

way in which life forms could have been preserved as fossils. Living things normally decay to nothing over a period of months, and would not be preserved by slow sedimentary processes. Vast eras of geological time are not necessary to the production of fossil-containing strata.

Another reason for believing that the geological column is not a 'time axis' of the development of different life forms is the existence of 'misplaced' fossils, where a fossil is found in a much older layer than, evolutionarily speaking, it should be. A famous example of this is the Castenedolo human remains, which were found in Pliocene rocks. Finds of this nature indicated the possibility that 'older' rocks were in reality laid down at the same time as 'younger' rocks.

If the fossil-containing rocks we see in the earth's crust were formed rapidly, and not as a result of long periods of deposition of sediment, we have to find some explanation as to why there is a gradation of life-forms from 'simple' to 'complex' across deeper to shallower rocks. One possibility is that, in a geologically unstable earth, creatures which had greater mobility and intelligence had a greater capacity to escape from natural disaster. In the event of a major disruption to the earth's crust, such animals would, out of a sense of survival, run and escape from danger and would be buried later than 'simpler' sedentary creatures who would be engulfed with no opportunity to escape.* That seems a fairly obvious explanation, and one which eliminates any requirement of the fossil record to be sequence history.

For the reasons I have given, I see no need for us to give credence to the popular view of the earth's geological history. I do not see the fossil record as being "a record of creation in the rocks", as Brother Fowler suggests, but rather a record of the *extinction* of species. A creation once replete with species became poorer in diversity as God poured judgement on His degenerate creation. When fossils were formed we do not know. The description of the earth as "without form, and void" (Gen. 1:2) suggests to me that there were no fossils before God's six days of Creation began. The period of the Flood remains the most likely time of fossil formation, since we are told that "all the fountains of the great deep [were] broken up" (7:11), indicating seismic activity at that time.

In view of the lack of evidence supporting the conventional time scale of geology and evolution, I believe there is no reason why we should

think of the Genesis record of Creation as having been anything other than a literal week of days.

Vernon Skinner
London South

I have just received my copy of your Special Issue "Science and the Bible", and first impressions are that it is an excellent compilation of interesting articles well presented. I specially want to compliment you on publishing Brother Alan Fowler's article, "[Interpreting the fossil record](#)", which is excellent—a most scholarly and informative offering, honestly tackling the subject. Would that some of your other writers could be equally positive!

A case in point is Brother John Nicholl's article, "[What happened to the dinosaurs?](#)". The first three-quarters is excellent and factual, citing the abundant geological and fossil evidence for the generally accepted conclusion—that dinosaurs were the dominant species on earth for about 100 million years during the Jurassic and Cretaceous periods, and became extinct approximately 65 million years ago. Then he spoils it all by saying that, because he personally believes in a Creation in six twenty-four-hour days 6,000 years ago, he thinks that dinosaurs must be quite recent, possibly being in Noah's Ark and still around at the time of Job. I presume the writer sincerely believes that, but how can he? How can anyone these days?

The evidence for the great antiquity of planet earth, the solar system and the rest of the universe is overwhelming. The Hubble telescope has confirmed the incredible size of the universe and consequently its age. If, as we are told, the light from the farthest reaches of the universe has taken ten billion years to reach us (we are looking back in time) then the universe must be twelve or more billion years old.

It is fairly easy to calculate the age of the star which is our sun by measuring the amount of hydrogen (fuel) which has been used up (converted into helium) to produce light and heat. This process has been going on for about 5,000 million years, and the sun is good for another

* This argument clearly cannot apply to plants. Brother Skinner has suggested in a further communication that the fossil sequence of plants in the rock strata can be explained by such factors as the greater buoyancy of large trees, the greater populations of rapidly growing 'simpler' trees such as conifers early in the earth's history, and the ecological and habitat variations of species before the Flood.—D.J.B.

5,000 million years yet. Therefore we can assume that the planets, including the earth, must be slightly younger—say 4,500 million years old. Plenty of time for the long-term creation of life in all its forms and subsequent development, as outlined in Brother Fowler's article.

Surely it is now time for us Christadelphians to honestly face the evident facts of science. Why halt between two opinions? God could have created everything in 144 hours, but it is plain that He did not. With all eternity at His disposal, why should He be in such a hurry? It appears that the universe runs on established laws (God's laws), and that mostly God uses natural methods in His creative work. Creation is a slow process usually.

Genesis was written in a non-scientific age for non-scientific people, and has been perfectly adequate for most of human history. Genesis, like the rest of the Bible, is a spiritual document. It teaches that God is the Creator of the universe and the Creator of life in all its forms.

Consider chapter 1 as an inspired forecast of the course of history since the creation of Adam. 2 Peter 3:8, "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years", hints at this interpretation. For example, the seventh day of rest speaks of the millennium, which is "a rest to the people of God" (Heb. 4:9). The creation of the sun on the fourth day is matched by the appearance of the "Sun of righteousness" (Mal. 4:2), the first coming of Christ, after 4,000 years of history. Think about it. How could there be evenings and mornings, as in Genesis 1, before the sun was made, if you take it literally?

It seems that our interpretation of Genesis is the problem, not science. We do not even need to consider evolution by chance, it could never have happened. Now that we are in the twenty-first century it is time we got up to date with our thinking. If not, we are liable to drive away our young folk. As an example, the article in the Special Issue, "[God—the first physicist](#)", by John C. Bilello, is a brilliant exposition of a very difficult subject, but one which we should try to grapple with in order to increase our understanding of 'How does it all work?'

May I conclude by offering a sincere word of praise to the editors of *The Testimony* for the forward thinking displayed in the production of this Special Issue? They have done a good job and deserve every commendation.

Arthur Mallinder
Stirling

We were very disappointed to find *The Testimony* promoting 'Evolutionary Creationist' ideas in the May Special Issue. More specifically, we would disagree with Brother David Burges' statement that "The fact that these differing views can all be held by sincere believers suggests that there exists no objective way of proving which is correct". The Scriptures themselves prove that the Genesis record of Creation is to be taken literally. Israel is told: "for in six days the LORD [Yahweh] made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD [Yahweh] blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it" (Ex. 20:11).

Even in the Genesis account of Creation, the statement that God "rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made" (2:2) implies that the work had taken place up till day seven, that is, on days one to six. This precludes the idea that the six days "were days during which God revealed the Creation to Moses". We know that each day consists of an evening and a morning, so there is no reason to think that this is really "a longer epoch of time". No one who believes the Scriptures would claim that God lacked the power to complete the wonderful work of Creation in six literal days.

If modern science appears in any way to contradict this, can there be any question that we should believe God's Word rather than man's science? Paul exhorts Timothy: "keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding . . . oppositions of science [or knowledge] falsely so called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith" (1 Tim. 6:20,21).

L. Maffioli, Bristol Horfield
J. Ebbs, Colchester

I have read with keen interest the May Special Issue of *The Testimony*, entitled "Science and the Bible". If I may say so, the articles range from the sublime to the improbable. The article "Fractals and faith" by Sister Valerie Pinfield is first class, demonstrating that the orderly and beautiful world in which we live teaches us something of the character of the Creator, a God of love.

In sharp contrast, the article "What happened to the dinosaurs?" by Brother John Nicholls seems somewhat far-fetched. It appears unlikely that dinosaurs were put into the Ark and that they roamed the earth after the Flood, since it is a scientific fact that dinosaurs lived on the earth long ages before man was created. It seems a