

local correlation of fossil-bearing rocks (pp. 106–107) to the many assumptions and nuances involved in cross-continental and intercontinental biostratigraphic correlation. He would have us believe that they are essentially the same, which they are not. Inter-continental correlation involves, for instance, a complex assumption-driven match-up of zone fossils and index fossils, all of which are presumed to have evolved and persisted for a narrow interval of time.<sup>11,14</sup>

Eldredge also tells us that Sedgwick and Murchison described the Lower Paleozoic systems strictly as a result of applying the Law of Superposition (pp. 104–106). Not quite. The *ad hoc* nature of the geologic column is proved by the fact that the Cambrian and Silurian systems had been named, based on local outcrops, **before** their respective subcontinental stratigraphic relationship had been established: had they been found overlapping, instead of superposed, the Cambrian would have been considered a facies of the Silurian.<sup>15</sup>

In common with many others, Eldredge claims that the geologic column was founded by creationists. Of course, this depends upon one's definition of creationism. One can contend that a willingness to accept an old Earth and/or reject a global Flood nullifies one's profession to be a creationist (i.e. the so-called old-Earth creationists, of past and present, were and are actually semi-creationists).

Eldredge would have us believe that: 'Rocks predicted to be nearly the same age on the basis of their fossil content always turn out to be nearly the same age when radiometric dates are obtained' (p. 108). One wonders what planet Eldredge is referring to, because it certainly cannot be planet Earth. Fact is, one can document hundreds, if not thousands, of serious discrepancies between paleontologically-inferred dates and isotopic dates.<sup>16</sup> The latter usually take the fall, and there is available an elaborate series of rationalizations for coping with discrepant isotopic dates.

There is little point in going on with further examples in this book. It should

be obvious that this book is hardly worth the paper that it is printed on. It is inaccurate, outdated, and superficial. If you are looking for a critical analysis of creationism, don't waste your time with this book.

### References

1. Eldredge, N., *The Monkey Business*, Washington Square Press, New York 1982.
2. Gish, D.T., *Creation Scientists Answer Their Critics*, Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, 1993. Dr Gish shows (p. 243–244) how he had been completely misrepresented earlier by Eldredge on the subject of the Created Kinds. In this new book, Eldredge, without comment, trots out the same mistaken material (pp. 120–121).
3. RATE (**R**adioisotopes and the **A**ge of the **E**arth) is an inter-disciplinary group of seven creationist scientists formed to investigate the radioisotope data from a young-earth perspective.
4. Russell, J.B., *Inventing the Flat Earth*, Praeger Publishing Company, Connecticut, 1997. The myth about Columbus' contemporaries believing in a flat earth is little more than a 19<sup>th</sup>-century rationalistic fairy tale, designed to misportray medieval religious people as foolishly ignorant.
5. Woodmorappe, J., *Noah's Ark: A Feasibility Study*, Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, 1996.
6. Shanahan, T., Evolutionary progress from Darwin to Dawkins, *Endeavour* **23**(4):171–174, 1999.
7. Valentine, J.W., Two genomic paths to the evolution of complexity in bodyplans, *Paleobiology* **26**(3):513, 518, 2000.
8. Woodmorappe, J., The non-transitions in 'human evolution'—on evolutionists' terms, *CEN Tech. J.* **13**(2):10–12, 1999.
9. Valentine, Ref. 7, p. 513.
10. Luckett, W.P. and Hong, N., Phylogenetic relationships between the orders Artiodactyla and Cetacea, *J. Mammalian Evolution* **5**(2):130, 1998.
11. O'Leary, M.A., Parsimony analysis of total evidence from extinct and extant taxa and the Cetacean-Artiodactyl question (Mammalia, Ungulata), *Cladistics* **15**:327, 1999.
12. Woodmorappe, J., *Studies in Flood Geology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, 1999. Consult the reprinted article on cephalopods.
13. Woodmorappe, J., Studies in Flood Geology: clarifications related to the 'reality' of the geologic column, *CEN Tech. J.* **10**(2):279, 1996.
14. Woodmorappe, Ref. 13, pp. 279–290.
15. Woodmorappe, Ref. 13, p. 282.

16. Radiometric geochronology reappraised; in: Woodmorappe, Ref. 12, pp. 145–175. See also Woodmorappe, J., *The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods*, Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, 1999.

### Anything out of nothing?

It is absurd for the Evolutionist to complain that it is unthinkable for an admittedly unthinkable God to make everything out of nothing, and then pretend that it is more thinkable that nothing should turn itself into anything.

Gilbert Keith Chesterton

<http://www.princeton.edu/~gcu/quotes.htm>