EVOLUTION

Creation

This essay covers a number of articles concerning evolution. It provides a different perspective with challenging arguments. There is no claim of authorship here except for compilation of the material from the books mentioned and their respective authors. This is a summary of facts about neo-Darwinism. The challenge put forth in this essay is for the reader to consider the possibility of a different world view.

Introduction:

This essay deals with aspects of an article, 'Creation verses Evolution. The author's name is Garth D. Wiebe who published it on the web in February of 1997. The article is well referenced. Major topics include a defence of creation, spontaneous biogenesis, random mutations, natural selection, transitional forms, fossilization, stratified layers and dating methods. The article is only 35 pages so any discussion of these topics was very basic. The author's objective was to encourage critical thinking about this subject, there's a huge percentage of society, including Christians who have accepted these evolution without any regard to questioning them whatsoever. In addition, this essay includes information presented in a study by Morris and Sherwin, the Fossil Record. The third article that is referred to in this essay tells us about 'Geological Column' by Reed and Oard. This focuses on Diluvial Stratigraphy, rejection of the column's Chronology and the theory of the Mabbul and Recolonization. A very interesting study.

Part I

First, the author sums up neo-Darwinism through the following points and I quote, 'spontaneous auto-organization of random chemicals into complex biopolymers, by chance forming complex self-replicating automatic machines that then evolve into more and more complex self-replicating automatic machines through genetic transcriptional errors and the injection of random noise, filtered into highly coded information and structures by predators, the climate, and other mindless agents working together to produce an ecosystem capable of sustaining and improving all these countless life forms for billions of years.' The author provides us with a contemporary meaning of evolution as being the belief that all life forms are related by ancestry, and that the first life form occurred spontaneously, all due to completely natural processes. But author defines creation as being, the origin of all life forms as being attributed to a creator who purposefully created them with planning and intent. This occurred some six to ten thousand years ago. The article is presented in the form of an apologetical defence of creationism. Before the author goes into his defence, he gives us a definition of 'design' which is part of his defence. 'Design demonstrates the existence and capability of a designer, the inherent design in life, the earth and the universe implies the existence and capability of its designer. The author goes on to say that a designer provides better and more authoritative information about his design than the design does about itself and in case of life on earth; the Designer has identified Himself and shown us specific information about some of the circumstance surrounding creation.

The laws of biochemistry, probability and statistics, and basic information theory are against living matter being spontaneously generated from non-living matter. Only existing genetic information allows for variations to occur among members of that species as individuals within that species interbreed which occurs in 'micro-evolution.' Abnormalities from random genetic mutations have never been shown to be beneficial; in fact they are almost always bad. The principle of micro-evolution (genetics) which has been scientifically verified disproves evolution. Evolutionary taxonomy is an effort based purely upon speculation and prior acceptance of the evolution model as is any discussion of transitional forms. This is an attempt to look at similarities and thus conclude there are common ancestries between them but the creationist sees the common designer and principles for these kinds of animals. The fossil records of life simply don't support evolutionary taxonomy but instead the process of fossilization plainly fits within the model of geological catastrophe. And besides, fossils only exist in the present. And it must be said that similarity doesn't imply ancestry. This is easily indicated by the fossil order within the various stratified layers of rock, hence there is no basis for assuming uniform geological processes as the evidence isn't there to support it. Thus uniform theory is an ideology without a foundation. Any assumptions, thoughts and discussions by evolutionary scientists are based on uniformitarianism and entering into any discussion, they already have a set of presuppositions, but a scientific theory must be validated through experimental observation and/or theoretical evaluation. One such presupposition is the age of the earth. Another presupposition based on uniformitarian interpretations is the idea of gradual sedimentation and fossilization, as with multiple ice ages. Methods for dating rocks also involve certain assumptions about initial conditions and environment that aren't known, so the results of the afore mentioned dating methods are inconsistent. It is assumed that carbon-14 dating has been constant for tens of thousands of years but this is indeed an assumption. For example, the strength of the earth's magnetic field affects carbon-14 and this magnetic field is decreasing every year. But, since it's assumed by evolutionists that the earth is old, the magnetic field can not be decaying and because, it's not decaying there must be a dynamo that's keeping it up. This is what's called circular reasoning. Plus, it's been shown that the rate of decay can be changed through the use of electricity. Many of these methods do suggest a young earth instead of an old earth but the age of the earth or life on it cannot be rigorously demonstrated through any dating method because the method is not testable. Because of this scientist make assumptions based on probabilities and statistics which represent observations and there are so many assumptions

which evolutionists think of as facts. Out of randomness we often try to predict an outcome using established mathematical models. This has happened with involution and given the immensely lower probability of things happening in the evolutionary scheme of things; one should be consistent and thus conclude that it simply doesn't work. Evolutionist often uses the idea of 'chance' in their theories. Chance here is equated with randomness which in turn is associated with disorder and chaos. So the classic evolutionary concept of spontaneous biogenesis involves living matter coming about from non-living material by chance. The odds of this happening are so great that it would be a religion in itself. This would take a miracle. Living matter consists only of left-handed amino acids. Any random formation of amino acids produces left and right molecules which have been confirmed in a laboratory. Life is made up of about twenty particular sequence acids. These acids can react and form bonds with other chemical compounds also. To have such an environment for this to take place, it would have had to be reducing rather than oxidizing containing very little free oxygen and also an abundance of hydrogen and gases like methane and ammonia. This is only for a single protein! Because of the near impossibility involved in this, evolutionists are now proposing that DNA or RNA first occurred. Some suggest that life took place on a clay template rather than a primordial sea. But this has to be as complex as the primordial soup would need to be. But all of this lacks a theoretical foundation according to the principles of chemistry probability and statistics and basic information theory. Without any experimental basis, such scientific hypothesis can't be supported. 'Chance' doesn't cause anything. Random processes associate with increasing disorder, not complex design. Such is the tautology of natural selection. Neo-Darwinian evolutionist must explain the process of nature and the innovative functionality of life forms which originates from it. Instead they usually provide an evasive justification based on random genetics mutations and natural selection. There are no new genetics codes in natural selection since survival doesn't compel survivors to have any new functions and codes that weren't there before. Neo-Darwinian evolution (design by mutation and national selection) cannot be supported, scientifically or otherwise. There isn't any demonstrated vehicle for such design!

There are other assumptions; there are still comets so there must be a whole cloud of them out beyond the solar system, and every once in a while something causes one to come into the solar system. Moons are not volcanic; that is until they discovered Io on Jupiter. The amount of lava currently being thrown out by volcanoes corresponds to the volume of all the continents today if the earth was 4.5 billion years old. If the earth is billions of years old,

consider the amount of erosion that takes place. All lands would have gone down to sea level long ago. A different subject but with the same processes, evolutionists have assumed the following ‘missing links’ between humans and apes: Australopithicus africanus, Australopithicus robustus, Zinjanthropus bosei, Australopithicus afarensis, "Lucy," Paranthropus, Plesianthropus, Telanthropus, "Skull 1470," Homo habilis. These have consisted of parts of skulls or groups of bone joined together to forms a partial skeleton. There have also been several that have been faked by evolutionists so as to make a name for themselves. The standing posture of these has been shown to be caused by a lack of certain vitamins while other bones have been shown to be that of apes. Whereas other young bones were found in deposits ‘older’ than where the bones of the Neanderthal bones were found. The Piltdown man was a complete fraud.

Science only deals with natural phenomena whereas intelligent design, planning and intent is not a natural phenomenon. Logic and common sense is not a science nor is history. Science is a discipline which deals only with the workings of the natural order and it requires other methods of inquiry. It is observation which invalidates Newtonian mechanics or scientific theory. Scientists cannot contradict historically confirmed observations; they are the very basis for scientific analysis. The Bible is principally an historical record of historical events written down by historical witnesses. Some of what is written documents include supernatural phenomena, which is inherently outside of the realm of any kind of scientific inquiry. Creation scientists are those who pursue scientific study in light of the facts of history that the scriptures document. Even thought evolution is said to be a scientifically defensible theory, however it must be understood that neither evolution nor creation is strictly scientifically defensible. The evolutionist’s argument has very little evidence to support itself but the argument from design is a much more powerful and obvious defence for creations verses evolution. But there are four objections to design: who designed the designer is one, crystals and snowflakes are example of ordered things spontaneously occurring in nature but these is nothing compared to the complex self-replicating machines that living systems consist of. Crystals and snowflakes only represent simple order and repetition. We are not qualified to criticize the design since we have not designed anything of such a sophisticated level as we’re speaking of. The fourth objection is why people don’t believe it, whether something is valid or not is not determined on whether it’s accepted or not.

There’s a philosophical point in regards to scientists and evolutionists and their theories. It seems in discussing evolutionary topics, anything they say, agree with or disagree

with, is done from the point of view that evolution is a fact. Their thinking is as if, how can there be anything else? Even those scientists, who actually see the problems associated with neo-Darwinism and disagree with it, disagree from a viewpoint that evolution is still a fact. This permeates the atmosphere of evolution and sadly this atmosphere has spread throughout Christendom. I would go so far to comment, how many Christians are there that would come right out and say that they believe in a six day creation. Sadly, I'm not sure there are many.

We see that evolution is not just a theory but must more. The evolutionists have presented its theory in the form of facts thus making it one of the biggest lies of this age. There are other lies that are similar to this: perhaps when communism was at its height, what about Islam, also? But it seems there are different types of evolutionists, those who really believe that it is true because they have been 'converted' and there are those who know it isn't true but they are so anti-Christian, they are willing to say anything that goes against Christianity. Lastly, we have those who are willing to accept it because they don't know any better and aren't willing to put any effort into understanding it. I guess what bothers me more than anything is; Christians don't seem to think it is the threat and they aren't very concerned about it at all!

I guess one interesting point is that Wiebe went to a lot of trouble to summarize all these points on evolution. The references were good and precise. His refutation, even though a summary, was through. There's no question as to whether the author met his objective. Wiebe points out that he is a layman and thus this article was written in layman's words so that anyone could understand it. Other articles, thus far, were also well presented but what stands out with Wiebe's article was the testimony of God's input into these matters. I though the way the author did this was especially good.

Even though this article was very concise, one of the problems I did see with it and many others is the lack of a summary ending. Even though this is a small point, for a non scientist, it's very easy to lose oneself within all of these facts. If the authors were to present a pointed conclusion to help refresh the reader's mind at the end, I believe it would add to the article. Thankyou!

Part II

So I deal with The Fossil Record by Dr John d Morris and Frank J. Sherwin Unearthing Nature's History of Life.. Evolution looks at the world and its creation through purely natural processes. It assumes the position of naturalism and stresses an uniformitarian viewpoint. Whereas, Biblical creation stresses a world history based on a theistic worldview

by way of a catastrophic background. The evolutionist's main tool and presentation is the use of false claims in regards to the fossil record. Part of this essay's purpose is to discuss these claims and if there is any truth to them.

The evolutionary model as presented by many is frankly the 'descent from a common ancestor.' This means that life developed from more primitive forms, starting with single-cell organisms, marine invertebrates, to chordates, fish, reptiles and amphibians, mammals and finally humans. So evolutionary theory says that man, not only came from the ape but started with the evolutionary chain of single-cell organisms. To further define the evolutionary definition of the human, we come from the universe's chemicals, which were self-organized by natural processes over eons of time eventually developing into a single-cell life form and then transformed into a higher form eventuating into a human being. As higher animals, we have incorporated animal behaviour into an established society. And the only true meaning of life is survival and reproduction. At death, we simple cease to exist.

On one hand, evolution presents itself as science fact but in truth it should be better understood as a pseudo-scientific justification for live. It has become a state-sponsored religious dogma decreeing a complete, exclusive worldview. It is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion and a full-fledged alternative to Christianity. Thus it is in itself, a religion. It is not science in the empirical sense of observation and testing. And to be clear, both Biblical Creation and Evolution neither can be directly observed. But Evolutionist has built their claims on the beliefs on what Darwin postulated. The Biblical Creationists have based their claims on Biblical History as demonstrated in the Bible. The Evolutionary perspective, according to Richard Lewontin, a leading evolutionist in regards to the classroom, demonstrates an absolute stranglehold of materialistic atheism. This makes the classroom one of the most censored, thought-controlled environments.

Referring to evolutionary changes purported by evolutionary ideology; interestingly, limited change is all that scientists of any viewpoint have ever observed and this is fully supported by the Bible. This limited change has only been demonstrated with distinct groups. A better word for this is variety but this is not evolution necessarily which state that mutations frequently occur developing new 'new kinds'. The Fossil record only shows minor changes within a 'kind'. There just isn't any fossil record showing large scale changes needed by Evolution.

Harvard palaeontologist and devout evolutionist Dr Stephen J. Gould was a leading proponent of a new evolutionary concept, 'punctuated equilibrium'. This theory was

developed in answer of the failed fossil record to show one single example of phyletic evolution. So according to this theory, evolution seems to have happened in fits and starts; such as from trilobites to pterodactyls, ammonites to archaeopteryx. Thus palaeontologists quickly accepted punctuated equilibrium however geneticists did not accept this. This became a stalemate and evolutionists general agreed not to use the fossil record as evidence for evolution. Thus, now, no real evolutionist uses the fossil record as evidence in favour of evolution over Biblical creation. In order to make this clear; they have acknowledged that there is no evidence in the fossil record to show evolutionary transitions (missing links) as previous dictated. These missing links have never existed.

Punctuated Equilibrium – changes only comes about suddenly in any local area. The species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and fully formed.

Phyletic – relating to or denoting the evolutionary development of a species of other group.

Trilobites – an extinct marine arthropod that occurred abundantly during the Palaeozoic era, with a carapace over the forepart, and a segmented hind part divided longitudinally into three lobes.

Pterrodactyl – a pterosaur of the late Jurassic period, with a long slender head and neck and a very short tail.

Ammonite – an ammonoid that belongs to the order Ammonitida, typically having an elaborately frilled suture lines.

Archaeopteryx – the oldest known fossil bird, of the late Jurassic period. It had feathers, wings, and hollow bones like a bird, but teeth, a bony tail, and legs like a small coelurosaur dinosaur.

Missing Links – These are supposedly transitional forms. Claims of finding these forms have generally shown mistakes and hoaxes. For example, the Archaeoraptor, ‘dino-bird’ was exposed as a fraud. The more recently, ‘Ida’ was celebrated as a missing link but eventually shown as a variety of the modern lemur. Every claim by one evolutionist that a dinosaur fossil represents a transition between kinds has been counter-claimed by another evolutionist on the grounds of its well-formed anatomy. The reason for this is that each dinosaur fossil appears to be from a fully formed creature with every part in place.

Invertebrate – an animal lacking a backbone, such as an arthropod, mollusc, annelid, coelenterate, etc.

Chordata – a large phylum of animals that includes the vertebrates together with the sea squirts and lacelets. They are distinguished by the possession of a notochord, a hollow dorsal nerve cord, pharyngeal slits, an endostyle and a post anal tail. at some stage during their development. They also have pharyngeal pouches (relating to the pharynx) and an endostyle, a shallow groove in the pharynx (throat) floor of protochordates . The first chordates and early vertebrates were found in Cambrian sediment which is earlier than evolutionary theory says they should appear.

Amphibian – a cold-blooded vertebrate animal of a class that comprises the frogs, toads, newts, and salamanders. They are distinguished by having an aquatic gill-breathing larval stage followed typically by a terrestrial lung-breathing adult stage.

An illustration by Darwin used in his famous book demonstrates the evolutionary mindset that all life came from a common ancestor, the origin of life from non-life, or spontaneous generation. This is so unlikely that it one could not imagine it happening once much less multiple times.

Evolutionary changes require genetic instruction to change. This is simple in concept but complex in operation. There is no intelligence present to rewrite the necessary genetic software. It must originate through random processes, through mutation and genetic recombination. The steps involved in this would take long periods of time over many generations. But this natural selection usually acts as a conservative mechanism, preserving the organism and prohibiting major changes. It only acts on biologic properties that already exist; it cannot create completely new properties. If this were so, there would have to be major transitions from one type of life to another. And if this is true, out of the trillions of fossils that exist today, none of these transitions are present in the geological record of fossils. To repeat, evolution says that fossil remains should reflect a simple-to-complex history of life's development. There should be extensive diversification of both plant and animal types, from the original few types to today's abundant types, and this should outpace extinction.

Just to re-iterate, neither Biblical creationism nor evolutionism in regarding to the earth's past can be observed. Evolutionists insist that natural processes have been 'uniform' throughout history though this cannot be known for certain as it was not observed. This belief goes against any catastrophic processes; unseen events in the unknowable past are interpreted within today's norms. For the creationist believe that processes to operate very differently that processes to the past. They do not agree with evolutionary naturalism and

uniformitarianism but instead believe that earth's past is shrouded in catastrophical occurrences. So evolutionary naturalism starts with the simple and progresses toward the more complex, ethereal quantum nothingness to a cosmic egg, then a Big Bang where subatomic particles appeared and then proceeded to combine into hydrogen and helium which then developed into stars and galaxies. But the creation model involves a supernatural force creating all things. This model is the most widely known and logical. The Biblical creation of life began with complexity. Each 'kind' was created as a distinct kind, complete with all the body parts, physiology, and instincts needed for survival. This is faith, but not a blind faith, since the creation is believed to bear God's signature. He created all reality, time, space, mater/energy, and light, including the planet earth.

A side step here; the word, 'life' as used in the Bible refers only to those that draw breath. For plants were created as food for living things. This can be said for bacteria also as it was created to facilitate true life. Biblical life refers to those animals that remember, think and feel. This could also loosely conform to the term 'conscious'. So life does not extend to plants and 'lower' animals. This linguistic concept is important for understanding Biblical creation. Until the Adam sinned, there was no death. God created man and woman and they were given creation to take care of. God said that everything was perfect but death, decay and deterioration followed Adam's rebelliousness. This rebelliousness was sin and this sin was equated to death. Sin changed everything and soon all things suffered under that death, a fallen world. This sin grew and eventually God decided to destroy it all through a global restructuring of the earth, a vast flood which created vast deposits of water-laid settlements that created vast coal and oil deposits. This restructuring brought about tectonic changes of continents. It is demonstrated today by the presence of fossil deposits that have encountered flooded terrain.

The two creation models: Evolutionary and Biblical Creation; evolution state that all things originated and developed through time, chance, and natural processes bases on the properties of matter. Basic types of organisms developed in stages from previously existing types and these proliferated over time along with their complexity. Living things were buried and fossilized by processes possible today. Whereas the Biblical account says that all basic types originated abruptly through supernatural processes. Organisms diversified within limits from their original created kinds. These 'kinds' experienced either stasis or extinction over time. Their complexity was present from the very beginning. Burial and fossilization occurred through extreme processes that are unlikely today.

The geological column is a standardized graphic made up by the Geologic Society of America in 2009. This is looked upon as a column of proposed voluntary development. Each of the eons-long epochs, periods, and eras relates to the particular life forms that thought to have lived during that time. The geological column represents an attitude toward time. The worldview encompasses the idea of 'uniformity.' This assumes that what occurred in the geological past was not much different from events that are going on at the present, especially with respect to the laws of nature. It is a column of time, with the older layers and fossils situated beneath the more recent ones. It is divided up into four major time periods: Precambrian, Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic. Each of these periods is further divided up into further zones. For example, the Palozoic starts with the Cambrian at the bottom and works up with the Ordovican, Silurian, Devonian, Mississippian, Pennsylvanian and the Permian. According to evolutionists, life came about in the Precambrain period below the Cambrain strata, millions or billions of years ago. So much life came about that it is sometimes referred to the Precambrain explosion, from which evolutionists find it difficult to explain. This is because evolutionists propose that only one type or a few types of life formed by spontaneous generation from non-life. Instead of one type, the Cambrian explosion suggest that multiple types of invertebrate all appeared at the same time, each quite complex and quite different from the others. The fossil record actually looks like a lawn rather than a tree. Creationists insist that essentially all living creatures appeared suddenly and basically retained the same forms (stasis) through time. Some types have gone extinct over time, but no new basic types have arisen. The Mesozoic contains the Triassic, Jurassic and the Cretaceous. The Cenozoic contains the Tertiary and Quaternary periods. This whole column is a created timescale, a conceptual device used to help picture relative time. The question to ask is whether the times indicated by geologists do indeed cover millions of years or whether it is a much shorter time. Where there is an abundance of fossil data, there is no hint of evolution. For example, when clam fossils are found, there are no identifiable ancestors present. Clams are clams, found in the trillions, in many different layers. They are found in many settings, tops of high mountains. This is true for different animals also. Furthermore, all kingdoms are found as fossils from near the bottom of the column to the top, and still have living representatives today. This is the flaw and lie of the geological column. In addition, of the poorly preserved terrestrial vertebrate classes, representatives of each are found as fossils. And one thing that is also clear, the links that were missing in Darwin's day are still missing.

There are no transitional fossils. Those species that are varieties of a 'kind' might be linked by transitional fossils, but no transitions exist between basic categories.

Determining the age of rocks and fossils is not clear cut. Radioisotope dating can only be used on rocks that were once in a hot, molten condition, such as lava rocks or granite. Carbon-14 dating is sometimes used to date organic remains but during fossilization, the organic material is removed or contaminated. In radioisotope dating there is an assumption that the rate of decay has been constants throughout the entire time the rock has existed. The quantity of parent has not been altered by outside contamination and the quantity is known in the first place. However, evidence has shown that decay rates have been different in the past. In addition, water action can leach atoms out of the system. Plus Igneous rocks that were observed to form in historic times have unexpected isotope concentrations that are more indicative of rock that has been around for a long time. Assumptions used in radioisotope dating are questionable and give erroneous, inconsistent, and sometimes bizarre dates.

Paleozoic – of relating to, or denoting the era between the Precambrian eon and the Mesozoic.

Cambrian – of, relating to, or denoting the first period in the Paleozoic era, between the end of the Precambrian eon and the beginning of the Ordovician period. The Cambrian period lasted from about 570 to 510 million years ago and was a time of widespread seas. It is the earliest period in which fossils, notably trilobites, can be used in geological dating.

Trilobite – an extinct marine arthropod that occurred abundantly during the Paleozoic era, with a carapace over the forepart, and a segmented hind part divided longitudinally into three lobes.

Nautiloid – a mollusc of a group of mainly extinct marine mollusks that includes the pearly nautilus of the class: Cephadlopda.

Cephalopoda – a class of active predatory molluscs comprising octopuses, squids and cuttlefish. They have a distinct head with large eyes and a fling of tentacles around a beaked mouth and are able to release a cloud of inky fluid.

Crystaline – having the structure and form of a crystal, composed of crystals, a crystalline rock.

Taxonomy – the branch of science concerned with classification, especial of organisms; systematics.

Vertebrates – an animal of a large group distinguished by the possession of a backbone or spinal column, including mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and fishes.

Echinodermata – a phylum of marine invertebrates that includes starfishes, sea urchins, brittlestars, crinoids, and sea cucumbers.
Therapsid – an extinct reptile of a Permian and Triassic order, the members of which are related to the ancestors of mammals.

One must be aware also that in uniformitarian thinking, fossils are buried near to where they had lived. Rarely would they be mixed with fossils from a different environment. However Catastrophism shows that the earth was subject to a vast upheaval where water inundated the earth. This brought about rapid sedimentation, preserving dead remains from differing habitats. Life forms would show complexity and design at every level. This is far more scientifically viable than the uniformity theory. Another example: in Uniformity one decides that the flow of the Colorado River through the Grand Canyon has always been the same and thus it would have taken ages to crave out the canyon. But in Catastrophism, there could have been vast flooding of the regent at one time or many times. This would involve a much shorter time period, perhaps hundreds of years. Both stem from different assumptions that are applied at the start.

Another example, in Uniformity, one decides that the flow of the Colorado River through the Grand Canyon has always been the same and thus it would have taken ages to crave out the canyon. But in Catastrophism, there could have been vast flooding of the area at one time or many times. This would involve a much shorter time period, perhaps over hundreds of years. Both stem from different assumptions that are applied at the start.

Fossils must go through rapid burial for fossilization. Fossilization cannot take place over long periods of time as the materials will just rot. Vast quantities of these fossils are found around the earth. In fossilization, one must understand that often the original organic material remains. One can find unaltered shells of marine shellfish consisting of calcium carbonate, phosphatic, or siliceous shells. Or, once buried, the fossil may undergo alteration of its hard parts while its soft parts decay. Sometimes, though rarely, soft parts are preserved by freezing and becoming entombed. At other times, the organism decays and leaves an impression in the surrounding sediment. When heated, the buried plants expel gasses, leaving behind mostly carbon causing the formation of coal. Also fossilized faecal material or stomach contents are found. Recently a large tyrannosaur thigh bone was found soft tissue that was flexible and pliable. Its hollow blood vessels contained actual blood cells. This Rex was deemed to be seventy million years old. But even under ideal circumstance, organic

tissue like this is known to break down in a rather short period of time, especially in the presence of water. There were fragile proteins and enzymes found in the specimen. This indicates that the Rex must have been fairly recently deposited, far more recently than the assigned age. It was found in porous sandstone where groundwater certainty penetrated it. The formation in which it was found has to be misdated. In another find by Schweitzer and colleagues report an 80 million year old duck billed dinosaur with fresh dinosaur protein. This seems to support the presence of inferior historical reconstructions of the unobserved past. Stories should not be allowed to substitute for evidence.

The evolutionary idea of life came about spontaneously from non-living chemicals. The problem with this idea is with the tiniest, simplest living cell abounds in complexity and biological engineering. Its intricacy seems far beyond the reach of random causes and statistical probabilities. The concept that life self-generated through purely natural processes stretches credibility. This belief is incompatible with the level of organization seen in the DNA code. Now, once life exists, changes may come about but the correctly arranged amounts of amino acids, proteins and genes are direct evidence of creation by an intelligent design. This is why some evolutionary theorists have resorted to the proposition that life was seeded here on earth.

In Fossil-Bearing Strata, sedimentary rocks are deposited as laterally extensive, flat-lying blankets of mud, often containing the organic remains of plants and animals. These blankets can be of varying thicknesses; some as much as a hundred metres and covering thousands of square kilometres. One such bed, The Morrison Formation, lay in the western US covering the states of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and most of New Mexico and bordering states. Nearly all sedimentary rock was deposited as sediments in moving water or air with the majority of fossils having a marine origin. This Jurassic-dates formation contains abundant dinosaur fossils mixed with petrified wood, clam and snail fossils along with a few mammal fossils. The 4,000 cubic kilometres of clay assumes mega volcanoes with enormous quantities of ash. No uniformitarian process can be said to have caused this deposit comparable to anything we have in recording history. For the Grand Canyon, sandstone is the lowest and oldest horizontally bedded strata. Geologists often interpret it as having resulted from major underwater mudflows. A fossil-bearing rock in the Grand Canyon called the Redwall Limestone reveals discovered cigar shaped nautiloids. An estimated four billion similar sea creatures were found in the same layer of rock throughout Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and New Mexico. These remains were caused by a catastrophic flood occurrence.

Any pre-flood ecology would contain floating forests. Denizens from the ocean were the first to be buried as sediments were pushed inland by dynamic currents. Eventually, shallow and upper-marine creatures succumbed, and then terrestrial dweller and continental habitats were buried. These watery forces destroyed fragile creatures leaving sea shells for possible fossilization. Most mammals and birds would bloat, float and be eaten by scavengers. Eventually, land animals would be buried in sediments that contained a wide variety of fossils. Later, intense volcanism particularly as mountains rose and continents spread with generated more sediment for further burial. In this burial, 95% of the fossils were marine invertebrates, nearly all found in catastrophic, widespread deposits on the continents. These geological past processes are unlike any we have recorded today, though we are seeing major earthquakes causing tsunamis and destruction around the world. Of this, plants, including trees and algae make up less than 5 percent with Vertebrates of all kinds showing less than one percent. Why aren't humans remains included in this record? As mentioned already, 95% of fossil remains are marine invertebrates. The remaining 5% are plants and less than 1% are fish and even less land animals. In general, land creatures have a low fossilization potential as most die and bloat and then rot. Some believe that the continents were sub ducted into the mantle of the earth totally obliterating all remnants of human civilization.

A subdivision of the Vertebrates would include the Amniotes, a nontaxonomic designation of a type of development for a group of higher vertebrates that are distinguished by the presence of extraembryonic membranes during embryonic development. Three groups include: anapsides (without holes in the skull), diapsids (with two holes in the skull) and synapsids.

According to the Book of Genesis, the world was created as an incompletely formed, uninhabited place. Perhaps it was only a rotating slurry of watery matrix called 'the deep'. Then earth underwent a series of modifications in preparation for life. Oceans and the atmosphere were separated and then continents were raised. Planets were created as eventual food for animals and humans, which soon appeared in the sea and sky and then on land. Mankind was then given stewardship over this creation, under Gods authority. Tranquillity reigned until the Earth broke up with floods and waters covering the whole planet.

According to Evolutionist Robert Barnes, he said, 'The fossil record tells us almost nothing about the evolutionary origin of phyla and classes. Intermediate forms are non-existent, undiscovered, or not recognized. With the abrupt appearance of so many different invertebrates during the Cambrian Explosion, none have known ancestors. Evolutionists

claim that the Burgess shale, a fossil found in Canada's Burgess Shale by Charles Walcott in 1909. This area did reveal unfamiliar fossil types and even new phyla were perhaps found. But they weren't ancestral to any other type nor was it a transitional form. But to summarize, the creation model predicts that no ancestral form will ever be found, for they never existed. Interestingly, none of the above information is allowed to be discussed in the classroom because of the current censorship of any criticism directed against evolution. But the evolutionists answer to this, is punctuated equilibrium which has already been touched on.

One of the questions in regards to fish which is well represented and fossilized by the billions. Evolution assumes that vertebrates evolved from non-vertebrate chordates, a known group of animals with a stiff notchord down the back. Evolutionists say that the notchord non-vertebrate chordate is the transitional link to fish. But, alas, there is no evidence of this. How did it evolve a backbone and become a fish? Fish have been discovered in the Cambrian strata and even in the lower Cambrian layers of which many are unusual but they are still fish. They belong to a jawless category of fish and often have bony scales for skin. There were fish of many different types: the armoured fish, the shark, the stingray, jawless fish and fihs with cartilage instead of bone, fish with lungs in addition to gills. These exist today. Some look more like snakes and some live in burrows, but fish are fish. They did not descend from invertebrates. The fossil record shows three subdivisions of the bony fishes with no intermediate forms. One such creature that stands out for the evolutionists is the Pikaia nearly identical to the living creature, the Amphioxus. This was found in the Middle Cambrian Burgess Shale. This is thought to be the ancestor of modern vertebrates. But two aspects of this, the Pikaia actual lives after the appearance of fish in the Early Cambrian. In addition, the Amphioxu being nearly identical to the Pikaia is a living fossil and hasn't changed in the presumed half a billion years. Also, evolutionists try to link the starfish and other echinoderms vertebrate because of a chemical compound found in the gut area that is somewhat similar to a chemical used in the gut of vertebrate embryos. Of course, this is a stretch for the evolutionists to supply their theory that vertebrates developed from non-vertebrates. But there's dilemma even in the argument because all phyla including vertebrate fish are found in the Cambrian explosion of life, located near the bottom of the geologic column. Again in the vast array of invertebrates, there is not documentation of this important transition.

Transitional Animals & Sharks:

Virtually all of the proposed sharks are easily recognized as sharks, showing only that a wide variety of sharks and other cartilaginous fishes existed in the past, just as they do today. Many if not all comes from a list made up from Kathleen Hunts of transitions from primitive jawless fish to sharks, skates and rays. Every claim by one evolutionist that a dinosaur fossil represents a transition between kinds has been counter-claimed by another evolutionist on the grounds of its well-formed anatomy. The reason for this is that each dinosaur fossil appears to be from a fully formed creature with every part in place.

An ancient hybodont shark (Tristychius) – Similar to a number of modern Sharks. It was small, fusiform, with a curved, a well-developed caudal fin. They also had spikes at the bases of the dorsal fins. Not a transition, not even mentioned in the works of Edwin Colberts, Michael Benton, Michael Allaby, or Barabra Stahl. It was a fully formed shark.

A Hybodont Shark (Ctenacanthus) – A primitive, slow shark with broad-based shark like fin and fin spines. Incomplete fossils have been found. The Ancestors of the hybodonts were sharks similar to Cladoselache is suggested but not proved. Not a transition. In a separate posting titled, 'Transitional Fossils FAQ,' Kathleen Hunt lists the following transitions from primitive jawless fish to sharks, skates, and rays: the Cladoselachians; Hybodonts, Hetrodonts and Hexanchids. There are nine living species of Heterodontus that live in tropical waters. They are small for a shark only about 20 cm long.

Cladoselache is a genus of extinct shark appearing in the Devonian period. Phylum – Chordata

Hetrodonts means different teeth.

Hexanchidae are characterized by an additional pair or pairs of gill slits. Cow sharks are part of this family. Hunt claims that they are part of the transition from jawless fish to sharks, skates, and rays. They are six and seven gill sharks and found in the Pacific and Northern Atlantic. This is a small family of marine sharks having a single dorsal fin and six or seven long gill slits. They have highly differentiated teeth between the lower and upper jaws. Neither Colbert, Allaby, Benton, nor Anderson and Sues refer this to a missing link. They are 100 per cent sharks.

The Hybodus – Hunt also claims that this is part of the transition from jawless fish to sharks, skates and rays. They are found in Asia, Europe, Africa and North America having a

heterocercal tail with an upward bending backbone growing to about 2.5 metres and fossil teeth of this creature are often found to be still very sharp.

Paleospinax – an early Jurassic modern shark. This shark has more advanced features such as detached upper jaw, but retains primitive ctenancanthid features such as two dorsal spines, primitive teeth etc. A better known genera of sharks uncovered from Germany and England include well-preserved impression of vertebrae, jaws, and teeth and less than one metre long. There are uncertainties about this being an evolutionary ancestor of modern sharks. Ms. Hunt claims this shark as being a transitional form but it is not mentioned in Colbert, Stahl, Benton, or Allaby. It is simply one of six better known genera.

Others listed as missing links are Osteichthyes (bony fish), cheirolepis (mostly ray finned fish), African bichir, Calamoichthys (reedfish), Acipenseroid chondrosteans (sturgeons and paddlefishes), Semionotus (an early Mesozoic holostean).
For early Reptiles, Hunt includes an 'early' retile group in her list of transitions from reptiles to mammals:

The Dimetrodon (Permain Pelycosaurian Retile) – Fairly complete skeletons have been foud ranging from 2 to 3 metres long. The order is from the Upper Carboniferous to Lower Permian. It supposedly preceded dinosaurs by some 40 million years. Regarding the 'sail lizard', it suddenly appears in the fossil record complete and fully formed. The evolutionists see this animal as a possible link to mammals, skipping over the entire supposed 'dinosaur age'.

For the Morganucodon, Hunt's claim that the Morganucodon is a transitional fossil; a double jaw joint, but now the mammalian joint is dominant. They were small mouse or shrew like creatures. According to evolutionary interpretation, it represents the most definitive transitional form between reptiles and mammals. Darwinists think all mammals came from the rat like Morganucodon. DNA studies do not agree on the timing or place of placental origin thinking that mammals appeared 65 million years ago when the dinosaurs died off. In addition, Mark Springer stated that there was great mammalian diversity 1255 million years ago. One can clearly see that the dating involved with molecular systematics is pure guess work that is based on multiple, compounded and unrealistic assumptions. A fossil has yet to be unearthed that represent an intermediate stage.

Another claim of a transitional fossils is the **Cynognathus**, a wolf sized therapsid. The fossil evidence actually shows a spinal column with lumbar, dorsal, and cervical sections,

and peg like incisors in a rather large skull. The other teeth were well-designed and the elbow pointed backward and the knee pointed forward.

Other names Hunt has claimed to be transitional fossils are the Pelyconsaur synapsids or mammal like reptile, therapsids of the Permian and Triassic, A Tritgylodon which is clearly technically a reptile. In addition, there are Eupantotheres, Eutheria (placentals), a proteutherian, a small mammal with a low sull less the 5 cm in length with a large pair of piercing incisors in the upper and lower jaws and bats. The Diacodexis reveals an animal about the size of a rabbit with elongated limbs and lived during the early Eocene. Hippos and pigs (cloven hoofed animals) suddenly appear in the Eocene and are so numerous that no one has yet been able to review them all. Hippos actually have a limited fossil record dating to the mid-Miocene in Kenya with no traces of them until late Miocence or early Pliocene times. Others include anthracotherium, propalaeochoerus, paleochoerus, Perchoerus, and Protylopus and more.

Tetrapods – a four-footed animal, especially a member of a group that includes all vertebrates higher than fishes.

Coelacanth – a large, bony marine fish with a three-lobed tail fin and fleshy pectoral fins, found chiefly around the Comoro Islands near Madagascar. It's thought to be related to the ancestors of land vertebrates and was known only from fossils until one was found alive in 1938.

Cladorgrams – pictorial arrays of similar animals grouped onto a branching ladder by the relative abundance of similar traits. These only portray the author's opinion of how the animals diverged from one to the other and the steps, they think that evolution took. An underlying assumption dominates the diagrams. They often ignore the data with intermediate fossils still systematically missing. Thus, they are simply, graphical illustrations of an individual researcher's idea, not as fact. Cladorgrams do not constitute evidence of or proof of a theory.

Tiktaalik is another living fossil with an unusual arrangement of bones in it robust pectoral, or front, fins. Some of the bone fragments around its respiratory and digestive systems appeared to hint at tetrapod anatomy, but had none of the necessary legs. **Pterosaur** – an extinct warm-blooded flying reptile of the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods, with membranous wings supported by a greatly lengthened fourth finger, and probably covered with fur. The graphic doesn't show an evolving pelvic or shoulder girdle that can be exhibited.

Hands and feet are also completely missing from all the fish fossils in question. The pseudo-bones in the fins are roughly analogous to the bones in the typical tetrapod's arm or leg but they are never shaped, arranged, or employed in the same way that tetrapod bones are. These chips of cartilage or bone present in the fins are loosely embedded muscle and not connected to the backbone at all. Lacking the necessary skeletal features, the fish are not even remotely equipped to stand and bear their weight. Similarity, it doesn't demonstrate ancestry. The coelacanth has long been considered a likely tetrapod ancestor. Many fossil specimens show chips of bone in the fins that were proposed as forerunners of leg bones. Close study of the living fossil showed that it was quite different from what was expected of a transition. Its heart, gut, and brain revealed characteristics that were vastly different from what was expected as no feature was adapted to life on land, but was well-designed for life in the deep ocean. Studies found that it lived in deep water not shallow water and the strong fins were deftly used to make difficult swimming manoeuvres in deep water not to support its weight. Another living fossil, the tiktaalik had a rather amphibian like flat head with eyes on top, not like a typical fish head. It neck was unattached to its shoulder bone and was free to rotate the head, more like an amphibian than a fish. However, it was clearly a fish as it had gills and scales and fins and lived in the water. Pelvic fins in the rear were scarcely different from normal swimming fins. Neither the front nor back was connected to the backbone. There was no hint of the ability to stand on two or four legs and its backbone was very weak in the pelvic region, where strength is needed for standing. In comparison with the coelacanth, it too doesn't lift itself up. The Tiktaalik's pelvic fin is present as nothing but a fin, with no incipient change supposedly leading to a hind limb. Soon after the frenzy of its discovery, numerous evolutionists said that the fossil (over three metres long) wasn't what was needed to establish an important evolutionary transition. They were fully fish. In addition, Polish scientists found a series of tetrapod tracks in strata that predated the Tiktaalik, thus animals were already walking before the supposed appearance of the Tiktaalik. In addition, a similar living fossil, the gar fish are nearly identical to their modern-day counterparts of which are known for their toothy snout and their tightly-packed, diamond-shaped, bony scales.

The first land animals, for example, fossilized frogs are recognizably frogs. There are many different varieties of living frogs, and some extinct frogs, but variation and adaptation doesn't equal evolution. According to evolution, once animals had crawled out of the sea, they continued over many generations to adapt to life on land. Nearly every life function had to be changed. Fish take in oxygen through gills and lungfish cannot survive

long by breathing air as their life cycle requires them to breathe underwater through their gills. Amphibians employ both gills and lungs at specific times during their lives as was their original design, just as tadpoles had the genetic ability to breathe air at conception. Newborn amphibians breathe underwater, but they do not transform their gills as they grow but instead their entire body changes into something different. This metamorphosis is not evolution, but simply growth over a frog's lifetime. Early amphibians already had legs, not incipient structures. There were no intermediate animals with only partially evolved legs, hands, or feet. The evolutionists have elevated the Ichthyostega, a four legged land animal as a possible ancestor of all tetrapods. It is very different from a fish and wholly suited for life on land and would not survive for long in the sea. How would fish live during any intermediate stage? They eyes, ears and other sensory abilities must all work at some helpful level from the start and at every subsequent stage in the new environment. Did transformation happen all at one or partially? Note also that there are different amphibians both fossils and living examples, even legless amphibians. The first known fossils of amphibians are date to the Early Devonian period while at the same time supposedly the earliest Rhipidistain fish, an amphibian ancestor candidate came about. Isn't this out of order?

Reptiles: Amphibians and reptiles seem to be rather similar but the out covering of a reptile is very different from that of an amphibian. Moist skin covers an amphibian while hard rigid scales cover the reptile. Amphibians deposit their jelly-coated eggs in a watery environment unlike the reptile eggs which are not laid in the water. Even though skin is seldom preserved but a protective covering would be necessary from the very first generation. In addition retile scales are quite different from fish. Today there are both amphibians and reptiles which are very different and do not cross with each other. Most reptiles habitually live on land but evolutionists say that some devolved and returned to the water. One such fossil, the ichthyosaur reptile was captured in the process of giving birth. This was an instantaneous rapid burial. Ichthyosaurs appeared suddenly fully formed and functional, without the necessary ancestral linkage. The well-known plesiosaur is thought by evolutionists to have evolved from land reptiles. They are so specialized for life in the water, however, that one wonders how random mutations could have accomplished this. The two groups of flying reptiles, the pterodactyloids and rhamphorhynchoids are quite distinct from other reptiles and also themselves. The pterosaurs are known for a long, bony crest on top of the skull while the rhamphorhynchoids ha a heavy knob on the end of their long tail with wingspans up to 54 feet. No none flying dinosaur resembled these, especially the extended

fourth finger. There are no transitional forms found that are remotely similar. Another animal, the turtle first made their appearance by the later Triassic period. Theyt were complete, complex, diversified, well-designed and reproduced after their kind. No transitional forms have been found. Both are well-recognised today and their fossils. What non-snake gained so many vertebrae to become a snake and what non-turtle gained the supper and lower plates to become a turtle? Snakes are placed in the same order as lizards and are thought to be evolved from them, having somehow lost their legs. But there are no forelimbs in any and according to Benton the nature of lizard ancestors is a mystery. One such evolutionary textbook states that the fossil history of the snakes is very fragmentary so inference is needed!

Dinosaurs' fossils have been found on every continent in large numbers in the world. Most of them were of normal size or a dog or small horse. Many Hadrosaurus were known as the cattle of the Cretaceous with many fossilized bones having T. Rex Teeth marks on them. All dinosaurs had 'fenestra' or openings in their skull either behind or in front of the eyes. They all had one of two kinds of hips: bird hipped dinosaurs and lizard hipped dinosaurs. Unlike modern reptiles, these hips allowed walking with legs directly underneath them, like mammals. No living reptiles today have either of these hips. Lizards do not have a lizard hip and birds have a hip design of their own. They are thought by evolutionists to have evolved from lizard-hipped dinosaurs. Palaeontologists have virtually no clues as to the origin of the bird hipped dinosaurs. There is no tell-tale lineage from dinosaurs to birds. Museums and textbooks explain their assumptions as truthful information to the public omitting the inconsistencies pointed out by scholars. Birds to not even use their hips to walk and virtually all tetrapod's walk by moving the thigh bones. Interestingly, bird metabolisms require about twenty times more oxygen than reptiles. Air is continuously drawn in by the stationary thigh bone being connected to the rib cage supporting the diaphragm and lung system. Plate tectonics and the movement of continents accounts for dinosaur fossils being found over the world. This movement was most likely due to a worldwide catastrophic of water where rapid subduction dragging the oceanic lithosphere for down into the earth's interior. These fossils and related sediments have long testified that a relatively warm climate exited over nearly the entire globe throughout much of the past. In this environment, the dinosaurs (most were herbivorous) thrived where larger plants grew in lush subtropical rainforests where plant volume far surpassed the need for food. This is shown by the huge coal deposited over the earth from inorganic plant material. Liquid hydrocarbons come primarily from buried microbes, algae and other vegetable matter. Note that a common

misconception of dinosaur fossils; they are said to be in the millions and millions but actually there are much less than that and the number of complete dinosaur fossils are far less. Multiple thousands of portions of dinosaur fossils have indeed been found. There are only 650 dinosaur species that have been named and many of these are very similar to other recognized dinosaur species. Evolutionists like to split kinds up to allow for boarder dinosaur groupings. But dinosaurs are now extinct. Dinosaur fossils in North America are often found in the well-known Morrison Formation. This formation shows where they were buried which was not in their own habitats. They died showing signs of drowning with wide open mouths and heads thrown back as though gasping for air. They are best understood as having been buried alive, in a watery environment. Dinosaur extinction theories abound most coming from evolutionists with the most popular being an asteroid hit initiating a chain reaction. Thus, no dinosaur survived beyond the beginning of the Tertiary time, also known as the K-T boundary. But note, dinosaur fossils have been found in Tertiary rocks after the K-T boundary. Whatever destroyed them, it involved unimaginable forces which deposited sediments representing a watery flow of terrestrial mud that devastated large portions of the globe.

Fossil 'Feathers': (Thomas, 2013) Feathered dinosaurs have become the rage now. A large collection of dinosaur fossils from China has featured some interesting-looking then, straight fibres. Some evolutions have suggested that these fibres represent transitional feathers. But none of these fibres display any branching patterns like actual bird feathers have. But many of these fibred dinosaurs lie in rock layers that also contain fully formed bird. They lived and died at the same time, they do not show any ancestor-descendant relationships. In addition scientists found fossil bird tracks in sedimentary rocks containing the 'oldest' dinosaurs (according to evolutionary theory). In addition, we know what bird skin looks like. And we know what dinosaur skin looks like. No dinosaur skin fossils have yet shown even one follicle which bird skin has. Also interesting, these fibres from the Chinese dinosaurs have been shown to result from rotting animal skin frayed at its edges from water.

Original Dinosaur Tissue: (Thomas, 2013) Contrary to belief, not all dinosaur fossils are pure rock. Dried remains surrounded by minerals have been found in over 40 different reports. Using chemical procedures, haemoglobin, elastin, osteocalcin, histgone, ovalbumin, collagen, and others have been examined. The conflict here, if dinosaur fossils are sixty five million years old, this collagen protein in the fossils restricts their age to $1/65^{th}$ of that time. In addition, laboratories have found plenty of radioactive carbon in these

dinosaur bones from Montana. All the carbon-14 should have long decayed into nitrogen if they are sixty five million years old. These points show that dinosaurs died recently. Even with this evidence, secular scientists invent rationalizations in order to deny that decayed dinosaur flesh even exists, despite scores of detailed descriptions by other evolutionary scientists.

Lithosphere – the rigid out part of the earth, consisting of the crust and upper mantle.
Herbivores – an animal that feeds on plants.
Palaeontologists – the branch of science concerned with fossil animals and plants.
Cretaceous – Relating to the last period of the Mesozoic era, between the Jurassic and Tertiary periods.

Whales: they are mammals rather than fish. They appear suddenly in early Tertiary times, fully adapted by profound modifications of the basic mammalian structure for a highly specialized mode of life. At one point, evolutionists pushed the bear-to-whale idea but now that's fallen out of favour. Now a wolf-like carnivore has taken its place. Jessica Thedor of the University of Calgary and Jonathon Geisler of Georgia Southern University suggested that the hippotami were the ancestors of whales. But that was dashed by evolutionary dating saying that the whale has been around five times longer. But there is no consensus of opinion about the whale. According to Colbert's standard palaeontology textbook in 2001, mammals probably arose in early Cenozoic times from primitive carnivore-like mammals known as mesonychids and whales having separated from mesonychid ancestors at an early date suddenly appeared in early Tertiary times, fully adapted by profound modifications. A Few teeth and partial skull found in Pakistan in 1979 was said to be indisputable evidence of whale evolution, dubbed Pakicetus. It was found in a river bed and claimed to be fully aquatic. And the most primitive cetacean whale known. But Thewissen thinks that Pakicetids were the first cetaceans but far more primitive than other whales but did not live in the sea but instead fed while wading in shallow streams. But the teeth of the Pakicetus were no bigger than the fingernail on your little finger and did not look like a whale's tooth. Simply noting similarities between mammals, of which there are many, does not proved related ness. All the possible fossil 'whales' called archaeocetes does not seem to be whales at all. They were all fully land-dwellers with legs. But the name calling did not stop with this. There came the otter-like Rodectus and then the deer like Indohyus which dethroned the Pakicetus.

Thewissen said that the Indohyus was a plant eater. Then came the Ambuloceus which means, ‘walking whale that swims’. According to Thewissen, this was truly the missing link but later as more fossils of it were found, these indicated a strong swimmer with powerful kicks and occupied a lifestyle like croc’s do today. They had true legs and able to get around on land. This is claimed to also be a transitional but just because it lived in two environments at different times of its life doesn’t make it transitional. After this came the sea creature Basilosaurus, originally considered a reptilian sea snake. Its leg was only about six inches long compared with the 60 foot long creature. So was this a whale or whale ancestor. Most evolutionists say it was not, perhaps a whale relative. Basilosaurus and the Dorudon may have actually been mutant whales. But, in the end, whales are whales and land creatures are alnd creatures, there is not sufficient evidence to establish that whales evolved from land creatures.

1. Do you mean the legs shortened and mutated into flippers? The standard answer is yes. But is this process as simple as seems to be suggested? Whether it was a fish-eating bear, a vegetarian grazer, or a carnivorous wolf, any ancestor would have had to undergo a radical alteration for life in the sea. To begin with, random mutations in its genes would have resulted in shorter, mutated legs, which over the generations underwent similar mutations that resulted in still shorter legs. This would not happen by habitually living in the sea, but by random mutations. According to this scenario, the legs eventually disappeared, and in their place were gradually lengthening flippers, produced by other mutations. Today whales swim primarily by thrusting their tails up and down and by arching their spines, not by using their flippers for transportation at all. Where did they gain this ability?

2. Did the small tail become the fluke, the whale’s broad, powerful swimming tail? How? Explain this to me. The fluke on a whale is such a broad, powerful, and necessary organ. What feature on any land animal could mutate into this? All land animals’ tails operate from side to side, but the whale’s movement is up and down. This requires different muscles and skeletal connections in the vertebrae. All must be in place and operational for the fluke to work. These changes would require separate, coordinated mutations. How could the whole suite of changes occur together?

3. Do you mean the brain case thickened to withstand high water pressure when diving? Some species of whale dive to extreme depths in search of food. There, the water pressure is unthinkably high and would crush the skull of any ancestral land animal. This would require many successive mutations to the ancestral type, each yielding a thicker skull than the

previous generation. According to natural selection, each mutant had to be somehow favored in order to be selected. It then had to survive to reproduce more mutants, while those whales without the favorable mutation went extinct. These mutations are distinct from those required for the other changes already mentioned, so how could there be enough generations for them to accumulate? How long is a whale generation? They are not like fruit flies, which reproduce every couple of weeks. How many generations are possible in the relatively few million years evolutionists postulate this process took place, assuming each generation got just the right mutation and in just the right order?

4. Do you mean the hide lost ifs hair and developed a thick layer of blubber for warmth? Terrestrial mammals usually have hairy hides, to one degree or another. A whale is smooth and hairless. The loss of all the hair on a mammal is sometimes quite harmful. How could such a mutation be an evolutionary step forward? The blubber on a whale is a very complex and a necessary source of nutrition and warmth. It is not comparable to the fat layer in normal mammals. It seems to be something different from anything that had gone before. Where did it come from? Did something on a land mammal change to become the necessary layer of blubber? If so, what?

5. Did mother whales, which are mammals, acquire the ability to give birth and nurse underwater? Birth among air-breathing whales requires immediate access to air for the offspring. It cannot work like a land animal, where the young simply drop to the ground and breathe. A new system, complete with adapted body parts and new habits, must be in place from the earliest days the animal took to the water, or there would be no next generation. A female mammal's nipples are normally on her underbelly. When a whale calf nurses, a special skin flap covers the calf's mouth to keep it from drowning, while special muscles in the mother rapidly force milk into it. What feature on the whale's ancestor was modified by mutation to allow this?

6. Did the lungs and other organs adapt to the new environment, or were they replaced by a different design? Nearly all the major organs in whales function somewhat differently from those in their terrestrial counterparts. For instance, land animals drink fresh water, but whales need to be able to filter or handle the excessive salt in seawater. Furthermore, their lungs needed to increase their volume and oxygen exchange many times over to allow for long, deep dives. Their eyes and ears had to toughen to withstand increased underwater pressure, and their ears had to be able to pick up both airborne and underwater sound waves. How did the intermediate forms survive until all the necessary parts were in place?

7. Do you mean that the nostrils migrated to the top of the skull to become a blowhole? They must have done so. Some whales have two blowholes, more like the nostrils on a terrestrial animal. In some, the nostrils are in an intermediate location, but always fully functional for the whale's behaviour. Changing from one breathing mechanism to the other would take many, many, generations, but there is no evidence of this. Interestingly, the whale has a mechanism to close its nostrils to keep out water, but few land animals have this ability. To add this function requires the necessary flap, the muscles to control it, and the nervous system to activate it. Holes in the top of the head also imply cranial alterations. Since breathing is necessary for each generation, how quickly did this change occur?

8. Do you mean that the teeth of some were replaced by baleen? Where did baleen come from? Did baleen whales and toothed whales evolve simultaneously from different sources, or did they split off from a common whale ancestor? They have some similarities, but the differences in structure and habit are great. Baleen whales feed by engulfing large amounts of water containing tiny sea life, and then straining it out through a "screen door" consisting of long strands of interwoven skin-like fibers called baleen or "whale bone." There is no conceivable structure in any land animal that could have mutated into this structure, and nothing similar in toothed whales. Nor do any land mammals have a diet similar to baleen whales. Changes in the required feeding and digestive systems must be functional in each generation. Is it mere convenience to say that toothed whales and baleen whales come from a common source, or is there a better theory?

9. Do you mean that each of these changes happened sequentially and gradually? Or did they happen in one generation? Is evolutionary gradualism responsible for these changes, or could punctuated equilibrium have caused them? Were the major changes in leg length, lung capacity, and dietary habits all due to point mutations that affected a single trait at a time, or did the mutations affect numerous traits at once? All these traits and body parts are exquisitely designed. Do you mean that natural selection could have acted on them all, fine-tuning them in such a relatively short time, while the majority of related creatures that did not receive the favourable mutation failed to successfully reproduce? Were there enough generations and enough time for such natural forces to act? Is there any length of time that can produce truly new genes, not just varieties of genes for traits that already exist? Do you mean that mutations were especially active on certain critical features? Since rampant mutations are known to cause deterioration and lead to extinction, what guiding factors were involved?

10. Did the changes occur instead as mega-mutations? Genomists have discovered that one gene often affects many traits. Do you mean that a single mutation in one of these hot spots could have caused numerous favourable changes? Can you illustrate with an example that has likewise accomplished multiple alterations and yet not adversely affected the host? It is also known that rapid change in a population with a limited number of individuals inevitably trends to extinction. How do you propose whales absorbed so many major alterations and yet avoided extinction?

11. Did all of these adaptations occur simultaneously? Natural selection, better stated as survival of the fittest, really means extinction of the unfit, doesn't it? If so, the members of a population that do not possess a particular beneficial mutation must not survive to pass on the weaker trait to successive generations. How can a species, especially one with such a small population size as whales and with such a long generation time, avoid total extinction in the face of the ravages of natural selection? When the multitudes of mutations implied by this discussion act on a small breeding population, how can it remain? Isn't this counter to the dictates of population genetics? Geneticists call accumulating mutations "genetic burden" or "genetic load," something that drags down genetic quality and threatens species survival. Every seemingly helpful mutation is accompanied by numerous harmful ones. How can an animal group survive multiple mutations?

12. Who is wrong—those who claim that the whale came from a wolf-like creature, or those who believe it was from a hippopotamus? What about those who think it was a deer-like animal? Evolutionary palaeontologists have pointed to the cattle-like ungulates and then to the wolf-like mesonychids as ancestral to the whales. Now, DNA evidence indicates that hippos seem more closely related. Both sides make a good case, and both can refute the other. Which do you favour, and why? If only a portion of the experts hold a particular view, why should we hold that view over another? Now some experts are promoting a small deer-like, raccoon-size creature as the ancestor of whales. How can we decide, and on what basis? Is it right to say the other experts are in error? What if there is another view about which we have not been told?

Human Ancestors: There has been numerous hoax by prominent evolutionist such as the Piltdown Man, then the Neanderthals were discovered existing on the genetic fringes within the human range, closer to an ethnic group than modern Australian aborigines. They lived in communities, raised crops, hunted large animals, used weapons, decorated their bodies with jewellery and tattoos, buried their dead and observed religious rites. They lived in

the northern regions when the Ice Age was ravaging Europe. These were essentially modern humans, prohibited by difficult conditions from making technological advances and unaware of the advances of others. There are 'stone age' people today living in comparatively primate conditions in isolated areas. They lived in several parts of the world, though primarily in Europe. Then there was Lucy, who was only forty percent complete (bones). She was dubbed the southern ape from the afar region. She was quite chimp-like. The fossils were three feet six inches tall typical of today's chimps. And even among evolutionists, there are various discrepancies in regards to Lucy's hip and knee. The pelvis of Lucy was actually re-assembled from 40 pieces of crushed phone. The reconstruction was questionable as presented by a film. And then there was Ida, hailed as the long awaited link between man and animal but it soon became obvious that the creature was nothing more than a variety of lemur.

Evolution is described in various ways: The survival of the fittest is one such way. Yet the overwhelming trend in the fossil record is one of stasis with life forms exhibiting little or no change. Fossils actually do not appear to have changed much over the time their deposited strata. Sometimes a living animal or plant is found that is thought to have been extinct for millions of years. Darwin named these 'living fossils.' Such living fossils are numerous such as the Graptolites found in the Indian Ocean supposed to have died out 300 million years ago. Then there is the tuatara found in New Zealand supposedly extinct since the cretaceous. A conifer, the Metasequoia tree extinct for twenty mission years is found in China today. An extinct Cretaceous coral, the Heliopora is found today. Crocodiles, are known from strata all the way back to the Upper Juranssic. Numerous teleost fishes mirror their fossil counterparts dating back to the Early Cretaceous. Sturgeons go back to the upper Cretaceous. Today's bowfin fish has not changed for seventy years. The Gar fish show statis for a hundred mission years. The gastropod Pleurotomaria dates back to the Cambrian. The Neopilian, a prominent mollusc was extinct for 280 million year yet lives today. The Wollemi pine trees is rare but still live today and have done so since the time of the dinosaurs. The oldest fossils are millipedes dating back some 425 million years. Some 84 percent of the insect families alive today were alive one hundred million years ago. And the list goes on.

Petrified Wood doesn't take ages to develop for many numerous examples of rapidly petrified wood have been documented. In Arizona near the Painted desert is a supposedly petrified forest but all the trees are lying with no root system. No complete ecosystem is present but instead a mixed environments.

To conclude: the fossil record doesn't communicate the macro evolutionary picture. There is no evidence that any particular animal ever morphed into a fundamentally different type of animal. No trend can be found of gradual, Darwinian alteration through mutation and natural selection. These processes occur, but they are not mechanism for true evolution of basic body styles. Nor do we see punctuated equilibrium transforming them rapidly. Any changes touted by punctuated equilibrium we see are either common variation of individual offspring or adaptation of a population to differing conditions. The fossil record does communicate the sudden appearance of basic types with lot of variety but variety is not evolution. One a basic type appeared; it demonstrated stasis as a dominant trend and does not speak of major changes. The Cambrian explosion constitutes a major episode in the history of life and studies show that essentially all phyla were present at the start, each distinct from the other and fully equipped to function and survive. Various fossil types are found in many different layers and statistics provide reason to think that essentially all types lived throughout a large portion of history. The majority of animals depicted on evolutionary fossil chars in textbook are vertebrates but this doesn't accurately portray the read fossil record as 95 percent of all animal fossils are of marine invertebrates. (Thomas, 2013) Fossil graveyards often contain numerous animals from mixed habitats. Saltwater fish are sometimes found with upland dwellers while crocodile fossils are found with deep sea denizen and desert and arctic mammal. They could scarcely be lumped together in this by the uniform processes of today.

Part II

This section contains a summary of Reed, J. K. & Oard, M. J. (2006), The Geologic Column: Perspectives within Diluvial Geology. To the average person the Geological Column is the orderly and precisely placed divisions and subdivisions of time on earth. It is, in fact, a comprehensive graphical representation that presents an idealized order in which evolutionary biology claims life has evolved. Whatever it presents, it does it with evolution in mind and therefore its objectivity is questionable from the very beginning. For historical information from the bible cannot and should not be classified as theological or supernatural. For some creationary geologists, proving the reality of the Genesis Flood has mainly to do with proving the accuracy of the biblical narrative. It is historical because geology essentially deals with the post Creation period and one can therefore rightfully talk about a creaionary geology as scientific knowledge. In this context, proving the accuracy of the Bible should be more a conclusion, rather than a purpose per se. The supernatural is and has been in place as various stages of history. For example natural laws were not in place at the moment of Creation but were established during it. Once natural laws were in place, it became possible for us to scientifically understand creation.

William Smith published the first modern geologic map showing the rock record of England and Wales in 1815. This set a standard as most geologists have conceptualized the rock record in terms of a vertical succession of layers as shown in the Grand Canyon.

So the essence of the geologic column is an interpretive framework for the rock record built on successive, globally-correlated, synchronous time period.

James Hutton added his uniformitarian theory which added long periods of time to the column, thus representing vertical succession of time units, each displaying long periods of gradual sedimentation and other geologic activity. This translated rock units into globally correlative time periods created a key to the Uniformitarian stratigraphy. Out of this, a school of neocatastrophism emerged which recognized that rock records was punctuated by catastrophic events within a revised history dominated by uniformitarianism, evolutionism and deep time. At the same time biological evolution has shown to have serious scientific weaknesses forcing its supporters to the courts to maintain an educational monopoly over it. The modern geologic column is a model that holds significant conceptual power, being virtually unquestioned, yet, it possess significant weaknesses in its assumptions and internal coherence.

These assumptions of uniformitarianism, the validity of plate tectonic models, the correlation of dissimilar oceanic crust and continental sediments by radiometric methods, and the contemporary causal links between astronomical phenomena and the rock record are unacceptable to diluvial geologists.

The fundamental features of geological study such as field work, collection and theory construction, weren't developed until the 17^{th} to 19^{th} centuries. Before this many Christians attributed them to the Noachian Flood as do many today. Around 1667, Nicholaus related the formation of the geological layers in the area of Tuscany, Italy, within a biblical framework and argued that the geological evidence confirms the truth of the literal history in Genese 1-11. He expressed a belief that the Earth was almost 6,000 years old and those organic fossils and the sedimentary strata were laid down by Noah's Flood. He set forth several principles that became the foundation for modern geology.

1) Most of the rock layers were once water laid sediments.

2) Marine deposits can be distinguished from fresh water deposits by the fossils they contain.

3) The order of superposition of the layers indicates the relative age of the strata.

4) The sediments were originally deposited in an essentially horizontal fashion.

5) Strata that are no longer horizontal were disturbed after deposition.

At the same time, Johann Lehmann, a mining and mineralogy professor in Berlin recognized three classes of rocks: the non-fossil-bearing and greatly inclined rocks in the high mountains (formed during creation week), fossiliferous rocks resting roughly horizontally on the flanks of the mountains.

But in the 18th and 19th centuries, the idea that the Earth was much older than Biblical history slowly replaced the traditional view. This idea grew over the years and became common place. There was the Neptunist-Vulcanist debate over whether rock formations were deposited by water or by molten lava. Abrah Werener (1800) of Germany and James Hutton of Scotland became highly influential geologists. Werner divided the rock layers into five periods. The lowest three, deposited by the global ocean were the primitive rocks, transitional rocks equivalent to the lower Paleozoic and floetz formations from the upper Paleozoic through the Cenozoic and finally, the alluvial and volcanic. Hutton's geological views were published in the Theory of the Earth. He said that everything can be explained by present-day processes of erosion, sedimentation, volcanism, and earthquakes. This was an early version of the uniformitarianism. Neither of them gave much thought to fossils. William smith around the same time published works on the relative chronology of the stratigraphic formations by fossil characteristics. He became known as the father of English Stratigraphy. Even though this established a theory of an old Earth, it also lead to the establishment of Catastrophism where sedimentary strata were deposited before the flood by supernaturally induced, large-scale catastrophic floods. Georges Cuvier during the same time a French comparative anatomist and vertebrate palaeontologist began to develop his theory of catastrophism. He believed in a young Earth and that the flood had occurred about 5,000 years ago. Other geologists in England included Willianm Buckland, a professor of geology at Oxford argued that geology was consistent with Genesis but soon adopted uniformitarianism from Lyell and others. Adam Sedgwick (1960) said that old earth theories did not contradict the Bible was also believed in Catastrophism but changed to uniformitarianism later. By the 1820s the major divisions of the geological record were well defined. Charles Lyell (1960) revived the ideas of Hutton set for geological methods based on a radical uniformitarianism. Thus by the 1830s, few old-earth catastrophists in Britain, American or Europe believed in a geologically significant Noachian Deluge. In the last half of the 19th century, estimates of deep time increased and became quantified.

But in 1961, the young-earth creationist movement was launched by the publication of the genesis Flood by John Whitcomb and Henry Morris. And by the 1970s, some secular geologists also began to question uniformitarian assumptions. The neo-catastrophists reinterpreted many formations to be the result of rapid, violent catastrophic floods.

In regards to Old-Earth Theory, two key assumptions were: everything in the physical universe can and indeed must be explained by time, chance and the laws of nature working on matter; and natural physical processes have always acted in the same manner, rate and intensity as we see operating today. So the conflict is in how to interpret the geological record. Homes, 1965 says that no powers are to be employed that are not natural to the earth and no action to be admitted except those of which we know the principle. Thus was a conscious rejection of Scripture as this atheistic way of think developed in Europe. Another assumption permeated this naturalist view of the world: the Bible has nothing relevant to say to the question of the age and history of the Earth. Those who were influential in this development were Buffon, an atheist and Laplace was an open atheist. Werner was a deist or possibly an atheist.

Fossils and the Non-Existence of Creatures became had established principle of judging the non-existence of a creature in history based on the absence of its offal remains. John Phillips in 1841 assumed that different kinds of creatures lived in different systems of life at different time. But the Flood, as the Bible teaches, it produced most of the geological record of sedimentary and fossiliferous rocks makes this old-earth thinking very erroneous. Evolutionists use this idea when it supports their theory and then ignore the principle when it doesn't support it. And many examples of creatures which evolutionists have claimed to be extinct have been since discovered 'alive'. Take the primitive gastropods found in the Upper Cambrian rocks, these deep-water shells were thought to be long extinct until discovered alive in 1855. These gastropods just didn't re-appear, they have been alive all along. Thus the absence of fossils in a particular rock layer does not mean that those creatures did not exist at the time of deposition of that layer. In addition, recently palaeontologist digging in China and Mongolia has unearthed thousands of well-preserved salamanders in rocks 165 million years old but previous these were found in rocks 65 million years old. They're just like the one found alive today in North America Asia. The correct interpretation of the geologic record can only be obtained by using biblical assumptions gleaned especially from Genesis 1 – 11. Young earth creationists must see the anti-biblical assumptions developed by the scientific establishment over the past 200 years. But during this time of uniformitarian dominance a removal of the Lyellian straitjacket has happened plus the technological information age has increased the ability to image, measure, analyse and visualize rock sample.

Stratigraphy is the study of the arrangement of earth materials (particularly stratiform rocks), especially as to geographic position and chronologic order of sequence (Bates and Jackson, 1984). First, it must be said that diluvial stratigraphy is distinct from its uniformitarian counterpart. However, Naturalists would have us believe that the two are one and the same. Diluvialists stress the unique global catastrophe of the Genesis Flood. Uniformitarians measure deep time by the chronometers of evolution and isotopic decay; diluvialists default to the biblical narratives. Niels Stensen around 1665 promoted three principles of stratigraphy:

1) Original horizontality – rock layers form in the horizontal position and deviations are caused by later disturbances.

2) Original continuity – rock layers extend laterally, Breaks within layers, such as valleys, postdate deposition.

3) Superposition – rock layers are arranged vertically, from the oldest at the bottom up to the youngest.

Giovanne Arduino around 1785 introduced the first chronology of the earth's crust: primary, secondary, tertiary and quaternary. Two schools of thought eventuated in the 18th century, the Volcanist and the Neptunist who debated whether the rocks of Earth's crust were formed volcanically or hydraulically.One such Neptunists was the Prussian geologist, Abraham Gottlob Werner around 1800. From the viewpoint of the naturalist, they restrict reality to matter/energy, restrict truth to science and subsume history within science. Sequence stratigraphy, a recent major innovation, emphasizes sedimentary sequences. They are defined

by their bounding surfaces (usually unconformities) rather than more traditional bedding or faunal markers. Nicholaus Steno, the Father of Geology felt that the Genesis Flood laid down distinct layers of different sediment types, which later hardened and experienced deformation. Interestingly, global patterns of sedimentation are found particularly in Precambrian and Paleozoi series of rocks.

Event Horizons can be useful in studies of local areas, and are also useful for establishing correlations over much wider areas. The volcanic eruption of Mount Mazama, the remains of the mountain now containing Crater Lake, spewed ash thousands of square km in the Pacific Northwest and Southwest Canada.

The Recolonization Model of the Mabbul (The Flood) has recently been proposed as biblical solution to many real or perceived enigmas in the rock record. The word ‘mabbul’ is used of the destruction of the flood. It applies to the first 40 days of the flood. After this, the springs of the great deep closed, the floodgates of heaven stopped, and the torrential rain ceased. Jesus said in Matthew 24 and Luke 17 that people carried on as usual until the day Noah entered the ark. The day Lot left Sodom was the same day that the city was destroyed by a downpour of fire and sulphur and on the day Christ returns, people may be in the home or in the fields but it will bring their activity to an abrupt conclusion. It begins after the flood peak at day 40. So the post flood is seen as a time of Recolonization. Some feel that it accepts too many uniformitarianism interpretations and attempts to fit them into a biblical timeframe. According to God, the flood is the last major event to affect the Earth. It released extraordinary destructive power. The spring of the great deep burst forth. This is understood as a global crustal fracturing. The Recolonization Model advocates subterranean water bursting from below the continents, immediately scouring everything from the land into the sea. With this, decompression effects would have been significant, and hot rocks at depth would have melted and flowed upwards. This would result in pillow lavas, peperites and hyaloclastic deposits, and extensive igneous activity and massive sedimentation. This sediment would be mingled with the products of igneous activity, accompanied by extensive metamorphism. The model also involves the destruction of the land of the antediluvian world. A global destruction horizon happened at the same time the whole Earth was covered in water. The original crust, referred to as the Hadean once existed and was destroyed and a new crust was formed. The book of Genesis tells us that, as a result of the mabbul, all air-breathing animals perished except for those on the Ark. The key word of Recolonization is ecology not evolution. And the previous mentioned local stratigraphic sections seem to line up with the general order of the geological column at hundreds of locations showing that the column is a vertical or stratigraphic representation abstracted from rock units mainly found laterally adjacent to each other in the field. Some creationists advocate that the column is an exact representation of the events the flood and possibly post flood deposition, minus the uniformitarian timescale. This may be true but there are many exceptions. Because of uniformitarianism, there are false philosophical systems. It was first set up in England, the Alps and the Ural Mountains of Russia. The original column was developed by a succession of index fossils and it was generally developed by catastrophists who believed in multiple

catastrophes. After first being relegated to the surficial layer, the Genesis Flood was rejected entirely by most scientists in the 1800s.

The column is not a vertical, onion skinned model but a fossil scheme derived from lateral relationships. Interestingly, two thirds of the Earth's land surface has five or few of the ten geological periods in place. And only about 20 percent of the surface has even three periods in correct order. The Paleozoic is well represented by coal from trees such as lycopods in the Appalachian Mountains, while in Montana and Wyoming the coal contains angiosperms and gymnosperms. The coal in Montana and Wyoming is dated as early Cenozoic which is much younger than the Appalachian lycopods in the geological column, yet they could have been laid down at the same time. The horizontal relationship of index fossils is also a global phenomenon according to Woodmorape, 1999b. So global column is built by extrapolating periods and index fossils from each area into a global sequence but how well this sequence lines up with reality and represents a flood order requires much more research. Many creationists are sceptical that each period in the column actually represents an absolute sequence of events in the flood model. There are so many 'anomalies' that they are not considered rare at all. For example one such sponge called Nucha was found in the upper Triassic of Vancouver Island (Stanley, 1998), an identical one was found in the Middle Cambrian of western New South Wales, Australia. It was not found in strata within the 300 million intervening years. This makes one question the 300 million year difference between the Cambrian and the Permian as being real. Fossil ranges have also been extended downward in the column. Vertibrates have been pushed back into the Cambrian (Oard, 1996a: 2004a) where 50% to 85% of all phyla originated in the Cambrian Big Bang. Sharks have been pushed back 25 million years into the Late Ordoviian. Another type of anomaly was finding two fossils of different ages in the same layer. Then a young fossil was found in an old strata. This is call downwash. Again, these anomalous fossil occurrences are not rare. Then older fossils are found above rocks that contain young fossils. These out of order fossils are the opposite of the evolutionary hypothesis. They are considered impossible by evolutionists and are dismissed as the result of 'over thrusting' which involved older strata being pushed over younger strata at an angle less than 45 degrees. Roberson (1996, p 35) claims that over thrusts are based on geophysical evidence and not out of order fossils. The problem here is that overthrust are often determined by fossils instead of geological and geophysical methods. There is evidence of reverse fault where a block is shoved up over other rock at an angle greater than 45 degrees. A real overthrust should show abundant physical evidence; relying just on fossils is unreasonable.

So other models have been advocated instead of the geological column. One such model is the Walker's Model (1994). He classified the basement rocks around the Brisbane are area as being from the Eruptive Phase of the Inundatory Stage of the Flood. He then assigned the shale and sandstone deposits of the Great Artesian Basin to the upper Zenithic Phase . The strata covers a large area and is over 2,000 metres in thickness. They are dated as mostly Jurassic and Cretaceous in the geological column. Precambrian sedimentary rocks outcrop in the Rocky Mountain Ranges and their thickness indicates that they represent deposits from large, isolated basins that have uplifted. Paleozoic and Mesozoic strata can form large sheets

over extensive areas such as the Great Plains, but they are generally broken and tilted in the mountains in the western United States, except for the Colorado Plateau. The Cenozoic, on the other hand, is the most problematic. It generally fills basins in the Rocky Mountains and outcrops as sheets on the High Plains. There are also mammal tracks in some of the Cenozoic strata in these basins that reinforce the deduction that most of the remaining Cenozoic strata were deposited in the Inundatory Stage. Practically all the current strata in the high western United States were deposited early in the Flood.

Some creationists have stated that the column is independent of evolution, because it is merely and empirical compilation of lithology and faunal assemblage. And naturalism considers science and natural history as synonymous, creationists cannot. Historical reconstruction differs from experimental science, especially with regard to certainty. Most of natural history chronologically parallels human history, but focuses on a different source – the superiority – of the historical record in the Bible, while naturalists do not. And identifying time periods in the rock record is the essence of stratigraphy. Though the column encapsulates the uniformitarian geologic interpretation of Earth's crust, that interpretation includes the rejection of the Christian worldview in favour of naturalism – a worldview that replaces a reality founded on God's Creation and governance of the universe with an impersonal, un caring mechanism, a worldview that substitutes Christianity's confidence in truth granted by God's revelation with an unstable positivism that succeeds only when it pilfers Christian doctrine. In addition, there is no other document that offers such a clear, specific, validated eyewitness account of the beginning of the universe or of man's earliest days. However, the Bible doesn't deal in detail regarding geology, yet the rock record and the Bible bear testimony to the upheavals of the past.

References

Abramson, P. (1998). *A Defence of Creationism.* (30 pages) from www.creationism.org/articles/genesis.htm

Battan, D. (2006) *The Creation Answers.* (384 pages) from Creation Book Publishers website: http://www.answersingenesis.org

Bradley, W. L. (1995). *Is There Scientific Evidence of the Existence of God? How Recent Discoveries Support a Designed Universe.* (28 pages) from http://winteryknight.wordpress.com/2011/03/08/walter-bradley-explains-three-scientific-arguments-for-gods-existence/

Creation Science by Dr Kent Hovind downloaded from Creation Science Evangelism at www.drdino.com (40 lectures plus notes).

Creation Science by various authors downloaded from Seattle Creation Conferences http://nwcreation.net/videos/ on 30 October 2011 (40 lectures)

Creation Science Videos by Ken Ham downloaded on 15 April 2011 from http://nwcreation.net/videos (15 lectures).

Darwin, C. (1876). *The Works of Charles Darwin and the Origin of Species.* NYU Press; Volume 16 edition (February 15, 2010) (512 pages).

Gitt, W. (1993). *Did God use Evolution?* US: Master Books ISBN-13: 978-0890514832 (144 pages).

Griggs, J. F. *Evolution 101*. (50 pages) from http://www.creationism.org/griggs

Lang, W. & V. (1984). *Two Decades of Creationism*. USA: Bible-Science Association and Genesis Institute ASIN: B0006YXH9G (100 pages).

Morris, H. M. (1974). *Scientific Creationism*. US: Master Books 978-0875523385 (277 pages).

Morris, H. M. (1988). *Men of Science – Men of God: Great Scientists who believed in the Bible*. USA: Master Books 978-0890510806 (127 pages).

Morris, H. M. (1997). *Biblical Creation.* US: Baker Books ASIN: B00107B178 (276 pages).

Morris, J. D. & Sherwin, F. J. The Fossil Reocrd; Unearthing Nature's History of Life. Institute for Creation Research, Dallas, Texas. © 2010 (219 pages)

Price, G. M. (1925). *Predicament of Evolution.* USA: Southern Publishing Assoc. (140 pages) from www.creationism.org

Reed, J. K. & Oard, M. J. (2006), The Geologic Column: Perspectives within Diluvial Geology. © Creation Research Society. Printed in the USA.

Smart, L. D. (1995). *Evolution Unmasked.* (95 pages) from http://unmaskingevolution.com/pdf_dl/book/resource.PDF

Sunderland, L. (1988). *Darwin's Enigma – Ebbing the Tide of Naturalism.* (192 pages) From Master's Books at http://www.newleafpublishinggroup.com/MB.php

Thomas, B., (2013). Dinosaurs and the Bible. USA. Institute of Creation Research. Dallas Texas at WWW.icr.org. (61 pages).

Wiebe, G. D. (1997). *Creation vs Evolution* (35 pages) downloaded 2009 from www.wiebefamily.org