list of how the biblical account and the proposed evolutionary timeline are at odds and cannot be compromised. That list includes-

The Bible says (Gen. 1:2) there were oceans before land appeared. The evolutionary theory says the earth was Hadean (molten) for more than 500 million years, then solidified as dry land for the next billion years or more before water was put onto the Earth via comets. The bible says that the Earth was formed out of water and that water was on the Earth from the creation. Zircons found deep in the Earth seem to verify the existence of water in the early Earth supporting the biblical account.

The Bible says that the Earth was created before the sun and stars on Day 4. Evolutionary theory says that the sun and stars were formed billions of years before the Earth. This point is especially important if you are trying to compromise with each day being long ages as the Age-Day theory does. If the biblical account is correct, then God can put plants on the Earth on Day 3, and they will live quite well until the next day when God places the sun in the sky to power their photosynthetic life mechanisms. But, if they are created and then have to wait around five hundred million years till the sun shows up they will all be dead long before the sun is ever created.

And as listed previously the differences go on and on!

**Prayer Needs and Praises!**

**ICR and AOI** – ICR is in the final stages of building their **Creation Discovery Center.** Please pray for this huge endeavor and pray about contributing to the last $4 million needed to finish the project. Likewise, our friends at the **Alpha Omega Institute** have moved into their own facilities and are looking to pay off that facility. Please pray that this facility helps them reach the college students for which this facility was bought and pray about contributing to paying off this facility.

**SABBSA on KSLR**

Please join the **San Antonio Bible Based Science Association** “on the air” each Saturday afternoon with “**Believing the Bible!”** Join us **Saturday afternoons at 1:45 pm on radio station KSLR 630 AM in San Antonio and airing for 9-million people across the U.S. in 10 major markets.**

Here is our schedule of upcoming program topics:

5/4 - **Geologic Column**

5/11 - **Homology**

5/18 - **Test Tube Life**   
5/25 - **De-Faithing of America**

These programs are available on **podcast**. If you cannot tune in on Saturday afternoons, or would like to sample our program or hear previous shows, they are available on podcast on the KSLR website. Click on the link below to go to the KSLR podcast page and scroll down till you find "**Believing the Bible**." ["Believing the Bible" - SABBSA on KSLR Radio](https://am630theword.com/radioshow/local) **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Last Science Workshop for FEAST this Spring**

Last month our resident astronomer, **Dr. Daniel Harris,** shared some great insights on how our galaxy and the universe itself have tell tail signs of a young age and recent creation to a good and attentive crowd.

Dr. Harris’ fine presentation can be viewed on YouTube in three parts at the links below –

Dr. Daniel Harris Part 1 of 3  Apr 22, 2019

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vAVOI-gefos>

Dr. Daniel Harris Part 2 of 3  Apr 22, 2019

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MDmk892qdK8>

Dr. Daniel Harris Part 3 of 3  Apr 22, 2019

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J9v2x4bCWRE>

Many thanks to Pastor David Thompson and the membership at Faith Lutheran Church for hosting us!

**Coming to SABBSA in 2019 on the second Tuesday of each month at Faith Lutheran church**

May - **Made in His Image**  
June - **Nuclear Apologetics pt. I** - Jason Lisle  
July - **Sunspot Activity**  (John Pendleton)   
August - **Nuclear Apologetics pt. II**  
September - **Clearly Seen** (Guliuzza)  
October - **Human Design** (Guliuzza)  
November - **Seven C's of History** - children's



**Cartoon Corner**

Thanks to **Answers in Genesis** who provides these cartoons each month for our newsletter and our presentations. Please think about donating to them in gratitude for this and all the ministries they give us.

**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 143. After the presentation, there will be refreshments, fellowship and creation science materials for all to enjoy. Their meetings can be streamed live! 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 Evidence Museum just outside Glen Rose, TX. This 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:**

The Museum of Earth History uses the highest quality research replicas of dinosaurs, mammals and authentic historical artifacts to not only lay out for the visitor a clear and easily understood connection between Genesis and Revelation, but will do so in an entertaining and intellectually challenging way. Open M-F 9 to 6. <http://visitcreation.org/item/museum-of-earth-history-dallas-tx/>


**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 on the first Tuesday of each month. <http://dfw-mios.com/>

**Abilene:**

The Discovery Center is a creation museum/emporium that exists primarily to provide scientific and historic evidence for the truthfulness of God’s word, especially as it relates to the creation/evolution issue. It also features some fascinating “Titanic Disaster” exhibits. <http://evidences.org/index.html>

**Lubbock Area (Crosbyton):**   
All year: Consider a visit to the Mt. Blanco Fossil Museum, directed by Joe Taylor. The Museum is 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 creation audio programs 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**

**"Creatures do Change, But it's not Evolution"**

Did you know that natural selection supports the Bible?

God created things in a way that thwarts evolutionary storytelling. See how mutations and natural selection contradict evolution, and how microbes-to-microbiologists evolution is impossible. See the incredible workings inside cells with the latest, original, cutting-edge animation showing how cells make proteins. It's mind-blowing! It defies evolution and shouts "Creation!" - Change is not necessarily evolution.

This video features Dr. Don Batten, PhD in Plant Science and Managing Director of Creation Ministries International-Australia. You can see a preview of this program by going to [www.youtube.com/watch?v=PnelfcQCctg](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PnelfcQCctg)



**Next SABBSA Meeting:   
Tuesday, May 14, 2019, 7 pm**

**Coming to SABBSA in May**

**"Made in His Image"**

"**Made in His Image** is one of the most powerful productions ever made on the marvels of God's creation. It is scientifically accurate, theologically sound, intellectually stimulating, and spiritually uplifting. Don't miss it!" - Emeal ("E. Z.") Zwayne, President, Living Waters.

The Institute for Creation Research offers **Made in His Image**, a four-episode series that will take the audience on a journey through the most complex and miraculous creation on Earth-us. There is no better example of complex, conscious design than the human body. This awe-inspiring series explores some of its most extraordinary systems, which are so perfectly designed and masterfully engineered that the viewer will be left with no doubt that we are indeed created by an expert designer, God.

"So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them." Genesis 1:27. Produced from a biblical perspective, **Made in His Image** will inspire audiences by looking at the human body in all its wonder-fully functional, fully human, and fully created in God's image.

Featuring medical, engineering, and other experts like Dr. Randy Guliuzza, **Made in His Image** will fascinate audiences with mind-blowing facts, dazzling imagery, and memorable illustrations. The four episodes will examine the stages of human development and show that everything we need to fulfill God's plan is instilled in us from the first moments of life. Each episode reinforces the knowledge that every human is special to God. He has endowed each of us with unique physical abilities, intellect, and spiritual lives to fulfill His purpose.

Episodes include- "The Miracle of Birth", "The Marvel of the Eyes", "Uniquely Human Hands" and "Beauty in Motion."

Christians of all ages will marvel at the complexity of God's creation as revealed in Made in His Image. We hope this series will prompt viewers to worship the greatest Designer of all, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Please join us in May for creation science and biblical apologetics teaching you will find nowhere else in Bexar County. We meet at **Faith Lutheran Church**, 14819 Jones

1. https://biotech.law.lsu.edu/cphl/history/articles/pasteur.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Ball, Philip (2016). "Man Made: A History of Synthetic Life". Distillations. 2 (1): 15–23. Retrieved 22 March 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Bernal, J. D. (1967) [Reprinted work by A. I. Oparin originally published 1924; Moscow: The Moscow Worker]. The Origin of Life. The Weidenfeld and Nicolson Natural History. Translation of Oparin by Ann Synge. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spontaneous\_generation [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Francesco\_Redi [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Hamilton, Victor P (1990). The Book of Genesis: chapters 1. Eerdmans. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Futuyma, Douglas (1998). Evolutionary Biology. Sinauer Associates. p. 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.britannica.com/science/Hadean-Eon [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Bada, J. L. (2002). "Origin of Life: Some Like It Hot, But Not the First Biomolecules". Science. 296 (5575): 1982–1983. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Montmerle, Thierry; Augereau, Jean-Charles; Chaussidon, Marc; et al. (2006). "Solar System Formation and Early Evolution: The First 100 Million Years". Earth, Moon, and Planets. Springer. 98 (1–4): 39–95. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolution\_of\_fish [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/how-did-whales-evolve-73276956/ [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. "Landmark study on the evolution of insects". Sciencedaily.com. November 6, 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. https://answersingenesis.org/creation-science/baraminology/what-are-kinds-in-genesis/ [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Dobzhansky, Theodosius (1959). "Blyth, Darwin, and natural selection". The American Naturalist. 93 (870): 204–206. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. https://creation.com/abandoned-transitional-forms [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Living fossils: a powerful argument for creation—Don Batten interviews Dr Carl Werner, author of Living Fossils (Evolution: the Grand Experiment vol. 2), Creation 33(2):20–23, 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Butler, Carolyn (March 2011). "Living Fossil Fish". National Geographic: 86–93. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Carroll, R.L., “Towards a new evolutionary synthesis,” Trends in Ecology and Evolution, Vol. 15(1):27-32 (2000). [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Peretó, Juli (2005). "Controversies on the origin of life" (PDF). International Microbiology. Barcelona: Spanish Society for Microbiology. 8 (1): 23–31. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4961956/ [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Gould, Stephen J. (1987). "Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?", Self-Organizing Systems: 113–130. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)