

not also in exact accordance with the Flood theory? If the Flood buried the fossils, where would simple marine forms (shells, corals, and so on) naturally be buried? Being heavy, they would naturally be buried in the lowest strata. Where would fish be buried? Naturally, in strata higher than shells. Where would land animals be buried? Naturally, in the very topmost strata. Hence, while the situation as it exists is in accordance with the evolutionary theory, it is also exactly in accordance with the Flood.

-- Byron C. Nelson, *The Deluge Story in Stone* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1931), pp. 146, 147.

In spite of the attempts of George McCready Price, Byron C. Nelson, Alfred Rehwinkel, and Morris and Whitcomb to make Flood Geology the prevailing viewpoint of the Christian position on geology and paleontology, the evidence continues to run counter to that viewpoint. Stratigraphy and isotopic Geochronology (radioactive dating) simply refuse to be so simply explained away

All of the theories which hold that the geological strata are relatively young suffer from the same defect: they fail to take seriously the results of modern-day physics and astronomy. The universe, our galaxy, our solar system, and our planet, are obviously much, much older than we had dreamed. And the rock strata of the surface of the earth have a much greater time perspective than we had previously believed.

Of the theories which hold that the geological strata are relatively old, the Gap or Restitutionary Theory, by pushing the fossils back into a pre-Adamic world, falls into two important problems: (1) putting fossil men into a pre-Adamic world runs counter to Paul's statements about Adam's being the first man; and (2) the record of fossil man shows a sequence, without interruption, to the present. If at the time of the flint age, a great cataclysm had destroyed man, and God had recreated man, would we expect the recreated man to take up the very flint culture previously destroyed? And if such a cataclysm had occurred, would there not be some record of it in the rocks?

With respect to the mythical or symbolical theories, we hasten to affirm the necessity of taking the Genesis narrative as inspired of God, and therefore trustworthy and accurate. We also note that Christ took Genesis as a historical account, not as a myth or allegory; and that other Scripture writers do the same.

Perhaps Thomas Aquinas' comment on the first chapter of Genesis is in order:

. . . in questions of this sort there are two things to be observed. First, that the truth of Scripture be inviolably maintained. Secondly, since Scripture doth admit of diverse interpretations, that no one cling to any particular exposition