

The Answers Book: A Review
By Greg Neyman
© Answers In Creation
Complete Version
Original located at www.answersincreation.org/abc.htm



The Answers Book is published by Master Books, and is written by Ken Ham, Jonathan Safarti, and Carl Wieland. The editor is Don Batten. The book reviewed is the Revised and Expanded Version, Twenty-Seventh Printing, in October 2002.

This book takes what the authors consider to be the twenty most asked questions, and responds to them from a young-earth perspective. The book is offered for sale at Christian bookstores and online stores.

Chapter 1 – Does God Exist?

Yes He does! For the most part, this chapter is well-written, and does not affect Old-Earth belief. However, because the basic belief of the authors is in a young-earth, their work is naturally biased. There are several points which can be discussed as it relates to the age of the earth.

Other Evidence for The Creator-God of the Bible (Page 20)

In the middle of this section, the authors make the claim that there is evidence that the universe is relatively young, and this contradicts the belief in billions of years. As you can see from the rest of the Answers In Creation website, this so-called “evidence” is full of holes, and is only accepted by the young-earth community. As such, no reputable scientist has accepted any evidence that the universe is young. It is only when you delve into the narrow-minded world of young-earth theory that you see people who accept a young universe, despite all the evidence against them.

The authors also mention the traditions of hundreds of native peoples around the world which support Biblical history. Here the authors are alluding to the many flood stories throughout the world. Old-earth theory has no problem accepting this. Since all people descended from Noah and his family, all these stories have a common source. However, as you will see in the rebuttal for Chapter 10, the flood was not global, i.e. over the “entire” surface of the earth, but it was global from the perspective of Noah and his family.

Is It Science? (Page 21)

The authors attempt to show the inherent bias that is present in science, such as the scientists religious beliefs. Yes, this is an important fact to consider when discussing conclusions. However, it is not the old-earth scientists that you have to look out for...it is the inherent bias of the young earth theorist that is flawed.

What is a young-earth "creation scientist?" Is there such a thing? Let us turn to the dictionary for a definition of a scientist.

A scientist uses "scientific methods" to examine things. According to Webster's Dictionary, the scientific method is "...the collection of data through observation and if possible experiment, the formulation of hypothesis, and the testing and confirmation of the hypothesis formulated." Note the scientist FIRST collects data, and then formulates the hypothesis.

However, young-earth scientists do not operate by the above dictionary definition. They have reached the conclusion (hypothesis) that the earth is young FIRST, before they collect scientific data from the rocks. Only then do they try to match the scientific data to their pre-conceived age of the earth. Since the authors do not comply with the scientific method, they cannot rightly be called scientists, and at best should be referred to as "theorists." Therefore, to call someone a "Creation Scientist" is to put a title on them that they do not deserve, because they do not use the scientific method.

As a result, you cannot trust the conclusions of so-called young-earth scientists. Who then should you trust? When it comes to "creation science," one should look for Christians who objectively look at the evidences before coming to "age" conclusions. There are many good Christian scientists out there in the church. We should rely on them, and not on people who label themselves as "creation scientists" under false pretenses.

At the top of page 22, the authors make the statement that scientists that believe the Biblical record to be God's Word, will come to a different conclusion from those scientists that disregard the Bible. This is not true. There are many scientists (Dr. Hugh Ross, Gerard Schroeder, etc) who believe the Bible, yet they believe in an old earth. The authors falsely believe that believing the Bible means you must accept a young age for the universe. There is no problem with a person believing in an infallible, inerrant Bible, and believing in an old universe. The Answers In Creation website proves this, and is a gathering point for old-earth believers.

Who Created God? (Page 22)

There is a great point here at the top of page 23. The authors recognize God as the creator of time, and as such, He is not limited by the time dimension. In the summary on page 24, they say that "God...is outside of time." This admission opens the door to old-earth belief. Since God is not limited by time, what does "time" mean to God?

Young earther's will make a defense of the "days" of creation being literal 24-hour days. The truth is, there is no claim in the Bible that states the length of

these days. The "day" as we know it didn't even begin until the fourth day of creation, when the sun and the moon were created (according to young-earth interpretations). The saying I like to use is, "If you are God, and you are in outer space, a million miles away from any stars or planets, then how do you mark the passage of time? As God, you do not sleep, you do not need rest, therefore time has no meaning." When we get to heaven, we will spend eternity there. Are we going to have clocks in heaven? Wow, there goes another million years! It won't matter to us, just like it doesn't matter to God.

Should finite man limit infinite God to a twenty-four hour day? It is finite man that has imposed his interpretation of the word "day" onto an infinite God. Well, our rules of time don't apply to an infinite, everlasting being. Just look at the creation. God rested on the seventh day. In fact, he is still resting, and we are still in the seventh day! If this day has lasted for over 6,000 years, then who are we to impose time limits on the other days of creation? The use of the word day is just so that man can have some type of framework to understand creation, and does not imply 24-hour days.

Non-Biblical Evidence (Page 25)

2. Living Things. Not a problem for the progressive creationist, but it is a problem for the old-earth theistic evolutionist.
3. Fossils (page 26). Provides a rebuttal against evolution, but has absolutely no bearing on the progressive creationist.
4. The Age of Things (Page 27). The first paragraph has inaccuracies. The authors make the claim that there is much evidence that the universe is young...but this is far from the truth. The truth is that the only scientists who accept this is the young-earth believers...no reputable scientist has accepted a young age for the universe. For instance, they mention the argument that the decay of the earth's magnetic field is evidence of a young earth. What the young-earth theorist is pointing to is the weakening of the magnetic field. However, this weakening has occurred many times over earth's history. As the earth undergoes a magnetic reversal, the field lessens, then reaches zero, then reverses polarity. This movement toward zero is not a "weakening" but is a natural part of the reversal process. This is but one example of how they try to "pull the wool" over the reader's eyes.

Conclusion

I agree with the young-earth theorist that God exists. However, I do not possess the preconceived assumptions that the young-earth believer has. I rest on the scientific evidence for the age of the earth, whereas the young-earth believer first assumes the earth is young, and then he tries to prove his conclusion with science, which ignores the "scientific method." Therefore, so-called young-earth "creation science" is not science at all, but is part of a system of belief, best summed up as a "theory."

I can rest on the science, and still believe in the inerrant Word of God. Instead of ignoring the scientific community, we should embrace it.

Chapter 2 – Did God Really Take Six Days?

Yes He did! However, the length of these days was not twenty-four hours. Unfortunately, this chapter is flawed right from the first sentence. The authors say the gospel message is undermined by millions of years. From my discussions on time in this book's rebuttal and elsewhere on the Answers In Creation website, you can see that there is no problem with old earth belief and the gospel. In the last sentence of the first paragraph, the authors warn that the Bible cannot be interpreted on the basis of fallible theories of sinful people. Rest assured, old earth believer, that we can say the same thing...the Bible cannot be interpreted on the basis of fallible theories of sinful people...which includes old and young-earth believers.

The second paragraph can be summed up with two words..."don't think." We can see here the basis of young-earth belief...it consists of accepting everything you see and read at face value, instead of using your God-given capacities to reason and think. By using your God-given reasoning, you are not "questioning God." In fact, you are doing exactly what God wants you to do. Acts 17:11 is an example of this, where the believers examined the words, to see if they were true.

If you only remember one thing from this chapter, remember this...do your own thinking, and don't take my words, or the words of the young-earth creationists, as true, without first examining them.

Why "Long Days"? (Page 34)

The first sentence is a quote from Romans 3:4, "Let God be true, and every man a liar." I'm not sure why the authors would use this. It does not flow well with the following paragraph. They wish to cast doubt upon the supposed "lies" of the millions of years in each day of creation. However, one must remember...the young-earth authors, and all their believers, are also men, and as such, are just as guilty of being liars.

The second paragraph says that those who have accepted long days of creation have been influenced by ideas from outside of Scripture. This is a lie. You can believe in millions of years long days of creation, and still believe in an inerrant Scripture. Unfortunately, it is a misinterpretation of the Bible which causes the young-earth authors to make this false claim. You can research this further in other articles on the Answers In Creation website.

The authors mention the fact that the church fathers mostly accepted the creation days as ordinary days. It is important to remember that the early church fathers, up until the early 1800s, did not have the scientific evidence that we have today. As such, their viewpoint was based on incomplete evidence. We have

much more information in today's world, and can make a much more accurate estimation of the age of the earth than they could have.

The "Days" of Genesis 1 (Pages 37-39)

The authors make an argument against the Hebrew word for day, yom, for meaning anything but a 24-hour day. God used the word "day" to convey something that man could understand. Would early man, such as Adam, Moses, etc, have understood it if God had said, "Over the first 2 billion years, God created heaven and earth?" We are talking about simple people, who were not educated at Harvard or MIT...they probably didn't even have a word for "million" in their language.

However, they could understand "day." And by using the "day" He gave us a model for the week. The message was tailored to the education level of the people at the time of revelation. It did not matter if they understood it as "day" or millions of years...the length of time is irrelevant to an eternal God...man was the limiting factor in understanding the concept of time, and thus it was given to us in a manner so that early man could understand.

Why Six Days?

On page 41, 13 lines down, the authors mention Exodus 20:11 as referring to literal days. This has nothing at all to do with the six days of creation, and no comparison can be implied for the work week, and the actual length of the creation days. God used the seven days as the basis for man's week, but this does not imply any length of "man's days" to the creation week. After all, man was not around until the sixth day, so these "days" are as God sees days, not as man sees them.

Objection 1 (Page 41)

Science has proven the earth to be old, therefore creation must be long periods of time.

In A, the authors say that man's fallible methods have not proved a billions of years old earth. On the contrary, they have. Fortunately, man's fallible interpretation of God's Scripture has not proved a young earth. This entire section is based upon incorrect assumptions dealing with man's interpretation of Scripture, and not upon the "fallible" methods of man.

The authors claim the Bible states that death and disease are a consequence of sin. It is true that spiritual death came by Adam's sin, but not physical ([click here for more](#)). The authors appeal to the fact that Jesus took Scripture literally, so we should also, based on Matthew 19:3-6. This passage makes no claim about the literal interpretation of Genesis, and I, as an old-earth believer, can agree completely with this passage with no problems. If the young-earth

proponents want to take all of Scripture literally, then they should have both their hands and feet cut off, and their eyes put out (Matthew 18:8-9).

The authors make the claim that man was permitted to eat meat only after the flood of Noah. They claim there was a change in the way animals reacted to man (Genesis 9:2). However, that is not what the passage says. It is written in the form of a simple statement, and does not imply a before and after condition, and thus does not indicate any change...it merely states facts.

The authors make the claim that Genesis 2:17 says that physical death came as a result of Adam's sin. However, no such conclusion can be reached based on this verse, given the weak evidence of the authors.

After Adam's sin, God clothed them. The authors tie this in to Hebrews 9:22, and read into the text something that is not present. God simply clothed them, and there is no connection between these two passages of Scripture.

Using Romans 8:19-22, the authors argue against physical death before the sin of Adam. However, there is no connection between physical death and this passage...it is put there by the young-earth interpretation. Then the authors claim that thorns were created after Adam and Eve sinned...there is no reference given for this claim, nor proof of any kind. If this is true, then God created thorns, AFTER the creation week was over. However, at the end of Day 6, God entered into rest, and did no more creating. Therefore, belief in the thorns after sin theory is contrary to even a young-earth interpretation of Scripture.

In concluding, the authors state that millions of years destroys the foundations of the Cross. However, I am here, as are millions of other old-earth Christians. I am saved by Christ's shed blood, and I look to the Cross and thank God for His saving me. I fail to see how I am resting on a Cross with a crumbling foundation...I only see a strong God, and a Savior that is as solid as a rock to me.

Objection 2 (Page 44)

How could they be 24-hour days if the sun was not created until Day 4?

To answer this, the young-earth authors step way out on a thin limb. They give very weak answers, and even claim the sun was not needed for the "day and night" of the creation week.

The old-earth, progressive creationist explanation fits both the scientific record, and the Bible. It all depends on the observers (or, author's) frame of reference. In this case, the author of Genesis was observing the creation from the viewpoint of the surface of the earth. Even though the sun came into existence before the Day four point, it was not visible yet (for a fuller explanation, see the book, *Creation and Time*, by Dr. Hugh Ross, or visit his website, [Reasons to Believe](http://www.ReasonsToBelieve.com)).

Objection 3 (Page 45)

II Peter 3:8 makes it possible for the days of creation to be long periods of time.

Again, empty answers. The main point here for the true answer is in section b, six lines down. It states "God is outside of time." Since time has no meaning to an eternal God, who are we to limit the creation to 24-hour days. Old-earth creationists have long pointed to this verse, and there is no reason from this book that would cast doubt upon this.

Objection 4 (Page 46)

Imposing Limits on God

The authors use the weak argument that the billions of years belief diminishes God by implying he needed large amounts of time for creation. However, so do the six 24-hour days of the young-earth creationist. God didn't create the universe in six seconds...therefore He must be weak!

I challenge any young-earth creationist to do this...starting right now, create a new universe, complete with stars, planets, and at least one planet with life. And, I'll be generous and give you 40 billion years to do it. Can you do it? Of course not...but God can, and did. Again, since God is eternal, time has no meaning.

Objection 5 (Page 46)

Adam had too much to do on Day Six.

The standard objection is that since Adam had to name all the animals on the day he was created, it must have been a long period of time. They dismiss this because he only had to name the animals God brought to him. The authors make a distinction between the animals of Genesis 2:20 and 1:25. However, there is no basis for their claim

The next few paragraphs are very interesting. The authors claim Adam's brain was perfect, and that he knew what death was, even though he had not seen any death. I had no idea Adam was omniscient! If Adam was so perfect, why did he sin? He would have known the exact consequences, and would not have made that choice! If Adam was so smart, God could have easily said, "I started the Big Bang, and the first several billion years I spent forming the stars and galaxies...and Adam would have understood Him perfectly. However, God simplified it by breaking the creation into days, so that Adam could understand.

Objection 6 (Page 47)

Genesis Chapter 2 is a different account of creation. No problems here.

Objection 7 (Page 48)

Evening and Morning, Day Seven.

The authors arguments are inconclusive and weak. No need to provide a rebuttal.

Objection 8 (Page 49)

Genesis 2:4

The authors claim that since the word “yom,” or day, in this passage, is not qualified by a number, nor by the terms “evening and morning.” Indeed, it is quantified by a number...it says, “In the day that the Lord God made the earth and heavens.” The number is one, and I agree with the authors, that it refers to the creation week. However, since God, in His Word, refers to the creation both as “six days” and “one day”, it is further evidence that God is not bound by time, so a day to God cannot be strictly implied to mean a 24-hour day, which is man’s interpretation of a day, based on man’s viewpoint here on the rotating earth. If you are in deep space, for example, how long is a day? Even on other planets in our solar system, a day varies, from Jupiter (9 hours, 50 minutes) to Venus (243 days).

Other Problems (Page 49)

These present no problems from a progressive creationist viewpoint...some of these silly explanations border on senseless babbling. For instance, implying that Adam would be millions of years old! By the time of the end of creation, the days and years that man observed were normal periods of time. For further explanations, see the works of Dr. Hugh Ross.

The “framework hypothesis” discussion makes no sense at all!

Long Age Compromises (Page 51)

The authors claim that all long-agers reject Noah’s flood as being global...not true. I know old-earth creationists who believe in a global flood.

Does It Really Matter? (Page 52)

No, it doesn’t. Jesus still died for our sins...no matter how long the creation week was. I am a Christian, and I believe in an old earth. You can be too! If you want to remain a young-earth believer, that great! It does not matter when it comes to your salvation.

Chapter 3 – What About the “Gap Theory”

There may be no problems with believing in the Gap Theory, for many of the same reasons already mentioned in Chapter 2. We at Answers In Creation fall under the category of progressive creationism, and thus we do not believe in the Gap Theory. We will review this chapter at a later date.

With that said, if there is another old-earth creationist who wishes to provide a rebuttal for this chapter, feel free to send it to me for publication here.

Chapter 4 – What About Carbon Dating

Nothing has received a more vehement attack in the geological sciences than radiometric dating techniques. Unfortunately, too many people are willing to accept the young-earth theorist arguments against it. If you step back, and take the time to examine the true methods behind the science, and not the slanderous half-truths produced by the young-earthers, you will see the reliability of these methods.

As usual, the half-truths start on the very first page. The claim that Christians take the Words of Jesus seriously, and then they state that His words only make sense with a young earth. Not true. As a Christian, I have no problem with any of the words of Jesus, and as an old-earth believer, this presents absolutely no problems. It is a mystery why the young-earth proponents so vehemently defend their young-earth belief, when in reality, you can be a Christian and believe in and old earth.

How the Carbon Clock Works (Page 75)

The authors give a good discussion of how Carbon dating works; however, they do have one major flaw. At the bottom of page 78, they state that Carbon dates should be adjusted because of the global flood of Noah. No reputable scientist has accepted this into their calculations for carbon dates, as this would provide an invalid date. Because of this, any dating performed by young-earth theorists should be disregarded as inaccurate.

Other Radiometric Dating Methods (Page 79)

At the bottom of page 79, the authors make the claim that there are three assumptions the scientist must make to accept radiometric dating. Two of their arguments are not valid. One claim is that the decay rate is constant. Since it is, this is not an assumption, but a fact. Another is the third one, or closed system argument. For the most accurate dates, one would want the sample being dated to be in a closed system, or, in other words, not exposed to other sources of radioactive material which would upset the balance of original radioactive material. Great pains are taken to ensure the purist samples. Since you can hack your way into the rock, and take a sample from the middle, you can

reasonably assume that the overlying rock insulated your sample well enough to eliminate any doubt about contamination.

The first assumption given concerns the starting conditions, i.e. the amounts of isotopes present at the time the rock formed. This one is a valid assumption which the scientist must make. However, given the tens of thousands of samples that have been successfully dated, we have built a reliable database for reference for other dates that we seek, and thus we can be reasonably certain that we can believe the dates obtained, with a reasonable margin of error.

The main thing to remember here is...although dating may not provide an exact date, you can rely on it to give a good estimate. Young earth creationists refer to dating methods as "the dating game." The difference between old and young earth creationists is this...at least the old earth creationists are in the game, trying to find a solution to the ages of the rocks...whereas the young-earthers refuse to play the game, and flatly state that the earth is only 6,000 years old, despite the fact that they have no solid evidence. Who would you rather believe...someone who is trying their best to obtain ages for rocks, or someone who totally ignores science? Actually, since old-earth proponents are "playing the game," they are the unequalled experts, and thus should be believed.

If you walk up to me and Tiger Woods, and we both start talking about golfing techniques, who are you going to believe first? Obviously, you would listen to Tiger, since I'm an 18-handicap player. The same should apply to dating...listen to those who are playing the game, not those who are on the sidelines.

There Are Patterns (Page 81)

The authors claim there are no "infallible" techniques. I agree. However, at least we are playing the game.

The authors mention John Woodmorappe, who did a critique of radiometric dating, and provided 100 samples of bad dates. However, several real scientists have disproved his reasoning. Even without this, think about this...there have been many thousands of radiometric dates done. Supposing that there have been 100,000 dates performed (the actual number is probably much higher), to find 100 errors would yield an error rate of 100/100,000, or 1/10th of 1 percent. This error rate is extremely low, and scientifically, these 100 so-called bad dates don't invalidate the other 99,900 good dates.

Bad Dates (Page 81)

The authors claim that when bad dates surface, researchers quickly form excuses for discarding them. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Given the expense involved in dating, every attempt is made to make sense of the dates before they are non-chalantly discarded. However, since the young-earth theorist considers any date older than 6,000 years to be inaccurate, they non-chalantly discard them...thus it is the young-earth proponents that actually ignore

99.9 percent of all dates as “bad.” Using the formula above, the old-earth scientist would only disregard the 100 dates mentioned, or 1/10th of 1 percent.

First, the authors give the Australopithecus example, where the scientists apparently threw out 9 dates which did not fit the expected age. I would reason that they were using sound scientific methods, but that won't convince you they were right with their 4.4 million year old age...therefore, I must tell you what the young earth authors of this book omitted. There is an inherent problem with Argon dating, which involves excess Argon in recent age rocks. Young-earth theorists know about this, yet they don't readily provide this information (it is mentioned in Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe). Due to this problem, geologists and other scientists know that they must look at recent radiometric dates with great scrutiny. The key is to know when to disregard them, and when to accept them. Again, at least the old-earth scientists are playing the game, whereas the young-earth theorists completely refuse to play.

At the bottom of page 82, the authors appeal to Job 38:4. I love it when they do this. It states, “Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth?” They use this to stab at the old-earth creationists. However, the same question can be asked of the young-earthers. They were not present either! So again, we must play the “dating game” to find out the answer. At least the old-earth creationists play in this game.

At this point it is appropriate to state this...when considering ages for the earth, always look at the references for the material. If the reference work was accomplished in or by a young-earth theorist, it must be ignored. Again, they don't play the dating game, so they have no clue about the true age of the earth.

What Dates Would You Like? (Page 83)

The authors mention the fact that dating labs have you estimate the age of the material to be dated. So what! If I put down 40 million years, and it dates to 100 million years, the lab will tell me 100 Ma. Are the authors implying that the lab would test it to 100 Ma, but because it is only expected to be 40 million years old, so the lab will disregard the 100 Ma date and will tell you something around the date you expected. It is like the lab saying, “It is expected to be 40 Ma, but it is 100 Ma, so we'll guess it is 45 Ma and report that to the customer.” In implying this, the authors are questioning the integrity of all dating labs, and in essence are saying they lie about their work.

Methods Should Work Reliably....(Page 83)

Yes, in a perfect world this would be a nice thing. However, we don't live in a perfect world. Fortunately, geologists know when to accept dates, and when to reject dates. In other words, they know the limitations of the dating methods, and take them into account. The examples they give are for young lava flows.

Geologists have known for years about the excess argon problem which throws off the dates. The authors imply that the methods are considered “foolproof.” This is not the case...scientists know there is no foolproof methods, but the young-earth theorists would have their followers believe that scientists consider their methods to be error free, when in reality, nothing is farther from the truth.

Look at the date chart at the top of page 85. The dates range from 10,000 years to 2,600 million years. Yet geologists say these lava flows are about 1.2 million years old. Why? They know the limitations of the dating methods, and in this case, rely upon the relative position of the lava to other rocks, and completely ignore the radiometric dates. This is a perfect example of knowing the limits of dating.

Carbon-14 in Millions of Year Old Fossils (Page 85)

The authors state that no coal has been found that does not contain Carbon-14...of course not! While it is true that older than 50,000 year old rocks should not show much carbon, the very process of collecting and analyzing samples contaminates the sample. In order to perform a perfect test, the rock sample would have to be excavated in a vacuum, then kept in a vacuum during transport and testing. This can never happen, so a perfect “zero” reading for 14C will never occur, because at some point exposure to the atmosphere will happen.

Even if you could do this “vacuum” law, when you expose the fresh sample, it is also exposed once again to cosmic rays, which could in turn produce more Carbon-14 in the sample.

The authors mention wood in Triassic sediments, which dates to 33,720 years. It is impossible for me, without the source documentation, to determine the validity of this claim. There are other claims in this chapter that I am not addressing as well, for the same reason. The important thing to remember is...if it's stated by a young-earth creationist, and it has to do with radiometric dating, you can't trust their statements to be true. Again, they are not playing the “game.”

So-Called “Physical Evidences” (Page 86)

The authors claim that 90 percent of dating methods point to a young earth. I'm not sure where they get this figure...it makes me want to ask them...“What are you smoking?” Rest assured, there is no truth to their 90 percent claim.

A. Rapid formation of Strata. This has been disproved in several other articles on this site, such as Stratigraphy, The Coconino Sandstone Article, and others. At the bottom of page 86, they use the plastic folding diagram for the Grand Canyon rocks. However, they fail to explain the science behind it. All materials, including rocks, have a viscosity value, which can be calculated. Viscosity is the ability to resist flow. Even rocks, which are hard to the touch, are viscous. Given time and pressure, they will bend and fold. The argument that they should crack is only proposed by two sets of people...those who don't

understand fluid mechanics, and those who seek to discredit old-earth belief. Since the young-earth theorists are obviously smart (they have PhD's), this means they know about viscosity, but choose to ignore it, in the hopes their followers will not look too deeply at the science.

B. Red Blood cells in dinosaur bone. This has long since been disproved by the scientists that examined the bones in question. However, the authors refuse to update their web site articles and book articles.

C. Earth's Magnetic Field. They claim it can't be more than 10,000 years old. However, to their credit, they recognize that it has undergone reversals. To explain this simply, think about a pendulum. At its strongest point of potential energy, it is farthest away from the center. As it gets closer to center, the potential energy weakens, and once it crosses the center, it begins to strengthen again until it comes to a stop. We are currently in a downswing, moving towards center. The energy of the magnetic field is getting weaker, as we move toward a field reversal. Once we cross the center, or, switch polarity, it will build back up again. The age of the field, and its strength, has absolutely no relation to each other.

D. Radioactive Decay. I have not seen the original work, and thus I will not comment on this one. However, the study is by a young-earth theorist, so it probably should not be given any merit.

The next two are astronomic, so I'll leave that to Dr. Hugh Ross. The salt idea has one flaw...the young-earth theorists must assume that the rate of salt deposition into the sea is the same for the last 62 Ma. There is no way to know this.

The most amazing statement is on page 88, seven lines down. It states that creationists (young-earth) understand the limitations of dating methods better than evolutionists! How could they do this, if they refuse to play the "dating game." However, let's break it down further. I'm a creationist, and I'm certain that I understand the limitations, so their statement is obviously flawed for not considering the old-earth creationists.

They state that creationists date the earth from the history of the Bible. However, it is not the earth that they date...it is the age of Adam that they date. The earth existed before Adam, therefore using genealogies only runs the date back to Adam's existence, not the earth.

The final sections of this chapter deal with several issues from young-earth creationists, thus they must be thrown out as valid evidences. Remember, when it comes to dating techniques, listen to the experts...the ones actually using the techniques. You would not ask me to fix your golf swing, when you have Tiger Woods available to help you. Listen to the experts!

Chapter 5 – Distant Stars

The authors dismiss the standard young-earth explanations from the past, and then present their new theory from Mr. Humphries.

A New Creationist Cosmology (Page 97)

For the most part, I'll skip this chapter. However, some statements must be challenged.

In the first paragraph on page 98, the authors state that his theory passed "peer review." Sorry, but a gathering of young-earth believers hardly qualifies as a "peer review." Peer review is a term used by scientists to claim that their work has stood up to the scrutiny of fellow scientists. In this case, only young-earth "scientists" reviewed the work.

To date, there is no known acceptance of his theory outside of the young earth community. To make a claim about peer review is to claim status for his work that is undeserved.

Finally, in Chapter 12 of this book, Dr. Humphries has the theory that the waters for the flood are stored out beyond the galaxies at the edge of the universe. This would add considerably to the mass at the edge, and would throw off his theory.

The authors mention the affect of gravity upon clocks. It has been shown prior to the 1970s that a clock at the top of a tall building runs faster than clocks at the bottom. My question is...has this been done recently, with digital clocks? We should be able to measure this down to the microsecond using today's digital clocks, but I'm not aware of any modern experiments.

It also stands to reason that if I take an airline flight, my watch will be affected. After all, if you did this on the Empire State Building, the altitude is about 1,400 feet. In an airplane at 35,000 feet, it should be much more dramatic.

To test this theory, I calibrated my watch to the US Naval Observatory the morning of a flight, and then I checked it again when I got on the ground. Technically, it should have been faster than the Observatory when I got back on the ground. However, when I checked it, it was the same time. It can't be due to a bad watch, because normally my watch keeps time to within one second per month.

So then, was time affected by altitude, or was it the springs in the clocks that were affected by the gravity difference? Makes you think...

For more on this theory, please see Dr. Hugh Ross's article on his website, at www.reasons.org.

Chapter 6 – How Did Bad Things Come About?

I was a little bit surprised by this chapter. The authors present no answer to the question posed, but instead puts forth several theories, all of which have major problems. Because of this, there is almost no need to provide a rebuttal for this chapter.

It is interesting to note the teeth issue. John Morris of the Institute for Creation Research has suggested that the carnivorous teeth all developed within a few hundred years after the fall.¹ If this is true, then it would have to mean that God created all animals with teeth that were efficient for the processing of plant material. So, imagine this...a Tyrannosaurus Rex with molar teeth...or one of the raptor family with molars. They must have existed, so then, we should have found some in the fossil record. However, nobody has ever discovered a T-rex with molars.

Some may say that they ate plants with their carnivorous teeth. This is even better! Was God's creation perfect? Yes, it was. How could God's creation be perfect, if these animals were given inefficient teeth for chewing on plants? Therefore, in order to maintain God's creation as "perfect," they had to have molars. In fact, no animals would have been created with carnivorous teeth!

¹ "If All Animals Were Created as Plant Eaters, Why Do Some have Sharp Teeth," by John D. Morris, Back to Genesis, No. 100, April 1997, page d.

Chapter 7 – What About Arguments for Evolution?

When it comes to evolution, the old-earth creationists are split. Some believe that God used evolutionary principles to develop life (Theistic Evolution). Others do not believe in evolution, instead opting for the belief that each life form was a unique creation by God, as evidenced by the fact that there are no "missing link" fossils for all species (Progressive Creationism).

Answers In Creation's ministry is to aid the old-earth believer, no matter what form of creation they believe in. I am a progressive creationist. However, I recognize the possibility of theistic evolution. As always, there is an open invitation to any theistic evolutionist to submit material to Answers In Creation. If you would like to provide the rebuttal for this chapter, please contact me.

Chapter 8 – Cain's Wife – Who Was She?

As a progressive creationist, I agree with the authors of this book. Cain's wife must have been his sister. The arguments presented by the authors are sufficient, and do not need any discussion.

Chapter 9 – Were the Nephilim Extraterrestrials?

As a progressive creationist, I agree for the most part with the authors on this topic. Since this topic has no impact upon old earth belief, no rebuttal is necessary.

Chapter 10 – Was Noah’s Flood Global?

As a progressive creationist, I do not believe the flood to be global, i.e. over the entire face of the earth. However, there are some old-earth creationists who would argue for a global flood. If you want to do so, that is fine, there are no theological implications. It is perfectly acceptable to Scripture to believe in a global, or a local, flood event.

Biblical Evidence for a Global Flood (Page 150)

A. The Need for the Ark. Yes, it’s true Noah could have migrated away. However, there are several good reasons he did not. First, if he did this, others would follow. Think about the Tower of Babel...God had to introduce the various languages to scatter the people all over the earth. Before Genesis 11, people stuck together! If Noah had moved, others would have moved with him, and thus they would have been saved as well.

Also, the Ark served as a testimony. People came from miles away to see this boat. No doubt, Noah spent much time foretelling the future doom of mankind, so he was able to “preach” to the people. God always gives people a chance to repent. In this case, they had 100 years of preaching, to no avail. However, if Noah simply moved away, the people would not have the chance to repent.

B. The Size of the Ark. Although the ark was large, it would not hold all the animals in the world. Even young-earth proponents have to shrink the animal population to get it to work. For instance, they say that a common ancestor, or “dog-kind” was the only pair saved, and from them came all the species we have today, dogs, coyotes, wolf, hyena, etc. The size of the Ark was well-suited for the population of animals needed.

C. The Need for Animals on the Ark. They were needed for three reasons. First, to repopulate the area decimated by the flood. Second, as a food source for Noah and his family. And third, as an illusion. Suppose the evil people had caught on that the flood was real, so they moved away, and escaped the local flood. By keeping up appearances that only those on the ark would survive, then running away from the flood would not occur, because they knew they could not escape it.

D. Birds. For the same reasons as C.

E. The Judgment Was Universal. This section has an amazing sentence. On the third line, they state that “it boggles the mind to believe that, after all those centuries since creation, no one had migrated to other parts (of the world).” Huh? Genesis Chapter 11 tells about the Tower of Babel, and how all the people lived in the same area, and eventually God had to scatter them abroad! Because everyone lived in the same area, there was no need for the flood to be global.

F. The Flood was a type of the judgment to come. “A partial judgment in Noah’s day would mean a partial judgment to come.” The judgment in Noah’s day was not partial. It affected all of humanity.

G. The Waters were above the Mountains. Obviously, God protected the rest of the world by keeping the waters only in the local area. Surely, if a supernatural rainfall occurred, then certainly a supernatural force maintaining the water in this area is possible.

H. The Duration of the Flood. We will have to ask God how and why He did the Flood. He chose to cover this part of the earth for more than one year. It was His choice.

I. God’s Promise Broken? The authors imply that since we have local floods today, then God broke his promise, numerous times, not to flood the earth again. Here the authors assume a small size for the local flood. However, the Flood covered an area probably several hundred miles in circumference, and thousands of feet deep, for more than a year. This flood may have been “local,” but it was by no means “small.” This was a huge flood event, one that has not been repeated on this scale again.

The covenant God made to never flood the earth again is in Genesis 9:15. He states that “the waters shall never again become a flood to destroy all flesh.” Yes we have local floods today, but they are true to God’s covenant...these floods do not “destroy all flesh (humans).”

All People are Descendants of Noah (Page 152)

This is OK by me...I agree.

The Hebrew Terminology of Genesis 6-9 (Page 152)

The key to the first section is in Genesis 6:13. God said “...the end of all flesh has come before me, for the earth is filled with violence through them.” When God speaks of killing “all flesh” he is talking of humankind, for humankind is the one that filled the earth with “violence.” This obviously does not represent the animal kingdom. Since humans were only living in a small geographic area, this “violence” all existed in the same area.

“All Flesh” (from page 153) only means humankind (Genesis 6:13). God set the pattern in Genesis 6:13, referring to humankind by this term, so it clearly does not mean all animals as proposed by the authors.

None of the other terms present any kind of solid argument for a global flood.

Genesis 9 – Genesis 1 Parallels (Page 153)

I agree. Adam was told to fill the whole earth (which failed by the time of the Flood), and so Noah was given the same instruction (which failed by the time of the Tower of Babel). Parallels here mean nothing.

The New Testament Speaks of the Flood as Global (Page 154)

Nowhere in any of the passages mentioned does it claim that the flood is completely global. In fact, the opposite may be true. II Peter 2:5 states “...bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly.” In the early chapters of Genesis, the people did not migrate away from each other and settle the whole earth. In fact, God had to change their language, and scatter them from the Tower of Babel, because of this tendency for people to live together. In the above passage, it says the world of the ungodly was flooded. In order to accomplish this, God would only need to flood the Middle East region to fulfill the goal of killing off these ungodly people. Since the rest of creation only existed of plants and animals, which corruption had not reached by young-earth standards of belief, there would be no need to kill them.

Objections to a Global Flood (Page 154)

Number 1: “All” does not always mean “all.” One must consider who is describing the Flood. From the viewpoint of humankind, which solely lived in the Mesopotamia region, the flood was most certainly “global” and killed “all” life. Yes, it would not mean “all” if you lived in America...but then there were no humans in America at the time, so “all” means “all” to those in the Flood.

Number 2: The Post-Flood geography is the same as the Pre-Flood geography. A weak, but interesting argument. Not important for the debate of global versus local.

Number 3: There is no evidence for such a flood in the geologic record. I’ll say that again...there is no evidence for such a flood in the geologic record. All the evidence presented by young-earth theorists has been disproved. Here are some of the articles disproving a global flood on the Answers In Creation website.

- Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe – Book Review
- Noah’s Flood – Is the Young Earth Model for Noah’s Flood right?

- The Floating Forest Theory Sinks. Young-earth creationists have proposed that there were floating forests to explain the coal beds that we see in the strata today. This article logically sinks this theory.
- Coconino Sandstone – This rock formation in the Grand Canyon area is said to have been formed by the Flood of Noah. However, the authors missed some key contradictions.
- The Desert Problem – All it takes is one wind-deposited desert in the geologic record to disprove the young earth model.
- Stratigraphy - Or, can the Global Flood of Noah produce all the rock layers we see in the Grand Canyon?
- Chalk from Noah's Flood? – Young-earth theorists claim that all chalk layers were produced during the Flood. However, can the Flood even produce chalk?
- Dinosaur Extinction – Can the young-earth model explain dinosaur extinction?
- Canyon Deception – Can a modern canyon that formed in six days give evidence of the Flood being able to create the Grand Canyon?
- Missing Rivers – Do absence of Canyon forming rivers mean anything?
- Creationist Stratigraphy – Is such a thing feasible?
- Redwood Hoax? – Redwood Trees provide no evidence for Noah's Flood
- Joggins Fossil Cliffs – Are fossil trees proof of Noah's Flood?
- Yellowstone Petrified Forests – Rebuttal of the Petrified forest theory.
- Human Fossils – Young-earth proponents claim there would not be any human fossils from the Flood of Noah. Can this be true?
- Buried Birth – Do rapidly buried fossils prove a young earth?
- Catastrophism, or Uniformitarianism? - What's the difference? Not as much as you think!
- Insect Beds – Do fossil insects give evidence of Noah's Flood?
- The Fossil Record – Are old-earth theories weakened by a changing fossil record?

Conclusion

The flood of Noah was local, yet it was global from the perspective of all who perished in it, and from Noah's perspective.

Chapter 11 – What About Continental Drift?

This is a very interesting chapter. The authors put forth the theory of catastrophic plate tectonics. Superficially, this theory is actually believable...however, just because something is "believable" does not mean that it is right. I could come up with a theory of the extinction of the dinosaurs, with no apparent flaws, but that does not mean that it is right...it is only one theory among many.

When you have multiple theories which appear to be correct, then one must turn to other, circumstantial evidences, such as stratigraphy, in order to choose the right answer. Yes, catastrophic plate tectonics sounds plausible, but when you ask if all the sedimentary rock layers of the world could be produced by the flood, the obvious answer is no, therefore this theory is not correct. Even so, the theory itself is not without flaws.

Problems (Page 161)

The first thing mentioned is the fact that magnetic polarity changes as you go down a core sample. The authors claim this as evidence of rapid formation, but there is no support for this belief. The rock units are not one huge slab, but break apart into blocks from the pressure as they spread from the center. These blocks, pictured in the diagram, can and do rotate. There is no reason to assume that these patches of polarity anomalies represent "rapid formation."

The authors also mention the rapid reversals found by Coe and Prevot. I do not have access to their work, and thus cannot debate this point. It is not clear from the text or the source whether or not these individuals are young-earth creationists, so the trustworthiness of their work is not confirmed.

Catastrophic Plate Tectonics (Page 162)

A "convenient" theory that supposedly fits the young-earth model perfectly (if it were not for all the other contradictory evidence!). There are a few minor comments for this section. Page 163 the authors say that the new ocean floor is dramatically hotter, especially in the upper 60 miles. Interesting, considering the fact that oceanic plates are only 10 miles thick!

The authors appeal to the grandeur of the Grand Canyon (I wish I had a dollar for every time this Canyon was used to support a young earth!). However, the Grand Canyon has already been shown in other articles to have formed slowly. Look at the weakness of their Grand Canyon claims here and here.

On page 164-165, they mention the fact that slabs of crust as it was subducted would not have had time to be re-melted into the core material, and that such slabs had been found. This argument proves an old earth, not a young one. Given their unique catastrophic model, I would expect the slabs to melt quicker in the young-earth model, since this is a time during which many molten rock events would occur, i.e. the numerous volcanoes, and rapid sea floor spreading and subduction. In other words, the earth's core is hotter than normal. In fact, the rapid subduction would generate more heat through friction than a slow moving, old-earth subduction model, so you probably would not have these slabs there in the young earth model...but you would expect them in the old-earth model.

The bottom of Page 165 says the uniformitarian model of plate tectonics has limited explanatory power. Nothing could be further from the truth. The authors cast doubt upon the fact that the slow moving tectonic plates would not have sufficient forces to build mountains, especially the Himalayas. However, there is

no such doubt in the scientific community...it only exists in the young-earth community (which is not scientific). It's a proven fact that the Indo-Australian plate is moving north at about 10 centimeters per year. We now have an accurate, GPS reading on the altitude of Mount Everest, at 29,035 feet.¹ It is only a matter of time before we have an actual measurement of the growth (height) of Everest. Only then will the young-earth community realize their error...but, of course, they won't admit it.

Think of it this way...any force which can move something as massive as the Indo-Australian plate 10 centimeters per year, has more than enough force to push the mountains upwards. Also, since this plate is moving north, pushing into the Asian plate, there is nowhere for the rocks to go but up!

However, perhaps the most damaging flaw in this theory is this. The young-earth proponents claim that Everest was formed from these great forces, in a short amount of time. However, look at their theory for the Grand Canyon rocks in the diagram on page 86. They claim that the strata of the canyon are "plastic," i.e. since they were still soft (wet), when the folds occurred, they didn't break, but were plastic, or, they folded. Now, look at the rocks of Everest. Hmmm, you have sedimentary, fossil bearing rocks. If these rocks were still wet when Everest was pushed up, it would be impossible for them to have formed jagged peaks...if they indeed were soft and pliable as the young-earth model states, then Everest would merely be a heap of dirt, instead of the jagged rocks that it is. Using the young-earth model, there is no possible way that Mt. Everest could have formed in a cataclysmic plate tectonic scenario. The only feasible answer is that the earth must be old, with the slow growth of creeping plates pushing into each other over millions of years.

¹ <http://geography.about.com/library/misc/bleverest.htm>

Chapter 12 – Noah's Flood – What About All the Water?

A very good question, considering that all the water of the Flood returned from where it came. Looking at today's topography, there is no way that the earth contained enough water to cover the tallest mountains. Because of this problem, the young-earth camp has a two-fold solution, the catastrophic plate tectonic model, which claims the earth was one continent, and lower in elevation than it is now, and secondly, the "Waters of the Deep."

The authors start with deception on page 170. They mention that 70 percent of what comes out of volcanoes is water...so what! This has nothing to do with how much water there is in the earth's crust. Water comes up as steam because it's hot down there, and water's low boiling point makes it come up first, before anything else (most rocks melt at 600 Degrees F. or higher).

The Windows of Heaven (Page 170)

The authors mention Genesis 2:5 as proof that it had not yet rained on the earth. Young-earth proponents like to say that it did not rain until after the Fall, or, even until the Flood of Noah. However, that is not what this verse implies. Simply paraphrased, it states that “there were no plants, for there was no rain yet.” It did not say that there was no rain until man. From the rock record, we have ample evidence of “rain pits” formed from rain dropping onto sediments. There was obviously rain millions of years ago. Genesis 2:5 simply says there were no plants until it rained. The “mist” of Genesis 2:6 presents no problem...it was obviously cold and damp, with an overlying fog providing moisture.

The Waters Above (Page 171)

Interesting that Mr. Humphrey’s theory of the Waters Above meant water from beyond the stars at the edge of the universe!!! (I always thought he was “out there!”) How would this affect his new cosmology theory which was explained in Chapter 5? Surely the mass of this water would negate this entire theory!!!

A Water Vapor Canopy (Page 172)

A Major Problem (Page 173)

Interesting to note the young-earth camp has apparently abandoned this theory. However, if this truly is the case...why can I still read about it on their web sites?

Where Did the Waters Go? (Page 174)

The authors appeal to Psalms 104 to claim the mountains rose and the valleys sank down. So, does this passage of scripture support them? Let's see, read it here...but I'll include verse 5. I'll comment on each verse.

5 Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed forever.

Here, you have to take into account Genesis 2:1-2, which states "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all his work which He had made." God has rested from his creation, after he laid the foundations during the creation events of Genesis 1.

6 Thou coveredst it with the deep as with a garment; the waters stood above the mountains.

Okay here's the Flood of Noah.

7 At Thy rebuke they fled; At the voice of Thy thunder they hasted away.

Okay, now God rebukes the water and it recedes. Notice the water is the only thing moving.

8 They go up by the mountains; they go down by the valleys unto the place which thou hast founded for them.

Here, the water went up over the mountains?, and the water went down into the valleys, to the place that God appointed for them (oceans and underground). Again, the water is doing the moving...not the mountains or the valleys.

9 Thou hast set a bound that they may not pass over, That they turn not again to cover the earth.

Here, a boundary has been set for the water.

The authors' claim this passage implies uplift and other earth movements...exactly where does it imply this? The only thing moving in these verses is the water! You can see in verse 5, and from Genesis 2:1-2, creation is complete...the mountains are in place. Unless the movement occurred from natural processes, any movement during the Flood of Noah would equate to a second creation event, but that can't be, since its clear from Genesis 2:1-2 that creation is complete! Even more compelling is the focus of Psalm 104. Look in any Bible commentary, and you will discover it is talking about the waters during the creation, in Genesis 1:2, 9. It's not even talking about the Flood!

Sorry about getting sidetracked, but this lie needed addressing. Back to the waters, yes, some of the waters obviously sank into the ground, completing the so-called "return" to their place of origin. However, there is not nearly enough groundwater to come anywhere close to providing a global flood. Since the Psalm 104 argument has been disproved, the model of a flat earth, with 2.7 Km of water, as depicted on page 175, cannot be true.

Mount Everest (Page 175)

Not much of importance here, except the obvious lack of geologic learning of the authors. The last paragraph on page 176 says that erosion from the Flood is the reason river valleys are much larger now than they should be. The authors show a complete lack of understanding of rivers. Wide river valleys are observed today, as rivers frequently change course within the basin. One merely needs to look at an aerial photo of the Mississippi, with all it oxbow lakes, to understand the process known as 'meandering.' I'm surprised at such a simple admission of ignorance.

Chapter 13 – How Did the Animals Fit on Noah’s Ark?

Not much of an issue for Old-Earth creationists. There are some errors that do need addressed, though.

How Many Types? (Page 179)

On page 180, the authors say that seeds and plants could have survived the flood on floating mats of tangled vegetation. Let’s visit our favorite article on ocean currents, by Baumgartner and Barnette (<http://www.icr.org/research/jb/patternsofcirculation.htm>). With ocean currents of 156 miles an hour, NOTHING would be floating for very long during the flood. Therefore, it is not reasonable to expect any plants to have survived this way.

What is a Kind? (Page 181)

For this, see my article on young-earth evolution. (www.answersincreation.org/youngevolution.htm)

Was The Ark Large Enough? (Page 183)

John Woodmorappe’s calculations for the volume of the ark are way off! He gives a figure of 1.52 million cubic feet as the volume, based on the 450 foot length, 75 foot width, and 45 foot height. However, this is based solely on these dimensions, and does not take into account the external walls, nor the internal floors, stairs, support beams, etc, that would diminish the usable volume of the ark considerably.

Not a critique, but a comment...God said to make the Ark with three decks. If common naval understanding is used, then the ark had two internal protected decks, and the third deck was the top surface of the ark.

Food Requirements (Page 184)

This is the biggie. The food requirement while on the ark is not in question...but afterwards. The land would be decimated, with no living plants. Noah would have to feed the herbivorous animals for months after they departed from the ark, so the ark would have to carry this food as well. In addition, the number of carnivorous animals would probably make the herbivores extinct in a matter of weeks...so then why do we have cows today? If we assume cows came from a common cow-kind, as the authors suggest, and there were seven pairs on the ark, then there were 14 cows. Even if you assume cats like lions and tigers came from a cat-kind, you also have dogs, and several species of dinosaurs, including T-Rex. The two T-Rex alone would probably make the cow-kind extinct after a month...and then you have the two Raptor-Kind also!

However, if it was a local flood, the animals simply migrated to areas that were not touched by the flood, and there would be food aplenty for them.

Chapter 14 – How Did Fish Survive The Flood?

This question does not have any implications for the old-earth creationist, unless you are an old-earth creationist who believes in a global flood. However, there is one point that needs discussing.

The authors mention plants on page 189. Let's look at the conditions of a globe full of water. The fluid dynamics of the earth covered with water was calculated by two young-earth theorists. They discovered that there would be currents on the order of 156 miles per hour!¹ At that speed, no pre-flood trees would survive. Also, any that did would be completely buried by the new sedimentary layers. Therefore, any trees, or plants of any kind, would have to sprout from seeds after the water subsided.

The dove was sent out from the Ark, and brought back an olive twig. Since there would only be seedlings, it could not have brought back a full twig, but instead had to uproot a 2-3 inch tall seedling! Also, since all grass and trees perished during the flood because of the currents and the rapid deposition of new rock, there would be no food for the animals once they departed the Ark. Therefore, Noah would have to feed these animals well after they departed from the Ark. However, there is no support for this from the Bible.

In an old-world, local flood scenario, the animals merely had to migrate a few hundred miles to find land not devastated by the flood. Also, you would not have the devastating currents from the global flood, so trees and plants would have been better suited to survive and re-populate the flood region.

¹ Baumgartner and Barnette, "Patterns of Ocean Circulation Over the Continents During Noah's Flood" located at <http://www.icr.org/research/jb/patternsofcirculation.htm>

Chapter 15 – Where Are All the Human Fossils?

A very good question, one which the young-earth proponents of this book cannot provide a good answer for. They go wrong from the very first page. The authors refer to the Coconino Sandstone, a rock unit in the Grand Canyon. They appeal to its supposed quick deposition by the Flood. If you desire, you can check out their argument for this sandstone by clicking here for their article.¹ Unfortunately for the young-earthers, this is an extremely easy article to dismiss, as it is full of problems...click here for the rebuttal.²

They claim the Grand Canyon strata are all deposited quickly, but there is no evidence of this. Yes, if you accept the young-earth theorist's claims, you could believe this, however, in order to do so you must ignore the solid science behind the old-earth claims. As far as the claim about the folded strata, I've already discussed in a previous Chapter about the concept of viscosity.

The authors give a listing of six items on page 192, which have been discussed elsewhere on Answers In Creation. They have no solid proof of any evidence which would even remotely suggest rapid deposition.

Dinosaurs and Humans (Page 193)

This is the most important part of this chapter, so let's look at their claims.

A. Dragons. Last time I checked, dragons were mythical, and did not exist. The authors allude to Job 40...there is no evidence that suggests the author was speaking about dinosaurs. Because of the young-earth creationists' insistence on accepting every verse of the Bible as literal, they have to explain away the behemoth of Job. The best they can come up with is a dinosaur. However, no dinosaurs have been found with the features described (bones of bronze, ribs of iron (Job 40:18)). He is said to rest under the lotus tree, yet the lotus tree is too small for a Brachiosaurus to rest under (Job 40:21). The Leviathan of Job 41:19-21 breathes fire, yet no dinosaur has this capability.

B. Unfossilized dinosaur bones. A myth that is spread around young-earth circles. When a report came out years ago about a science team at Montana State finding red blood cells in a t-rex fossil, the young-earth community went crazy. Unfortunately, they have failed to print follow-up stories to this claim, because then they would have to tell the truth about the finding, which did not contain red blood cells. Even the more recent discovery of soft tissue inside a T-Rex femur does not support a young earth. Most of the bone was fossilized, in essence sealing the contents inside the bone. Also, consider this...given the millions of fossils that have been found, there are varying stages of preservation...some are poor, some are excellent. To find one with excellent preservation, even with blood cells, would not mean it was recent...it would only mean that it was well-preserved. Even if they did find blood cells (which they didn't), it does not mean the fossil was only 6,000 years old.

C. Rocks with dinosaurs have very little plant fossils. Plants are soft, fragile things...the break apart when they decay, and the decay process takes less than a year...not enough time for it to fossilize unless they are rapidly buried, thus you would expect little plant material in the same rocks.

The authors mention the Morrison Formation. This formation sits on top of several thousand feet of sediment which the young-earth proponents say are part of the rocks deposited during the receding water phase of the flood.³ How could the dinosaurs be living during this latter phase of the flood? Genesis 7:21-23 makes it clear that by Day 40, when the rains stopped, all animals were dead. Why then do we have footprints, dinosaur nests with eggs, dinosaur poop, and dinosaur bones, in rocks that were deposited after the rains stopped?

The diagram on page 195 confirms this, and shows the dinosaurs during the receding phase, which is absolutely impossible according to Genesis 7:21-23!

Out of Sequence Fossils (Page 194)

This is an example of the young earth theorists only telling their followers part of the story. Let me tell you the rest. They claim that fossils are found outside the range of their supposed lifespan in the rock record. Yes, it does happen...but this does not negate the lifespan of the organism, nor the old age of the rocks. Let's say we have Organism A, which was supposed to live from 100 to 60 million years ago. Johnny Geologist goes out, and finds a fossil of Organism A in rocks which are 120 million years old. Does this prove the young age of the earth? Far from it...it merely means that Organism A lived from 120 to 60 million years ago. The timeline of the organism's lifespan is increased. Young-earth proponents always argue that we are always expanding these timelines...of course we are...it is logically impossible to shrink them, so the only way to go is to lengthen them...Duh!

The authors refer to a Hindu book, but don't provide evidence from it. Why even refer to the book if you are not going to quote evidence from it? I personally don't read too many Hindu books, so I'll leave this one alone...

The General Pattern (Page 195)

Here the authors propose their model which can be seen in the diagram on page 195. Only two comments are needed here. First, the general pattern they propose matches exactly the pattern found in the rocks, which matches the old-earth model as well. No surprise here...we just get to the same results via different methods.

Second, on page 196, paragraph 2, they estimate 10 million people by the time of the flood. Then they go on to explain that the reason we haven't found any human fossils is because these people are buried, scattered throughout all the sedimentary rock layers from the flood (over the entire earth). However, this is not a valid assumption for their burial.

The authors, in other works, have pointed to the great dinosaur graveyards. These are places, such as the bend of an ancient river, where bones are likely to accumulate. They claim that as the flood waters rose, the dinosaurs herded together, until they were overcome. So, let's look at the Flood model and Humans. All the humans were in a very small geographic area, around Mesopotamia. As the flood waters rose, they also, like the dinosaurs, would flee to higher ground. Therefore, the humans would also be grouped, or herded, together as they escaped the flood.

Because of this herding to escape the flood, and the small geographic distribution of the humans, it is not a reasonable assumption to say that the human bones are scattered throughout ALL the sedimentary rocks of the world. They, like the dinosaurs, should be found in mass graves in the Middle East. However, no such mass graves have been found. I'm certain they were there in the past...so they must not have been found yet.

If they are found, I'm sure the young-earth people will put their spin on the story, and change all their literature...after all, it would not hurt their story any.

¹ http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/docs/v15n1_grandcanyon.asp

² <http://www.answersincreation.org/coconino.htm>

³ Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe, Figure 4.1. (Book by Steven Austin)

Chapter 16 – What About the Ice Age?

Do not believe the first sentence. The authors say there is only clear evidence for a single Ice Age. They say this because they have to. If there were evidence for another ice age, it would disprove the entire young-earth model for creation. Therefore, other ice age evidence is either discarded, or not addressed. If they cannot explain away something, they ignore it in the hopes that everyone else will do the same.

Click here for an article on the Ice Ages. (Pasted below for convenience)

Ice Ages

by Greg Neyman

© 2005, Answers In Creation

First Published 1 April 2003

Answers In Creation Website

For many years the young earth community has argued that the one single ice age occurred as a result of the aftermath of Noah's Flood. While it is obvious that the recent Ice Age deposited sediments that are on top of all the ancient rock layers, what is not so obvious is the periods of glaciation which occurred in the geologic past.¹

They have made an attempt to explain these away. Michael Oard (a meteorologist) has an article on the Answers In Genesis website, (<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/1188.asp>) claiming that these ancient deposits are submarine debris flows. He is right in that one geologist thinks the Bigganjarga is a debris flow. However, it's poor science for a meteorologist to assume that this can translate to ALL ancient glacial deposits. He does not address the others. If he had evidences against the rest, he would definitely write about them. Instead, he has only weak evidence which can plainly be interpreted by a geologist as being glacial or non-glacial. This lack of evidence speaks volumes to the weakness of his conclusions.

Definitions

Glacial features are easy to spot in the geologic record because of these easily-identified features;

Drift – general term referring to glacially-deposited sediment

Till - unsorted and unstratified glacial drift; usually contains both local rock material, and rock material transported from a distant source. Typical glacial till is unsorted, unstratified, has a variety of particle sizes, and a wide range of particle lithology

Outwash – Till deposited from a melting glacier onto a continental mass

Glaciolacustrine – Deposits in a lake formed at the end of a melting glacier

Glaciomarine – Deposits from a glacier contacting a marine boundary

Tillite – Lithified version of glacial till

Clasts – Rock composed of fragmented material

Glacial Striation – linear excavations (generally small) that are formed by the sediment-laden ice as it passes over bedrock. The larger grooves may be several meters deep in soft rocks.

Crescentic Gouges – Gouge cut into bedrock by an ice sheet, in the form of a crescent, usually several centimeters in length

Ice Rafting – Large pebbles dropped by melting ice. They are dropped into a soft-mud surface as the ice melts

Late Paleozoic Glaciation

Widespread, well-known glacial deposits occur throughout the Southern Hemisphere Gondwanaland landmasses, ranging from Carboniferous to Permian in Age (354 to 248 million years ago).

Dwyka Formation

These glacial deposits occur throughout southern Africa. The Dwyka is about 1300 meters of sediment, with the middle 800+ containing tillite units. These units rest on widespread striated pavements, and contain striated and faceted clasts. Well-preserved glacial valleys are exposed throughout the area. The tills are typical, including clast orientations, and contain both local and remotely-derived gravel particles.

Permian of Australia

Glaciers were widespread over all of Australia during the Late Carboniferous, with continental ice sheets reaching maximum coverage during Permian time. The evidence for this ice exists throughout the entire spectrum of glacial sediments, which includes outwash, glaciolacustrine, and glacial marine deposits. Glacial pavements with striations, grooves, and crescentic gouges abound.

At Hallett Cove and Fleurieu Peninsula, there are clasts of various plutonic and metamorphic sources. Ice rafting was also common, as evidenced by the large dropstones scattered throughout.

It is estimated that there were dozens of glacial advances in southeastern Australia during the Permian.

Why Does It Matter?

The above two examples of Carboniferous/Permian glaciation occurs in rocks that are 248 to 354 million years old. According to the young earth Flood model, deposits put down during this time are considered as being deposited during the early part of Noah's Flood.² How could there be widespread glaciers at a time when the entire globe was underwater?

The young-earth model cannot give any explanation for the existence of these glacial deposits and features. Because these rocks are Permian in age, the Flood could not possibly have deposited them. As such, this is enough evidence to disprove the global flood model proposed by young earth scientists.

Even More Evidence!

Tillites are well-documented on all continents except Antarctica, with dating to the Precambrian, 650 to 700 million years ago. By the young-earth model, these glacial deposits are considered as creation week rocks, however it seems odd that during the intense mountain building, volcanic-ridden creation week, that glaciers dominated six of the seven continents!

The Varangian Ice Age deposits are found throughout northern Europe, the British Isles, and Greenland. Pebbly mudstones (from ice rafting) are common, with some striated pavements. The Port Askaig Tillite in Scotland and Ireland is over 700 meters thick, and contains glacial marine, glacial fluvial, and nonglacial sediments. In Norway, the Upper and Lower Tillite Formations contains tillites deposited in a glacial marine environment.

In Canada, the Gowganda Formation, also Precambrian, displays typical glacial till features; poor sorting, unstratified, varying particle sizes and sources. Sandstone lenses show evidence of ice rafting. The base of the formation contains striations and grooves in the underlying bedrock. The age of this formation is considerably older, at 1,300 million years old.

Conclusion

The existence of glacial deposits in early Noah's Flood rocks shows that the young-earth model for the Flood is inadequate. There could not have been glacier deposition when the entire world was under water. Nor could there be glacial deposition during the rapid mountain building of the creation week. Clearly the young-earth model is flawed. But the old-earth model, with God creating the earth over the last 4.5 billion years, fits perfectly with the evidence of the rock record.

¹ Depositional Systems, Chapter 7, Richard A. Davis Jr., Prentiss-Hall Inc., 1983

² Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe, Figure 4.1, Page 58, Institute for Creation Research, 1994

Chapter 17 – How Did Animals Get to Australia?

A great question! This is one of the weaker chapters of the book, which fails to answer the question that it poses. They admit this weakness in the very first sentence (and the last paragraph), although this admission is veiled. The authors appeal to the readers emotions, in again re-iterating the claim that God covered the entire globe with the flood. This has nothing to do with the subject, and could have easily been left out. However, the authors needed this emotional appeal to focus their readers on their main Flood argument, because there is nothing in this chapter upon which to focus.

Even if kangaroos hopped their way all the way to the coast, and then swam across...there should be kangaroo populations all along this migratory route. There should also be Koala populations as well. Where are they? Enough said!

Clues From Modern Times (Page 212)

The authors mention the re-population of many species on the island of Krakatao. This proves nothing. For instance, the field mouse is not native to Australia, but it is there, brought on ships. Many islands were contaminated by the many animals that were brought over on trade ships. This island is no different, as the animals listed probably had a little "help" from man in getting back on the island (of course, the young-earth authors omit this fine point...why cloud the issue with the truth!)

Did the Kangaroo Hop all the Way to Australia (Page 213)

I agree with the authors...if the model is true, then the animals had centuries to migrate...thus they did not have to start hopping right when they got off the ark. However, this reiterates my earlier point...there would be kangaroo populations all along this migratory route...there are NONE. The authors do

mention that there are no fossils enroute to Australia. However, the kangaroo is a sturdy animal, and would easily have survived in some areas...thus we should have living pockets of kangaroos, not just fossils.

Unique Organisms (Page 214)

The authors try to explain away what is mentioned in my preceding paragraph. Since they present no solid evidence, no rebuttal is necessary.

The Koala (Page 215)

Nothing important. Only contains a weak argument that needs no rebuttal...it's weakness speaks for itself.

Chapter 18 – How Did All the Different “Races” Arise?

This chapter presents no problems for the old-earth creationist.

Chapter 19 – What Happened to the Dinosaurs?

Nothing is more challenging to the young-earth theory than the dinosaurs. In attempting to explain them, they have come up with some interesting theories; however, there is still plenty of unexplained data that they cannot address. When it comes to these issues, they are silent, in the hopes that nobody will think about it.

I will handle this chapter in the order it is presented, and will intersperse this data throughout.

Are Dinosaurs A Mystery? (Page 237)

Not to the old-earth creationist...although the young-earth authors would have you believe they are. The authors claim there is no mystery if you accept them as having been created only 6,000 years ago. However, the evidence from the dinosaur fossil-bearing rock layers is so contradictory to their story that it completely eradicates their theory.

Why Such Different Views? (Page 238)

I love it when they do this...once again they appeal to Job 38:4, “Where were you when I laid the foundations of the earth?” In making this statement, the authors are alluding to the fact that since the old-earth believers were not there, they cannot possibly know when it was. However, as I have said many times before, the young-earth creationists were not there either, yet that doesn't stop them from guessing about the age of the earth.

On page 239, they make the claim in the third paragraph that a paleontologist who believes the Bible to be the Word of God, will come to a completely different conclusion about the fossil record than an atheist. Not true...there are many paleontologists who believe the Bible is the Word of God, and they believe in a billions of year old earth. I'm sure everyone has heard of Dr. Bob Bakker, the famed paleontologist, for one.

Actually, the following is true...if you look at the Bible only as your source for dating the earth, and ignore the creation, which God made (and, which testifies to its true age), then you will inaccurately date the age of the earth. There is no problem in believing the Biblical account of creation, and believing the earth is billions of years old. It is only when you get into incorrect interpretations of the Bible, as the young-earth camp does, that you have problems. However, these are problems with interpretation, not with science.

This entire section, especially the second half, is basically saying, "it's our way, or the world's way." They pit it as themselves, as the true interpreters of the Bible and science, against a secular world. However, they do not have the monopoly on Biblical interpretation. Fortunately, we are all free to interpret the Bible, so we don't have to be tied down to believing this expert, or that expert. As much as the authors would like to paint it as "Godly" against "worldly," it's not that simple.

Using their model, I take the "Godly" viewpoint, yet I reach "worldly" conclusions. I disagree. Old-earth creationists take the "Godly" viewpoint, and reach a "Godly" conclusion that the earth is old. Another way of summing up this section is, 'ignore worldly science.' Unfortunately, they must say this in order to explain their own inaccurate interpretations. If anyone listens only to their brand of science, then they will only come to a young-earth conclusion. However, anyone who has a mind and likes to think for themselves, will see the obvious errors in their scientific work (if you can call it 'scientific').

Unfortunately, the people tied up into believing their "science" do not think for themselves. They instead are taught to ignore all worldly viewpoints. For example, my wife was at a recent homeschool support group meeting, and they were discussing a field trip to a nearby natural exhibit, and dinosaurs came up. Another parent knew about our old-earth beliefs, so she asked my wife to explain it. One young-earth believing mom was in the group, and rudely interrupted my wife before she could get started. Despite several attempts, my wife could not get a word in edgewise. The other mom would not hear of it, nor would she allow my wife to talk. Since young-earth believers exhibit this type of reaction, you could say that they are trained to be, and to remain, ignorant in true scientific matters. (The same reaction can be seen in their leaders...during a discussion between Dr. Hugh Ross, a prominent old-earth creationist, and Dr. Russell Humphreys, Dr. Humphreys behaved in the same juvenile fashion...that is why Dr. Ross will not debate him anymore).

Why did the mom react this way? Because she had been trained this way. Young-earth leaders know that if the true science ever is presented to their believers, and they start thinking by themselves, they will realize the errors of the young-earth belief.

Unfortunately, wrong science is rampant throughout the homeschool curriculum in use today. My son is a fifth grader, and this year he studied all about Noah's Flood, from a young-earth perspective. Therefore, you can see that the indoctrination starts at an early age. By the time they reach adulthood, they are so immersed in their young-earth belief that they will not entertain anything but a young earth. Answers In Creation, in response to this, will eventually publish an alternative curriculum to replace the young-earth version that is found in so many homeschool texts.

Dinosaur History (Page 240)

More misinformation. The authors make the point that many fossil finds are just fragments of bones, and "some" nearly complete skeletons have been found. Actually, MANY nearly complete skeletons have been found. This is a veiled reference to the fact that some scientific discoveries were based, for instance, on a single bone. Dinosaur history is not that sketchy...there are plenty of bones.

Where Did Dinosaurs come From? (Page 240)

This section takes a stab at evolution. For the old-earth progressive creationist...no problem.

What Did Dinosaurs Look Like? (Page 240)

Here we have the famous "Brontosaurus" claim. OK, a scientist made a mistake. If I had a dollar for every mistake I've found in young-earth creationism, I'd be rich!

Who Discovered Dinosaurs? (Page 241)

Naturally the authors claim that Adam discovered them. However, this is not plausible due to the 65 million year gap from dinosaur extinction to Adam. They claim that secular books will say 1677. Actually, this is the first documented find. However, there are numerous earlier finds that are not documented.

Young-earth literature is full of claims that dinosaurs lived recently. One of these claims is that Indian rock art, dated to within the last 1,000 years, depicted dinosaurs. The article on the Answers in Genesis website titled "Messages on Stone," by Dennis Swift (<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/1123.asp>), tells the tale of rock art, dated from as late as 1200 A.D. This rock art depicts dinosaurs and mammoths, and was drawn by natives of North, Central, and South America.

The author tries to use this as proof that these beasts lived in the past few thousand years. If true, then dinosaurs are not millions of years old, but instead are products of God's creation event that occurred only 6,000 years ago.

No fossil evidence has ever been recovered of dinosaurs which lived in the past several thousand years. Without that, there is no proof of Mr. Swift's claims. What we have in the rock art is this...the first paleontologists! Indians who found these massive fossil skeletons probably depicted them by drawing the beasts, to try and guess what they probably looked like.

The author inadvertently gives credibility to this argument. He states that in the American Southwest, there is a pictograph that looks like a pterosaur, which is a Cretaceous flying reptile. He goes on to state, "*not far away from this site, the University of Ohio quarried a fossil pterosaur.*" The artist was most likely trying to flesh out the creature that he saw in the rock record somewhere in the past.

In fact, this is probably the source of many mythical beasts, such as fire-breathing dragons. They were seen in the rock record, and the primitive peoples tried to describe them, and from that the folk-tales grew. It is no wonder that the Chinese culture is so immersed with dragons, given the immense number of dinosaur fossils coming from China.

It was not until the 19th century that true, objective paleontology began. Dinosaur discoveries were first published then, and with the concurrent growth of newspapers, it got a lot of attention. But, since these fossils have always been there, they certainly were not the first dinosaurs to be discovered.

When Did They Live? (Page 242)

This section is flawed due to the inaccurate Biblical interpretation of no death before sin. Again, Adam's Fall introduced spiritual death, not physical death. To imply that Adam could not have even cut himself in the Garden is incredibly stupid. For more on death before sin, see the following articles.

[Death Before The Fall of Man](http://www.answersincreation.org/death.htm) (www.answersincreation.org/death.htm)

[Death Through Sin](http://www.answersincreation.org/deathsin.htm) (www.answersincreation.org/deathsin.htm)

Does the Bible Mention Dinosaurs? (Page 243).

The authors allude to the "dragon" legends of the world, and allude to them as possibly being dinosaurs. See above sections for a possible answer to this.

When discussing this topic, young-earthers always go to the behemoth and leviathan of Job. However, these creatures don't fit the description of dinosaurs, using young-earth standards. Remember that young-earth creationists are literalists, and believe every verse of the Bible is to be taken literally. In that case, Leviathan must have actually breathed fire (Job 41). However, there are no known dinosaurs with this capability. For Behemoth, no dinosaur had bones of bronze or iron. More importantly, the authors refer to this as one of the sauropods. Job said the animal shaded itself under the branches of the lotus tree. A sauropod would have a difficult time getting under the short limbs of a lotus tree!

With all that said, even if Job did refer to dinosaurs, God could have been referring to them. There is no timeline given. God could refer to any animal of His creation, whether they were living, or extinct.

Other Ancient Records (Page 245)

This section lists many stories (fairy tales) which mean nothing when it comes to dating dinosaurs. Here we see the “scientific” merit of the young-earth dating methods...which relies on fairy tales!

What Do the Bones Say? (Page 246)

The authors mention the story from Montana State University about the supposed find of T-Rex red blood cells. What the authors do not do is follow up on this discovery with the latest information (Answers In Genesis has a follow-up, but it does not present any evidence in favor of the young-earth position). Here is the response of Montana State’s famed paleontologist, Dr. Jack Horner:

Hi Adrian,.....Young Earth Creationists are like the "Flat Earth" people of >last century, they latch on to pieces of straw, ignoring the bale.

>

>No cells have been found in any dinosaurs, but the remnants of red blood >cells have been hypothesized on the basis of Heme, a kind of iron produced >biologically. The discovery of heme, by my graduate student Mary >Schweitzer, in a skeleton of T-rex (Not SUE, however, but the Museum of the >Rockies Wankel T-rex) indicates that the remnants of cells can be >preserved.

>

>1. Was it really blood? NO

>

>2. Does it mean anything? It means that under optimal conditions the >fossil record can preserve some very interesting things that make it >possible to hypothesize the nature of extinct organisms.

>

>Jack

In summary, there was NO red blood cells in this T-Rex! However, you won’t find this or any follow-up stories on the young-earth websites. Why? Because it invalidates their young-earth claim to a young T-Rex that lived in the last 6,000 years.

The authors also mention the partially frozen hadrosaurs from Alaska. Unfortunately, I don’t have any data on this, nor can I find any contradictory information on the web. This is not to say the young-earth argument is correct...I’m only saying I have no data on this subject.

Dino Diet and Behavior (Page 247)

The first part of this section argues against the idea that T-Rex and other dinosaurs were always meat-eaters. Because of the mistaken theology of the young-earth authors, they believe that T-Rex was a plant eater when he was first created. Let's look at the logic of this.

The young-earth authors would agree with me that God's creation was perfect. In that case, T-Rex was created perfectly. However, if T-Rex was created perfectly, then he must have been created and designed for the processing of plant material. In this case, God must have designed T-rex with molar teeth for grinding plants. The sharp, carnivorous teeth of T-Rex would have been inefficient for chewing on plants, therefore implying that T-Rex was not a perfect creation. However, we have already established that T-Rex, as a creation of God, was perfect.

However, no fossils have ever been recovered of T-rex with molar teeth! Young-earth proponents have argued that the carnivorous teeth developed after the fall...great, where are the fossils? There are none.

The second, and only other possibility for T-Rex, is that the old earth model, with dinosaurs living over 65 million years ago, is correct. Since we have no evidence of any T-rex (or raptors, or Allosaurs, or Carnataurs) with molars, then this is the only plausible answer.

To argue for a plant-eating T-rex, is to imply that God's creation was not perfect. Case closed!

You can say the same for the recurve killing claw of the Raptor family. It serves no purpose in a plant-eating world...unless these were living plants which moved when you attacked them!

Examples from other creatures that God made are also applicable. Why does a spider have the capability to spin a web? According to the young-earth creationist, they must have been used to catch falling leaves! Why do spiders, snakes, scorpions, etc, have poison? They did not have to poison the plants, nor did they have to defend themselves in the "perfect" Garden of Eden. They serve no purpose but to kill. They are not consistent with the young-earth model for creation.

The authors make the "perfect world" argument on page 248. Yes, it's possible. Does that mean it's right...no. Is there any evidence from the Bible that not a single ant was stepped on in the Garden of Eden...no.

The biggest clue to the fact that the young-earth authors "don't have a clue" is at the bottom of page 249. The indented paragraph states "...must await further research." They recognize their answers are weak and fail to give a plausible explanation, so they fall back on this cop-out.

Why Do We Find Dinosaur Fossils? (Page 250)

The most important thing here is the picture. Young-earth creationists are fond of referring to the mass dinosaur graves as evidence of the cataclysmic

Flood of Noah. However, many dinosaur fossils are found as solitary individuals, not in mass graves.

Also, the authors fail to give the stratigraphic distribution of dinosaur fossils. If you look at the graveyards, there are dinosaur fossils both above and below them in the strata, sometimes separated by thousands of feet of sediment. Did the dinosaurs 1,000 feet up the rock layers tread water until they finally died from the Flood? No. Many of the graveyards have evidence of feeding, as their bones have been chewed on, leaving grooves in the bones. When a T-rex feeds, it loses teeth. Not only are adult teeth found at these sites, but juvenile teeth as well. So now we have a T-rex family, which swam down to where these dinosaurs were killed by the flood, and fed on them underwater!

The young-earth explanation is that the waters fluctuated, exposing these bones for others to dine on. However, my Bible says that the waters rose for 40 days...it does not say the waters fluctuated for 40 days.

Also, Genesis 7 states that after the 40 days, all animals were dead. According to the young-earth model, all rocks that geologists refer to as "Mesozoic" in age were deposited during the receding water phase of the flood, i.e. during the final 150 days of the flood¹. However, ALL the dinosaur fossils are found in these rocks. ALL the dinosaur nests, with eggs, are found here. How could you have dinosaurs building nests and laying eggs, when they were all supposed to be dead? ALL the dinosaur coprolites (fossilized dinosaur poop) is found in these layers. How could you have dinosaurs pooping all over the place, when they were already dead? ALL the dinosaur footprints (known as Trackways) are in these rocks. How could you have dinosaurs walking around, making footprints, when they were already dead?

Clearly, the young-earth model falls flat on its face when you consider the dinosaur fossil evidence.

How Did Dinosaurs Fit on the Ark? (Page 251)

In short...there were no dinosaurs on the Ark. If there were, we would have no domestic cattle today, or animals of any kind. After the animals were let off the ark, the dinosaur species would quickly, within a matter of months, kill off every other species on the ark, as food.

Why Don't We See Dinosaurs Today? (Page 252)

Nothing in this section but pointless young-earth claims.

Are Dinosaurs Really Extinct? (Page 253)

Nothing important here. The authors mention cave paintings, but these were just drawings that Indians did of fossils that they had seen. No young dinosaur bones have been found, and no live dinosaurs have ever been discovered.

Birdosaurs?

This section is really out of date! At this time there have been quite a few findings of dinosaurs from quarries in China, that clearly had feathers.

The authors make the statement that there is no clear evidence that birds evolved from dinosaurs. As a progressive creationist, I agree. However, there are striking similarities, and any theistic evolutionist who wants to write an article on this may submit it to Answers In Creation for publication.

Why Does It Matter? (Page 256)

The Implications (Page 256)

Millions of Years and the Gospel (Page 256)

Conclusion (Page 258)

It doesn't matter. The millions of years long history of the dinosaur family fits well with the creation story of Genesis, and has absolutely no impact upon the Gospel message. You can be saved, and believe in a millions of years old earth!

¹ Steven Austin, in the book Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe, Figure 4.1.

Chapter 20 – What Can I Do?

An excellent question, whether you are young-earth or old-earth.

1. Stay informed. Keep current by checking out websites, magazines, and books.
2. Pray for everyone involved in the age debate, young or old.
3. Post our Signs in your churches.
4. Pass out tracts.
5. Invite a Speaker. Several organizations have speakers that will talk about old earth creationism.
6. Volunteer to speak at your local church. Answers In Creation is working on the slides and outlines at this time that you can use...or create your own.

Please keep in mind...this is about saving souls...not converting young-earth believers to old-earth. Avoid debates with young-earth proponents, as this is fruitless...after all, if both you and he are saved, you're both only wasting your breath. In most cases, they are too indoctrinated to ever admit they are wrong.

Since they are saved, let them be...they can serve the Lord faithfully in their own capacity.

We should, however, confront untruths whenever we encounter them. Be vocal about your beliefs. Keep in mind that when young earth doctrine is spread, it is only spreading untruths, and thus it should be confronted where it is possible to do so diplomatically.