

## Disconformable contacts in the Grand Canyon and the lack of a global sequence

Mike Oard's recent paper asks the question, "is the geological column a global sequence?"<sup>1</sup> He notes a disconformity in a sequence of strata between the Muav and Temple Butte Limestones in the Grand Canyon that suggests a fold in the Temple Butte at the disconformity.<sup>2</sup> This implies that both limestones were deposited at the same time or there was only a brief gap of time between the deposition of the two strata.

Several years ago, Clifford Burdick<sup>3</sup> briefly described a location on the North Kaibab Trail in the Grand Canyon where the Cambrian Muav and the Mississippian Redwall Limestones were intertongued with each other forming repeated sequences.<sup>4</sup> The Creation Research Society sponsored two field trips in 1986 to study the stratigraphic relationships at the place where Burdick found these sequences.<sup>5</sup>

The National Park Service had erected a sign on the North Kaibab Trail identifying the contact between the Redwall and Muav which read:

"AN UNCONFORMITY

Rocks of Ordovician and Silurian Periods are missing from the Grand Canyon. Temple Butte Limestone of Devonian age occurs in scattered pockets. Redwall Limestone rests on these Devonian rocks or on Muav Limestone of much earlier Cambrian Age."

We inspected the outcrop within this area and determined that the purported unconformity was not as obvious as uniformitarians might believe. The conclusions reached from our investigation determined that both the Redwall and Muav Limestones were deposited at or near the same time.<sup>6</sup>

Based on the recent work by Oard<sup>1</sup> and our past investigation<sup>4</sup>, it would appear that the geologic column is not a

global sequence. This is consistent with ideas espoused by John Woodmorappe<sup>7</sup> who also noted the nonexistence of the evolution-based, uniformitarian geologic column.

Emmet L. Williams

Alpharetta, GA

UNITED STATES of AMERICA

### References

1. Oard, M.J., Is the geological column a global sequence? *Journal of Creation* 24(1):56-64, 2010.
2. Oard, ref. 1, figure 6.
3. Burdick, C.L., *Canyon of Canyons*, Bible-Science Association, Minneapolis, MN, 1974.
4. Weisgerber, W., Howe, G.F. and Williams, E.L., Mississippian and Cambrian strata interbedding: 200 million year hiatus in question, *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 23(4):160-167, 1987.
5. Weisgerber *et al.*, ref. 4, p. 161.
6. Weisgerber *et al.*, ref. 4, p. 163.
7. Woodmorappe, J., The essential nonexistence of the evolutionary-uniformitarian geological column: a quantitative assessment; in: *Studies in Flood Geology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Institute for Creation Research, Dallas, TX, pp. 105-130, 1999.

## Hebrew scriptures as an aid to developing a creationist taxonomy (1)

After reading Lightner's article<sup>1</sup> and then because it seemed so antagonistic against an article by Joel Klenck,<sup>2</sup> I read the latter's article as well. After reading Klenck's essay, Lightner's article was comparatively more problematic. She critiques Klenck and Berndt's<sup>3</sup> analyses, authors who argue in favor of a biblical classification system, as "presumptuous" (p. 77), "this presumptuous methodology" (p. 77), "egregious errors" (p. 77), "ignores a basic understanding of how languages work" (p. 77) and "not strong" (p. 80).

Yet she pretentiously describes her essay as "... a more realistic view on what can be gleaned from Scripture" (pp. 77-78).

I was initially intrigued but this feeling soured when I saw a string of errors and mistakes. First, Lightner throughout her manuscript appeared very hostile to the idea that the Bible or God could provide a classification system or taxonomy with regard to living creatures, which was the premise of Klenck's article. Far from being presumptuous or not strong, I found Klenck's analysis insightful and with regard to the Hebrew, quite sound. He presents a two-level classification system where God describes groups of terrestrial animals in Genesis 1-2 and in Leviticus 11, delineates kinds of animals to each group. This methodology was supported by other scriptures.

Second, Lightner tries to argue that the great sea creatures are part of the swarmers (Genesis 1:21). Her argument is tenuous. The verse indicates a clear distinction between "... great sea creatures *and* every living creature that moves with which the waters swarm ... [emphasis mine]". These are two groups. Instead, Lightner tries to force the two groups together. Then she weakly supports her unique interpretation by stating both groups "... are specified separately here to emphasize that they were created by God and are subject to Him." Lightner should consider the most obvious interpretation; the two entities are mentioned because they are two groups of created animals.

Third, Lightner questions if God's reference to fish in Genesis 1:26 means that they were a subset of swarmers, the created group mentioned in Genesis 1:21. She then states, "If so, it could imply that man was not given dominion over all the earth..." and "If so, this could undermine the idea that fish or swarmers are taxonomic terms." She ignores an obvious answer: Fish were a part of marine swarmers. Has Lightner not seen a school of fish?