

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***  
*107 East Austin*  
*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*  
*830-997-8834    [jthomas@fbgbible.org](mailto:jthomas@fbgbible.org)*

**C1025 – July 21, 2010 – The Creation/Flood Model**

Everybody is into modeling these days; we've got weather models, hurricane models, economic models. Each model makes certain predictions. After some time has passed we can look at the data and see how well a model's predictions match the data. Obviously the model whose predictions most closely correlate with the actual data is the better model. That's what we're doing with the Creation and Evolution model. We wanted to think through each model to the predictions that model makes and then look at the data. The data in this instance is the geologic column and the fossil record. This is not an easy thing so we've used the model approach to try and simplify the explanation. So far we've looked at the Evolution Model. This model of history says that all life stems from a common ancestor. One of the predictions of this model is the discovery of transitional forms in a slow, gradual upward development from one celled organisms to multi-cellular organisms. We look at the Data in the earth, in the geologic column and we found that there is no evidence of gradual upward development and there are no transitional forms. So at this point the Evolution Model fails miserably to confirm. We said the way some evolutionists have gotten around this is to posit another Evolution Model called Punctuated Equilibrium. If the Evolution Model of Gradualism isn't confirmed in the data then we go back to the Model and change the Model. So now they've looked at the Data and after looking at the Data they come back and form a model that makes predictions that would fit the Data. So this is the reverse way of doing things. This is saying, we look at the end product and then come back and project an Evolution Model that could account for that Data. The thing Gould and Eldredge came up with was Punctuated Equilibrium, which just is their fancy word for evolution happened very quickly. They didn't do away with the mechanism of evolution, they just sped it up, particularly at the Cambrian explosion; that data has to be explained, how did virtually every phyla

suddenly appear in the fossil record without any past intermediates? Well, it happened so fast that the evidence is we have no evidence. The Punctuated Equilibrium model is people's imagination but I just wanted you to see this because the Data doesn't confirm at all either Evolutionary Model.

Now what we're doing here is demolishing strongholds. People have strongholds in their thinking, things they do not want to let go. Now, is it biblical to destroy strongholds? Is that a Christian thing to do? Paul says in 2 Cor 10:3-5, "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, <sup>4</sup>for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but divinely powerful for the destruction of fortresses." We are destroying fortresses, this is a fortress, supposedly strong, and we find it's made out of straw. Verse 5, "*We are* destroying speculations and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and *we are* taking every thought captive to the obedience of Christ," That's right, destroying speculations, what is all this evolution talk, billions of years talk? It's speculations, you don't know that. How could you possibly know the universe has been around for billions of years? You haven't been everywhere at all times have you? This stuff is raised up against the knowledge of God, this stuff is creatures down here slapping their Creator in the face. Of course, He has to hold them up and sustain them so they can even slap Him in the face. But that's what it is. So we destroy strongholds but today we're going to erect a fortress; we're going to take every thought captive to Christ.

Now this doesn't mean you're going to be able to win everyone to Christ by using this information. Unbelief is like slippery slime and it slips and slides from one explanation to another explanation to rationalize and justify their rejection of the God of Creation. That's the nature of depravity; it does not want to face the God we have to, so they go to great lengths and expend great amounts of intellectual energy to suppress the truth in unrighteousness. So don't ever confuse what this class is all about. This class is not about winning all my friends to Jesus by showing them the evidence and they're just going to have to believe. These people are in rebellion against their Creator. You can use these as talking points to peel back their eyelids for a moment so they have to stare the truth in the face which they so desperately try to close their eyes to, but that doesn't mean they have to believe our Model and come to Jesus. Now God can use it, they do have to be exposed to the truth and God can use these truths to convict them of their sinful suppression. God does use

these kinds of truths. If you read people's testimonies you find that all portions of God's word have stimulated people to look further into the Scriptures and eventually trust in Christ. For some it's the prophecies of Daniel, for other's it's the ages of the pre and post-Flood patriarchs recorded in Gen 5 and 11. We don't know what might stimulate a person to faith in Christ. God has obviously used all portions of the Scriptures. And if you read some testimonies you'll discover interesting portions of the Scripture that jump started people into considering what the Scriptures say and how God the Holy Spirit used His word to eventually draw them to Christ. So we are saying this can be used in evangelism, but don't expect that just because the evolutionary models are bankrupt that people will be forced to turn to the God of the Bible. They may or they may not, that depends on God the Holy Spirit's work in their life. We're just taking every thought captive, showing that we do have the answer, we are learning from the earth about the greatness of God.

So the evolutionary model is bankrupt, now what we're doing is showing how naturally the Creation/Flood Model predicts what we actually find in the earth. Remember, we didn't go around digging all this stuff up. Secular geologists have dug all this up, for the most part we're just reading our Bible and saying, alright, this is what we should find, now we go out and hey, there it is, just like the Bible predicted.

So to get started. Let's re-familiarize ourselves with fossils and the actual geologic column that we find in the earth. What is a fossil? A fossil is physical evidence of a once living organism (either man or nature). It doesn't have to be bones, it can be soft parts like mummies or insects in amber, it can be a cast or mold, when volcanic ash covers animals and people as it did at Mt Vesuvius, when the ash poured out and buried the city of Pompeii people were buried rapidly and impressions, casts and molds of people and dogs were left and you could pour plaster into these molds and out would come the shape of a human, interesting stuff. That's the position the guy or girl died in under the ashes. You also find fossils of fecal material, that's a yummy one, how exciting. And of course, we've found hard parts like bones, shells, wood, etc...those we're more familiar with. So there are many kinds of fossils but the conditions required to form such fossils are not so common. We don't see many things being fossilized today. Yet we see fossils all over the earth, billions and billions of fossils are encased in sedimentary rock. Sedimentary

rock is rock laid down by water. There are three kinds of rock; igneous, metamorphic and sedimentary. When we're talking about fossils in the geologic column we're talking about the physical evidence found in sedimentary rock, those are rocks laid down by water.

That's critical because what that means is that when you find a fossil water has been there, water has covered that area before and buried the fossil in mud. Now where do we find fossils? All over the world on land. So where did the water come from that covered all the world's land? If I look at the fossil record and I see these different strata, each of those strata was laid down by water, where did all that water come from? Are we going to explain all the fossils on earth as having been formed by lots of local floods over billions of years? Or are we going to explain all the fossils on earth by one magnificent global flood just 4,300 years ago? Either way you've got to have water covering the earth.

This reminds us of how fossils form. 1. The living organism has to die. 2. The organism has to be buried rapidly with mud from flood. Why do you have to have that? Because if it isn't rapidly buried then scavengers get it, the sun gets to it, bacteria get to it. So usually it has to be buried at least 2 feet down in the mud, bacteria require oxygen and they can't survive more than about 2 feet down because there's no oxygen. So rapid burial cut off from oxygen. 3. Minerals leach through soil and replace the bone hardening rapidly. Minerals like Silicate, Calcium Carbonate, etc...in water, as the water table decreases these minerals in the water leach in and replace the bone. You have to have this stuff to get a fossil.

Now the fossil record. Most if it is made up of marine invertebrates, mostly shellfish, 95%. Another near 5% are plants. Less than 1% are marine vertebrates, land animals, birds, reptiles or man. That's interesting, that's not what I find in my textbook. When I look in the textbook I'm led to believe that the fossil record is about half invertebrates and half vertebrates; the invertebrates are low in the fossil record and the vertebrates are higher in the fossil record and this leads me to accept the so-called 'fact' of evolution. We found that's baloney.

Most people don't know what the geologic column looks like at all. They've been lied to. You're some of the few people on the planet who actually have

access to the real geologic column. Now, even though we don't see all four of these eras in every place on earth, sometimes the Mesozoic is totally missing and you've got Cenozoic sitting on top of Paleozoic, there are other configurations but nevertheless, creationist Andrew Snelling says that basically we can look at these four eras and the fossils that characterize them are valid on a local and regional scale. He says, "It is crucial to recognize that the order of occurrence of fossils in the rock record is based on real and verifiable observational field data and does not depend in any way on the evolutionary interpretation which the conventional geological community imposes on the fossil record." In other words, generally speaking you can say there are these four basic eras, the Precambrian at the bottom, not much fossilization there, some but not much. Then above that you have the Paleozoic which means "old or ancient life" and includes the Cambrian period, which is where you have virtually every phyla found. That has historically been a very troubling thing for evolutionists and we documented that, it's called the Cambrian explosion. Then above the Paleozoic we have the Mesozoic or middle life and at the top we have the Cenozoic or young life, new life, that's the more recent period of the geologic column. Fine, not debating it too much, just debating the amount of time it took to lay all this down.

If you ask, "Well, how do they date these rocks?" Remember these rocks were dated *before* radioisotope dating systems were discovered, so how did they date them? The clue is right there, "*zoic, zoic, zoic, life, life, life.*" If they're naming the periods for life forms, what are they using to date the rocks? Fossils of the life forms. Oh, isn't that interesting? In other words, Paleozoic rock is not called Paleozoic because it's down bottom, but because of the kind of fossils that are found there. Same story for Mesozoic and Cenozoic. They just said the rock was old, middle or new because of the fossils found in those rocks. Well, how did they know the age of the fossils? They didn't, it was just old, middle or new. Now we know they're all young because radiocarbon dating has shown carbon from the bottom to the top of this column, from the bottom to the top. And how useful is radiocarbon dating? Max 60,000-100,000 years. After that it's so small it's undetectable. So if we're finding detectable amounts of radiocarbon from the bottom of the column to the top then the whole thing can't be older than about 60,000 years. That's radically, radically different than the proposed 4.6 billion years. Take a calculator and do the math. What percentage of 4.6 billion years is 60,000 years? 0.00001304. That

means 60,000 years is 76,666 times smaller than 4.6 billion years. So we're talking very, very different time scales here. But if you're an evolutionist and you already know the column is that old then are you going to waste funding on checking for radiocarbon in the column? Of course not. But recently it's been inadvertently discovered and published in secular peer reviewed journals. So obviously it's there, but your presuppositions kept you from even looking, now it's being found and, hey, what's that doing there, that shouldn't be there, something must be wrong. Well, the long of the short of it is, yeah, something is wrong.

The challenge for us is to go into this and see what the Creation/Flood Model would predict and see how well it correlates with the actual Data. So let's look at the Creation/Flood Model. Now we erect an impenetrable fortress because it's built on the foundation of Scripture and Scripture is a rock, it's immovable, it's impenetrable, that's why we build our lives on it.

Creation Sediments (Gen 1:1-2; 1:6-8; 1:9-10; 1:31)

Let's think about the Creation model and what it would predict. First, we have the Creation in six, literal 24 hour days, this is recounted in Gen 1:1-31, at the conclusion of the six days God looked at all that He had made and He said what? It was "very good." Very good. Now if it's very good should we find fossils in the creation rock? Would the Creation Model predict fossils in the lowest strata of rock? In the deep Precambrian? No. Why not? Because God created everything very good and death is not very good. What is death? Death is the wages of sin, Rom 3:23, the wages of sin is death. So if no sin, no wages of sin, no death. And therefore, Prediction 1 of the Creation/Flood Model is that we would not find fossils in the lowest strata. Question: are there fossils in the deep Precambrian strata? Answer: No.<sup>i</sup> Therefore prediction 1 of the Creation model, that we would find rock without fossils is confirmed in the data, there are no fossils in the lowest strata. So the lowest strata of the Precambrian are what we refer to as Creation rocks, the date those rocks were laid down is ~4,000BC.

Now what does that say about any accommodation view that has death going on for millions and billions of years before the Fall? Let's list some. We've covered all but let's list some. *Theistic evolution* says that God used the process of evolution to create. *Biologos*, the new fad in evangelical circles is

almost the same view; they say God used evolution to create. They used the slick phrase “creation by evolution.” *Progressive Creationism*, Hugh Ross and company, is similar, though they reject macroevolution, they say God intermittently created specific species then they died and God created other species, all during creation week which is stretched out over 13.7 billion years. Then we have the *Old Earth Gap Theory*, Scofield and co., they say all the geologic ages, the fossil record all fit in a Gap of unknown amount of time between Gen 1:1 and 1:2. Then the *Framework Hypothesis*, the scholastic expression of “we believe in evolution,” Gen 1-2 are contradictory, we look at the text but we murder the text and teach it in theology class which undermines the faith of the student body. These are in evangelicalism, these views dominate conservative theological circles. What are they all doing? They’re all accommodating to the assured conclusions of modern science. Now, I’ve taken you through how assured these conclusions really are. They all buy into the false presupposition of 2 Pet 3:4, that all continues just as it was, the presupposition of uniformitarianism. Peter says it’s a false presupposition. Paul says, take every thought captive, don’t buy into pagan categories of thinking or you’ll find yourself way out in left field somewhere ripping the Scriptures to shreds. The evolutionary story is a myth; it’s nothing but the academically adopted form of the ancient Continuity of Being regurgitated in slick scientific lingo, it’s an imaginative fairy tale. But people keep accommodating to fairy tales. That’s what Paul said people would do in the last days anyway, “the time will come when they [Christians] will not endure sound doctrine...they...will turn away their ears from the truth and will turn aside to myths.” 2 Tim 4:3-4.

Now what do all these views that assume the myth is true share in common? Death before the Fall of man. God’s original creation had billions of years of death going on before the Fall of man? I thought death was the result of the Fall of man. Now, if you do have death before the Fall of man what does that tell us about God? First it tells us He’s a liar because He says death comes after the Fall of man. Second it tells me that God isn’t perfect because His original creation wasn’t perfect, it contained death. Third, it tells me that God is evil because if man’s sin isn’t the author of death then God must be. What does it tell me about sin? If the wages of sin are not death because death pre-existed sin then I have a problem with Rom 3:23, I guess we can kick that out of the Bible. It gives us problems with our doctrine of God, it gives us problems with our doctrine of sin, it even gives us problems with the

doctrine of salvation because what did Christ die for on the cross? Our sin. But if we've already said that death existed before sin then how is Christ dying on the cross have anything to do with our sin. He just would have died anyway, it matters not whether He was sinless or not, His death was merely a premature death not a substitutionary death. See how this just cascades all the way through Scripture and topples doctrine after doctrine after doctrine. You can't hold on to the doctrines central to the Christian faith if you remove the foundation in Genesis.

Then, if that weren't enough, when we look at the predictions of these accommodation attempts, you have billions of years of death going on where is the fossil evidence for that death? Where's the fossil evidence of death in the earliest rocks? There is none. See, all accommodation views that buy into evolution in some form or another also fall under the same lack of evidence as evolutionists. Only the orthodox understanding of creation as six, literal 24 hour days when God created everything very good makes Predictions that actually match the Data. So Prediction 1 is confirmed by the Data, there are no fossils in the lowest strata.

#### Pre-Flood Sediments (Gen 2:5; 2:10-14; 3:14, 15, 18, 19; 5:5-31)

Then, after the Creation we have the Fall; we don't know how much time passed between the Creation and the Fall. Dr Whitcomb suggested about 30 days based on the passage in the NT where Jesus said, "I saw Satan falling like lightning." He inferred from the bolt of lightning that it didn't take long from Satan's creation for him to fall, he said about 30 days, we don't know for sure. But once man sinned at the Fall death entered, death began working in both man and nature. Nature is under man so when man fell nature fell. This is fundamental theology. Always as goes man, so goes nature. So if death enters when man falls then the question is do we find fossils in these layers just above the Precambrian Creation rock? We would predict the possibility of fossils in these layers. So Prediction 2, little to no fossilization during the Pre-Flood world. Conditions for fossilization would have to occur and those conditions are rare. Since this is a time of relative tranquility we would not expect a lot of fossils. Now we do find some fossils; stromatolites, which are conglomerates of blue-green algae, single celled organisms, also called cyanobacteria, and they're right at the top of the Precambrian. It would be possible to find fossils of fish, reptiles, animals and men here if conditions for

fossilization occurred. So it is possible, but not likely. Why not? Why don't you find a lot of animal and marine fossils in this section? Because there's no flood in Gen 3, 4 and 5 to rapidly bury organisms that die. All you have during the Pre-Flood world for 1,600 years is sediments laid down by normal geological processes such as rain (perhaps) and rivers that flowed out of the Garden of Eden. Look at Gen 2:5, "Now no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no plant of the field had yet sprouted, for the LORD God had not sent rain upon the earth, and there was no man to cultivate the ground. <sup>6</sup>But a mist (or flow) used to rise from the earth and water the whole surface of the ground." Now when was this uttered? On the sixth day, before man was there, before man was created it says the Lord God had not sent rain upon the earth but this mist came up. Now this involves us in a discussion of the hydrological cycle in the pre-Flood earth. Whatever it was it's not what we have now, this part about a mist rising from the earth is not exactly the dominant aspect of the hydrological cycle on earth today. This is describing a different world. Maybe it was a world without rain altogether, I don't know for sure. From what is described hydrologically here, if you have river flow and artesian type wells from underneath it's hard to create an atmospheric model without any rain, usually you get some evaporation and then the evaporate condenses and you get rain. That's not to say there wasn't any rain at all, I just don't know of a model that can account for no rain and Hebrew scholars debate whether the text requires no rain before the Flood or not. So all I want to do is paint a picture for you of what the earth was like. Look at Gen 2:7, "Then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being." Now what was man formed out of? The dust of the ground, that's the chemicals in the earth that you see on the periodic table. Then look at verse 9, "The Lord God planted a garden toward the east, in Eden;" east of where? East of the dust from which he made the first man. "And there He placed the man whom He had formed." So was Adam made in the Garden? No, he was made outside the Garden and then God put him in the Garden. When Adam falls in Gen 3 he gets kicked out of the Garden. Look where God kicks him, Gen 3:23, "therefore the Lord God sent him out from the garden of Eden, to cultivate the ground from which he was taken." See that - kicked him out to where he was originally made. You don't like My garden, fine, have a big time trying to make your own! Verse 24, "So He drove the man out; and at the east of the garden of Eden He stationed the cherubim..." east is very important direction in the Bible, when used metaphorically it means to be away from

God, to be distant from God. So Adam was formed east of the Garden, then he was placed in the Garden, then he sinned and was placed east of the Garden and the cherubim are placed at the entry way to the garden. The word Garden in Hebrew means an enclosure, an enclosed space, there was only one entryway to the Garden. So what is this Garden? The Garden is the first Temple in Scripture. It's a Garden Temple, the entryway is in the east, which direction is the entryway to the Tabernacle? The east. Solomon's temple? The east. Herod's temple? The east. Always the east. Man approaches God from the east. So Adam, when he was without sin lived inside a Garden Temple in close relationship with God, then he sinned and was kicked out of the Garden Temple to the east. God is holy.

We can make another observation. Does the Garden cover the whole earth? No, it covers a part of an area in the region called Eden. It's the Garden *in* Eden not the Garden *of* Eden. Eden is a larger region and there are other regions mentioned in Gen 2:10-14: Havilah, Cush, Assyria, these were all regions on the original earth. Eden was one of the regions and Eden just means a plateau or steppe so it refers to an elevated region with respect to the other regions. Apparently Eden was the highest place on earth in the original earth.

Now look at Gen 2:15, here's the dominion mandate. God gives the first divine institution; labor, "Then the Lord God took the man and put him into the garden," it should be "in Eden" to cultivate it and keep it." So you have this beautiful garden God made, fully producing fruit up on this plateau region called Eden. He puts Adam in it to cultivate it and keep it, make it blossom and to spread it out over the whole earth. That's Adam's job, to take that beautiful garden and cultivate it, make it productive, make it cover the area outside of the Garden from which he was taken. I gave you a good start Adam, now you finish. I envision most of the land outside the garden as barren for the most part, as verse 5 intimates. Apparently here's what was going on. Outside the Garden the primary source of water for the things that grow would be a mist or flow that came up from underneath the ground, these are like artesian wells so far as we can tell, a flow of water coming up from inside the earth. Most of the water before the Flood was inside the earth, not in clouds above the earth. So these artesian wells flowed up to water most of the earth. Inside the garden the primary source of water would be a river that flowed through the garden and went out into the earth, that's

verses 10ff, “Now a river flowed out of Eden to water the garden;” notice one river, then it branches, “and from there it divided and became four rivers.” Now what do you have to have for a river to divide? It has to be flowing downhill. So the river starts at the high point in Eden, up on the plateau, and flows into the garden as one river, some people say it comes out from God’s throne, God’s throne was on the earth in this Garden Temple, in the Garden Holy of Holies and from underneath His throne a river flowed out and it passed through the Garden Temple and when it left the Garden it divided and became four rivers and it all sounds strikingly like details in Ezekiel’s Millennial Temple and the Revelation’s New Jerusalem Temple. A river going out that divides and the rivers are in verses 11-14, “The name of the first is Pishon; it flows around the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold. <sup>12</sup>The gold of that land is good; the bdellium and the onyx stone are there. <sup>13</sup>The name of the second river is Gihon; it flows around the whole land of Cush. <sup>14</sup>The name of the third river is Tigris; it flows east of Assyria. And the fourth river is the Euphrates.” Now the Tigris and Euphrates there aren’t the Tigris and Euphrates of today in modern Iraq anymore than London, TX is London, England or Paris, TX is Paris, France. The earth was so changed by the Global Flood of Noah that none of these places exist anymore on planet earth, but the names did remain and they were applied to other rivers later. So you cannot find the Garden of Eden no matter what some rabbi says, no matter what some academic theologian at Oxford says, it doesn’t exist, these rivers no longer exist.

So the picture is that Eden was a raised plateau or steppe and the garden was up there and the river flowed through and when it came out it fell off this plateau and divided into four rivers to water the rest of the earth, along with this mist that rose from the earth. Now we go through this for the geological implications. Can rivers fill beyond their capacity and flow downhill and cause erosion, mud flows, turbid water and rapid burial of organisms that cannot escape the waters path? Yes, they can and the Scriptures indicate it is possible for these processes to be at work between the Creation and the Flood. So conditions for fossilization of organisms are possible in this time period, but not likely and the fact is that fossils in this layer are extremely rare. But given that the Fall of man and nature occurred near the beginning of this period and the statements in Scripture that both man and nature were under the curse of sin and the wages of sin is death, it is possible that fossils formed during this period. But the only known fossils in these rocks are

stromatolites and they look identical to living stromatolites today. So the pre-Flood sediments sit on the top of this Precambrian period, and range from 4,000-2,350BC. Therefore Prediction 2, little to no fossilization during the Pre-Flood world is confirmed in the data.

### Early Flood Sediments (Gen 6:7, 11-13, 17-19; 7:3-4; 7-8; **7:11-14, 17-22**)

Third we have the Flood of Noah. I break the Flood into two sections, the early Flood sediments and the late Flood sediments. The reason we do this is because the Flood narrative divides it into two sections. The first section is the first 150 days of the Flood, from the initiation of the flooding until the flooding prevailed over the highest mountain by 22 ½ feet. The second section of the flood is the last 221 days when the waters retreated and flowed into newly forming ocean basins, Ps 104 stuff. So we have two periods during the Flood.

First, the early Flood sediments. What would the Global Flood of Noah predict we would find in this first 150 days? Turn to Gen 6:7, “The LORD said, “I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the land, from man to animals to creeping things and to birds of the sky; for I am sorry that I have made them.” A lot of theology there, but for our study observe that God was not very happy with man or nature. Verse 11, “Now the earth was corrupt in the sight of God, and the earth was filled with violence.” Notice the earth was filled, so man and animals covered the earth, they didn’t just live in one spot on the earth, they lived all over the earth, this says a lot about world population at the time and the abundance of animal life, it had to be high populations lest you can’t say the earth was filled with violence. This is where you get the idea that animals by this time had become violent, some dinosaurs, about 5% as far as we look at the fossil record and interpret these dinosaurs correctly, about 5% were carnivorous, they ate meat, before the Fall they didn’t eat meat but after the Fall there were changes and eventually they did eat meat. And so both man and animals had become violent on the earth just before the Flood, sin had worked its way into both man and nature. Verse 12, “God looked on the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth.” All flesh, not just human flesh, all flesh, man and animal and bird. Sin destroys, not just spiritually, it destroys the physical world. Man is against man, man is against nature and nature is against man and nature is against nature.

Verse 13, “Then God said to Noah, “The end of all flesh has come before Me; for the earth is filled with violence because of them; and behold, I am about to destroy them with the earth.” That shows that most of the water came from within the earth, I will destroy them with the earth, not with the Atmospheric waters, but waters from within the earth. Now we have a catastrophe on the horizon. Come down to verse 17, “Behold, I, even I am bringing the flood of water upon the earth, to destroy all flesh in which is the breath of life, from under heaven; everything that is on the earth shall perish.” So now we’re told it’s a water catastrophe. How are fossils formed? By floods that rapidly bury organisms in mud. Is this water catastrophe global in scale? He says it will “destroy all flesh...under heaven, everything on the earth shall perish.” So if flesh is covering the earth as he said in verse 11 and God is sending a flood of water to destroy all flesh then it has to be a Global Flood to accomplish the objective. A local flood can’t do it. So Prediction 3 of the Creation/Flood model is that we would find millions and millions of fossils, rapidly buried by water in sedimentary rock. What do we find when we look at the geologic column? Millions of fossils, rapidly buried by water in sedimentary rock.

There’s another prediction here, Prediction 4 of the Creation/Flood Model. That the life encased in these rocks will clearly be different kinds. No transitional forms. Remember that in Gen 1? Let’s go back to Gen 1. God made distinct kinds. Hebrew *min*, and each kind was to produce after its own kind, there are reproductive barriers built into the genetic structure of organisms.<sup>ii</sup> They can produce variety within the kind but one kind can never become another kind. Look at Gen 1:21 “God created the great sea monsters and every living creature that moves, with which the waters swarmed after their” what? Their “kind,” that covers sea creatures, now to the rest of the verse, “and every winged bird after its kind, and God saw that it was good.” Verse 24, “the creatures and cattle and creeping things and beast of the earth after their kind.” And man, man is made in God’s image; he’s man kind, that’s why we say mankind. But throughout Gen 1 it’s kind, reproduce after their kind, over and over and over, there are distinct kinds, not one kind that eventually becomes every other kind by way of evolution, but kinds that reproduce after their kind and produce variety within the kind. That’s our model.

So what is the biblical “kind?” Now the kind is under intense investigation and has been for a number of years. This branch of science is called baraminology, from Heb *bara*, which means “to create” and *min*, “kinds,” *ology* is “the study of,” so baraminology is “the study of the created kinds.” We are interested as creationists in the original created kinds. The modern classification scheme is the Kingdom, Phylum, Class, Order, Family, Genus, Species, easily remembered by the acronym, King Philip came over from great Spain. Now the S is species and let me be dogmatic about something. The biblical “kind” is not the equivalent of the modern “species.” That’s a blunder many renowned theologians make. Don’t say that because a) it’s not true and b) you’ll be forced to argue there were millions of animals on the ark. The created kinds are “usually broader than the species and even, in many cases, the genus.” Why do I say that? For three reasons. One, “Jones (1972b), largely using Scriptural evidence (e.g. the animal lists in Leviticus), demonstrated that the created kind is approximately equivalent to the subfamily or family, at least in the case of birds and mammals.” Two, “Recently, Scherer (1993) has arrived at the same conclusion, but on the basis of scientific evidence. This evidence includes numerous documented cases of interbreeding between individuals of different species and genera, as well as interbreeding with a third species or genus in situations where two species or genera do not themselves interbreed.” Three, if the biblical “kind” is equivalent to modern “species” then we’d have to have billions of organisms on the ark. However, Woodmorappe’s conclusion is that if the biblical kind is what the Bible and science suggest then no more than 16,000 animals would need to be on the ark.<sup>iii</sup> That would be a maximum, probably a figure of about 2,000 is more accurate. So I’d just say, anywhere between 2,000-16,000 animals on the ark. That’s 1,000-8,000 originally created kinds, assuming that no kinds went extinct before the Flood, which they probably did not.

So the point we want to make here about our model is that when we look at this massive amount of fossilization starting in the Paleozoic rock, we would predict to find distinct kinds. What do we find? Distinct kinds, just like the model of Gen 1 and 6-8 predicts. Virtually every known phyla exists in this period. Even the evolutionists admit, look at these admissions, they don’t know what they’re admitting because they’re biblically illiterate, but look at what they say, “The abrupt appearance of higher taxa in the fossil record has been a perennial puzzle. Not only do characteristic and distinctive remains of phyla appear suddenly, without known ancestors, but several classes of a

phylum, orders of a class, and so on, commonly appear at approximately the same time without known intermediates...” Well yeah, they all appeared in the same week and they were all buried in the flood during the same year! “If we read the record rather literally, it implies that organisms of new grades of complexity arose and radiated relatively rapidly.” Yeah, instantaneously, that’s the kind of rapidity we’re talking about. God created instantly functioning, fully developed organisms. That’s our model. That’s what it would predict and that’s what we find. So Prediction 4 is confirmed in the data. We find distinct kinds rapidly buried by water in sedimentary rock.

Alright, I want to make a general statement before we go into more about the early Flood sediments. There are more predictions that when we look in the earth and we look at the fossil record are beautifully confirmed. The Genesis text of the early Flood period explains perfectly the mass amounts of fossils in the Paleozoic Era. The fountains of the deep (Mid-Atlantic Rift Valley) burst forth shooting supersonic steam high in the atmosphere, literally ripping the earth’s crust apart sending massive amounts of sediments, mud slides that would rapidly bury billions and billions of fossils. First it would bury marine invertebrates and vertebrates that lived in deeper waters, and then it would bury those that lived in shallower waters. As the waters prevailed on the earth increasing numbers of land animals and men would be buried last, primarily in the Mesozoic layers, which were later radically re-organized by the runoff when the Lord God sent a wind to cause the waters to retreat into newly formed ocean basins.

---

<sup>i</sup> One could argue that we find in the Archaean some microfossils, things like bacteria, blue green algae, then in the Proterozoic we find some multicellular algae. However, those could just as well be pre-Flood sediments and not Creation rocks. Even if they are in Creation rocks are bacteria and algae living? From a Christian worldview just because something is cellular does not make it living in the biblical sense. In the biblical sense something is living if it has soul life, that is, if it has material and immaterial components. Are plants, algae and bacteria considered living? Are they soul life? No, they’re cellular life, we won’t argue with that, if you want to call them cellular life or biological life that’s fine, but just know it’s not soul life. Only animals, birds, reptiles, some fish and men have soul life. That sometimes shocks people but animals, birds, reptiles and some fish are soul life but that doesn’t mean they have the same kind of soul as human beings. Human beings are made in God’s image and our soul is made in God’s image. No animal, bird, reptile or fish has a soul made in God’s image. So we don’t have a problem finding algae or bacteria microfossils down in these deep

---

Creation rocks, that's not death, in the biblical sense. But probably those microfossils are in in pre-Flood sediments.

ii This is currently being studied by ICR scientists on the Life Sciences Team. The last three *Acts & Facts* have discussed the nature of the questions they are asking.

iii That would be if the genus were the equivalent taxonomic rank of the created kind. Jones (1972b) placed the family as the taxonomic equivalent of the created kind meaning that only 2,000 animals would have to be on the ark.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010