

Evolution 101

Lesson 11

THE GEOLOGICAL COLUMN IS IRRELEVANT

If evolution is impossible as has been shown, the geological column has no significance and is irrelevant. In any case, the geological column is found only in the textbooks. Nowhere in the world is it found complete. A stratum is identified by the nature of the fossils it contains. The oldest stratum is found on the bottom and the youngest is found on top. For instance, the Cambrian formation is given an age by the geologists of 500 million years because there he finds the trilobite fossil, an early arrival in the evolutionary history. On the other hand, the biologist dates the trilobite fossil at 500 million years because it is found in the Cambrian formation.

CIRCULAR REASONING

Scientist Larry Azar asks, *“Are the authorities maintaining, on the one hand, evolution is documented by geology and, on the other hand, that geology is documented by evolution? Isn't this a circular argument?”*

Geologist J. E. O'Rourke adds, *“The intelligent layman has long suspected circular reasoning in the use of rocks to date the fossils and the fossils to date the rocks.”*

The geological column is not consistent. In many places in the world, the so-called oldest formation will be found on top. In other places, several formations will be missing or out of order. In the real world, the actual sediments around the globe average about one mile in depth. In the textbook version, the sediments add up to over 100 miles. Many times, the key fossils are found out of place.

For instance, the trilobite lived during the Cambrian period and died out while early man appeared on the scene only about a million years ago. Yet, William J. Meister found a fossil human sandal print with two embedded trilobite fossils near Antelope Springs, Utah in 1968.

The rock specimen was found in a popular trilobite hunting ground. When struck on the edge, the rock opened up like a book. One side is the print and the other is the mold. The heel shows wear on one side. The trilobite is shown enlarged (See picture below). It looks pretty convincing but how can it be if evolution is true? Naturally, the evolutionists do not accept it. One geologist remarked to this writer that there would have to be many more examples before it could be believed. He didn't feel the same way about Archaeopteryx. Anyway, if this fossil is valid, it means that

there are no long ages represented in the geological column at all. Noah's Flood seems to be the best explanation of the sediments after all.

Another possible mix-up is found on the Paluxy River in Texas where dinosaur tracks are found alongside what appears to be genuine human tracks. The dinosaurs supposedly died out over 70 million years ago. In the same beds with the dinosaur tracks a charred tree limb was uncovered which was dated by the Carbon-14 method to be about 18,000 years old!

Evolutionists close their minds to all evidences that negate their sacred theory. A good scientist will follow where the facts lead and change his theory to fit the facts. Not so the evolutionist. His commitment to evolution is more religious than secular and not easily discarded.

CREATIONISTS ACCEPT THE DATA

There is no difference between creation and evolution scientists in day-to-day **operation science**. Both follow where the data lead. Only when working in **origin science** is there a parting of the ways as dictated by their presuppositions. Even here, creation-ists are more faithful to the numbers.

For instance, on the basis of probability, creationists believe that there are no two identical fingerprints. They do not demand conclusive proof, which would require that every fingerprint, past and present, be compared. They go by the numbers. After multiple thousands of comparisons, no two identical fingerprints have ever been found.

Likewise, creationists follow the numbers when deciding that there are no two identical snowflakes. No two identical snowflakes have ever been found. Conclusive proof would require inspection of every snowflake past, present or future.

The probability of macroevolution is even less likely than two identical fingerprints or snowflakes. Yet, the evolutionists disregard the numbers and embrace macroevolution without the support of even a single empirical test. Creationists believe that the faith of the evolutionist is irrational and that placing one's faith in the God of the Bible satisfies the mind as well as the heart. The evolutionists and atheists follow the desire of the heart, not mind.

www.FineTunedUniverse.com