

The Flood: A Better Explanation

(by Bob Pulliam)

The Fossil Record...

We've already noted the fossilization process above. Is it reasonable to believe a [dragon fly](#) would die, fall to the ground, and its wings stay in tact for years while sediments bury and then fossilize it (wing structure and all)? How about a [fern](#)? What about earth worms? I have some beautifully fossilized earthworms. Put a dead worm out on the side walk and see how long the ants leave it alone! It just isn't reasonable to formulate a slow burial and fossilization of these billions of specimens! Someone might ask, "But what about the cattle horns and skulls I see when I go out west?" Are those fossils? Have they turned to stone? Or, were they found in a field and hung out to be sold? Cow horns in the souvenir shop don't count. Today, fossils only form under relatively rare circumstances. Note this quote:

"Comparatively few remains of organisms now inhabiting the earth are being deposited under conditions favorable for their preservation as fossils. ... It is, nevertheless, remarkable that so vast a number of fossils are embedded in the rocks..." (William Miller, *An Introduction to Historical Geology* (NY, 1952), p12)

But what about all of those layers (strata) we find? Those take millions of years to build up, don't they? No, they do not. Consider this quote:

"...it is reasonable to postulate a very rapid rate of deposition; that is a single lamina would probably be deposited in a period of seconds or minutes rather than in a period of hours ..." (Alan Jopling, Geology Dept., Harvard, *Journal of Sedimentary Petrology*, V36, No 4, p880)

When Mount St. Helens erupted, a large slide of mud left a large bed deposit at the bottom of the mountain. When it solidified, it had laid out in one-quarter inch laminations (layers), just as if they had all been laid one by one. When you look at those layers in the earth, you've been trained to think that they were laid one by one over vast spans of time. That is a myth created by evolution's need to manipulate the facts. It is an unbelievable doctrine that needs such misinformation to keep it alive.

Now consider the vast number of fossils in the record. If, as we saw above, comparatively few organisms are being fossilized today, why were so many fossilized in the past? The best possible answer is *a flood*. And what of those fossils being laid in beds with other like fossils... Why does the evolutionist's geologic column seem to fit? There are two phenomena in a flood that makes this a natural occurrence. 1) The higher vertebrates with greater mobility are able to escape the earlier stages of a flood, and 2) the moving water is actually selective of the organisms in it by their size, weight and shape.

A Monumental Catastrophe...

When one looks at the evidence in the fossil record, and the upheavals evident in the features of the earth's surface, one can easily see the results of a great catastrophe. Scientists have been slow in the past to adopt a catastrophic event in the past for what we can see around us. But now it is not uncommon. No, they do not look to the Bible for the answer. They see great crustal movements in the earth, or collisions with asteroids. Nevertheless, a catastrophe occurred sometime in the earth's past.

The Depths of the Ocean...

There is a good bit of evidence that sea level was once much lower than it is now. If that be true, where did the water come from that raised the seas to their present level? And better than that, if the ocean floor has descended vertical distances measured in miles, where did that amount of water come from? Well, we must first prove these two assertions to be true. Is sea level much higher? Has the ocean floor dropped significantly? A few quotes should help here:

"Can we, as seekers after truth, shut our eyes any longer to the obvious fact that large areas of sea floor have sunk vertical distances measured in miles?" (Kenneth Landes, "Illogical Geology", *Geotimes*, Vol III, No 6 (March 1959), p19)

"The difficulties encountered in explaining the lowering of sea level necessary for the canyons to have been cut by streams seem insurmountable. ... If Tolstoy's conclusion that Hudson Canyon extends down to a depth of 15,000 feet is correct, the magnitude of lowering of sea level to permit subaerial canyon cutting seems beyond any possibility of realization." (William Thornbury, *Principles of Geomorphology*, (NY, 1954), p472)

They would like to conclude that the extension of the Hudson Canyon (which extends out into the continental shelf in the Atlantic Ocean) was cut above sea level. But if that canyon extends 15,000 feet deep, then sea level would have had to have been that much deeper than the top of the continental shelf. The canyon may not have needed to be cut altogether above sea level, but ordinary forces would not have done so below sea level. And then there are a great number of "sea mounts", the tops of which are submerged over a mile below the surface of the ocean. Dr. Edwin Hamilton describes these as "fossil landforms" (*Scientific Monthly*, Vol 85, p303, Dec 1957). They were, at one time, above the surface of the ocean, but are now far below.

The bottom line here is, where did the additional water come from? The oceans are far deeper than they used to be. The Bible has a definitive answer.

All That Rock...

Think about all of the sedimentary rock our scientist love to dig through. A vast majority of this rock is the result erosion, transportation, deposition (to deposit) and lithification (turning to stone). When was the water deep enough to cover much of the earth's surface (which is covered with sedimentary rock). A world-wide flood would be a pretty good explanation of that wouldn't it? Incidentally, remember that the sediment would have had to have been eroded from somewhere *upstream*.

A common explanation is that the sediments were thrust upward great distances after lithification. This is the mountain building we commonly hear about. But the mechanics are not understood, nor is the process all that certain. Illustrating the geologists problem with forces sufficient to accomplish this, Dr. George Kennedy wrote:

"These deep troughs filled with sediments may contain 50,000 to 100,000 feet of sediments and may be 1000 or more miles long and 100 miles in width. ... The mystery, then of the downsinking of the sedimentary troughs, in which low density sediments apparently displace higher density rocks, is heightened when we note that these narrow elongate zones in the Earth's crust, downwarped the most, with the greatest accumulation of rock debris, shed by

the higher portions of the continents, become in turn the mountain ranges and the highest portions of the continents." (*American Scientist*, Vol 47, Dec 1959, p495)

It is a *mystery*, and the answer is not forthcoming by the assumptions of evolution.

Conclusion...

Is a world-wide flood really unreasonable when all of the evidence is examined?... More unreasonable than an unscientific, unproven, illogical theory? A world-wide flood is actually a better explanation for many features we find in this world.

Uniformitarian Evolution cannot explain what we find in the geology of the earth. The geological record shows great catastrophe and non-uniform events. Marine fossils on mountain tops got there somehow. Billions of fossils were formed by non-uniform means. There was a rapid burial of animals and plant life, instantly entombing and setting a rapid fossilization into action. The slow burial explanation of evolution is the silliest notion imagined. Our children are taught to believe a fish would die and not be cannibalized or decay before buried in a few decades to a few hundred years. How absurd? And they ridicule the notion of a world-wide flood!