

**IDENTIFYING THE NOAHIC FLOOD IN HISTORICAL GEOLOGY
PART TWO**

**BERNARD E. NORTHRUP TH.D.
BIBLICAL TRANSLATION CONSULTANT
BIBLES INTERNATIONAL
861 REDWOOD BOULEVARD
REDDING, CA 96003**

ABSTRACT

The initiation, universal and early retreat stages of the Noahic flood have been seen to lie remarkably parallel to the physical evidence in the lower three quarters of the Paleozoic deposits. This study examines the Biblical information concerning the retreat of the Noahic flood, finding continuing parallels with the upper Paleozoic and early to mid-Mesozoic deposits.

THE TEST CASE CONTINUED: THE TERMINATION OF THE NOAHIC FLOOD

13. Continuing Signs of the Retreating Flood. As the Noahic flood continued its retreat over the next year (and apparently in the centuries following Genesis 8:4-14), we confidently can predict that it would have left continuing, increasing exposure of the landmass. This would have accompanied the wind and tidal wave deposits discussed above as major geological signs. Are there indications of an extended continuing exposure of the landmass as one searches upward through the Mesozoic deposits? That is precisely what is found. Now the continental movement which began later at about the middle of Mesozoic times did cause major downwarping of the crust in some areas and the return of the sea. Nevertheless, the expansion of the surface of the landmass lying above sea level continued. The land mass displays the two major physical characteristics of the Mesozoic deposits. These are continuing wind and tidal wave deposits! Moore discusses Triassic or lower Mesozoic deposits, repeatedly referring to continental red beds and tidal intrusions.(1) This is exactly in accord with my own research. Surely this is a remarkable correlation of geology with the Genesis Record! This is what the creationist should predict in the light of Genesis 8:1 and 3.

14. Reptile/amphibian tracks along the retreating flood shoreline. Already it has been pointed out that Genesis 7:21-23 does not require us to believe that every creature outside of the ark was destroyed by the Noahic flood. We should predict from this that the oscillating, retreating shoreline of Noah's flood waters would have provided ideal preservation conditions for the shoreline tracks of water loving creatures which survived the flood in their own environment. It is regrettable that Biblical research, like scientific research, so often has been inclined to make vast, illogical leaps on the basis of fragmentary information. It has done great injustice to the text of Genesis in treating the statement "all flesh died" apart from the vital context of Genesis 7:21-24.

As mentioned above, smaller tracks are extremely common in the Permian Coconino Sandstone wind dune/tidal intrusion layers of the Grand Canyon. These tracks tentatively are identified as amphibian.(2) But larger shoreline tracks become quite common as the great reptiles began coming ashore early in the Triassic foundations of the Mesozoic "era." I suggest that these reptiles were carrying out their normal practice of egg laying along the sandy shores as preserved near Choteau, Montana. Those creationists who argue that the Coconino sandstone tracks at the Grand Canyon were made underwater (to fit with their flood harmonization model) need to try to apply their erroneous arguments to these great Triassic tracks as well. After all, these dinosaur tracks can be found in Triassic, shoreline muds near Tuba City, Arizona just east of the Grand Canyon.(3) These tracks also are found on the Kaibab Plateau. Another excellent stacked track bed in successively deposited muds can be studied at Rock Hill, Connecticut. It provides an excellent exposure of many, many retreating Triassic shorelines. Ah, it looks as if we should listen more carefully to the message left by these dinosaurs. They just might have a testimony concerning the stage setting on which these actors played out their parts in Biblical history! When we try to force them into the scene as creatures destroyed by the Noahic flood (as I originally did), their testimony (Psa. 148:7) is lost and

their message garbled.

Several geology texts also make a grievous error here. They have misidentified the red beds of Triassic times in which dinosaur tracks and skeletons are found as evidence of a very arid period in a desert setting.(4) Moore correctly says of Triassic deposits:

"The red color of the rocks and general absence of fossil remains are indicative of thorough oxidation of the sediments before, during or shortly after deposition. These features do not signify dry desert conditions but rather may be interpreted to denote temperate climate with alternate wetting and drying of the deposits."(5)

Since these early Mesozoic great red beds are accompanied by many indications of wind deposits, I conclude that this records the windy and extremely humid post-flood environment leaving the rich red oxide stains here. Certainly these red beds do not in any way point to the universal submergence stage of a single cataclysmic flood harmonization model!

15. The Flood's rich record of the Pre-flood Climate. As discussed above, Genesis 1:6-8 inescapably describes God's work of elevating a great mass of water "up over the top of the expanse" (rachia). This Hebrew word means that which is "stretched out." This is the place where the birds fly in Genesis 1:20. (An understanding of this fact will give the creationist a different outlook on the work of the fourth day of creation also). The remarkable effect of this great mass of water vapor above the atmosphere on life here on earth clearly has been recorded in Genesis 5. The brief description of the opening of the windows of the heavens (lit.) in Genesis 7:11 at the beginning of the flood is thought by many creationists to refer to the collapse of that "canopy" of water vapor which had protected life on earth for not less than 1,500 years. Therefore this model of harmonization can predict a remarkable and otherwise unexplainable characteristic of the Paleozoic deposits. The vegetation and animal debris deposited by the Noahic flood should have left signs of a universal climate with a single, worldwide ecozone if this interpretation of Genesis 1-5 is accurate. As a matter of fact, the near universal dispersion of lifeforms in the Paleozoic deposits do seem to confirm that the entire earth was under a single great climate zone in Paleozoic times.(6) The geological record shows that this was a time when all kinds of creatures were found universally without zonation. How strange! How could the entire earth have had a universal climate apart from the presence of such a canopy? Once again Genesis helps one to understand strange phenomena recorded in geology.

16. The Evidences of life after the collapse of the Canopy. Genesis 8:22 strongly implies dramatic climate change after the Noahic flood. The removal of the canopy from above the atmosphere when the windows of heaven were opened (Gen. 7:11) would have transformed the climate record on the newly exposed landmass. There seems to be a direct reference to this climate change in God's words to Noah. "During all of the days of the earth, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter and day and night will not stop" (Gen. 8:22). Indeed, evidence of a great climate change does occur in the geological record of the Mesozoic deposits. For the first time one can detect clear evidence of climate changes. Furthermore, one will find windblown sands that provided some locations away from the sea with near desert environments. There are places like Zion National Park where Jurassic winds have dumped many hundreds of feet of sands in the shallow sea. The strata record at higher elevation shows that the deposit gradually became exposed to the atmosphere, either by elevation or through the immense quantity of sand which had been dumped by the wind. It has been estimated that as much as 2,000 feet of sands once covered the present Coconino and Kaibab plateaus overlying the present Grand Canyon area. This still is found in the nearby Vermillion and Echo Cliffs overlying the marine Kaibab formation. Farther west this Kaibab formation is the upper layer of the Grand Canyon.

That transformation of the climate by the removal of the canopy should have resulted in the replacing of the dominant life forms of the pre-flood period by other life forms better suited to the transformed climate on the surface of the earth. Living under the canopy before the flood obviously had slowed down the maturation rate and lifespan of mankind according to Genesis 5. It should have had a similar effect on all land mammals, retarding their multiplication before the flood. For this reason, the creationist must avoid calculating the population of the earth at the time of the Noahic flood on the basis of present rates of maturation and multiplication by man(7) and the other mammals. Indeed, I suggest that it is very likely that the scarcity of mammals in the Paleozoic deposits may be partially explained by this factor. After the flood and the removal of the canopy, life forms abruptly would have been subjected to those forms of radiation which now enter our atmosphere from the unshielded heavens. It is known that this radiation plays a major role in the aging of man and the decreasing of his lifespan today. As a result, as man and land creatures spread from the ark, the researcher should find indications of rapid multiplication resulting from a faster rate of maturation and a decreasing life span. That record graphically is thrust upon the Biblical researcher when he examines the chronologies that follow Genesis 11:10. Man's lifespan reduced according to a log curve in the years that followed the flood. Perhaps the rapid

multiplication of mammals seen in Mesozoic and Cenozoic times also is evidence. This is, of course, difficult to research in geology. Nevertheless, this factor appears to be present when one examines the next geological "era" which follows the Paleozoic deposits. The Mesozoic "era" clearly is a period in which crisis extinctions dominate the fossil scene. The marine catastrophe very obviously recorded in the Paleozoic deposits had produced its own unique record of death assemblages. In their own way, the Mesozoic deposits point to a vast extinction of the great reptile forms of life.

It is a well known fact that reptiles, unlike mammals, do not reach a given span of life and then die. Instead, they continue to live until disease or predator removes them from the biosphere. Furthermore, in the process, they continue to grow larger and larger. Surely this is a factor which accounts for some of the giant lifeforms which reached as much as 100 feet in length. These are found in the wind and tidal waves of the Mesozoic deposits. Some of these lifeforms may well have lived as much as 1,500 years in that idyllic climate (for reptiles) which had preceeded the flood. One has done great injustice to the text of Genesis when he includes the dinosaurs among those creatures destroyed by the Noahic flood without observing the vital context of Genesis 7:21-24. Closer scrutiny of that context indicates that the statement "all flesh died" is true only when understood in the light of the series of restrictive clauses which follow it. This great judgment is one which primarily affected land creatures living "on the face of the ground" which breathed air through their nostrils, which were of the elevated landmass. I find it inescapable that marine mammals, reptiles and many amphibians were quite capable of survival in that environment which was used to judge mankind. However, they did not survive for many centuries after the flood. Job's mention of fierce marine "dragons" in Job 7:12 and Job 41 and of giant land creatures in Job 40 may well take us close to the termination of their existence except in remote areas. The Japanese discovery of a rotting Plesiosaurus carcass in the south Pacific in the mid 1970's apparently indicates that a few may still exist. Perhaps the Loch Ness monster also is a survivor if it really exists.

17. The continued modification of postflood lifeform dominance. In view of the somewhat selective nature of the extermination produced by the flood as discussed immediately above, the Biblical researcher should predict an abrupt change in the dominant types of life forms to be found in deposits during and following the retreat of the Noahic flood. Assuming the thesis of the paper, this indeed is in harmony with the fossil record of Mesozoic deposits. It has been observed under section 3 above that the dominant fossil types found in the very beginning of the Paleozoic deposits were exclusively marine life forms. For this reason, the Paleozoic has been called "the age of fishes." However, the Paleozoic deposits move toward their close with a great dominance of land plant and amphibian types of life. On the other hand, one should also expect that, as the land mass is exposed more and more, one should predict the immediate appearance of a new dominant assemblage of life forms in the geological record. Creatures which normally spend much of their lives in water and which go out upon the landmass to lay their eggs should be found in the flood's retreat deposits. What does the geological record show? As the Mesozoic "era" opens, the great, red, oxide stained and water washed deposits of the Triassic are replete with the shoreline tracks of multitudes of amphibian and reptilian tracks. This has been called "the age of Reptiles" because there is a sudden revolution in the great abundance of their skeletons in these deposits. The Mesozoic period of history would have been better named "the time of the death of the Reptiles." As that period of geological history moved on, it seems obvious that the dinosaurs and similar creatures were poorly adapted to life under the brilliant and burning sun of the unveiled skies. They were not well adapted to life on a planet which was raked by great, jet stream winds and their blasting sand storms. It becomes obvious that life on the low profiled landmass where tidal waves could sweep them miles from the shoreline to leave them stranded and exposed to the elements was more than difficult for these giant creatures. These factors clearly are recorded in the Mesozoic deposits to eyes that are opened to the testimony of these deposits. "Speak to the earth and it will teach you...that the hand of the Eternal Lord has done all of these things" (Job 12:7).

18. The spread of the mammals from Noah's ark. The Biblical researcher also should predict the discovery in the geological record of another fairly abrupt and major transformation in patterns of dominance of lifeforms in the years following the Noahic flood. The actual departure from the ark of those creatures which had survived the flood is described in Genesis 8:16-19. As these multiplied, the Biblical researcher should expect increasing traces of wider distribution of mammalian fossils in the post-flood geological record. Indeed, this should begin to be observed in the later series of the Mesozoic deposits if my postulate that the Paleozoic "Era" records the rise and the beginning of the retreat of the Noahic flood. Does the record of the rocks support that? Indeed it does! It is in the later Mesozoic deposits that the mammalian land creatures begin to appear widely in increasing numbers. Of course the evolutionist has given this information his own misguided twist, based on his faulty presuppositions. He supposes that these have evolved during this geological era. Now it is a geological fact that these land mammals swiftly multiplied to dominate all land creatures apart from the insect world by Cenozoic times. Indeed, the "epochs" of Cenozoic times

actually are distinguished by the regularly increasing percentages of each epoch's lifeforms which survive into the present! Each of God's creatures has its own unique testimony, even when it only survives in fossil form to pass on information about earth's catastrophic history.

19. The rapid multiplication of mammals under the open sky. It already has been mentioned that land loving marine reptiles which left their skeletons and even their egg nests on the post-flood land mass would have found their former life under the canopy ideal for multiplication. The creationist researcher should expect to find that, after the collapse of the canopy in the flood, these creatures should have found life exposed to direct solar radiation under a transformed climate much more difficult. They should lose their position as the dominant lifeforms even as the mammals from the ark began to multiply "like rabbits" under an open sky. This may well be a major reason why the Mesozoic is considered the graveyard of the dinosaurs. Ill adapted to life under direct solar radiation as discussed above, they also suffered greatly from the catastrophism which is discussed in Genesis 10:25, the dividing of the continents. In my model this coincides with mid-Mesozoic times in historical geology. The violent volcanic eruptions resulting from the massive heat release caused by this event should have produced steadily decreasing temperatures as the atmosphere became filled with ash and steam. Furthermore, this would have changed the albedo or reflectivity of the earth, further decreasing earth's surface temperatures. That event series can be traced directly through the Cenozoic "epochs." The record of the disturbed climate climaxes eventually in the Biblical ice "age." Strong intimations of a depressed climate may be found in the book of Job which I believe is contemporary to that "age." But there appears to be mounting evidence that still another catastrophic event wrote the final death sentence to the last survivors of these beleaguered creatures at the end of Mesozoic times. The dramatic boundary which divides Mesozoic times from Cenozoic times appears to have been caused by a massive meteor strike. A growing pool of evidence indicates that its vast dust cloud also contributed to plummeting temperatures to earth's many climate zones. The scenario currently is echoed by scientists who fear that an ice age would be caused by the atmospheric debris of a nuclear war.

20. Stranded shoreline life left by the Flood. The creation researcher also should predict the finding of partially decomposed and partially dismembered marine shoreline life forms which had been collected around water holes where they sought refuge when stranded by the retreating Noahic flood's tsunami far from the shore. This is common in the Jurassic deposits of the Mesozoic. The quarry near Vernal, Utah provides a clear example. There many of the great reptiles appear to have gathered at a sandy waterhole far from the shoreline. No indications of reproduction are found there for no young creatures have been found as fossils. Most of their carcasses have become disarticulated before their abrupt burial. However, at least one Camarasaurus skeleton was quite complete. Its head and tail were swept in the direction of the great tidal wave which came in from the northwest to bury these many great fossils in a tomb of volcanic ash and marine sands. That repeated intrusions great marine waves were involved is amply borne out by the presence of the many marine fossils, blemmites and straight shelled ammonites that I have found in the immediately overlying Curtis formation. These marine intrusions interbed with about a dozen layers of windblown sands.

21. The dominant forms of plantlife before the flood. The creationist also should have predicted that the gymnosperm plants or naked seed plants would have been dominant under the canopy climate before the flood. They are far better suited to life in a very humid, tropical ecozone than are the angiosperm or hard seed plants for the most part. These gymnosperms abruptly should have lost their place as the dominant type of plant life in the new post-flood climate under a brilliant sky. This is precisely what is found in the fossil plant assemblages of Mesozoic deposits. These plant forms retreat to local, more jungle-like environments in Mesozoic and Cenozoic deposits. A similar scene is found today.

22. The dominant forms of plantlife after the flood. Conversely, we should expect the angiosperms to have found the hot and humid environment under the canopy quite repressive. But the creationist should expect to find the angiosperm plants leaping into dominance under the clear blue skies of post-flood times. Once again this is precisely what is found in the geological record of Mesozoic times. It is here that the angiosperms began to dominate the plant world.

23. The continuing transformation of the post-flood climate. As the flood retreated and as animals and plants spread on the land mass, the creation researcher who pays attention to the geological record should look for constant hints of the transformation of that climate in the record of plant and animal life and death. This factor remarkably is confirmed in the Mesozoic deposits as discussed above in several of the previous points. Indeed, the Mesozoic record points very precisely to a climate which was drying out. Only when continental division began in earnest in Jurassic times in the middle of the Mesozoic record does a great, humid, cooling trend begin. The vast eruptions of ash and steam from the volcanoes were triggered by the abrupt separation of the continents in Genesis 10:25 rapidly brought

increasing precipitation that ultimately climaxed in the icy catastrophe of Pleistocene times.

24. The record of mankind's spread across the world from the ark. The creationist believes that mankind spread from Babel after the flood (Gen. 10:1-11:9). He should predict that the archaeologist and the linguist studying roots of the human race should find hints of the spread of man and his languages from the area near the Mesopotamian Valley. In particular, the Indo-European family of languages point in that direction. While researchers have not actually turned to the tower of Babel, they nonetheless speak of the root language which lies behind many of the European languages.(8) It is intriguing to see the linguists wrestle with other branches of languages which are totally different from the Indo-European family. But this is precisely that which the creationist should expect them to find. I face that constantly in my checking of Bible translations in Africa and in India.

25. The absence of flood materials in the great ocean bottoms. Elsewhere I have discussed the identification of the division of the earth in the days of Peleg with the mid-Mesozoic division of the continents found in geology.(9) The absence of any Paleozoic/Mesozoic material on the Atlantic ocean bottom strongly argues that this ocean bottom did not exist at the time of the Noachic flood. I contend that the division of the continents was a very abrupt phenomenon beginning five generations after the Noachic family left the ark. If this is accurate, then there is a remarkable correlation between geology and Genesis that must argue for the identification of the two events.

RETROFITTING THE EVIDENCE

What are the odds that these 25 elements of the flood account accidentally would occur there and in the same order as in historical geology? If my math is accurate, it should only occur once in an astronomical number of tries. And yet, to my research of 21 years on the subject on five continents, the two accounts do display striking parallels. But it is crucial that we recognize that these parallels which we have discussed only cover a portion of the geological column. Yet the Noachic flood record and the entire physical geological column should be completely parallel if the flood were responsible for practically all of historical geology as creationists have maintained.(10) No, this normal Creationist explanation simply does not agree with the physical or with the Biblical facts. There is no way that one can harmonize the major part of historical geology with a single marine catastrophe, whether it be the under the scenario of the Gap Theory or by the Noachic flood alone. But perhaps all is not lost. These 25 elements related to the Noachic flood are found correctly arranged in a specific section of the geological column as seen above. It appears that the researcher can find a fair fit between the the Noachic flood's expected geological byproducts and the Paleozoic/early Mesozoic deposits.(11)

What can this mean to the uniformitarian? It can only mean one thing. This great section of geological history appears to agree with Biblical history. It is mathematically probable that this section of the geological record was laid down by the worldwide Noachic catastrophe. The close correspondence between the two event series scarcely could have happened by accident. The story recorded in the record of the rocks has its counterpart in God's Word. Furthermore, geological chronology gradually distorted the very real though often incomplete physical, geological column found these layers. But some one will argue: "What about those very large segments of the geological column which both precede and follow this limited portion of geological history? What deposited those other layers?"

FURTHER OBSERVATIONS

There are references to other geologically catastrophic events and "fossilmakers" buried and largely forgotten by creationists in the Sacred Text. Since the geological column both precedes and follows these layers here identified as the products of the Noachic flood, it is logical to search the chapters which precede and follow the Biblical description of the Noachic flood to discover any neglected geological catastrophism there.

CATASTROPHISM AFTER THE FLOOD

It is easiest to consider initially that catastrophism which followed the flood. Indeed, one already has begun this pursuit when he is examining the implications of its retreat in Genesis 8.

1. The long retreat of the flood. How long did the retreat of the Noachic flood continue? Is that retreat consummated in Genesis 8 or did Noah and his three sons and their families continue to observe the flood's retreat in later generations? There may be clues hidden in Genesis 9-11. In that migration from Ararat to the plains of Mesopotamia, it is noteworthy that "...as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and

they dwelt there" (Gen. 11:2). Why did they arrive from the east in travelling from the apparently correct traditional location of Ararat in Turkey? A possible explanation is that, in following the slow retreat of the Noachic flood, the Noachic family journeyed to the southeast by means of the highlands called the Urartu and the Zagros Mountains. There they sought in vain for a satisfactory location to settle, build and farm. This would assume that, as found in the physical evidence, the Mesopotamian valley still was linked with the Tethys Sea in a great waterway that was continuing to retreat. Their exploratory journey carried them into the northern part of the mountains of Iraq near the site of ancient Susa in their search. As the flood waters gradually receded from the great Mesopotamian plain, they found there the deep, rich soil and the water supplies for which they sought. They therefore settled there. This Biblical statement may indicate that the retreat of the Noachic flood continued for many years. I see indications of that in the Mesozoic deposits.

2. Peleg and evidence of continental division. Genesis indicates that several generations passed before further major geological events happened. Genesis 10:5 and 20 record that a little more than two generations passed before the sin of the tower of Babel (described in 11:1-9) brought the division of tongues. The migrations of the offspring of Ham, Shem and Japheth after this event provide much of the field research grist for the faulty historical projections of Archaeology. I conclude that this long retreat continued throughout many Mesozoic deposits and even later wherever the landmass rose more slowly out of the retreating sea. But that leaves the great deposits of later Mesozoic and Cenozoic times unexplained, including the powerful Mesozoic evidence for the division of the continental plates. The continental margins along the Atlantic provide evidence of the rending apart of the strata of the flood and the retreat of flood deposits at their edges. The total absence of the Paleozoic/Mesozoic series, the flood and the retreat of flood deposits, on the bottom of earth's great ocean basins clearly demonstrates that these basins were formed after the Noachic flood. The chronologies of Genesis 10 and Luke 3 demonstrates that approximately three generations passed after Babel before continental division. In these generations Noah's descendants scattered abroad to repopulate the earth. At the beginning of this fifth generation after the flood, a child was given a very catastrophic name, Peleg. This means "Utterly divided by water."⁽²⁾ This division cannot be identified with the linguistic division at Babel. That event occurred at the end of 2 generations after the flood. This event in Peleg's days was five generations after the Noachic flood. Furthermore, that division of the tongues and of the nations on the earth is described by a totally different Hebrew word as Genesis 10:32 reviews the entire process of the scattering and division of the nations. This catastrophe in Peleg's day was so violent that children for several generations following were given names reflecting catastrophic circumstances. When the Lord was rebuking Job, He clearly identified Himself as the cause of the Pelegean division. The Lord emphasized the violent abruptness of this Pelegian division by paralleling it with the violence and the abruptness of the shattering strike of lightning (Job 38:25). He even used the intensive verb form from the root PLG to describe the abrupt overflowing of the land by waters. Suddenly an explanation is found for the ongoing series of geological deposits. Their evidences of violent uplift, of subduction on the leading edges of continents, accompanied by regenerated tsunami activity in many parts of the world in geology, become comprehensible to the creationist as a part of the Biblical record. The torn yet matching edges of Noachic strata along the Atlantic borders of the continents suddenly make sense to the creationist. The vast, post-flood erection of great mountain chains along the leading edges of the continental blocks suddenly become a vital part of the evidence in the creationist's attempt to form a working model. The desperately shattered, tilted and uplifted line of collision between moving plates which I have observed in the front ranges of the Himalayas no longer is an incomprehensible, embarrassment to the conscientious harmonization modeler. Suddenly these parts of God's handiwork begin to testify to the extreme and abrupt violence of post-Noachic flood catastrophism.

3. Icy catastrophism caused by continental division.⁽³⁾ The geological record in the so-called Cenozoic era contains an enormous amount of evidence that humidity across the earth rose violently once again. That was accompanied by steadily plummeting temperatures in a violent time of mountain uplift, of vast volcanism and precipitation. This steady cooling trend of the atmosphere reached its climax when these newly formed mountains and the plains below were scoured by the moving ice of the final geological catastrophe recorded in Scripture. I pointed out many years ago that the book of Job is a remarkable, contemporary commentary on life in Palestine during the Biblical ice age. How did the Biblical ice age happen? The fierce sub-plate heat produced by the continuing plate movement of the previous catastrophe was producing enormous explosions of steam and of volcanic ash from the thousands of volcanic vents that were developed to relieve this heat. By filling the atmosphere with ash and steam, earth's great post-flood volcanoes (which usually are built on the Noachic flood debris) rapidly produced this effect. The atmosphere became so reflective that the albedo of the earth was changed. The sun's radiant energy now bounced off. Earth rapidly was plunged into the catastrophic cooling trend which is very precisely recorded in oxygen content of the marine fossils of the Cenozoic strata.

CATASTROPHISM BEFORE THE FLOOD

All of this strongly suggests that we must recognize at least three major geological catastrophes in the Bible which would have been "fossil makers." These are the Noachic flood, the post-flood division of the continents and the consequent "ice age." Are there other catastrophic geological events which possibly could have produced earlier portions of the geological record? Indeed there are. Does not the uplift of the land mass out of the universal sea in Genesis 1:9-10 in part of a single solar day qualify as a geological catastrophe that precedes the deposition of the Noachic debris found in the Paleozoic layers? But is that the first event in creation which conceivably could have left geological deposits which we should be able to identify in the very early portions of the geological record? It is not.

1. The first universal flood in Genesis. The first activity of the Creator which would have left geological evidence is His act of preparing the sea. The writer of Psalm 104, a great creation student, tells us what happened after God had finished "...laying the foundations of the earth that it should not be moved for ever" (Psa. 104:5). "You covered it with the deep as with a garment. The waters stood above the mountains" (Psa. 104:6). Many have lost this fascinating commentary on Genesis One by mis-identifying this event with the Noachic flood. The Psalm obviously is a commentary upon the six days of creation, viewing it from man's vantage point as created in the sixth day. God's further revelation in Job 38:6-9 unveils to us the fact that, after the His laying of the foundations of the earth, the sea "...broke forth as if it had issued out of the womb." Simultaneously He "...made the cloud the thick garment of it and thick darkness as a swaddling band for it." This catastrophic event, so briefly described in Genesis 1:2, has suffered much at the hands of creationists. It has been misused by gap theorists. It has been ignored by Noachic flood theorists. While this is geological catastrophism which would have deposited vast quantities of water-transported debris, that debris would be utterly without fossils. That is precisely what is found in the Archaeozoic deposits at the bottom of the physical, geological column.

2. The second geological catastrophe in Genesis. But these Archaeozoic deposits are violently distorted wherever they still remain exposed to man's eye. How did this happen? As mentioned above, the sudden precipitation of the vast sedimentary deposits by the pre-Adamic flood is not the only geological factor of note in Genesis One. In the first part of the third solar day of creation, our powerful God suddenly lifted the landmass out of the sea. This had covered it since he had placed there as described in Psalm 104:5. It was this vast uplift of the single continent which produced several observable geological factors. Remember, the pre-Adamic flood had gushed forth from the well springs of the crust of the earth to deposit the unfossiliferous Archaeozoic deposits and provide the base on which all other geological deposits were formed. Compare Job 38:8-9.

a. The abrupt uplift of the single continent out of the sea in Genesis 1:9 distorted the Archaeozoic deposits.

b. It established powerful drainage patterns as the waters of the sea fled off of the positive land mass into the great single sea which surrounded it. The Proterozoic series of deposits, a remarkable sedimentary (water borne) deposit series, normally overlie the Archaeozoic deposits. In some locations the Proterozoic deposits appear to approach 30,000 feet in thickness.

c. Initially the Proterozoic might be expected to be unfossiliferous. The first creation of life, other than that of the angels (Psa. 104:4), never precedes the description of the initial uplift of the continent out of the sea. Compare Genesis 1:9; Job 38:1-9 and Psalm 104: 1-10. However, we should not be revolted at the fact that pollen-like bodies have been identified in the Bass Limestone at the bottom of the Proterozoic and above in the Hakatai Shale. After all, the creation of plant life on the newly exposed land mass (and surely in the sea also) took place in the third day of creation. The waters draining the landmass appear to have deposited the Proterozoic deposits. These would have carried the pollens blown into the waters from these newly created plants (Gen. 1:10-12).

d. The presence of an occasional trace of marine life such as an apparent jellyfish print, a worm trail or a brachiopod shell in the upper layers of the Proterozoic also should be expected if this model is correct. After all, it was only two solar days later when marine life teemed the waters of the ocean surrounding that land mass.

e. Indeed, in Psalm 104 the land mass is described as being drained powerfully through springs, streams and rivers into that sea. It should be expected that this continued for many months and perhaps for many decades.

f. According to the Genesis model of interpreting geology, there should be evidence of a period of geological quiet on the top of the Proterozoic marine deposits. At that time the

earth moved into a period of at least 1,500 years of geological quiet before the Noahic flood wiped out man's sinful ways on the face of the earth. That record of a break in catastrophism forms the base on which the Paleozoic record of the violence of the Noahic flood begins. But already we have considered the Cambrian burial of the pre-flood world's less mobile marine life by the initial stages of the Noahic flood.

CONCLUSION

The chances approach infinity for both the physical and in the revelational records of earth's early events accidentally occurring in parallel. The implications seem to be that the two accounts actually representing the same event series. It appears that one should conclude that the physical geological record is a very vital corollary and non-contradictory testimony to those early events as they are described in God's holy Word. Furthermore, it appears necessary to recognize a much broader base of Biblical geological catastrophism than has been the custom in creationist circles. Since I have been examining this correlation for over 20 years without finding major problems, I request creation scientists to pursue the question required by this proposed model: "Is this approach to harmonization really a working model or should this approach be discarded with the other inadequate creationist harmonization models?"

REFERENCE

- 1 Moore, Raymond, *Historical Geology*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 1958. pp.327-340.
- 2 Breed, William J. and Evelyn Roat, Editors, *Geology of the Grand Canyon*. Flagstaff: Museum of Northern Arizona, 1976. 2nd Edition. pp. 70-73.
- 3 Rosnau, Paul O., Jeremy Auldane, George F. Howe and William Waisgerber, "A Field Study of Quasihuman, Quasimammalian, and Dinosaur Ichnofossils near Tuba City," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*. September, December 1989.
- 4 Kirkaldy, J.F., *Fossils in Color*. New York, New York: Hippocrene Books. 1972. 3rd Edition, p. 114.
- 5 Moore, *Ibid.*, p. 340.
- 6 For a comment on a climate without marked seasons in Pennsylvanian times, see Moore, *Ibid*, p. 561.
- 7 Whitcomb, John C. and Henry M. Morris, "The Genesis Flood." Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. 1961. p. 26.
- 8 Mallory, J.P., *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth*. Thames and Hudson, 1989.
- Note also: Renfrew, Colin, "The Origins of Indo-European Languages," *Scientific American*, Vol. 261, #4, October 1989. pp. 106-114.
- 9 Northrup, Bernard E., "A Critique of the Contemporary Division/Flood Model," *Bible Science Newsletter*. Minneapolis, Minnesota. Vol. 15, #12, December 1977. pp. 6-7.
- 10 Whitcomb and Morris, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 243-291.
- 11 Northrup, Bernard E., "A Walk Through Time: A Study in Harmonization," *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Creationism*, Vol. II, Technical Symposium Sessions. Edited by Robert E. Walsh, Christopher L. Brooks and Richard S. Crowell. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Creation Science Fellowship, 1986. pp. 147-152.
- 12 Northrup, Bernard E., "Continental Drift and the Fossil Record," *Repossess the Land, Essays and Technical Papers of the 15th Annual Convention of the Bible Science Association*. Anaheim, California: Bible Science Association, 1979.
- 13 Northrup, Bernard E., "Vulcanism and the Creationist," *Bible Science Newsletter*, May, 1980. Vol. 18, #5, pp. 1-5.