

recent study<sup>5</sup> challenges this, proposing that even complex stromatolitic structures could have been formed by inorganic processes. If correct, the study has devastating implications. It necessitates a complete reappraisal as to which even ostensibly fossiliferous Precambrian strata are necessarily intra-Flood and which can remain assigned to the pre-Flood.

As for sufficient time for geologic work during Creation Week, we must keep in mind that supernatural processes were undoubtedly in effect during that period of time, so it is probably unwise to reject out of hand the possibility that at least some of these rocks were created *ex nihilo*, or at least were subject to divine sculpting that is completely different from currently-known geologic processes (hence the complete breakdown of any semblance of uniformitarianism during this point).

I also warned of any 'natural' pre-Flood/Flood boundary at any lithostratigraphic or biostratigraphic location. For instance, I noted that the Precambrian/Cambrian boundary is often circularly defined (for example, Cambrian begins at the first appearance of trilobites, and then we hear that trilobites do not appear before the Cambrian. At other times, the Precambrian/Cambrian boundary has been moved downward with the discovery of trilobites found to occur before the previously-defined Precambrian/Cambrian boundary). The same chain of reasoning holds for attempting to 'discover' a 'natural' pre-Flood/Flood break within Precambrian rocks as a whole.

It is unfortunate that so many creationists assume that similar strata or lithologies must necessarily be contemporaneous, and therefore time markers. In actuality, there is no basis, much less guarantee, that the same lithology, lithological sequence, unconformity, etc., formed at the same time during the Flood in adjacent basins, much less that it was

necessarily contemporaneous on different continents. About the only guarantee of isochrony comes from ash falls (tuffs), provided that they have been correctly correlated.

John Woodmorappe,  
Chicago, Illinois,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

## REFERENCES

1. Hunter, M. J., 1996. Is the pre-Flood boundary in the Earth's mantle? *CEN Tech. J.*, 10(3):344-357.
2. Woodmorappe, J., 1983. A diluviological treatise on the stratigraphic separation of fossils. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 20(3):133-185.
3. Woodmorappe, J., 1993. *Studies in Flood Geology*, Institute for Creation Research, San Diego, California, USA.
4. Hunter, Ref. 1.
5. Grotzinger, J. P., and Rothman, D. H., 1996. An abiotic model for stromatolite morphogenesis. *Nature*, 383:423-425.

---

## SUFFERING AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

Dear Editor,

In *CEN Tech. J.*, 10(3) there appeared a paper by James Stambaugh which addressed an important philosophical problem.<sup>1</sup> This problem seems to be fatal to any theistic religion.

The problem may be expressed thus:

- (1) God is totally good,
- (2) God is omnipotent, and
- (3) Evil exists.

But these three statements cannot all be true, because they present an obvious contradiction.

As Christians we clearly need to find an answer to this problem.

I am not clear as to what Stambaugh's solution is to this problem, or to what extent he offers his paper as a philosophical solution.

Someone who believes that God created the diversity of life by means of evolution (that is, a theistic evolutionist) has an insoluble problem. Clearly, God is either not totally good (because He allowed His creatures to suffer needlessly), or else He is not omnipotent (because he had to use a trial-and-error procedure). In this case the solution is simple, God did not use evolution!

If I understand Stambaugh correctly, the thrust of his paper is to show:-

- (1) That animals do indeed suffer because they have a similar physiology to man, and
- (2) That the teaching of Scripture is that God did not use evolution. Hence animals suffer only because man chose to sin, and not because it was something programmed into God's creation.

As I see it, this moves the problem from the obviously insoluble category to maybe soluble, but we are still lacking a solution. Would this be a fair assessment?

I ask for clarification because I am working on a paper for the *CEN Tech. J.* which follows on naturally from Stambaugh's paper, and will try to come as close as possible to a solution to this difficult problem. Stambaugh does quote from Romans 8:19-21 which implies a '*future renewal of creation*' (p. 401), which together with a start to suffering as a result of man's Fall into sin, suggests that evil exists only for a finite time in comparison to man's limitless existence — thus allowing the possibility of a philosophical solution.

David Malcolm,  
Newcastle, New South Wales,  
AUSTRALIA.

## REFERENCE

1. Stambaugh, J., 1996. *Creation, suffering and the problem of evil*. *CEN Tech. J.*, 10(3):391-404.