

Creationist Stratigraphy
By Greg Neyman
© Answers In Creation



First Published 29 Apr 2003
Answers In Creation Website
www.answersincreation.org/cstrat.htm

An article on the True Origins web site attempts to paint a positive picture of stratigraphic evidences within a young-earth framework. The article is titled “Assessing Creationist Stratigraphy With Evidence From the Gulf of Mexico,”¹ by Carl R. Froede Jr., and John K. Reed. Unfortunately, the true picture of young-earth stratigraphic evidence is extremely bleak, and their scientific methods are not scientific at all.

Introduction

There are some important points in the authors’ introduction. They state there is a lack of workers willing to undertake the job of constructing a Bible-based alternative to accepted geologic history. First, the reason there are so few workers is because we all realize the truthfulness of geologic history. It is even hard to comprehend how any reputable scientist can sanely testify to a young earth, for they must do so by completely ignoring most of the evidence. Second, they seek to give a Bible-based alternative...there is no need for an alternative, because the geologic history agrees completely with the Bible in the first place. There is no problem with saying the earth is 4.5 billion years old, and God created it. You only need an alternative if you blindly ignore the evidence for an old earth.

The second paragraph talks about the efforts of some young-earth creationists to merge the geologic column with the first few chapters of Genesis. An example of this is the book *Grand Canyon: Monument to Catastrophe* by the Institute for Creation Research. The Paleozoic rocks are called “Early Flood,” the Mesozoic rocks are called “Late Flood,” and so on. Yes, the authors point out this is a risky venture, and rightly so...look at my book critique of the Grand Canyon to see how bad their proposal is. The next paragraph gives more examples. I agree, this is foolish, but for completely different reasons.

The authors continue their discussion, making the claim that “event-based stratigraphy” is “strongly implied in the Bible.” Where? There is no mention of any events that could cause a stratigraphic layer in the Bible outside the Flood, and the Flood does not mention any stratigraphy. However, since the authors must explain the rocks, they must make this false statement.

Finally, the authors mention a nineteenth century debate between geology and Christianity, as an example of a trend of compromise on the part of Christians, which “led to the abdication of Biblical authority in earth history.” This so-called abdication exists only if you hold to the false theory of a young-earth. In reality, there was no abdication, but rather a greater discovery of God’s creation, which led to a greater understanding of geologic history. There is absolutely no problem in harmonizing science and Scripture...you can have your cake, and eat it too. The authors’ assumption

that an attempt to harmonize science and Scripture is eroding Biblical beliefs is completely wrong...instead it is strengthening beliefs in the Creator. This is typical of the young-earth creation science movement. In reality, there is no threat to Biblical authority...it is all imagined in the minds of the young-earth believers.

Divide Within Creationist Stratigraphy

The authors claim that most rocks we see today were created during the Flood (see www.answersincreation.org/stratigraphy.htm and www.answersincreation.org/coconino.htm to disprove it). The authors then present an alternative to the geologic column, showing first creation, then Antediluvian, then Flood Event, Ice Age, and finally Present Age.

The authors go on to argue against the commonly used Flood/post-Flood boundaries proposed by other young-earth creation scientists. In this, we will let them. Before they do, they say, “*any interpretation of history that rejects biblical revelation should in turn be rejected.*” I agree...yet I have no problem believing in an inerrant Bible, and an old earth.

Testing GUC Boundaries

For most of the following sections, we will not discuss the intricacies of their arguments, but will only mention minor points. In this section, the authors write, “We believe that a careful examination of various young-earth Flood stratigraphic models will disqualify *any* of them that are built on any attempt to harmonize the Scriptures with the GUC.” I agree completely, however, you can’t say the same about old-earth stratigraphic models, because there is no problem harmonizing them with Scriptures. There is no problem between Scripture and the geologic column.

Paleozoic/Mesozoic Boundary

The authors mention a 1996 symposium proposing a Flood/post-Flood boundary here, and the authors disagree with this boundary. I agree, of course, but for different reasons. One only needs to consider the dinosaurs. Most young-earth creationists say they were mostly killed in the Flood. However, ALL the dinosaur fossils are found in the Mesozoic rocks, which this symposium proposes as post-Flood. This means no dinosaurs lived before the Flood. Did God create them after the Flood...no, creation was completed on the sixth day.

Mesozoic/Cenozoic Boundary

This solves the dinosaur problem. However, for the arguments against it, the authors do a passable job.

Pliocene/Pleistocene Boundary

Again, we shall leave this to the authors. It is interesting to note, though, that as the boundary moves up the geologic column, that means you must create more and more stratigraphic layers with the Flood itself. In doing so, the authors are boxing themselves into a corner, one which is unbelievable. Now, we must lay down several miles of sediment over a 370 day period of the Flood. This is not physically possible. Nor does it explain the stratigraphic distribution of the fossils contained in these layers. For instance, we have dinosaurs in the upper portion of the flood sediments. If the flood deposited the lower portion of the sediments during the first 40 days of the flood (being generous), and all life on earth ended, then why do we have fossil footprints of walking dinosaurs, fossil eggs of reproducing dinosaurs, fossil excrement of pooping dinosaurs, at a time when the earth is covered in water? No need to say more, the proof against a young-earth flood model is conclusive, based on dinosaur evidence alone!

Gulf of Mexico Record

“There has been no direct impact in the secular geologic community.” Of course not. The authors claim it is because the secular community realizes the creationist as a threat to their historical scenarios and their worldview. Huh? There has been no impact because young-earth creationism is “junk science.”

Assessment of Previous Work

The authors are appreciative of previous young-earth work over the past 40 years.

An Alternate Strategy

(Yes, it’s needed...the one employed during the first 40 years failed miserably). However, you can ignore it, because it fails also. It fails to account for fossil distribution (remember the dinosaurs). It fails to provide a pre-Flood/Flood boundary, which is necessary to explain the fossils. It explains the post-Flood Ice Age, but does nothing to account for Ice Ages that occurred millions of years ago, which are in the geologic column right in the middle of the Flood!

Conclusion

“Concepts, models, and interpretive theories depend on the physical supporting data. The GUC is an illustration of the reliance on non-scientific presuppositions that may or may not be readily apparent to the user.” The first sentence is completely right...however, no evidence is given for the second...because it’s a lie.

The authors (scientists) of this article are completely out of touch with science. What is 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, the authors 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.”

The young-earth scientists who try to squeeze the geologic column into the Flood event are somewhat better, as they acknowledge the column and try to work within it’s framework. However, they also have the presupposition of a young earth, and thus don’t use the scientific method either.

As a result, you cannot trust the conclusions of so-called young-earth scientists. When it comes to “creation science,” look for Christians who objectively look at the evidences before coming to “age” conclusions. If you do, you will quickly learn that God created the world in 4.5 billion years, not six 24-hour days. Yes, you can be a Christian, and believe in an old earth!

¹ trueorigin.org/cfjrgulf.asp