

# **Earth Science Associates**

## **Open Letter to ICR**

### **Table of Contents**

#### **Preface and Introduction**

**Part I** — Flaws in the claim OF HAVING UNEQUIVOCAL EVIDENCE THAT granites originate from fossiliferous Flood rocks.

**Part II** — Scriptural basis for cooperation WITH ICR and others.

**Part III** — The search for what the Bible teaches about creation: How it relates to the fallacious basis of radiometric dating.

**Part IV** — Granites and the foundations of the earth: Discovery of what God's Word has always plainly taught about their creation.

**Part V** — Identifying granites as the biblical foundations of the earth.

**Part VI** — The devil's attempt to counterfeit God's proof of creation, contrasted with what God's Word has always plainly taught about the creation of Earth's primordial rocks: How this relates to the everlasting gospel.

**Part VII** — Comparing the discovery of Earth's foundation rocks with what Andrew and ICR now propose about granites originating from fossiliferous sedimentary rocks.

**Part VIII** — More fallacies in the claims of a secondary origin of granite.

**Part IX** — Flaws in picturing phase equilibria experiments as supporting the view of a secondary origin of granites, revealed by failure of those experiments to actually synthesize granites.

**Part X** — Fallacies in the arguments that [skarns](#) support a secondary origin of granite.

**Part XI** — Examining the contention that regional relationships provide evidence for an [igneous](#) origin of granites.

**Part XII** — Before and since the [Arkansas creation trial](#), I have widely publicized an experimental test, whose outcome unequivocally falsifies both the linchpin of evolutionary geology as well as your hypothesis of the secondary origin of granite and their enclosed polonium halos. Proof that it is a genuine falsification test: It has confronted the worldwide scientific community for over twenty-four years without being contradicted by evolutionists or anyone else.

**Part XIII** — Andrew's and ICR's proposal for a secondary origin of granite and enclosed polonium halos: Will both parties now confirm that it must pass the crucial test of experimental verification? Or are you both seeking a pass on this crucial question?

**Part XIV** — My obligation to the worldwide scientific community in light of your disseminating the claim that polonium halos in granites are secondary: I MUST SPEAK OUT FOR THE SAKE OF PASTORS AND MANY OTHERS WHO WOULD OTHERWISE BE BADLY MISLED INTO THINKING THEY MUST ACCEPT YOUR NEW POSITION BECAUSE OF THE STRENGTH OF YOUR REPUTATION OF BEING THE WORLD'S LEADING CREATION GEOLOGIST.

## **Conclusion**

**Appendix A** — Failure of attempts to use cross-cutting of different rock types to disprove the primordial origin of granites and their enclosed polonium halos.

**Appendix B** — A document submitted as a Letter to the Editor of *Science* concerning Roger Lewin's 5/17/85 news article in which he reported that researchers E. C. Scott and H. P. Cole could find no evidence of published evidence for creation and no evidence of censorship.

[Appendix C](#) — One of world's leading evolutionary geologists twice admits that polonium halos in granites still remain a tiny mystery.

# Open Letter to ICR

- To:** Andrew Snelling and ICR RATE group members and officers, including Henry Morris, Duane Gish, and other creation science organizations.
- From:** Bob Gentry, July 11, 2003.
- Topic:** Pre-publication draft of comments on ICR's *Impact* article #353.
- Focus:** Primordial polonium halos and deep hole drilling point to granites as Earth's primordial Genesis rocks, identical with the biblical foundations of the Earth: It's a great biblical and scientific truth that shines as a lamp in a dark place, one that is growing brighter and brighter unto the perfect day (Pr. 4:18).

## Preface and Introduction

### Preface

ICR's November 2002 *Impact* article #353 (to view, click [HTML](#) or [PDF](#)), authored by my good friend Andrew Snelling, has successfully refocused attention on the origin of granite and has brought the topic to a very high level of prominence to a very wide audience by virtue of Andrew's claimed disproof of the primordial origin of granite and their enclosed polonium halos. According to #353 this disproof rests squarely on Andrew's claim of having discovered unequivocal evidence that granites are secondary rocks whose origin can be traced to the melting and cooling of fossil-bearing Flood rocks. In their public promotion of a secondary origin of granite Andrew and ICR proceed to claim this is indirect evidence that polonium halos in granites must also be secondary.

Scientific protocol requires these claims be carefully evaluated, for they deny my decades-long series of publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals, containing results which show why polonium halos in granites are primordial, and hence that the host granites must themselves also be primordial. The failure of any scientist — atheist or agnostic, evolutionist or creationist, including Andrew — to respond to my widely published challenges over the last twenty-five years to refute these results and publish their findings in the same peer-reviewed journals, constitutes scientific proof that this remarkable evidence for Earth's recent fiat creation remains as immovable as the granites themselves. This is no surprise, for when God called planet Earth into existence on Day 1 of creation week, He made it impossible for man to overturn or account for His Fingerprints of Creation by any natural processes.

## Introduction

In November 2002 ICR used its private publication, *Acts & Facts* to call into question my widely published scientific evidence of Earth's young age and rapid creation. In early 2003 someone informed me that ICR's Vice President, Larry Vardiman, had sent him a report, authored by Andrew and Mark Armitage, which claimed to falsify various aspects of my results on the primordial origin of polonium halos in granites. It was marked "confidential," so as to prevent my viewing it. I was informed it was to be presented at the forthcoming Fifth International Conference on Creationism. This is a *déjà vu* of events leading to the Second ICC in 1990, when its organizers and their chosen editors selected two highly adversarial evolutionists to criticize my work without giving me opportunity to reply. The evidence now in hand suggests that ICR and the Fifth ICC organizers, and their present editors, are planning a repeat of 1990. This document will be enlarged to respond to that paper.

The hundred thousand or so trusting souls who received *Impact* #353 — and possibly another hundred thousand who also may have read it by now — may well believe they have been given new truth about granites and their enclosed polonium halos. ICR's thrust against my work is curious considering that Andrew has long been an integral part of the two Adventist Media Production videos, [The Young Age of the Earth](#) and *Fingerprints of Creation*, both of which strongly endorse primordial polonium halos as evidence of the primordial origin of granites, as well as an approximate 6000-year age of planet Earth. Andrew's strong affirmation of

all these positions is widely known both nationally and internationally through these videos.

Internationally, the videos have been translated into Serbian, and are now airing on many of the most prominent TV stations all throughout the Balkans. I continue to get glowing reports of God's providential leading in bringing this to pass. The videos are already in China and are presently being translated into Korean. Moreover, they have recently been translated into Spanish and Portuguese and, in what I consider to be a miracle of God's intervention, they will soon begin airing in Spanish via satellite all over North and South America, and Western Europe. And negotiations are already underway for the Portuguese version to air on satellite TV that covers all of Brazil. Moreover, they have also been translated into Russian, and just a few months ago I received a letter from someone who viewed *Fingerprints of Creation* on Polish TV. Clearly the Lord is continuing to lead very powerfully in their distribution and airings.

Nationally, in 1996-97, the [Young Age](#) video aired nine times all across North America on the Eternal Word TV Network (EWTN), which is part of the Global Catholic Network. Many EWTN viewers called, expressing how it strengthened their faith in the Bible, and to order their copy. Additionally, both videos have been airing on Public Broadcast Television (PBS) for almost the last two years; but not without opposition. One organization, long known for their acceptance of radiometric dating and an ancient 4.5 billion year age of the Earth, made rather strong attempts to prevent the PBS airings. The reason may not be hard to find; both videos reveal why these positions are in error, both scientifically and biblically. This may explain why strenuous attempts have been made to prevent their distribution and airing.

The fact that both Andrew and ICR, and other entities, have independently published criticisms of my scientific results, without either one giving me opportunity to respond, is within their First Amendment rights, and I respect their freedom to say and print whatever they choose. They should likewise respect my freedom to publish my opinion that such actions are contrary to the 1984 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) Freedom of Inquiry resolution. I discuss it at length in my book [Creation's Tiny Mystery](#), contrasting its principles to the way that evolutionists have long suppressed the creationist implications of my published reports. The NAS passed it in 1984 to lend moral support to foreign scientists whose research and discoveries, and other human rights activities, had come into

conflict with the prevailing views of certain totalitarian-dominated regimes. Consequently they were under threats of imprisonment or worse, and the Academy saw fit, through their resolution, to awaken the conscience of the worldwide scientific community to muster as much high-level scientific support for these beleaguered colleagues as possible. It's a situation that is still ongoing many years later; certain scientists in those countries are still under threat because of their research or human rights activities. Of course, in principle it's no different than individual Christians in those countries being persecuted or threatened for their own personal evangelism, or because they belong to a certain religious entity that may be on the foreign government's blacklist.

This pre-publication draft exposes the fallacies of Andrew's and ICR's recent claim of having discovered unequivocal evidence of the secondary origin of granite from fossiliferous Flood rocks; coincidentally, it also exposes the fallacies of radiometric dating and Earth's 4.5 billion-year geological evolution. It is convenient to respond to both views simultaneously because they both are critically hinged on the same common, erroneous assumption concerning the secondary origin of granite and the enclosed polonium halos. This response may also be helpful in dispelling the considerable confusion that exists in many creationist circles concerning whether an ancient age of the Earth really contradicts the Bible. It seems that many who accept an ancient Earth have not been correctly informed as to the implications of what they believe. In fact, belief in an ancient Earth is virtually identical with the conventional geological evolutionary scenario which pictures formation of granites occurring deep underground tens of thousands of times, millions of years apart, throughout a presumed 4.5 billion-year period of Earth history. Both the [Young Age](#) and [Fingerprints](#) videos explain briefly why this is the downfall of the entire system of radiometric dating that underpins belief in an ancient planet Earth. This document more fully details the scientific and biblical reasons for this conclusion, while also showing that an ancient Earth is the foundation of both geological and biological evolution.

Until now I have generally not contested the wide dissemination of faulty claims and criticisms about my work. To remain silent any longer would leave the erroneous impression that these fallacious claims have credibility, when in fact they do not.

## **Part I:**

### **Flaws in the claim OF HAVING UNEQUIVOCAL EVIDENCE THAT granites originate from fossiliferous Flood rocks.**

In *Impact* #353 Andrew claims to find unequivocal evidence that granites originate from the melting and cooling of fossiliferous Flood rocks. Unequivocal evidence means proof, and the only proof that could possibly support this claim would be verification of sites where fossils now exist in granites. On 11/03/02 I sent Andrew an [email](#) requesting that he identify the precise locations of these sites. On 11/17/02 he emailed a [reply](#) containing the following excerpt:

- *"Bob, you know as well as we do that granites do not contain fossils."*

Actually, my 11/03/02 email to Andrew related that over the past few decades I have checked out every place in North America where evolutionists claimed that fossils exist in granites, and there were none to be found. This is partly summarized in my book, [Creation's Tiny Mystery](#), on pages 334-338, wherein I refer to H J. Hoffman's report, *Precambrian Fossils, Pseudofossils, and Problematica in Canada*, Geological Survey of Canada, Bulletin 189, 30-34 (1971). There I contrast reports of fossils *in granites*, with fossils found lying on top of granites; the former are spurious, while the latter are expected to occur when the Flood waters receded.

Turning attention now to what Andrew claims to believe about fossils in granites, we find that on page 446 in *Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth*, ICR's widely known RATE book, he actually strongly affirms the existence of fossils in granites:

- *"Even more convincing is the granite found in the central Urals which contained a number of fossil species of brachiopods [Malakhova and Ovchinnikov, 1970]."*

The contradiction here is clearly seen. On the one hand, his email claims that his

not believing that fossils exist in granites as *the* reason why he should not be required to give locations that would support his claim of granites being derived from fossiliferous Flood rocks. On the other hand, the above records his published, authoritative claim that certain granites do contain fossils. Thus I did have a valid basis for requesting Andrew to provide locations where fossils exist in granites. His failure to provide those locations constitutes one outstanding proof that his and ICR's claim is spurious.

Moreover, contrary to the attempts by certain evolutionists and creationists to use the *Malakhova and Ovchinnikov* report to cast my published results in question, actually there is no good reason for anyone to ever have believed it. Over ten years ago, on page 336 of the 1992 edition of my book, *Creation's Tiny Mystery*, I published details of its totally fictitious nature. Obviously, Andrew and ICR could have saved themselves the embarrassment of this citation appearing in the RATE book if they had only consulted my book. It will be interesting to see if it is deleted from the RATE book's next edition. But ICR is not the only organization inclined to act in this fashion. Interestingly, there is another creation-science-related entity who continues to cite it in their ongoing attempts to disprove the primordial origin of granites while promoting their secondary naturalistic origin over evolutionary time. Even after many years it has yet to admit this citation is without any factual basis.

## Part II

### Scriptural basis for cooperation WITH ICR and others.

The differences with ICR and Andrew cited above need not persist. Cooperation is still possible and most desirable. Part of Andrew's 11/17/02 email agrees with this:

- *"We would welcome you joining us in showing compromising Christians and unbelievers alike that these evidences in God's world powerfully support what God's Word has always plainly taught."*

Andrew and I have long been very good friends. I appreciate his invitation to join him and ICR. There is a way to continue our long and very fruitful association wherein we have followed God's many providences in showing compromising Christians and unbelievers alike that primordial polonium halos unequivocally point to God's instant creation of the Earth. So there can still be a solid basis for cooperation provided we could agree on what God's Word has always plainly taught about creation.

To prove this was earlier a very strong facet of our united efforts, I quote below part of Andrew's very timely Jan. 14, 1994, fax to then-Adventist-Media-Center President Glenn Aufderhar. Andrew sent this urgent, most helpful fax after he learned that Glenn had come under very strong pressure to cancel completion and production of the [Fingerprints](#) and [Young Age](#) videos. Here is part of Andrew's fax endorsing the [Young Age](#) video, and encouraging Glenn to continue.

- *"As I have already said, I can wholeheartedly endorse the video and vouch for the scientific integrity and veracity of the evidence presented in it. This evidence, and therefore the video which presents it so ably, needs to be seen and heard by both believers and unbelievers alike, so believers will have their confidence in God and His Word powerfully confirmed, and so unbelievers will see that God alone is truth and therefore seek Him. Again, I urge you not to let any opposition, whatever its source, to*

*deter you and your team from getting this vital video completed and out to the public. If I can help you in any way to achieve that objective, then don't hesitate to contact me. May the Lord give you the courage to stand firm upon the truth of His Scriptures."*

Yes, being in agreement with what *God's Word has always plainly taught* about creation was always the preeminently important basis for the cordial association that Andrew and I experienced for so long. And what is the Bible's teaching?

## Part III

### **The search for what the Bible teaches about creation: How it relates to the fallacious basis of radiometric dating.**

In Isaiah 1: 18 the Bible says, "*Come let us reason together says the Lord . . . .*" Here the *us* is generic, applying to all of humanity. So we know from this text that God intends to reason with people from all walks of life on all the major topics of our existence, including, of course, what God tells of about His great works of creation.

And to insure that the common man's reasoning would be without fault, God did something special for us so that no one would be indebted to just the few who, like those trained in geology, would tell us, as the evolutionary geologists have done for the past two centuries, that they are the only ones capable of deciphering Earth's history and giving us the truth about its origin and development. I refer to the fact that, aside from the parts that are couched in symbolism, on the whole the Bible is written for the common man in language and terms that can easily be identified with objects and events of everyday life. Indeed, the Bible says that in Christ's day the common people heard him gladly, the obvious reason being that he not only spoke their language, but He also uttered the grand truths of eternity in words whose meaning they could easily comprehend. Indeed, in reading the accounts of Jesus' ministry in the four gospels, it is repeatedly stated that it was the leaders of Israel — the priests and scribes — who caused the rejection of Christ because they confused the common people with false and spurious meanings of His words, thus leading the Israelites to reject Him as the Messiah. More on this later.

Likewise, virtually all the confusion, disinformation, and direct and subtle attacks that atheists, agnostics, evolutionists, theistic evolutionists — and other adversaries — have launched against what the Bible says about the Genesis record of creation, both in Genesis and in other parts of the Bible, comes from the fact that, in one

way or another, they all either flat-out ignore, outright deny, or very cleverly attempt to cast in doubt, the literal meaning of the commonly-understood terms that God used to describe His creative acts in calling the heavens and the Earth into existence during creation week. Stated differently, these adversaries, whether believers or unbelievers, or geologists or paleontologists or geochronologists, or astronomers or cosmologists, would have all believe, to one degree or another, that the commonly understood words the Bible uses to describe both the Genesis account of creation — and the many other supporting references found therein — don't really mean what we commonly understand those words to mean.

Instead, they say, the common man must bow to them, the scientific authorities, to rightly decipher the history of the cosmos. In using highly technical terms that are characteristic of their specialty, these authorities know they are in effect speaking an unknown language to the common man. Thus, they are able to promote as truth whatever ideas or theories they wish, without the common man being able to discern or test whether it really is the truth. Then, as long as the common man can be kept in the dark; as long as he believes that the authorities are really just reporting on the progress of science, and that he would be backward and ignorant if he didn't accept the new views; as long as he doesn't suspect he is the victim of the Trojan Horse approach to get him to accept a cosmic history whose hidden assumptions are badly flawed; as long as he can be duped into believing he has been given a valid scientific basis for replacing biblical definitions with spurious definitions that badly contradict the plain words of the Bible, then there is no limit to the lies that the world can be convinced of. And this is exactly how evolution has been prospered.

It's easy for me to identify with the above scenario. As a physics undergraduate at a public university, I was the common man who was transformed into an evolutionist by the above process. I didn't even realize what was happening. It all seemed so logical. In responding to the challenge of learning the terminology of physics — a necessary component of any scientific discipline — I didn't realize my physics professors were also programming me to accept evolutionary geology's 4.5-billion-year history of the Earth — actually at that time it was presumed to be a billion or so less than now. I was shown — I thought — that its age was just as firmly established as conservation of energy. Never was it even hinted that radiometric dating does not really date anything. Never was it emphasized, or even admitted, that such ages are not ages at all, but instead only hypothetical constructs hinged on the fallacious assumption that the radioactive decay rate had always been

uniformly the same during Earth's history.

The professors said it had been constant. Believing they had the truth about the rest of physics, I was so swept up with their eminent reputations that it never occurred to me to ask why they were so sure. They said it; they were the experts. I believed. The power of authority had taken over. I had been so brainwashed that I had lost the capacity to think rationally and ask the one question which might then have made me aware that I was being thoroughly duped into believing a huge lie.

It's a question that concerns the *raison d'etre* of all of physics. Physicists pride themselves as being the arbiters of scientific truth. Their claim is that why nothing in all of modern physics is accepted until and unless its underlying assumptions have undergone rigorous laboratory testing. That's what they claim. And in general it's true. But there are two extremely important exceptions. One concerns big bang cosmology, which I'll deal with later. The other is the assumption of uniformity of radioactive decay. I had very effectively been taught the party line about both.

Being convinced about the uniformity of radioactive decay rates, I became just as convinced I had new truth about Earth's ancient history and the evolutionary development of life thereon. Thus I went forth to utilize the pseudoscience approach described above to convince whatever common man I might encounter that he was badly deceived if he accepted the literal reading of Genesis. Years later, I woke up to the fact that I had been badly deceived, and that in turn I had been badly hoodwinking others by conveying the impression I had the facts proving evolution.

This I had accomplished by learning to speak a language unknown to the common man. Such had no way to defend themselves because they couldn't speak the language; they didn't know enough to even inquire about the assumptions I was using. Indeed, I hardly understood them myself. Later I would realize this is exactly how evolutionists have gained control of the masses, and this is exactly the way they have managed to undermine and destroy the faith of Christians in the Bible. For me troubles began after I began to probe the decay rate assumption. I soon learned just how deeply it had become embedded in the psyche of modern physics — how it had become one of the predominant icons of modern physics, one that was not to be challenged. Physicists are trained to think objectively and diligently inquire — in theory, that is. But I soon learned there was a stringent, unwritten limit as to just how far this thinking and inquiring was supposed to go.

As I began studies on the question of the uniformity of radioactive decay I learned how strongly physicists in high positions can react against research that threatens to reveal the fallacies of this assumption. I experienced the fear that investigation of this topic engenders in the highest echelons of the physics community.

Years ago I enrolled in a PhD physics program at Georgia Tech, intending to do my thesis on this topic. After much discussion, the Department Chairman forbade it, saying that, even though the probability of my finding anything that could be published was microscopic, nevertheless he couldn't tolerate that minuscule chance of success. Why? Because, if I did find something significant, it would forever embarrass the entire faculty of Georgia Tech if I, as a faculty member, were to publish a serious challenge to evolution's long age of the Earth. He was truthful in saying this. But this doesn't fully explain why he was so willing to jettison academic freedom and the search for truth in order to prevent investigation of this topic.

And he never gave a full explanation. But the evidence points to the fact that he was gripped by the same fear that has been pandemic throughout the physics community for many decades. Specifically, in the deepest recesses of his mind — perhaps even subconsciously — I believe he may well have feared that my continued insistence in wanting to know precisely why every budding physicist was required to implicitly accept an assumption that had never been tested, just might, in the end, cause me to stumble onto the realization that Earth's presumed ancient radiometric age was the prop the scientific community accepted for its support of biological evolution. In that case he could well have realized that if I did discover something that definitely exposed the uniform decay rate assumption as fallacious — something that in some way would strongly validate the Genesis record of Earth's fiat creation and young age — it would cause the collapse of both geological and biological evolution.

However, his concern was not that the physics community might long have been instrumental in foisting a vast deception on the world in support of these hypotheses. His concern was not for searching out the truth with the possibility of seeing this vast deception unveiled. Rather it was to suppress any original thinking and research that might threaten the status quo. It's a mindset that, over the past few decades, I have repeatedly encountered in getting my discoveries of Earth's rapid creation and its young age published in the world's leading scientific journals.

Even more, it's a mindset that for over two decades has sought to either misrepresent those results, or to suppress them whenever opportunities arise for their wide distribution. And, yes, there are even some who are not evolutionists who have been just as much involved in this censorship as have the evolutionists. I do not know the reason for this. What I do know is that careers, reputations, publications, academic positions, respect as eminent authorities — in brief, everything that holds modern academia and its collective economic status together, will immediately begin to unravel once the scientific truth validating God's great works of creation is freely disseminated.

I've detailed my personal experience because I've found that it's not just the evolutionists who are often successful in using the unknown tongue approach to embed distinctly unbiblical scientific beliefs in the unwary. Just as in the days of Jesus, even now the common man — even though a minister — is often covered by the prestige of those in authority, who employ the unknown tongue approach as a Trojan Horse to breach the barriers of the mind. As a result the world has lost its anchor in the Word of God, and it is filled with skeptics. Evolution with all its devious, man-made claims has come in to take its place, and the world spirals downward, all because people have been deceived into believing they cannot trust the commonly understood meaning of the words of the Bible. And what is one of the preeminent deceptions that evolutionists have convinced the world of as far as Earth's origin is concerned?

## Part IV

### **Granites and the foundations of the earth: Discovery of what God's Word has always plainly taught about their creation.**

For centuries evolutionary geologists have told the world that granites originated from the cooling of a hot magma derived from sedimentary rocks. This is very similar to what you are now proposing, except they hypothesized slow cooling, and you want faster cooling. Believing themselves to be wise above that which was written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world have come, these geologists claimed to have sufficient expertise to interpret Earth's history, independent of the Bible anchor, and thus denigrated its abundantly clear declarations as to Earth's origin.

They scoffed at Psalm 33:6, 9 and its imperative declaration that the heavens and their entire host were called into existence by the breath of His mouth. Hence they scoffed at the existence of Genesis rocks, those called into existence at the beginning of creation week. Setting themselves up as geological authorities who had scientific truth, they ignored the many, clear biblical texts that show conclusively it is Earth's foundations rocks that are the Genesis rocks. Look at how many there are:

*Where wast thou when I laid the **foundations of the earth**? declare, if thou hast understanding. (Job 38:4)*

*Thus saith the Lord; If heaven above can be measured, and the **foundations of the earth** searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord. (Jer. 31:37)*

*And I have put my words in thy mouth, . . . that I may **plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth** . . . . (Isaiah 51:16)*

*Whereupon are the **foundations thereof fastened?** or who laid the corner stone thereof; (Job 38:6)*

*They know not, neither will they understand; they walk on in darkness: all the **foundations of the earth** are out of course. (Psalm 82:5)*

*Have ye not known? have ye not heard? hath it not been told you **from the beginning?** have ye not understood **from the foundations of the earth?** (Is. 40:21)*

*Who laid the **foundations of the earth**, that it should not be removed . . . . (Psalm 104:5)*

*Of old hast thou laid the **foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands.** (Psalm 102:25)*

*. . . for the windows from on high are open, and the **foundations of the earth** do shake. (Isaiah 24:18)*

*And forgettest the Lord thy maker, that **hath stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth;** (Isaiah 51:13)*

***In the beginning Lord, you laid the foundations of the Earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands,** (Hebrews 1:10)*

These repeated references to the *foundations of the Earth* focus attention on them as rocks that God created *in the beginning*, and interestingly enough, coincident with the heavens being the work of His hands. So we find that Earth's *foundations* are Earth's primordial rocks. That much is beyond doubt. And just what are these foundations?

## Part V

### Identifying granites as the biblical foundations of the earth.

Everyone knows that a foundation to any structure is that upon which it is constructed or built. So there is no chance, guess work, or geological speculation involved as to the plain meaning of the word foundation, or foundations, when it comes to applying its meaning to the Earth. Likewise, God didn't leave it to chance, guess work, or any geological speculation, to identify the foundations of the Earth.

He directed events so that the issue would be settled unambiguously — even more than that — to actually be proven by direct experimental results. I refer to the fact that, over the last century or so, various oil companies, and others, have drilled deep into the Earth's crust on different continents. The result? Those drillings have repeatedly shown it is the granites and similar, hard crystalline rocks that form the foundations of all the continents. Indeed, independent of the many oil drillings, page 322 of my book, [\*Creation's Tiny Mystery\*](#), cites the Oct. 21, 1989 *Science News* report (p. 267) of the Russian drill team who, in the 1980s, attempted to find a layer of basalt which geologists thought must exist somewhere deep in the granite in the Kola peninsula. But after going down to 39,000 feet, and finding nothing but granite, they gave up, saying that if the basalt layer existed at all, it must be much deeper.

Yes, they were resoundingly defeated in their efforts to find a layer of basalt beneath the granite because granites, and similar hard crystalline rocks, are an exact match with the biblical foundations of the Earth. Thus, from a biblical standpoint both granites and other hard crystalline rocks, such as granodiorite, diorite, syenite, and gabbro, are equally a part of Earth's primordial rocks.

This agrees exactly with my discovery — as repeatedly described in my scientific publications — that granites the world over have been imprinted with primordial

polonium halos as God's signature of creation. So your *Impact* report of finding polonium halos in other granites than those I have reported about is exactly what I predicted many years ago. It all fits together precisely. So precisely, in fact, that only the God of Heaven, only the Ruler of the Universe, the Creator and Sustainer of all things, could possibly have planned it. Yes, our Creator God is the only One that could have imprinted Earth's foundation rocks with His *Fingerprints*. And He is still leading providentially in getting this evidence out to this perishing, unbelieving world through my book, [\*Creation's Tiny Mystery\*](#), and through the videos, especially through [\*Fingerprints of Creation\*](#), where you, Andrew, strongly affirm the great biblical and scientific truth that granites are rocks that God created. Yes, it's worth repeating:

*By repeated deep drillings the world over, God insured there would be no doubt about this experimentally determined fact — that granites are an exact match with the biblical foundations of the Earth. They are Earth's primordial rocks.*

By this fact, and by the Bible's multiple references to the foundations of the earth as those rocks He created in the beginning, God made it as certain as possible that all who accepted His word with its plainest meaning would not be confused by the devil's counterfeit scheme. He was not about to let any man, whether atheist, agnostic, evolutionist, skeptic, scientist, or theologian — or anyone else — confuse this most wonderful truth, and detract from His glory in His great work of creation.

## **Part VI**

### **The devil's attempt to counterfeit God's proof of creation, contrasted with what God's Word has always plainly taught about the creation of Earth's primordial rocks: How this relates to the everlasting gospel.**

Of course that didn't mean that geologists and others wouldn't try. Indeed, try they have. For about two hundred years, they have had remarkable success in denying the identity of granites with the biblical definition of Earth's Genesis rocks given in Hebrews 1:10, *"In the beginning Lord, you laid the foundations of the earth and the heavens are the work of your hands,"* and the many other texts previously quoted. Instead they attributed the origin of granites to secondary processes, being derived, they say, from the cooling of magma derived from the melting of sedimentary rocks. Thus for two centuries they have tried their best to turn the truth of God into a lie, and for the most part the whole world has been engulfed by this lie, for it has become the cornerstone of the theory that the Earth is the product of evolutionary processes and the cooling of an ancient, hot magma. And hence also, it has become a cornerstone of atheism, agnosticism, skepticism, evolution, and godless humanism.

Looking down to the end of time the Creator knew that evolutionists were going to desperately try to manufacture a substitute for His great works of creation. He knew that to succeed in their deceptions they would have to fabricate a counterfeit explanation of His works of creation to maintain their deceptions. He foresaw that by introducing a counterfeit theory they would try to confuse the meaning of the words of the Bible so that the common man might not connect the many Biblical passages about the foundations of the earth — such as the ones already quoted — with such granites as the wondrously beautiful and majestic granite monoliths of El Capitan, Half Dome, Mt. Rushmore, Pike's Peak, and many others in the Rockies.

I have no doubt that God intended these marvelous monuments of creation to call attention to Him, the great Creator God, knowing that if humanity grasped their

significance with certainty, with full and complete certainty, this fact alone would destroy the foundation — yes, *destroy the foundation* — of all evolutionary geology, and go a long way toward establishing faith in the entire Bible. Why? Because no longer would evolutionary geologists be able to deny the primordial origin of granites as Earth's foundation rocks. No longer would they be able to perpetuate the myth that granites are secondary rocks formed by natural processes. No longer would evolutionists get away with deceiving the unwary into believing that the Earth's age must be 4.5 billion years because it took hundreds of millions or billions of years for granites to form from the very slow cooling of magmas in deep underground chambers. No longer would the evolutionary myth of evolutionary time stand a chance against God's record of creation. People everywhere would constantly be reminded that God left unambiguous evidence of His great works of creation for all to see and accept. This is what I fully believe God wants all to have opportunity to know.

Indeed, I see three points of special relevance in God leaving this unique scientific identification of Earth's primordial rocks. First, we can easily point believers and unbelievers alike to something from the Genesis creation that is very tangible, and very accessible. In a sense it's quite exciting to realize that even in the here and now we can precisely study a significant part of God's great works of creation week of about 6000 years ago. Next, it also focuses attention on the Fourth Commandment's repeat of the Genesis creation account, "*For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth and the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: . . .*" (Ex. 20:11). And the enduring nature of these granites tells me His Commandments are just as applicable now as when Christ wrote them on stone on Mt. Sinai about 3500 years ago.

Lastly, their enduring nature reminds me how, in the book of Revelation, Christ emphasizes the Fourth Commandment's permanency by linking it with nothing less than the everlasting gospel itself — namely, "*And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, . . . Saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him . . . and worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters*" (Rev. 14:6,7).

Yes, I fully believe it was by God's direct providence that the waters of the great Flood washed away the pre-Flood soil and vegetation from off El Capitan, Mount Rushmore, Pike's Peak, and other similar granite monoliths as well, so that the

common man can now see these exposures in all their majestic, created grandeur. Further, I fully believe God intended these great monuments of creation to point inescapably to the immutability of the Fourth Commandment's Sabbath of creation.

Thus we have found what we sought to find and that is what *God's Word has always plainly taught* about the creation of Earth's primordial rocks. If Andrew and ICR could bring themselves to accept this biblical finding, then we would have the conditions for a powerful alliance, one where we would be united on a preeminently powerful biblical truth, a very necessary condition for unity of action.

## Part VII

### **Comparing the discovery of Earth's foundation rocks with what Andrew and ICR now propose about granites originating from fossiliferous sedimentary rocks.**

The present obstacle to this alliance is that ICR's November 2002 *Impact* article, located at <http://www.icr.org/pubs/imp/pdf/imp-353.pdf>, carries the following statement:

- *"The initial focus of the research has been granitic rocks that had to have formed during the Flood year. In each case there is unequivocal evidence that the granitic rocks formed by the melting during metamorphism (changes in rocks induced by heat and pressure) of fossiliferous Flood-deposited sedimentary layers, and that the resultant granitic magmas (melted rocks) then intruded into other Flood-deposited layers."* [*Impact* #353]

Obviously, ICR's claim that granites formed from magma derived from fossiliferous Flood-deposited sedimentary rocks is the opposite of what *God's Word has always plainly taught* about the creation of Earth's primordial rocks. It clearly contradicts the identification of granites as the biblical foundations of the Earth, the rocks that God created in the beginning of creation week. I may be in error but it seems to me that ICR will only involve itself in additional contradictions if it continues to promote this view. For this reason I hope it will reassess its position. To assist in that decision I now focus on the only two possibilities for my analysis of Earth's foundation rocks, and show that only one is realistic, and the other is just plain unbiblical.

One possibility is that, if ICR's view were assumed to be correct, then my analysis and conclusions about the Bible's teachings on the *foundations of the Earth* must somehow have to be shown to be in error. And the only way this could occur is for it to be demonstrated that the obvious, commonly-understood meanings of the

words of the Bible on this most important topic are not the true meanings at all; instead it would have to be somehow shown that God intended these words to have vague and uncertain meanings, where each person can pick and choose his own meanings, meanings that would then be open to question, meanings such that it would be difficult to really ascertain the truth. It would be like every man for himself. All would be free to pick and choose so as to fit in their pet theory of how the Earth originated. In this case the common man would have no chance to understand the biblical truth of creation if he sought help from the experts.

On the other hand, if my analysis of what *God's Word has always plainly taught* about the creation of Earth's primordial rocks is correct, then the words of the Bible on this most important topic have their obvious meaning. This would make it easy for the common man to conclude that God meant for El Capitan, Mt. Rushmore and Pike's Peak to stand tall as monuments of the accuracy of the literal meaning of Genesis. In that case it would again be very easy for the common man to conclude that God unmistakably marked the Genesis rocks as proof that He meant exactly what He said on Mt. Sinai when Christ wrote with His own finger that, ". . . *in six days the Lord made heaven and Earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day.*"

I think that some who read this might readily agree that only one of the foregoing is realistic. Even so, there are certain tests available which even further confirm this assessment. The first and foremost is from the Bible itself. I again refer to that part of Andrew's 11/17/02 email, where he says, "*We would welcome you joining us in showing compromising Christians and unbelievers alike that these evidences in God's world powerfully support what God's Word has always plainly taught.*" I am much pleased, that Andrew and ICR agree that we should stand on the scriptures. That means in particular we must stand firmly on what Paul said to the Galatians:

*I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ.*

*But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. (Galatians 1:8-9)*

So the fundamental reason underlying *my* belief that God did lead in Andrew's earlier participations in the videos, as well as his subsequent affirmations of them, is because they are clearly in accord with the biblical definition of the granites being the foundations of the Earth. Thus, in my view, there is no question that in principle Paul's counsel applies to Andrew's earlier affirmations. So, even if he were now to claim that an angel of heaven led him to different views, I would be unable to go with him. In fact, I must strongly oppose him on this matter. But how can I know for certain whether I must do this if ICR persists in its present course?

Quite simply, if God did lead in Andrew's previous assessment of granites and their enclosed polonium halos being primordial, it follows there must be something drastically wrong with the evidence he and ICR now cite as a basis for their promotion of a diametrically opposite view. If facts do reveal fatal flaws in that position, then Andrew and ICR have, most unfortunately — and up until now, most unwittingly — become entwined in the process of perpetrating one of the more significant misconceptions ever to come upon the creation science community. If nothing else than for my own edification, it behooves me to diligently pursue the truth about these new claims. They must be critically tested in every possible way.

## Part VIII

### More fallacies in the claims of a secondary origin of granite.

To begin this section it is most helpful to quote from Andrew's 11/17/03 email:

- *"Bob, as your friends and your Christian brothers, we have to say, unfortunately very bluntly, that it is wrong for you to go on denying and rejecting the many impeccable observational evidences, that are not tainted with uniformitarianism, but which unequivocally show that many granites were formed from magmas derived by the melting of sediments at temperatures and pressures that destroyed contained fossils."*

Actually, we need to understand that it is not observational evidences per se — or even impeccable observational evidences — that are at issue here. Rather it is the conclusions that are reached from the examination of whatever geological features may be in question. And of course the conclusions are not separate entities; they depend on the interpretive assumptions used. Thus whatever conclusions are obtained from the examination of any geological feature, are actually only as good as the lens itself — meaning, of course, the set of interpretive assumptions that were adopted.

The above makes it appear that observational evidences are *equivalent* to geological facts. The truth is that what is being claimed to be impeccable evidences *do not in fact even exist*, apart from certain underlying assumptions. All that really exists are the geological features, which in this case are being interpreted as impeccable observational evidences. Logically speaking, the above argument is fatally flawed because a *non sequitur* has been introduced into the argument. What is being claimed as being impeccable evidences are in reality only interpretations based on certain uniformitarian assumptions. More specifically, when it is claimed that ". . . many impeccable observational evidences, that are not tainted with uniformitarianism, but which unequivocally show that many granites were formed

*from magmas derived by the melting of sediments at temperatures and pressures that destroyed contained fossils,"* this is in reality an invalid claim. Andrew obviously was not present during the occurrence of the events he describes. Yet he makes it appear that his interpretation is the same as having been there and actually seen it happen.

This of course is how geologists have worked for about the last two centuries. I refer to the fact that in reality the only truth about a geological site is its visual appearance and what it actually contains in the here and now. However, geologists are trained to merge their descriptions of a site with their interpretations of its history using plausibility arguments based on their evolutionary-oriented assumptions. The overall impression conveyed by this approach is that geological interpretations are viewed as having the same credibility as does the existence of the site itself. This process, multiplied innumerable times all over the Earth for the past two centuries, easily explains why the evolutionary scenario of Earth history has gained such wide credibility. Indeed, the mentality behind this deception is so pervasive that nearly the whole world has come to disregard the seven-day creation in Genesis and to accept the evolutionary fabrication about a 4.5-billion-year Earth history.

Indeed, the fact that conventional geologists and physicists have long gotten away with promoting an ancient Earth history by really nothing more than clever manipulation of geological and radiometric terminologies, which the common man doesn't understand (being almost invariably intimidated from asking their meanings for fear of being ridiculed by these experts), leads me to be wary that Andrew and ICR may unwittingly have adopted the same mindset, and are now in the process of implicitly employing what I refer to as the **Eminent Geologist (EG)** approach. It could just as well be **Eminent Biologist, Eminent Paleontologist, Eminent Physicist, Eminent Astrophysicist, Eminent Cosmologist**, or any other **Eminent Scientist (ES)**. As far as the world's news and TV media are concerned, they are all in the **ES** category, and information that an **ES** releases concerning any facet of the presumed evolutionary history of the cosmos, the Earth, and life thereon, gets swallowed by the media and then regurgitated to the world, without any mention of the hidden, fallacious underlying assumptions on which their releases are based.

It's undoubtedly one of the most powerful tools ever devised to subvert the great biblical truths of creation to what is in reality a vast deception. Indeed, the great

success that conventional geologists have enjoyed using the **EG** method in convincing the world of geological evolution is nothing short of amazing. Because of its pervasiveness I must keep in mind the possibility that this method — namely, that whatever claims that an eminent geologist makes are quite often widely accepted as factual — may occupy a significant role in supporting ICR's claim of finding a geological feature, or occurrence, *not tainted with uniformitarianism*, but which unequivocally supports their claim of granites' secondary origin from fossiliferous Flood rocks. Andrew's email cites three evidences that are presumed not to be so tainted.

## Part IX

### **Flaws in picturing phase equilibria experiments as supporting the view of a secondary origin of granites, revealed by failure of those experiments to actually synthesize granites.**

We now turn to Andrew's presumed laboratory confirmation of his claim of a secondary origin of granite, as stated in his email's Point 1.

- *"Sedimentary basins ought to be places where granite magmas were generated. . . . At depths of 5-10 km . . . the pressures and temperatures can reach 5 kbar and 735°C respectively. These phase equilibria experiments indicate that under such conditions the fossiliferous sediments would partially melt to form granitic magmas . . . [which] would then rise through fractures to intrude into the overlying fossiliferous sediments. Subsequent erosion has exposed at the Earth's surface the cooled granite bodies intruded into those fossiliferous sediments."*

The common man would find it very difficult to comprehend this description; hence he would find it equally difficult to decide if these conclusions are valid. However, I know the language, and it's easy for me to unravel what Andrew is attempting to prove. In essence he has drawn conclusions based on a close mixing of a few facts to make it appear there is a credible basis for the conclusions he attempts to establish. In fact, the phase equilibria experiments being cited have nothing to do with the claim that granites are secondary rocks derived from fossil-containing sedimentary rocks. The common man cannot readily see that. But he can understand the fact that if this claim had merit, many others would long ago have employed these procedures to prove this contention by synthesizing granite in the lab, something which thousands of experiments have failed to accomplish. More on this shortly.

Indeed, what evolutionists have desperately tried to hide is that their multitudinous experiments have in reality failed to confirm the naturalistic origin of granite. But in order to maintain the fiction of evolution and a slowly cooling Earth in spite of this laboratory disproof, evolutionists must at the same time continue such experiments and interpret them in a sufficiently vague way so as to convey the impression that the results somehow do favor, or support, the evolutionary view of Earth history. In other words, by closely assimilating experimental data with interpretations, and by omitting discussion of the critical, underlying assumptions used to transfer data into conclusions, they leave the impression — which is almost universally accepted as fact — that their interpretations follow logically from the experimental results. The truth is just the opposite. In truth the experimental results disprove their interpretations. It's the same old game that began in the Garden of Eden, of merging truth with error so closely that few can distinguish between them. The result is a gigantic hoax that perpetuates the ruse of evolution and its vast deception that granites are secondary rocks derived from the melting of fossiliferous sedimentary rocks.

With all due respect to ICR and Andrew, it seems that Point 1 merges an essentially uniformitarian view of granite's secondary origin so closely with the data as to leave the impression that granite must be secondary, whereas in fact there is no genuine connection at all. Essentially the same thing is done in Point 3 of Andrew's email.

## Part X

### Fallacies in the arguments that skarns support a secondary origin of granite.

To be specific, Point 3 claims to find field evidence for the secondary origin of granite from studies of skarns.

- *"Local boundaries argue for an igneous origin of granites. In the field, and . . . within mines . . . , the effects on the host rocks of the intrusion of hot granitic magmas can be observed, including veining, stoping and contact metamorphism. The most spectacular examples of the latter are skarns, where granitic magmas have metamorphosed limestones to produce new minerals under high temperature and pressure conditions which have been verified by phase equilibria experiments."*

Since I understand the language spoken here, it's easy for me to spot the fallacies. However, those untrained in geology could well read the above and not perceive this because the issues are confused by the EG approach combined with faulty logic. For example, the first sentence attempts to make it plausible that certain local boundaries *argue for an igneous origin of granites*. This introduction implies two things, first, that there exists valid data or observations, and, second, that these can be interpreted so as to constitute a logical progression in support of the claim being made. In fact, this description does not support these implications.

Everyone knows rocks can be melted when in contact with deep heat sources. There is no mystery here. They know it because they see photos of volcanic eruptions. And lab studies show that heat and pressure applied to limestone do produce the same kind of mineralogical changes seen in sites intruded by rock melts (or magmas). But this is where it all ends. None of this, singly or collectively, supports the claim that magma from any melted rock type cools to form granite. There is absolutely no connection between the two. And yet this is precisely what is implicitly being attempted to be conveyed. In essence, here the

**EG** approach and flawed logic are used to construct what is a *non sequitur* to convey the desired conclusion.

Along the same lines, on page 440 of the RATE book, Andrew cites certain geological reports that are pictured as challenging the primordial origin of granite because of *documentation* obtained by *field research*. In reality *documentation* refers to items or information that can be proven or substantiated with a high level of confidence. Classifying the *field research* of certain authors as *documentation* conveys the impression that their conclusions were obtained using well-established, verifiable, reproducible, scientific principles. In fact, examination of the reports shows that what exists are only interpretations based on the usual, badly-flawed, evolutionary uniformitarian assumptions which are, of course, just the opposite of documentation. In reality the reports cited there contain the same kind of confusion between fact and geological speculation that appears in any number of highly adversarial evolutionist web sites that unsuccessfully attempt to cast in doubt my publications on the primordial origin of granites and their enclosed polonium halos.

Actually, it's not a complete surprise that Andrew has made reference to field studies to support plausibility arguments for granites originating from fossiliferous sedimentary rocks. I am not surprised because this is what conventional PhD geology training is all about — that is, going out and drawing conclusions about the time and order of emplacement by using certain interpretive assumptions. Yes, for the past two hundred years geologists have been using what they claim are the only geologically-correct assumptions to interpret Earth history. On that basis they have published millions of pages of geological descriptions that support the evolutionary view of Earth history. Thus they have succeeded in perpetuating belief in one of the cleverest deceptions in human history, specifically that the Earth and all it contains are the product of either blind, mindless evolutionary forces, or of theistically-aided evolution, over billions of imaginary years. Unfortunately, the same flawed uniformitarian assumptions that characterize evolutionary geology and its variant — theistically-aided evolution — continue to haunt the halls of modern creationism.

With all due respect to my friend Andrew, his use of skarns corresponds closely to that I encountered over ten years ago when I was responding to claims of an evolutionist who likewise claimed that skarns proved granite was of secondary origin. His views were almost exactly the same as those noted above. The

similarity is very great. I visited and studied all the sites that this particular evolutionist referred to in support of his claims and, in years past, discussed some of my findings with Andrew. But I didn't reveal all that I discovered at those sites, and from my subsequent experimental analyses of the specimens I collected. Both studies unequivocally deny the assertion that skarns corroborate a Flood origin of granites.

## Part XI

### Examining the contention that regional relationships provide evidence for an igneous origin of granites.

Point 2 of Andrew's email contains his last argument for a fossiliferous Flood-rock origin of granite. The basis of his argument is almost identical to the others.

- *"Regional relationships provide evidence for an igneous origin of granites. In the field it is possible to literally walk over the outcrops from fossiliferous sedimentary rocks through zones of metamorphosed sedimentary rocks, whose mineral constituents reflect the increasing temperatures and pressures of regional metamorphism (these temperatures and pressures being verified by many phase equilibria experiments), to where the felsic minerals in the metasedimentary rocks have melted to form migmatites, and then finally to where at temperatures around 735°C and pressures of 5 kbar and above the whole rock melted to form granite . . . . One classic example is the Cooma Granodiorite in southeastern Australia. Other examples abound, in Scotland, Germany and elsewhere, including the Zoroaster Granite in the Grand Canyon, and the Harney Peak Granite in South Dakota."*

Again my friend Andrew has described a scenario which he fervently believes is truth. The problem is that what is described is only what he infers happened in the past. What exists today at the sites mentioned is all that is actually known. What Andrew seems to overlook is that his conclusions about how these sites came to their present condition are completely dependent on the interpretive assumptions he employs. It's almost as if he doesn't realize these underlying assumptions even exist.

Nevertheless, they do exist, and it is quite evident that the assumptions used here are virtually identical with those of conventional geology. It's just that simple. If you use their assumptions, you will come to their conclusions about the secondary

origin of granite. However, I realize that some who read this may think the evolutionary assumptions are correct after all, and hence that the description given may still have some credibility. So, I want to go a step further in reasoning this out. From now on in this document I will address Andrew personally.

I am asking you to stop and consider this matter, my friend, for there is a very significant question you have unwittingly introduced into your discussion. We have known each other much more than ten years. You know of the primordial polonium halo evidence that I believe is coercive for granites being primordial rocks. You know of my scientific reports on that evidence which remain unrefuted after several decades of being critically tested. And you also know that I am the one person who potentially stands in your and ICR's way of convincing the creation science community — and for that matter, as many in the world as you can get to listen — of your new paradigm, which is that granites are secondary rocks and that you have solved the tiny mystery of creation within the realm of known physical laws. So it stands to reason that you and ICR would want to make every reasonable effort to convince me of the facts of your case, on the premise that I would be fair enough to come on board with you and ICR, if the facts so warrant it. After all that would be a reasonable assumption, for I am not a stranger. You both have known me for many years, and you, Andrew, and I have collaborated on the videos for many years.

So I ask: If you really believe to have discovered various sites where, in your words, *"it is possible to literally walk over the outcrops from fossiliferous sedimentary rocks through zones of metamorphosed sedimentary rocks, [to where] the whole rock melted to form granite"*, then why didn't you long ago call me and offer to lead me to the exact spot in the Zoroaster Granite in the Grand Canyon where this phenomena exists? According to the above description, you believe to have an open and shut case. And, according to the November 2002 *Acts and Facts* you have been in America collecting specimens in Yosemite in the recent past. Likewise, why didn't you offer to lead me to the exact spot at Harney Peak Granite in South Dakota where I could walk over *from sedimentary rocks to granite*, and possibly be as convinced as you are that indeed the sedimentary rocks had gone through the same process of transformation that you now describe? Your silence caught my attention, and so in April I called ICR and asked Steve Austin if, during his many trips to the Grand Canyon, he had ever seen any sites that fitted the description you give. He said he would think about it and get back with me if such came to mind, either there or elsewhere. Shortly thereafter I called again and asked

John Arend the same questions. Steve never called back, but John Arend did send back an email saying that neither he nor Steve Austin knew of the sites you describe. Does this not tell you something?

Indeed, why is it, my friend, that despite evolutionary geologists' long and very diligent efforts to find something to cast my published evidence for primordial halos and granites in doubt — and despite the fact that thousands of them are well acquainted with the geology of the Grand Canyon and the Harney Peak Granite — none have ever even remotely mentioned to me of having found evidence for the kind of geological scenario for the secondary origin of granite that you now claim. May I respectfully suggest the reason for this deafening silence is that your claim is not only fatally flawed; it can easily be shown to be fatally flawed by the simple process of carrying it to its logical conclusion.

In particular, when you claim to find sites *you where the felsic minerals in the metasedimentary rocks have melted to form migmatites, and then finally to where at temperatures around 735°C and pressures of 5 kbar and above the whole rock melted to form granite,*" you are, first of all, very definitely claiming to know the precise, naturally-occurring conditions under which such melts cooled to form granites. Of course you didn't see this actually occur. Rather it's only an assumption you make. So in effect you are again attempting to prove your thesis for a secondary origin of granite by making assumption appear as fact. Nevertheless, because your assumption of granite origin precisely matches the temperature and pressure conditions which evolutionary geologists believe are those needed for granites to form, this brings us to the defining moment of deciding the validity of your claim — namely, that your contention about granites and polonium halos being secondary in origin suffers a fatal blow from the fact that nowhere do you propose an experimental test of your hypothesis. The fact is that anyone who proposes a hypothesis without proposing an experimental test generally has no worries about defending it against falsification. But in your case, even though you avoid mentioning it, there is a definitive test. Thus it's time to focus attention on this exceedingly important topic, and how and why it is the downfall of what you and ICR have so widely promoted.

## **Part XII**

**Before and since the Arkansas creation trial, I have widely publicized an experimental test, whose outcome unequivocally falsifies both the linchpin of evolutionary geology as well as your hypothesis of the secondary origin of granite and their enclosed polonium halos. Proof that it is a genuine falsification test: It has confronted the worldwide scientific community for over twenty-four years without being contradicted by evolutionists or anyone else.**

As a physicist it's very easy for me to identify the reason for your failure to find valid geological arguments to support your thesis. It has to do with experiments.

In 1979 I published an experimental test squarely built on the same paradigm that has long been the foundational test of all modern physical theories — namely, that any theory which makes predictions based on the uniformitarian action of known physical laws is open to verification or falsification depending on whether the predictions of it's fundamental postulates are confirmed or contradicted by laboratory testing.

Now since evolutionists widely affirm that their theory is scientific, then they must hold and do hold to the premise that everything developed solely by the action of known physical laws, which means that they must also hold that granites and their enclosed polonium halos formed naturally, only by the action of known physical laws.

Realizing this fact was to me a God-send, for I saw in it a way where seekers for truth everywhere — especially the common man who might well have been terribly confused about the Bible and Genesis because of his earlier education — could now be brought out of darkness into the marvelous light of God's Word.

How could they be thus enlightened? By realizing that God has provided everyone with such a fantastically simple means of linking the Biblical foundations of the Earth with His own unique Po-halo signature of creation.

A great scientific truth is that a theory's validity or falsity is never determined by how much data can be fitted into that theory. Literally thousands of data-points or observations can be put into the framework of a theory, and yet the theory can be completely false. A prime example was the Ptolemaic theory of geocentric planetary motion, which for about two thousand years was accepted as accounting for planetary movements within the solar system. Not until Copernicus published the evidence for his revolutionary heliocentric theory — evidence which completely contradicted the foundational premise of the Ptolemaic hypothesis — did the truth begin to emerge.

Something of a similar nature has been occurring in geology for about two centuries or more. For all that time conventional geologists have so effectively promoted the idea that granites formed deep underground from slow cooling during eons of Earth's history that virtually the whole world has followed their lead. Few realize it as yet, but one of the greatest *faux pas* in the history of science is that geologists constructed their theory of Earth's geological evolution and ancient age using two fatally flawed assumptions, one being the previously discussed uniform decay rate assumption, and the other being the naturalistic formation of granite. And it is this *faux pas* that you and ICR appear to have overlooked in promoting a secondary origin of granite. In particular, as will now be shown, the cornerstone postulate of granite's naturalistic formation is even more seriously contradicted by experimental testing than was Copernicus' disproof of the Ptolemaic system.

In 1979, while still a Visiting Scientist in the Chemistry Division of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, I published to the world's scientific community — see discussion on pages 65-66 of my book concerning the essence of my remarks which were published in [\*EOS, Transactions of the American Geophysical Union\*](#) — that if the commonly accepted view of granite's origin was correct, then it must be possible to duplicate what happened in nature and reproduce at least a hand-sized piece of granite in the laboratory, and also to reproduce at least one polonium-218 halo in a piece of granite wherein all the halos have been annealed away.

Stated differently, since, according to geological evolutionary theory, granites had

formed hundreds of thousands of times throughout Earth's presumed 4.5-billion-year history — and since, furthermore, all these multitudinous occurrences of granite formation are held to have taken place under exactly the same physical laws that now govern the cosmos and the Earth — then it is inescapable that it must be possible to duplicate or synthesize granite in the modern laboratory setting using the same conditions under which granites were presumed to have formed deep underground. On the other hand, failure to synthesize a piece of granite and produce just one polonium-218 halo in a piece of annealed granite would falsify evolutionary geology's uniformitarian assumption about the natural formation of granite and its enclosed polonium halos, and thus prove that God had created both the granites and their enclosed polonium halos in such a way as to verify they were His creation, stamped with His signature, impossible for man to duplicate.

To reiterate, the significance of all this was that it was published in an established, widely-read scientific communication that went out to the entire 20,000-plus membership of the American Geophysical Union. It was published because the AGU Editor saw something in what I said that he recognized as presenting a challenge to evolution that had never appeared before the scientific community previously, and he was fair enough to approve it for publication, and let the chips fall where they may. But there was absolutely no response from the worldwide scientific community from 1979 until the time I was scheduled to appear as expert witness for creation in December 1981 at the Arkansas creation trial. (Neither has any provable claim of granite synthesis or polonium halo duplication appeared in scientific journals or otherwise since then.) So I presented this challenge during my testimony at the trial. Indeed, the challenge preceded my testimony by a few days because David Williams, the Arkansas Assistant Attorney General, closely cross-examined Brent Darymple, the ACLU's leading geology witness, about why geologists had not been able to synthesize granite, nor produce a polonium-218 halo.

As my book recounts, it was here that the ACLU almost lost their collective shirts before Judge Overton. Why? Because Brent gave such evasive answers as to why evolutionists hadn't been able to synthesize even a small piece of granite, and why neither he nor any of his colleagues could account for or duplicate the existence of polonium halos in these rocks. When pressed for an answer as to the cause of his and his colleagues' continuing failures to meet the challenge of creation, as a last resort he was forced to call polonium halos "a tiny mystery," for which he hoped someday to find an answer. Nevertheless, Judge Overton accepted Brent's lame

excuses, and the ACLU barely escaped. As you know, Andrew, my recounting of that close call is a centerpiece of my book, as well as being featured in the *Fingerprints* video.

Well, why should I go into this much detail and again emphasize the importance of this crucial test? The answer is, first, because of its enormous implications in proving that neither granites nor their enclosed polonium halos formed by the action of natural laws. In particular, even though at this writing over twenty-four years have lapsed since first being published, we find that evolutionists and certain creationists continue to make every attempt to bury the whole issue. Why? Because it's something that very definitely experimentally tests their view of Earth's history and which, when applied to the issue at hand, clearly disproves their view of granite's secondary origin. Since it's something they cannot scientifically counter, to them it has become unwanted information, and their only recourse is to either ignore it, or otherwise do their best to imply it has no significance for the evolution/creation controversy.

Not surprisingly, then, the evolutionists and creationists who combined forces about ten years ago at the Second ICC to criticize my work, didn't want any part of admitting that thousands of attempts of granite synthesis over the last several decades had miserably failed to produce the much sought after confirmation of the evolutionary prediction of granite's naturalistic origin. They wanted to hide the fact that all this had come to the worldwide attention of tens of thousands of evolutionists, not only those in geology, but in all fields of science, and with absolutely nothing but a deafening silence for a response.

Perhaps many who read this document may not know that the failure of world-renowned evolutionists to overthrow the primordial polonium halo evidence for granites' fiat creation at the 1981 Arkansas trial resulted in great consternation within the ranks of the ACLU contingent of lawyers and geologists. It was during the trial that I learned that, behind the scenes, the ACLU was much concerned that this evidence was being presented in such a widely publicized forum without their being able to refute or overturn it, even when they had the best minds in evolutionary geology at their disposal. In the six months after the trial, while still a Visiting Scientist at ORNL, their anxiety was somewhat muted, for they were hoping that some evolutionist somewhere would surely come forward quickly to refute the primordial polonium halo evidence for creation, and do so publicly. What concerned them most was that two years earlier I had proposed the

experimental test that could be done in the here and now to clearly settle the crucial question of whether granites and their enclosed polonium halos were of secondary origin, or whether they both were part of Earth's primordial creation. They were doubtless hoping that some evolutionist would quickly produce a synthesized piece of granite and, coincidentally, to replicate a Po-218 halo in an annealed piece of granite.

They had a golden opportunity to do this at the 63<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting of the Pacific Division of the AAAS in Santa Barbara in June 1982, where the AAAS sponsored its widely advertised Evolutionists Confront Creationists Symposium. The organizers chose ICR's Duane Gish and Harold Slusher to present the creation view in opposition to eight presenters for evolution. But Slusher backed out. When I learned of this I volunteered and, very reluctantly, the symposium organizers invited me instead.

In attendance were several hundred evolutionary geologists; all were hoping that Brent Dalrymple would somehow be able to redeem his failure to solve the tiny mystery of creation at the Arkansas trial in either of two ways. One way doubtlessly hoped for the most was that Brent would have actually demonstrated the synthesis of a hand-sized piece of real granite in the lab, and that he would also somehow have demonstrated how he was able to synthesize just one Po-218 halo in a piece of granite from which all the halos had been annealed. Failing either of these, they hoped he would somehow be able to portray a plausible evasion to this dual challenge that I had thrown down during both my trial testimony and prior publication in *EOS*. The history of that challenge, which caused much consternation among the ACLU entourage at the trial, and has continued to cause very great consternation in the ranks of evolutionists generally — and even some who call themselves creationists — is summarized in my book.

Well, Brent failed to produce the goods, and I learned that at least one prominent evolutionary biologist at UC Santa Barbara was perplexed as to why geologists were unable to produce the critical proof for geological evolution. But for the most part the several hundred geologists went away apparently unconcerned about his failure.

Now if evolutionists had really wanted to know the truth about granite's origin, they would obviously have been ecstatic about immediately following up on this test. Why? Because after more than two centuries of nothing more than speculation

and guesswork based on their own uniformitarian-based interpretations of various rock formations, it would at long last have afforded them the golden opportunity to be in step with the foundational principle of all modern physical theories — which is that a theory is not a scientific theory until its fundamental postulates have been confirmed by laboratory experimentation.

Well, the passage of time has shown that evolutionary geologists want nothing to do with a laboratory test that would challenge their prevailing paradigm, which is, "We know the truth about Earth's history because we believe that our uniformitarian way of interpreting the rocks is valid." Yes, they believe they know. Tragically, they overlook the fact that they are doing exactly what 2 Peter 3:2 says scoffers are going to be saying in the last days — namely, "Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation?"

In essence they have long played the game of pretending to have a scientific theory of Earth's origin and development, all the while hoping that no one would ever catch on to the fact that over the last fifty years their continued speculations about granite formation have really been tested many times, and found to be fatally flawed. In other words, if they would only have stopped to consider the situation, they would realize that countless laboratory experiments have shown that granite does not form in the laboratory when attempts have repeatedly been made to duplicate its formation under the conditions duplicating the high pressures and slow cooling deep in the Earth. By now there have been five national and international symposia on the Origin of Granite held by the world's most eminent geologists, and many hundreds of papers have been given presuming to throw some light on why the origin of granite is still a geological mystery. As our [\*Fingerprints of Creation\*](#) video points out, the reason it remains a mystery to evolutionists is that they ignore the fact that all their attempts to reproduce granite in the laboratory continue to fail. In the parlance of modern physics, their theory of granites' naturalistic formation has been repeatedly falsified, and the god of this world has so blinded their eyes that they cannot see it.

Indeed, this failure is something that evolutionary geologists have desperately tried to hide for decades. Nothing disturbs them more than the fact that God put the creation/evolution issue before the world in the context of an experimental test that can decide the issue in the here and now. Indeed, the continued failure of evolutionists — and those creationists who have long opposed the clear

implications of my scientific results — to synthesize only a hand-sized piece of granite, and the subsequent production of a Po-218 halo in it, proves that the God of Heaven left an unambiguous signature of His creation in the rocks He created. We thus see how clearly the Lord made it possible to distinguish the true from the false when it comes to the question of the origin of the granites. Where does this bring us?

Earlier we saw that granites easily qualify as being part of the biblical foundations of the Earth. Now we see that the decisiveness of this test presents an insurmountable scientific obstacle to the position that you and ICR are now attempting to persuade the creation science community to accept. The question is what is to be done about it.

## Part XIII

### **Andrew's and ICR's proposal for a secondary origin of granite and enclosed polonium halos: Will both parties now confirm that it must pass the crucial test of experimental verification? Or are you both seeking a pass on this crucial question?**

The preceding section has shown that evolutionary geologists have thus far maintained the fiction of a secondary origin of granite by evading the application of experimental testing to their hypothesis, even though experimental testing is the *raison d'etra* of all modern physical theories. In other words, evolutionary geology has thus far gained credence only because the scientific community has until now unwittingly granted modern geology a pass on this crucial issue of testing its foundational assumptions. The question before us is whether you and ICR are now wanting to obtain an identical pass from the creation science community. It is a most relevant question because the previous discussion applies to your position. The reason we need an answer is that by denying the primordial origin of granites and their enclosed polonium halos, you have made it unambiguously certain that you are claiming a secondary origin of both. This puts your framework of explaining them squarely within the framework of natural physical laws.

This is exactly the same physical-law-testing constraint that evolutionists have successfully evaded in propagating their views of Earth's history. So, again, the question arises as to whether you intend to agree that your proposal for the secondary origin of granites and their enclosed polonium halos must pass the crucial experimental test as to its validity. At present it does not appear to be so. Why? Because on page 446 of the RATE book you, Andrew, present a number of plausibility arguments designed to cast this experimental test in doubt. Actually the arguments you cite are flawed.

For example, you first cite two evolutionists and your long-time friend to support your thesis of secondary granite formation. Such citing in fact shows how

scientifically deficient your case really is, for none of the reports you cite contains any tangible, verifiable experimental evidence to actually support the laboratory synthesis of granite as it is found naturally, which is in fact the only true test of what granite actually is. Instead they repeat the standard evolutionary line, which is that synthesis of certain *isolated minerals* appears to suggest that synthesis of granite itself may someday be possible. You pick up on that theme, saying, ". . . *it could only be a matter of time before granite is simulated in the laboratory.*"

With all due respect to you and ICR, that's the same old subtle appeal to defer judgment interminably that Brent Dalrymple used at the Arkansas trial to help facilitate the ACLU's escape from certain defeat for its advocacy of Earth's evolutionary origin and ancient age. Nonetheless, Judge Overton bought into this trickery and deception without any hesitation. And evolutionists have repeatedly used this ploy ever since in their continued attempts to avert the day of final reckoning, a day wherein the world will finally understand that evolutionary geologists' hypothesis of an anciently evolving Earth was long ago disproven by experimental testing.

Later, again on page 446 of the RATE book, you further evidence your aversion to submitting your hypothesis to experimental testing by citing another individual who, in purely philosophical terms, denigrates the idea of such testing having any relevance at all. What you don't say, however, is that you are very well aware that this individual has long been opposed to the primordial origin of granites and their enclosed polonium halos, and that you are also aware that his objections are almost completely of a philosophical rather than of a scientific nature. And there is more.

Even later on that same page you begin citing evolutionary geologists themselves in an attempt to buttress your arguments against testing uniformitarian views of granite's origin. Here you again hypothesize that, because certain individual mineral types have been grown in the lab, you can conclude, ". . . *it seems unwise to pose a challenge to geological uniformitarianism on the basis of whether or not a hand-sized piece of granite is synthesized, since future experiments in science are unpredictable.*"

Thus you virtually throw out the significance of the exact test that disproves your claim. In the final analysis it is not a matter of whether you think the test is wise or unwise. What really matters is the truth, which is that there is no mystery about whether granite melted in the lab will, under conditions known to duplicate those

deep in the Earth, cool slowly to form a duplicate of the original piece of granite. Such experiments have been done repeatedly, and the end result is not granite, but instead is always a fine-grained rock that is almost indistinguishable from rhyolite. In the parlance of modern physics, this result falsifies the assumption that granites formed naturally deep in the Earth. For evolutionary geologists — and some creationists as well — this fact is a very much unwanted truth, one they have thus far successfully kept clothed in utmost secrecy. In another document I note that the way the world's scientific community has been hoodwinked on this point is one of the greatest *faux pas* in the history of science. I am herein attempting to forestall the same thing happening to the creation science community.

The bottom line is that your claim for granite originating from the cooling of fossiliferous magma is directly contradicted and falsified by laboratory experiments, as well as by the presence of their enclosed primordial polonium halos. And there is more.

## **Part XIV**

**My obligation to the worldwide scientific community in light of your disseminating the claim that polonium halos in granites are secondary: I MUST SPEAK OUT FOR THE SAKE OF PASTORS AND MANY OTHERS WHO WOULD OTHERWISE BE BADLY MISLED INTO THINKING THEY MUST ACCEPT YOUR NEW POSITION BECAUSE OF THE STRENGTH OF YOUR REPUTATION OF BEING THE WORLD'S LEADING CREATION GEOLOGIST.**

Andrew, my friend, for you to continue down your present path may possibly lead to my having to confront the issue even more publicly. For example, as earlier indicated herein, Larry Vardiman sent out a report by you and Mark Armitage to the effect that you have both found evidence that falsifies my results on the primordial origin of polonium halos. What I find most interesting is that neither you, nor Mark Armitage, nor anyone at ICR, has informed me of these results, which indeed would be most startling if they are true. In other words, you and ICR have chosen to work together secretly, in a most clandestine fashion to accomplish your goal of undermining my published results prior to my obtaining knowledge of your results. But have you and Mark really falsified my published works? And have you, for reasons best known to you and ICR, decided to keep it all a secret until you spring it on me?

Or is it true that you are now in the process of making claims of falsification based on the same kind of flawed plausibility arguments that you have advanced to supposedly provide unequivocal evidence for the secondary origin of granites?

There is a very easy and straightforward way to decide which it is.

Specifically, any claim for the secondary origin of polonium halos in granites clearly means that such must have formed naturally, by secondary processes, which even more specifically means — just as in the case of granites — that they

must have formed by nothing more than the action of known physical laws. Therefore, a laboratory test of whether polonium halos in granites really are secondary would be for them to be duplicated or synthesized in a piece of granite from which all halos have previously been annealed. As noted in my book, this is in fact part of the challenge I published in *EOS, Transactions of the American Geophysical Union*, back in 1979, which I then repeated at the Arkansas trial, and which I again presented at the widely attended, Evolutionists Confront Creationists Symposium, held as part of the 1982 Annual Meeting of the Western Division of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Santa Barbara.

Over twenty-four years have now elapsed since I first published that challenge, and there has been only a deafening silence. The failure of any team of evolutionists or creationists to accomplish this feat is why the tiny mystery of creation shines now even more brightly for God's glory than it did when Brent Dalrymple called it a tiny mystery at the Arkansas trial. And yes, even more recently, over the past decade this challenge has twice been forcefully presented to, on each occasion, about thirty thousand earth scientists, with no response whatsoever.

So, have you and Mark Armitage now succeeded where tens of thousands of evolutionists — and an untold number of creationists — have so signally failed? Have you now succeeded in producing even one Po-218 halo in a piece of granite? (I have a single specimen of biotite which has thousands per cubic centimeter, far more than one.) If not, may I suggest that your credibility, and that of ICR, will soon suffer far more than it has already suffered because of your present fallacious claim of having found unequivocal evidence of the secondary origin of granite. In my view your position is untenable, but not without hope if you and ICR are now willing to make amends.

Moreover, I strongly suspect that if your readership were now given the opportunity to review all those biblical passages on the foundations of the Earth contained herein — meaning, of course, if ICR were to publish all this information in a forthcoming issue of *A&F* — then you and ICR would very quickly learn it would be far more difficult to find any of the readership that would continue to buy into granites being secondary rocks derived from sedimentary rocks formed at the Flood. But, given the strong Christian affiliation that you and ICR have, would you not want to strongly consider taking action on this very soon? Even more, being an almost exclusively Christian audience, do not *A&F*'s readers expect that ICR will always and under all circumstances faithfully provide them with the whole biblical

truth — or should we say, all the biblical facts about the topic in hand in *Acts and Facts* — regardless of whether you ever give me the opportunity to respond or not?

So, it is quite evident that what is beginning to emerge from my response to your invitation to join with you, is now taking on meaning that is of far greater consequence than whether I will ever be able to do that. The tremendously urgent and imperative issue now at hand obviously pertains to the entire creation science community — and indeed to the world as a whole. For it focuses significant attention on the unreliable nature of the information that you and ICR have widely distributed to the hundred or so thousand persons who received your *Impact* #353, with its claim that granites are derived from fossiliferous sedimentary rocks, and thus that granites and their enclosed polonium halos cannot represent primordial rocks or primordial radioactivity.

Thus, with all due respect, and with due consideration of all the foregoing, it seems to me that you — and ICR as well — would have been far better off in your Nov. 17 email to have forthrightly admitted that you had erred, and that you really did not have unequivocal evidence for granites originating with fossiliferous sedimentary rocks at all. Whether you agree with this or not, I realize we must deal with what is, not with what is not. My suggestion for dealing with what is could be as simple as you and ICR admitting you had unwittingly erred and overstepped the bounds of scientific propriety. At issue here is the methodology you and your colleagues at ICR adopted to accomplish the dissemination of your claim of the secondary origin of granite and their enclosed polonium halos.

What you have attempted to do is to persuade the 100,000 trusting souls on ICR's mailing list of your plausibility arguments against a primordial origin of granites and their enclosed primordial polonium halos, and against the widely published scientific evidence of Earth's rapid creation — which evidence neither evolutionists nor creationists have ever been able to refute. Further, by attempting to discredit the experimental tests that can easily distinguish the true from the false, you and ICR have effectively taken a giant step toward completely divesting the origin of granite, and hence the origin of the Earth itself, from experimental testing in the laboratory in the here and now.

In this case there is left only one option upon which creationists could possibly build a model of Earth's history. And that is that some creation geologist, backed by the prestige of a world-renowned creationist organization, must come along

who will utilize a slightly modified form of conventional geology's time-honored assumption that the truth about Earth history can be obtained only by the elite few (one?) who, by long experience in mapping and close observation, have mastered the skill of rightly interpreting just how and when various geological formations were emplaced.

Thus this geologist and his host organization would by default become the ultimate authorities on creation and the Flood — authorities who are now most unfortunately bent on attempting to convince the world of a geological paradigm that denies the Bible's plainest statements relating to the identity of Earth's foundation rocks.

This is what I must oppose — and will expose, to the best of my very limited ability — if you and ICR continue on the path you have begun. It is my sincere hope that I will not have to do this. It remains my sincere hope that you and ICR will not only desist from propagating the errors thus far published, but will do an about-face and retract them yourselves, or provide me the opportunity of communicating the information contained herein to the readership of *Acts and Facts*.

I urge you to do this, for your claim that granites and their enclosed polonium halos are secondary is shown in every way to be based on false assumptions, which is all the more reason for you and ICR to join me in proclaiming the great truth of equating granites with the biblical definition of Earth's foundation rocks.

## Conclusion

This completes my prepublication response to *Impact* #353 and your email of 11/17/02. I remain much concerned that you have allowed yourself to become enmeshed in significant contradictions that will be quite difficult to extricate from except at great personal loss of face and perhaps significant financial loss as well. But far better, my friend, to heed my friendly counsel and immediately reverse the direction of your professional life. Even if ICR chooses not to retract the erroneous claims detailed herein, this will not prevent you from standing alone and doing so. It will take much courage, but the Lord is more than able to give the needed strength.

I am sincerely hoping this email will awaken you to a realization that you have been used as a pawn to accomplish what certain others have long wanted to accomplish. Heretofore they lacked a creationist of sufficient stature to make a credible try to disparage the evidence of God's great work of creation. Now, however, they have obviously persuaded you to attempt to supply that lack. For your sake I am hoping you will now see through such snares and break away before digging a deeper hole by further enmeshing yourself in these contradictions at the forthcoming Fifth ICC.

I very much hope to receive a positive response from you and ICR within the next few days. If nothing comes, I will assume you and ICR intend to maintain your present course. In that event, please be assured of my continued high personal esteem for you, even though of necessity I will then have to stand in opposition to you professionally.

I close by briefly referring to your attention Appendices A - C, each of which is self-contained and relevant to the issues discussed herein. I suggest you pay special attention to Appendix C. It shows that one of the world's leading evolutionary geologists continues to be at a loss to explain the tiny mystery of creation, and is not afraid to admit it, even after more than twenty years of searching for an answer.

There is more that will be included in the published document, but your 11/17/02 email will not be.

As ever, your friend,

Bob Gentry

P.S. This draft document will be edited before publication. It will include a response to any claims you might make at the Fifth ICC which would call my results in question.

## **Appendix A**

### **Failure of attempts to use cross-cutting of different rock types to disprove the primordial origin of granites and their enclosed polonium halos.**

I briefly mention this topic because there have been many adversaries who have long sought to focus on something sufficiently vague to make it appear that certain geological features cast doubt on the primordial origin of both granites and their enclosed polonium halos. You may remember that over a decade ago they focused on the cross-cutting features of different rock types in certain granitic environments; such, they claimed, cast in doubt the primordial origin of some of the granites that hosted a few of the mica specimens in which I had found polonium halos. Although they did not admit to it, their conclusion was implicitly based on the assumption that all such cross-cutting features must be secondary, such as lava flowing from a volcanic source and intruding into various cracks and cleavages where such existed in the flow area. What they did was akin to what you are doing now, which was to use the plausibility-argument approach to give credence to their views. They arbitrarily decided that God would not create rocks to appear with cross-cutting features, and proceeded to invent a pseudo contradiction that was of their own devising.

Obviously, they didn't read my book before doing this, for on page 129, in the section where I respond to Brent Dalrymple's testimony at the Arkansas creation trial, I explained that my creation model could easily account for such features as being traceable to diverse primordial liquids being instantly formed into primordial granites with exactly the cross-cutting features seen in many granitic locations, instead of the cooling of hot magmas envisioned by evolutionary theory.

Indeed, on page 203 of *Creation Tiny Mystery* I note that God obviously created a very wide diversity of cross-cutting features in various rock formations, and moreover did so, not to confuse geologists, but that they might see proof of His creation. Yes, my friend Andrew, you know very well of what I speak because, in

the *Fingerprints* video, you eloquently describe how the sharply defined boundaries, evident in the dark-and-light cross-cutting features in the granites and darker diorites at Palm Springs, are powerful evidence of granite's rapid creation. As you so ably point out, the lighter granites do not exhibit the thermal effects of the intrusion of a hot, darker, higher-melting-point magma. Your comparison of the primordial granites at Palm Springs with what happens when a hot magma actually does intrude a granitic rock, such as at Bishop, California, is one of the most easily understood and powerful geological evidences for the primordial origin of granites on the *Fingerprints* video.

## **Appendix B**

**The following document was submitted as a Letter to the Editor of *Science* concerning Roger Lewin's 5/17/85 news article in which he reported that researchers E. C. Scott and H. P. Cole could find no evidence of published evidence for creation and no evidence of censorship.**

**(Editor Daniel Koshland refused to publish it.)**

Roger Lewin (1) quotes Scott and Cole (2,3) to deny both the existence of recent published evidences for creation and the possibility of censorship. Despite these denials, all three of these evolutionists have omitted discussion of a critical test of the evolution and creation models. This test is derived from my published evidence which implies that polonium halos in Precambrian granites originated with primordial polonium (4). On this basis, these granites must be the primordial Genesis rocks of our planet, having been created rather than having crystallized naturally, as evolutionary geology supposes. If the Precambrian granites, with their polonium halos, are indeed the handiwork of the Creator, then, in my view, it is impossible to duplicate them. On the other hand, if the granites just formed naturally, as evolution assumes, then it should be possible to reproduce a hand-sized piece of granite in a modern scientific laboratory. My first opportunity to present this test to the scientific community came in 1979 (5). There was no response to this challenge; so on every available occasion I have repeated it (6) and focused attention on how clearly the issues are defined: Success in duplicating a granite containing just one Po-218 halo would confirm the evolutionary view that both these entities formed by natural processes, and this would falsify my creation model. Failure in this experiment would mean the opposite is true.

Now Scott and Cole (3) say, "It is the nature of scientists to study and debate any scientific fact or finding that challenges existing scientific theories and models. If even one of the creationists' basic assumptions or concepts were supported by empirical evidence from any of the fields of scientific inquiry, scores of scientists

would flock to the sites of the evidence and work earnestly to undo or 'falsify' prevailing scientific theories in light of this new evidence." Thus, when these authors were confronted with the falsification test in one of my publications (7), why didn't they issue an urgent call for "scores of scientists" to begin working "earnestly" on it?

A more penetrating question is why Lewin has maintained a deafening silence about this matter for over three years. He was present at the Arkansas trial when I testified about the polonium halo evidence for creation and explained the falsification test in detail. Yet he neglected to mention this decisive test of the two models in his coverage of the trial (8). I attempted to have this glaring omission (and other inaccuracies about my testimony) corrected through a rebuttal letter to *Science*, but my response was denied publication. Subsequently, I lost my position as a Guest Scientist at a national laboratory, even though shortly before my dismissal some of my latest research efforts (9) came to the favorable attention of the U.S. Senate (10).

How much longer will the scientific basis for creation be suppressed? For six years I have waited for those scientists who oppose creation to publish their results on the experimental challenge described above. Why would they wait interminably to refute what I claim to be unambiguous evidence for creation—except that they face an impossible task!

Robert V. Gentry

## **References**

1. R. Lewin, *Science* 228, 837 (1985).
2. H. P. Cole and E. C. Scott, *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 1982), p. 557
3. E. C. Scott and H. P. Cole, *Quat. Rev. Biol.* 60, 21 (1985).
4. R. V. Gentry, et al., *Science* 194, 315 (1976).  
R. V. Gentry, et al., *Nature* 252, 564 (1974)  
R. V. Gentry, *Science* 184, 62 (1974).  
\_\_\_\_\_, *Annual Rev. Nucl. Sci.* 23, 347 (1973).  
R. V. Gentry, et al., *Nature* 244, 282 (1973).  
R. V. Gentry, *Science* 173, 727 (1971).

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Science* 160, 1228 (1968).  
\_\_\_\_\_, *Nature* 213, 487(1967).
5. R. V. Gentry, *EOS* 60, 474 (1979).
  6. R. V. Gentry, *Proceedings of the 63<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting, Pacific Division, AAAS* 1, 38 (1984).  
\_\_\_\_\_, *Physics Today* (December 1984), p. 92.  
\_\_\_\_\_, *Physics Today* (April 1984), p. 108.  
\_\_\_\_\_, *Physics Today* (April 1983), p. 13.  
\_\_\_\_\_, *EOS* 61, 514 (1980).
  7. R. V. Gentry, *Physics Today* (October 1982), p. 13.
  8. R. Lewin, *Science* 215, 33 (1982); *Ibid.*, p. 142 (1982).
  9. R. V. Gentry, et al., *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 9, 1129 (1982).  
R. V. Gentry et al., *Science* 216, 296 (1982).
  10. *Congressional Record — Senate* 128, 4306 (1982).

## Appendix C

### **One of world's leading evolutionary geologists twice admits that polonium halos in granites still remain a tiny mystery.**

In 1991 Brent Dalrymple, the ACLU's chief geology witness against the polonium halo evidence for creation at the 1981 Arkansas creation trial, was the President of the approximately 30,000-member American Geophysical Union (AGU). Its members include the Earth, Atmospheric, and Ocean sciences. In 1992 Brent used the AGU's mailing list to send a fund-raising letter, with his signature, to all its members using the letterhead of the National Center for Science Education, a pro-evolution organization dedicated to preventing the teaching of creation science in the public school. I received his letter because I am an AGU member. In it Brent made the following comment about the urgency of finding a solution to the "tiny mystery" of creation:

- *The [creation] movement is beginning to affect some college classes, too, as members of Genesis Clubs enter classrooms with disruptive (and difficult to answer) questions. How would you answer a student who announced in your class that the Second Law of Thermodynamics doesn't permit evolution? Or that the presence of polonium halos in granite demonstrates that granite had to have formed suddenly (i.e., was specially created)?*

In 1995, just three years later I, along with the other 30,000 or so AGU members, received a similar fund-raising letter. As the following shows, in it Brent again sent out another SOS, telling all who received it how urgent it was that some conventional explanation of the "tiny mystery" of creation be found, for creationist students were continuing to bring this evidence into classrooms as proof of fiat creation.

- *The [creation] movement is beginning to affect some college classes, too,*

*as members of "Genesis clubs" enter classrooms with disruptive (and difficult to answer) questions. How would you answer a student who claims that the presence of polonium halos in granite demonstrates that granite had to have formed suddenly (i.e., was specially created)? [Note that this time he omitted reference to thermodynamics.]*

I find it most ironic that one of the world's leading evolutionary geologists, who has virtually everything to lose by admitting that polonium halos in granites remain a tiny mystery of creation, twice goes on record to tens of thousands of his colleagues, saying he can find no conventional explanation for them — while the world's leading creationist geologist, who previously has gone on record as believing just that, now begins to say that he can no longer find where they are evidence of fiat creation, but instead is now opting to believe that they are somehow of secondary origin. The Bible says that no lie is of the truth. Either the evolutionist or the creationist is now believing and disseminating the truth. There have been two conversions. Only one is of God.