

# MODERN GEOLOGIC THEORIES ARE THEY ACCURATE?

by Bill Jahns

Updated: November 12, 1991

---

**PURPOSE:** The following paper is a discussion of some of the ideas of modern Geology today. Modern geologists deny that the flood of Noah occurred and say that the fossils found in the earth are a proof of the theory of evolution. Yet when you research the scientific literature you can find discoveries that show that other interpretations of the Geologic record are reasonable and have discoveries to back them up. The following paper is a discussion of just a few of these discoveries.

**BACKGROUND:** Until the 1800's the flood of Noah and Genesis 6 was not questioned. Geologists simply interpreted the Geological Record in terms of the Biblical Flood. It was accepted that God was the creator by most of those in the "Christian World". Then Darwin and others in the 1800's started to change this view by scientists. Great ages were attributed to the earth. Gradually evolution came to be accepted. In order to make evolution plausible it was necessary for the earth to be of great age. A young earth would have meant it was implausible for life to have evolved. There is obviously evidence that the earth is older than 6,000 or 10,000 years. Men started digging more for oil and other minerals and it was found that the lower strata contained the "less complex" fossils. The upper strata contained the "more complex" fossils.

Today, the Genesis account of creation and the flood ignored by geologists and scientists as a whole. Modern dating methods using radioactive elements are considered a proof of the great age of the earth.

## **PROBLEMS WITH DATING METHODS:**

Geologists use the "Geologic Column" to show when certain life forms were on the earth. The further back in time you go the simpler the life form supposedly is. Yet there is evidence that this is not always the case. Also, certain forms of life have supposedly become extinct millions of years ago.

Whenever evidence of this is shown they simply ignore it, call it an "anomaly" or accuse the finder of outright fraud. In some instances they will not even hear the evidence that has been found and refuse to even look or investigate evidence in the rocks that shows something could be wrong with their interpretation.

The following is a list of a few of those artifacts and fossils. I want to emphasize that this list is only a few of the problems that have not been adequately explained by modern geological theories.

## 1. MAPS SHOWING ICE OVER EUROPE AND ANTARCTICA FREE OF

## ICE!

The Ice Age was supposed to have ended some 10,000 years ago. In fact C<sup>14</sup> dating methods have helped put the Ice Age into perspective. Before C<sup>14</sup> dating the last ice age was thought to have ended around 25,000 years ago. Maps of the Ancient Sea Kings by Charles Hapgood (which originally came from Turkey) show Europe under ice. The amazing thing is these maps were made in 1500 A.D. Obviously they were copies of maps that were made much earlier. In another part of the book he states that the maps probably came from Egypt. Amazingly Hapgood tries to say that the maps reflect the ice age which is said to be around 10,000 years ago. Question -- How could maps survive the flood and accurately record the geographical extent of the Ice Age in 1500 A.D.? An answer is that the ice ages are much closer to the present time than geologists want to say. The reason they say the ice ages are further in the past is because of C<sup>14</sup> dating. However, there is good reason to believe that many of these dates may be inaccurate.

Another amazing feature of the maps is they show Antarctica free from ice (Maps of the Ancient Sea Kings p. 79) Geologists have said that Antarctica was under ice for millions of years. Yet some ancient maps accurately show the geographical features of Antarctica (now under ice) and show it ice free. From this we see that the ideas that have been put forth by modern geologists could be wrong. Antarctica was covered by ice at a time closer to the present than they want us to believe.

## 2. A GOLD CHAIN IN COAL

The June 11, 1891 Morrisonville Times of Morrisonville, Ill., has a very interesting article about a lady by the name of Mrs. Culp. She was putting some coal in a scuttle and when she broke it she found embedded in it a small gold chain. The coal came from the Taylorsville or Pana mines. "At first Mrs. Culp thought the chain had been dropped accidentally in the coal, but as she undertook to lift the chain up, the idea of its having been recently dropped was at once made fallacious, for as the lump of coal broke it separated almost in the middle..." (Morrisonville Times, June 11, 1891).

This was obviously a human object that was found in coal. Humans had to be around at this point. This discovery raises a question about the timing of the origin of coal.

This is not the only time that human made items are found in coal. There are several more.

See Appendix 2.

### 3. A HUMAN BODY IN STRATA SUPPOSEDLY 100 MILLION YEARS OLD.

Desert Magazine, (February 1974), has an article about two human bodies found near Moab, Utah. The bodies were found under 15 feet of material that had been removed including five or six feet of solid rock.

"In addition, the dark organic stains found around the bone indicated that the bones had been complete bodies when deposited in the ancient sandstone. .... And that stratum was a least 100 million years old. Due to considerable local faulting and shifting, the site could either be in the lower Dakota or the still older upper Morrison formation. Desert Magazine, "The Case of the Bones in Stone," p. 36, Feb., 1975. In this same formation dinosaurs have been found.

These skeletons were found in strata that was thought to be around 100 million years old. The rock it was found in was "semi-rock" which is typical of the rock found in that area. Under about 40 feet of rock you can literally pick away at the rock with your hands. It is not very hard. Yet we are told that these rocks are "very old." This raises questions about how far back in the fossil record human remains are found. Dinosaurs are found in formations of this age at Dinosaur National Monument in Utah.

See Appendix 3

### 4. A BOAT BURIED IN THE MOUNTAINS OF SWITZERLAND.

Harold Wilkins, in his book, "The Secret Cities of South America" describes a very interesting incident in the 1400' s, "Again, in A.D. 1460, miners digging for metals in the mountains of the canton of Berne, in Switzerland, found, at a depth of 100 feet in the bowels of the earth, a most ancient wooden ship which must have perished untold ages before. It had carvings and was well fashioned. By it lay masts, broken and eaten away with secular corrosion. There was an anchor of iron, and what gave the old Swiss miners a horrid turn was the sight in the timbers of the bones and skulls of forty men." (Mysteries of Ancient South America, by Harold Wilkins, p. 417).

Again, does this make sense? If there were not a worldwide flood how can a boat be found that high in the mountains?

This is a proof that a lake covered these mountains and someone in a ship died during the time that lake was there. There are other accounts in his book of boats found buried on land.

See Appendix 4

## 5. PICTURES OF DINOSAURS IN CAVES

Dinosaurs are supposed to have become extinct long before the coming of man. Any other scenario doesn't fit in the evolutionary scheme of things.

In the Arizona Highways magazine, July 1951, is a very interesting article titled: "Were There Giants in Those Days?"

At the Grand Canyon a witness claimed to have seen a "giant" buried in sandstone. Also the witness claimed to have seen tracks of giants in the sandstone. Unfortunately, when an expedition was sent they could not find the reported giants. However, they did find something else that was reported. Wall pictures showing a dinosaur, elephant, ibex, etc. as well as human forms. One drawing is of an elephant attacking a human; if the size of the elephant is to scale the man is 18 feet high.

Photographs were taken of the dinosaur picture on the cave wall. Here is a quote from the article: "Here Carson was busy taking pictures of a pictograph which anyone must admit bears a startling resemblance to a dinosaur. Later the sculptor made plaster casts of the impression" (Arizona Highways, July 1951, p.38).

When this picture was shown to a scientist it was dismissed. "Dr. Gilmor, paleontologist, dismissed the matter as an accident or coincidence" (Arizona Highways, July 1951, p 38).

Could it be that the Bible is accurate in saying "There were giants in those days" – before the flood? How can a man draw a picture of a dinosaur he has never seen? This is not the only reported picture of a dinosaur. Another has been reported to have been found in a cave in Oregon (Secret Cities of South America, by Harold Wilkins, p. 271).

Other discoveries were also made that bring into question modern ideas of Geology. It was also claimed that petrified giants had been found who were 18 feet tall and 15 feet tall. Also the tracks in ancient strata of these giant men. However, when a thorough examination was made only the picture of the dinosaur (along with pictures of other giant beasts) could be found.

See Appendix 5

## 6. TRACKS OF MEN IN THE CARBONIFEROUS ERA.

As a student at Ambassador College some years ago, I heard about the Pauxy River tracks. They were mentioned again at the last Refresher. I thought they were the only tracks of men found in "ancient strata". When I started reading and studying more widely I found there were many more incidents of human tracks found. I realize the Pauxy River tracks are very controversial and there are legitimate questions about them.

Science Newsletter (Oct 28, 1938), has a very interesting article about tracks. It speaks of the riddle for science that an animal had footprints like a man.

"The footprints are exceedingly curious things. They are the right size to be human—nine or ten inches in length—and they are almost the right shape. Practically everyone who sees them thinks at first they were made by human feet and it is almost impossible to persuade some people that they are not." (Science Newsletter, October 28, 1938, p. 278).

These tracks were found in the same strata known to belong to the Coal Age.

Scientific American, (Jan 1940), also has a similar type of article. It mentions that the tracks look like human tracks. They are found in rock supposedly laid down 250,000,000 years ago. Yet they look human (Scientific American, January 1940, p. 162). There are many other reported incidences of human tracks in strata associated with coal. The people who found them are not creationists. In some cases they waited for years to reveal them knowing the problems that would come when they did.

## 7. HUMAN REMAINS IN THE PLIOCENE

The Bulletin of the Geological Society of America (Feb. 20, 1891), contains an article about human remains found in California. The strata the remains were found in was thought to be Pliocene (1.6 -5.3 million years old).

The article states: "If such an association of remains actually occurs, theories must be modified to fit the fact" (Bulletin of the Geological Society of America, Vol 2, Feb. 20, 1891, p. 190).

It was asserted that human relics were found beneath the lava cap. One mortar was found 200 feet below the surface. The article asserts "Mr. Neale declares it utterly impossible that these relics can have reached the position in which they were found excepting at the time the gravel was deposited and before the lava cap was formed (Bulletin of the Geological Society of America, Vol 2, Feb. 20, 1891, p. 192). It would be interesting if the lava could have been dated

by the Potassium-Argon method or the bones by C<sup>14</sup>. Note that not only was a skull found but also human artifacts.

It is difficult to find any of these incidents discussed in the modern geological literature of today. When some have tried to raise questions their very careers as scientists are in danger.

See Appendix 7

## 8. RADIOHALO DATING GIVES YOUNG AGES FOR COAL

We are led to believe that all radioactive dating methods give ancient dates for geological strata. However, there is some data that gives a much younger age for the coal that has been formed on the earth. This data indicates that the Jurassic and Triassic formations should have the time element of formation possibly as high as 1000 times closer to the present. Yet you cannot find this information in any geology book that espouses evolution that I have seen. The data is simply ignored. This is a very controversial find.

In an article by Dr Robert V. Gentry (Chemistry Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830) in Science, October 15, 1976 (page 315), Dr. Gentry discusses the halos around coalified wood found in the Colorado Plateau. "Specifically, it was discovered that the halos surrounding the alpha active sites are typically embryonic, that is they do not generally exhibit the <sup>214</sup>PO Ring characteristic of fully developed U halos in minerals. – For example, if the <sup>238</sup>U/<sup>206</sup>Pb - 27,300 value indicative of the formation time of the radiocenter, this is more recent by at least a factor of 270 than the minimum (Cretaceous) and more recent by a factor of 760 than the maximum (Triassic) geological ages estimated for the introduction of U into the logs" (Science, Vol 194, p. 315). This data was taken from the U-rich Colorado Plateau coalified wood.

Typically when you examine the raw data you find dates that do not fit the conclusion of the author. These dates are normally ignored. For example it was commonly reported in the press that the moon rocks gave ages for the Universe of around 4.6 billion years. But when you look at the raw data published in a science magazine you find that some dates were only in the millions of years. Of course most of the dates were much more than that. These samples do not have signs on them stating "I am an anomalous date." The dates selected to be put into the article are those that reflect the thinking and philosophy of the individual writing the paper.

## 9. RADIOACTIVE DATING PROBLEMS

We are commonly led to believe that we should accept the C<sup>14</sup> dates given by archaeologists and geologists as correct. Yet when you look into the scientific literature you find several authors and commentators of scientific magazines who wonder. Why – because there are known anomalies that show something is wrong.

Example: There is data showing that living mollusks shells in fresh water give anomalous dates. These anomalous C<sup>14</sup> readings can increase the apparent age of the mollusk shell to 3,000 years. The article is found in Science, Vol 141, (August 9, 1963).

In 1981 an article appeared in the Anthropological Journal of Canada, stating– "The troubles of the radiocarbon dating method are undeniably deep and serious. Despite 35 years of technological refinement and better understanding, the underlying assumptions have been strongly challenged, and warnings are out that radiocarbon may soon find itself in a crisis situation" (Anthropological Journal of Canada, Vol 19, No. 3 1981 p. 9). The author (Robert Lee) goes on to show that the culprit is **WATER!!** Notice the same thing happens with the mollusks. Water causes a change in the C<sup>14</sup> readings. Yet I have never seen this discussed when any C<sup>14</sup> date is given? Obviously, C<sup>14</sup> is a very good method of dating for artifacts that have remained dry for the last 4,000 years. But what about before that?

The following are some quotes by Frederic B. Jueneman in the June 1982 Industrial Research and Development publication (Page 21), "There has been in recent years the horrible realization that radiodecay rates are not as constant as previously thought, nor are they immune to environmental influences. And this could mean that the atomic clocks were reset during some global disaster, and events which brought Mesozoic to a close may not be 65 million years ago but, rather, within the age and memory of man." This man is not a **creationist!!** This is a secular publication. There is proof and evidence that the atomic clocks can be and have been affected by the environment.

The same problems can be found in other methods of radioactive dating. Potassium Argon dating is also affected by the environment and it has been shown that under water this method also gives anomalous dates. The Journal of Geophysical Research (Vol. 73, No. 14, July 15, 1968, p. 4601) has an article showing that anomalous dates are given by the Hawaiian lava flows. It was known that these lava flows were of recent origin – yet when samples were taken to the laboratory they gave dates as high as 3300 million years. How can you tell which dates are correct and which dates are wrong? Again – it depends on who is writing the article and what "philosophy" he has.

Tektites – are a type of meteorite that are found in some strata. The dates that normally are given for this strata are around 10,000 years. Yet radioactive dating methods for the tektite is around 700,000 years. Which one is right? The difference between these dating methods is a factor of

70. Again, something is wrong.

We have been led to believe that the bristlecone pine and tree ring dating methods have proven  $C^{14}$  to be an accurate form of dating. Yet in articles you can find arguments about what the tree rings have proven. There is conflict again between the oak ring dating methods and the bristlecone pine readings (Nature, Vol. 270, Nov. 3, 1977 p. 28). Apparently  $C^{14}$  is not as uniform and reliable as we are led to believe.

I have only discussed a few of the scientific articles which show something is wrong with the radioactive dating methods. There are many more!!

## 10. LIVING FOSSILS SUPPOSEDLY EXTINCT

The Geologic Column is supposed to record the forms of life that were on earth at a particular time in History. Yet several times there have been discoveries of living animals that show something is wrong with the way that geologists and evolutionists have interpreted the Geologic record.

On December 22, 1938, a fishing boat netted an unusually live and unusually unsightly fish about eighteen miles off the southern coast of Africa. None of the fishermen had ever seen anything like it before. It turned out to be a coelacanth which was supposed to have been extinct for at least 70 million years (A Modern Look at Monsters, p. 173).

This discovery and others like it bring up questions about the geologic theory of today. Why isn't this fossil found in more recent strata in the geologic record? It turns out that the coelacanth is not as rare as originally thought (Page 173, A Modern Look at Monsters, by Daniel Cohen). It had been seen by seamen from time to time before that but they had not known what it was.

One way to test whether a theory is correct is to test it. Does the theory accurately predict discoveries? If it doesn't something must be wrong with the theory. These discoveries do bring into question modern geological theory.

The existence of these living fossils brings up another question. If the modern geologic theory has coelacanth and other living fossils extinct non-existent in the more recent geologic strata – could beings like man have been present when older strata were laid down in the past? I think the answer is obvious.

Science Digest, Nov. 1968, had a picture and a short article called "Serpent-bird of the Mayans." "Jose Diaz-Bolio, a Mexican archaeologist-journalist says there is evidence that the serpent-bird

sculpture, located in the ruins of Tajin, is not merely the product of Mayan flights of fancy, but a realistic representation of an animal that lived during the period of the ancient Mayans—1,500 to 5,000 years ago. — Animals with such characteristics are believed to have disappeared 130 million years ago." Again we find a bird apparently alive in the time of man similar to archaeopteryx which is supposedly extinct in the time of man. Today we know that many animals are going extinct every year. Is it possible that animals which we think were extinct before the time of man actually lived with man in the past?

There are more of these discoveries to be found in the scientific literature.

**CONCLUSION:** There is scientific evidence that the conclusions and theories we find in modern geology books are in error. Other interpretations of the Geologic Record are reasonable and have scientific evidence to back them up. This evidence has simply been ignored in most of the Geologic literature of today.