

along familiar uniformitarian lines.

‘Evidently the environment became stressful, perhaps from heat, or desiccation, or some oxygen-robbing algal bloom, causing the mother to release the pups from her uterus before dying; the lives of the unfortunate babies were all too short, for they barely swam a few centimeters before succumbing to their mother’s fate.’

The more reasonable catastrophic explanation of this event, along with the difficulties with the author’s hypotheses, follows the lines of reasoning on fish tephonomy presented in Woolley’s article.¹

Furthermore, the speculation that the Green River formation would not be the only formation to show a correlation between fish coprolites and fish preservation is strengthened by examining Dr Bruce Cornet’s Web site (where excellent correlation is seen from the graphs of fossil fish remains and presumably the coprolites of *Diplurus*, a coelacanth).³ This is for a site in the state of Connecticut in the United States of America. The layers in the fossil site are part of the Newark Group. However, the remarkable vertical correlation exists only for the lower 80% of the fossil beds of this formation.

Bruce Lee Woolley
North Kingstown, Rhode Island
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

References

1. Woolley, D.A., Fish preservation, fish coprolites and the Green River Formation, *TJ* 15(1):105–111, 2001.
2. Mausey, J.G., *Discovering Fossil Fishes*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, p. 113, Plate 43, 1996.
3. <www.monmouth.com/~bcornet/blufhed3.htm>.

Uranus is special

The article *The age of the Jovian planets*¹ states three times that Uranus’ thermal behaviour is like that of

the other Jovian planets. This is not true. Uranus’ thermal behaviour is distinctive, as discussed in the paper on this topic included elsewhere in this issue.²

Jonathan Henry
Clearwater, Florida
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

References

1. Samec, R., The age of the Jovian planets, *CEN Tech. J.* 14(1):3–4, 2000.
2. Henry, J. The energy balance of Uranus: implications for special creation, *TJ* 15(3):79–85, 2001.

Doppler truth—does it really matter?

It is rather an anomaly, and for good reason, when a non-creationist astronomer receives a favourable book review in a **creationist** publication. How about **two** favourable reviews?^{1,2} Whether Halton Arp appreciates it is perhaps another matter. I am sure it is always rewarding when someone patronises your viewpoint. Meanwhile I doubt that the patronage has done much for Arp’s popularity in the big bang uniformitarian caucus, and probably more of them read the journal than we think.

But let’s face it, Arp’s not looking for citations from creationists, nor expecting them from the above mentioned conjectural empiricists. He just wants to say it like it is, and Oard’s book review highlighted (**along with some very serious censorship protestations**) Arp’s objection, in his saying that ‘the “**big bang**” is “**wildly incorrect**” [emphasis added].’³ I think the reader will agree that Arp is just telling the truth. It’s like the prosecuting attorney who could not shake the testimony of a very young girl facing him on the witness stand. So, after pausing a moment for effect he asked her, ‘Did your father tell you what you were to say?’ She answered, ‘Yes, he

did.’ Smiling triumphantly at the jury he said, ‘Would you tell the court what he told you to say?’ She answered, ‘He told me to tell the truth.’

Does it really matter? Most assuredly! If truth is not the ruling paradigm (and that’s what *Answers In Genesis* is all about) what remains is not the truth but the next thing to downright dishonesty. If the big bang hypothesis is true, Earth was a chance aberration, resulting from an absurdly lengthy sequence of astronomical quirks, and the Answer is not in Genesis!

William Tompkins
Toronto, Ontario
CANADA

References

1. Oard, M.J., Doppler toppler? *CEN Tech. J.* 14(3):39–45, 2000.
2. Worraker, B.J. and McIntosh, A.C., A different view of the universe, *CEN Tech. J.* 14(3):46–50, 2000.
3. Ref. 1, p. 42.

Searching for Moses

David Down’s article on Moses was of great interest to me. I would like to comment on two small points in an otherwise excellent article.

Creationists have just begun to appreciate that secular archaeology is having a stronger negative impact on belief in the Bible than evolution. In 1994, Aardsma, then of Institute for Creation Research, even proposed that the Exodus was in the third millennium BC to avoid the rather strong contradictions in the current archaeological interpretations. Unfortunately, the archaeologists are looking for evidence in the wrong places because they have a poor chronology based on poor Egyptian chronology.

Unfortunately, Biblical scholars have inadvertently contributed to the confusion by supporting a poor Biblical chronology. I believe we cannot combat the former before we fix the latter. To this purpose, I constructed