biblical chronology the task of doing battle with Thiele *et al.*, and I would ask only that fellow scholars bear patiently with me while I do battle with antagonists of my own. The research that I have undertaken is opening up entirely new fields of investigation. It is an enormous undertaking, and I can announce a most significant development, details of which should appear in a near future edition of this journal.

However, regarding the chronology of the early British kings, I can only re-echo a request that was once made by William Tyndale, a far greater scholar that I can ever hope to be, in the year 1526 when his translation of the New Testament was first published. Please . . .

> *'Count it as a thynge not havynge his full shape / but as it were borne afore hys tyme / even as a thing begunne rather than fynesshed. In tyme to come, yf God have apoynted us thereunto, we will geve it his full shape . . .'*

Bill Cooper,
Ashford,
Middlesex,
ENGLAND.

REFERENCES

1. Cooper, W. R., 1991. The early history of man — part 3. The kings of the ancient Britons: A chronology. CEN Tech. J., 5(2):139–142.
2. Thiele, E. R, 1979. A Chronology of the Hebrew Kings, Zondervan Corporation, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
3. Aaronson, B. J., 1989. The Jerusalem chronology of the Israelite monarchs, Jerusalem Institute of Ancient History, Jerusalem.
4. Thiele, Ref. 2.
5. New Bible Dictionary, Inter-Varsity Press, London, 1972, p. 223.

PRECAMBRIAN ROCKS

Dear Editor,

I would like to compliment Dr Andrew Snelling for an excellent article on where the 'Precambrian' rocks fit into creationist geology.[1] Looking at geology from the perspective of another scientific field, I too have seen the need for a total revision of standard geology. One of these reasons is because standard geology was developed from non-biblical premises, from the beginning. Those who first set up the geological column were more like progressive creationists, who believed in a time-equivalence to the fossils.[2]

There is no reason that I can see to postulate that the order of Flood deposition followed the order in the geological column. I can easily understand the 'Precambrian' rocks being laid down in the Flood not only at the same time as the 'Cambrian' rocks in some areas, but also at the same time as the 'Permian' or 'Cretaceous' rocks elsewhere. In the Rocky Mountains of Montana in the United States, 'Precambrian' rocks are found at any elevation in the mountains and directly overlie several 'young' periods of the geological time-scale. I also see little evidence of overthrusts, of which the Lewis Overthrust is but one of the many overthrusts in this state.

I have several questions that have perked my interest as I was reading Dr Snelling's article. Since there is plenty of organic carbon in the 'Precambrian', could some of this carbon be the remains of many other types of plants, besides bacteria and algae (the large plants in the Witwatersrand Group seem to be the only exception)? Could some of this carbon be the remains of animals? Has enough research been performed to know that much about the origin of this organic carbon? It is hard for me to envisage a burial environment in the Flood that entombed only algae and bacteria. If only algae and bacteria were buried in the 'Precambrian' strata, Dr Snelling's suggestion of a deep marine environment (non-uniformitarian), associated with volcanism and volcanic and chemical sedimentation, seems like a good hypothesis.

Apparently, stromatolites are the predominant organism identified in 'Precambrian' strata. If these strata have been altered by burial metamorphosis (a reasonable postulate), then why have colonies of stromatolites been preserved and not destroyed?

When I read the geological literature, I often see references to *in situ* stromatolites. I have always taken this as just another deduction, based on their evolutionary/uniformitarian model, with very little physical proof. I noticed that Dr Snelling mentioned the stromatolites in the Altyn limestone and dolomite here in Glacier Park, Montana, as likely laid down by 'storm conditions'. My next question then is, 'What evidence is available for either an *in situ* growth or a depositional mechanism for stromatolites?' If any stromatolite colonies show strong evidence for *in situ* growth, how can this be explained by a Flood mechanism?

The extension of Dr Snelling's ideas to the 'Precambrian' rocks in the Grand Canyon is a good application. I can see that the lower strata in this canyon are more controversial than I thought. I agree with Dr Snelling that the fossils found in the 'Precambrian' of the Grand Canyon imply a Flood mechanism for deposition. It also is quite probable to me that the other non-fossiliferous formations are Flood strata as well. It is hard for me to understand how any pre-Flood strata could survive the devastation and tectonic violence of the Genesis Flood. All the thick Flood sediment found all over the world had to be eroded from somewhere.

Another thought passed through my mind as I was reading this section. Apparently, the controversy is over whether the strata in question were laid down on the third day of creation or during the Flood. But why does there have to be geological activity on the earth at this time during a perfect creation? The earth was in the process of being created very good. God could have raised the dry

land without erosion and sedimentation. This is a variant of the creation with the appearance of age idea, which is part of the definition of creation. God created the biological world this way, why not all of creation?

Again, I offer my compliments for an excellent article.

Michael J. Oard,
Great Falls,
Montana, USA.

REFERENCES

1. Snelling, A.A., 1991. Creationist geology: Where do the 'Precambrian' strata fit? CEN Tech. J., 5(2): 154–175.
2. Woodmorappe, J., 1983. A diluviological treatise on the stratigraphic separation of fossils. Creation Research Society Quarterly, 20(3):133–185.