

## INTER-OFFICE

To: Bill Dankenbring

Date: September 10, 1970

Department:

Subject: Chapter 6 of Proof of God Booklet  
(Geology)

From: Robert Macdonald

---

I generally found the material from the middle of page 10 to page 25 to be excellent. Here you have real proof that these animals were created and did not evolve. There is one good quote you could have used from Stokes: Essentials of Earths History, second edition, page 83. "Faunal succession as revealed by the study of fossils does not constitute positive proof of organic evolution...."

There are seven points which summarize the position we have held for many years concerning the geologic column. These points were all incorporated into this chapter.

1. There are many instances of strata having been laid down in the wrong order.
2. Thrust Faults were devised to explain the wrong order of strata and do not exist.
3. The geologic column is mostly incorrect.
4. Rocks are dated entirely by the fossils in them. The sequence of fossils used to date the rocks is merely assumed and is based on the theory of evolution.
5. The principle of faunal succession has little validity. All it shows is burial order.
6. Almost all of the strata from the Cambrian on up is a result of two floods.
7. The greater part of these strata was deposited rapidly.

All of these points in my opinion should be subjected to reexamination. In the pages to follow I will evaluate them.

Every one of the ideas in these points has its source in Creationist writings which try to cram the entire geologic history of the earth into 6000 years. This comes from a misunderstanding of the Bible. Not one of these points is based on what the Bible really says. It is not necessary to resort to using any of these points to disprove evolution. There is abundant, valid material available by which evolution can be disproved.

I have made comments on various minor items in the text of the chapter directly on the enclosed copies of its pages.

RM:slb

*Mr. Wyrman*  
The material from the page marked "Comments on Page 26-36" on contain the material on slow deposition of the Geologic Column.

INTER-OFFICE

**To:** Richard Sedliacek

**Date:** August 28, 1970

**Department:**

**Subject:** Article: Geology proves God exists

**From:** Robert Macdonald

---

I generally found the material from the middle of page 10 to page 25 to be excellent. Here you have real proof that these animals were created and did not evolve. There is one good quote you could have used from Stokes: Essentials of Earths History, second edition, page 83. "Faunal succession as revealed by the study of fossils does not constitute positive proof of organic evolution...."

But there are serious objections to the material before and after this, on which I have generally commented in the pages to follow. Specific comments on the text are on the enclosed copy.

Commentary on Pages 5-7

This idea that thrust faults are non-existent came from S.D.A. and Fundamentalist writers who, in their zeal to prove a point of view (a misunderstanding of the Bible), have hidden their eyes from all the evidence that they do exist. I have personally investigated the Lewis Overthrust area and have found ample evidence of its existence. I have studied into Whitcomb and Morris' attempt to disprove the existence of thrust faults and generally agree with what Mr. Herrmann has said about it in his paper (which I have included): "The Problem of Thrust Faults."

Hence, the statements about "mixed up" order of strata, and "older on top of younger," which have their source in arguments that thrust faults do not exist, are wrong. Geologists are careful to look for real evidence of a thrust fault. They don't base their claims on wrong order. I have never heard of a legitimate case of strata being found in the "wrong order."

Of course, the 100 miles of the geologic column does not exist at any one place on the earth. No one says it does. It is a cumulative column for the world. It would be impossible to have sedimentation going on continuously worldwide without erosion at some locations. But a good representative portion of it does exist in the Arizona-Utah area: about two miles of it. All except for two geologic periods are represented in this area, and the fossils in these sequences do hold to the generally accepted pattern. This summer I accompanied an Ambassador College geology class which investigated this area and I can personally testify to the validity of this portion of the column. It is very plain and easily traced in this area.

As I said before, it is impossible to have continuous sedimentation worldwide; erosion has to take place from time to time. And as one would expect, there would be times at which neither erosion nor sedimentation would be taking place. So unconformities and breaks in the sequence of deposition should be no surprise. I have seen many unconformities. They do exist.

Hence I would disagree with the general statement at the bottom of page 7. In my opinion, the geologic column is nearly correct.

HISTORICAL GEOLOGY - - - The Problem of Thrust Faults

1. The theory of continental drift is accepted by about 50% of the world's geologists today. In 1933 it is estimated that no more than 2% believed this theory true. The current view is that the continents, the ocean floor, and the upper part of the mantle are moving as a unit rather than the older idea that the continents were moving across the ocean floor. Thousands of miles of displacement are involved.
2. Glaciers have moved many hundreds of miles with embedded rocks in their undersides grinding slowly across bedrock. At times this overrides a considerable thickness of ground moraine rather than moving it forward. The point in both cases 1 and 2 is that we have actual "thrust faults" on a very large scale.
3. If the outer crust of the earth were to shift, new portions would be moved over the equatorial regions and these new portions would have to stretch to fit the equatorial buldge. Rift valleys would result from this stretching of the crust.
4. Portions of the earth's crust moving from the equatorial regions to temperate zones would find themselves too large to fit the smaller earth circumference. Thrust faulting on a scale of twenty to thirty miles could result.
5. Displacement of up to 600 miles has been measured for the San Andreas Fault. It is conceivable that wedgeshaped areas might be crowded for room and cause local thrustfaulting, or the thrust might be transferred to an area miles away. Mountains are regularly forced up along the trace of a major fault such as the San Andreas.
6. Deep focus earthquakes along the east coast of Asia show a relationship between volcanoes, deep sea trenches, and crustal movement along an oblique plane.
7. The men who discovered thrust faults were motivated by curiosity and disputed the phenomenon among themselves without any religious doctrine involved in any way. Neither evolution nor atheism was involved.
8. The religious men who immediately opposed thrust faults hoped to use "wrong order" strata and fossils to disprove the general burial sequence of fossils and thereby discredit the concept of Faunal Succession which implied evolution. Two Creations are buried in sequence, and in each "Flood" the slow moving, weaker and bottom dwelling forms are buried first. Faunal succession is merely burial order."
9. Failure of these religious writers to recognize the pre-Adamic creation as separate from the creatures made to be with Adam led them to insist on one Flood to account for all fossils. They could not distinguish Satan's world from man's. Nor do they see Satan as Ruler of today's world.
10. What appears to be very poor quality research, if not deliberate falsification of evidence and quotation out of context, is evident in the writings of a number of prominent catastrophists. In their zeal to disprove the one wrong idea of evolution, they have added a legion of errors and untold confusion to the problem that faced the Bible-believing Christian. The motivation of many a catastrophist is that of upholding the church doctrine rather than to search out the truth of the matter. Each has added his own errors to the confusion of the one before him. The quality of their research is only surpassed by the deception their leaders practice in maintaining the doctrinal errors of the particular denomination.

CONCLUSION--Thrust Faults do indeed exist on both small and worldwide scales. They in no way support evolutionary theory, though they do support the idea of two creations and two destructions by water which buried life forms in a general sequence as the violence of the destruction increased.

Faunal succession is generally a valid principle. The order in which fossils are found in the two miles of the sequence in the Arizona-Utah area conforms to what is claimed. This is a very easy area to study as the strata are found one on top of the other generally, with no possibility of mistake.

Faunal succession shows not that life has evolved, but that life on earth has changed throughout geologic history. I think you, believing in two creations, would agree with this statement in principle. Life in the Paleozoic was certainly different from life today! Faunal succession does show that at various times, various organisms were created, and at other times other organisms were wiped out. I do not believe faunal succession is just a result of the sorting action of water. My reasons for this will be dealt with later.

The rocks of each age do bear distinctive fossils, and there is a good measure of validity to the dating of strata by fossils. I think you would agree with this in principle. You would not expect to find a dinosaur skeleton in a stratum containing mammoth bones, or vice versa. You would know that the stratum with the dinosaur remains was older.

On the matter of dating rocks from the fossils and vice versa: The idea that the reasoning is totally circular is not quite true. The circle does have a starting point. That starting point is the known observable sequence of fossils where that sequence can be determined by superposition. For example, this is easily done in the Arizona-Utah area. The only place the "circular reasoning" is used is in tying isolated strata into the column where the sequence in that locality cannot be determined. And here it is not really circular reasoning, but an interpolation. This point is made abundantly clear in the two quotes below:

Stokes: Essentials of Earth's History, p 48

the Earth as a whole. They furnish us with a chronology, "on which events are arranged like pearls on a string."

In the previous paragraphs we have assumed as an established fact the gradual evolution of life throughout geologic time. This provides a rational and convincing explanation for the sequence of fossil forms that we find in the rocks. But it is important to realize that the sequence of fossils was not assumed and does not rest on any theory; as explained on p. 9 it was revealed by patient exploration and discovery in many regions where there are thick sections of fossiliferous rocks having simple structure, so that the beds are known to be in the normal order of superposition, the oldest at the bottom.

\*Text terminated the quotes at these points.

Encyclopedia Britannica, article: Geology

It cannot be denied that from a strictly philosophical standpoint geologists are here arguing in a circle. The succession of organisms has been determined by a study of their remains embedded in the rocks, and the relative ages of the rocks are determined by the remains of organisms that they contain. Nevertheless the arguments are perfectly conclusive. This apparent paradox will disappear in the light of a little further consideration, when the necessary limitations have been introduced. The true solution of the problem lies in the combination of the two laws above stated, taking into account the actual spatial distribution of the fossil remains, which is not haphazard, but controlled by definite laws. It is possible to a very large extent to determine the order of superposition and succession of the strata without any reference at all to their fossils. When the fossils in their turn are correlated with this succession they are found to occur in a certain definite order, and no other. Consequently, when the purely physical evidence of superposition cannot be applied, as for example to the strata of two widely separated regions, it is safe to take the fossils as a guide; this follows from the fact that when both kinds of evidence are available there is never any contradiction between them; consequently, in the limited number of cases where only one line of evidence is available, it alone may be taken as proof.

Taking all these facts into consideration, then, it has been found possible to construct a history of the earth, at any rate from the times when conditions became comparable with what they are now.

These quotes are continuations of the two principle quotes that were used in this section, which when taken in context, have quite a different meaning. Is it possible that we too can be guilty of quoting out of context?

While it is true that faunal succession is used to try to prove evolution, evolution was not originally the intent behind the drawing up of the sequence. As you know, the original work on faunal succession by William Smith predated Darwin by a number of years. Smith was not trying to prove evolution. The sequence was what he observed.

This idea that the college has taught over the years that the entire geologic column down to the Cambrian can be accounted for by one or another of two worldwide floods is a slightly changed adaptation of the fundamentalist--S.D.A. attempt to cram the entire history of the earth into 6000 years by attributing almost all the strata to Noah's Flood. We have no need to be embarrassed by the figures of millions and billions of years of earth's history. The Bible sets no limitation on the period before Adam. Also, we should feel no need to condense this period just to disprove evolution. Evolution falls flat on its face of its own accord.

Certainly there are fossil graveyards that show mass destruction. But from all I've seen and read, the vast majority of all strata were laid down slowly. Contrary to what creationist writers say, it doesn't necessarily take a cataclysm to preserve a fossil. I can show you billions of fossil shells in San Pedro which are obviously an old beach deposit. Ninety percent of the fossils in the college collection were not preserved as a result of any cataclysm. Burial, certainly; but an inch of sediment on top of a shell deposited in a month's time or even longer would be sufficient for preservation.

There are a number of reasons why I feel that the greater part of the geologic column was deposited slowly.

1. The sorting action of water cannot account for faunal succession.

The idea of accounting for faunal succession by the sorting action of water in two floods has bothered me for some time. It just is not reasonable to expect such perfect separation by a flood. Why is a trilobite never found in the same stratum as a dinosaur or vice versa? Another explanation must be found. Why not a number of successive creations before Adam with several catastrophes to account for fossil graveyards and extinctions of species?

2. The source of sediments.

If the entire Paleozoic and Mesozoic were laid down in one short period of time, where did this nearly two miles of sediments in many parts of the world come from? By the time sediments accumulated in basins to a depth of several thousand feet, the lower ones will have hardened into rock. In highland areas the unconsolidated sediments will be much thinner. So there is only a limited amount of unconsolidated sediments on the earth's surface, not enough to produce these miles of sediments after being reworked by a flood. The same would be true of Noah's Flood. What was the source of all these sediments?

This great thickness of sedimentary rocks can be explained if we

allow long periods of time. Sedimentary rocks are hardened sediments which came from the erosion of rocks in other areas. Erosion of solid rock, a chemical, physical and biological process, takes time. Time to produce these sediments which are carried away and redeposited. Slow erosion in one place and slow deposition in another is the only way to explain these great thicknesses of sediments.

It should be added here that these great thicknesses of sedimentary rocks themselves have been partly incised and eroded away to produce the source material for later sedimentary rocks.

3. Time is required for the deposition of the chemical sedimentary rocks.

Clastic sedimentary rocks, those that are made up of broken particles of other rocks, can be deposited rapidly. Whether or not a particular rock was deposited rapidly has to be determined by examining the stratum in which it was found.

But there is one class of sedimentary rocks that has to be deposited slowly. These are the chemical sedimentary rocks, which include rock salt, chert and most important of all, limestone. This type of rock has to be deposited by precipitation of a mineral out of water, atom by atom. This necessarily takes a period of time. These minerals have a limited solubility in water. If for a variety of reasons there should be more of a mineral in solution than the water will hold, the mineral will be precipitated out on the bottom forming rock.

In the Grand Canyon alone there are five limestone formations interspersed between various clastic sedimentary rocks--formations with a total thickness of 1400 feet! And on top of these formations in the southern Utah area, there are several more formations with hundreds more feet of limestone. How long would it take to precipitate 1400 feet of limestone? As I stated above, the chemical sediments come from aqueous solution. Limestone is the least soluble of the common minerals. I don't have the figures on the amount of lime that is soluble in ocean water, but a 500-foot-thick layer of limestone like the Redwall formation in the Grand Canyon couldn't be deposited from any possible depth of ocean water unless more lime were brought into the area, which would take time.

The ultimate source of the lime is the weathering of rocks. The lime is then carried to the sea by water. Weathering is a slow process, and lime is brought in slowly to the sea where it is normally precipitated out at a rate somewhat comparable to the rate at which it is brought in. Conceivably, lime could be precipitated rapidly out of the ocean's reservoir for a short time due to a drastic change in the temperature or the pH of the ocean. A thin layer of limestone could be deposited rapidly under unusual conditions, but certainly not a 500-foot layer. Then what about the much thicker limestone deposits? How long would it take to deposit the 10,000 feet of Ordovician lime-



stone in Alabama or the 6000 feet of it in Oklahoma? It could easily take the millions of years ascribed to it!

The long time required for the deposition of limestone is completely ignored by the authors of the Genesis Flood. They do discuss the deposition of salt beds in an attempt to disprove slow deposition. They not only can offer no explanation of how they could be deposited rapidly during a flood, but they resort to ridiculous hypotheses such as an entire bed being transported from some previous location (ignoring the question of origin) or salt domes being a part of the original creation!

The same thing is true of the deposition of rock salt as is true of limestone. It would take the salt in 8000 feet of ocean water to produce 100 feet of salt. Deposits of salt thousands of feet thick have been found. How then would these be produced? If five miles of ocean water were evaporated, there would be less than 400 feet of salt. Obviously salt water has to be brought into the area from the outside to replace that which is evaporated. This situation is called a relict sea, of which we have an example today in the Caspian Sea. Again, this is a slow process, as it depends on the rate of evaporation. This is hardly the situation one would have in a world-wide flood.

4. Sequence of events demands time.

The order of geologic events can be determined by superposition and by studying other evidences such as erosion surfaces, faulting and igneous intrusions. These evidences often indicate periods of erosion, faulting, folding, metamorphism, uplift and igneous activity between successive sedimentary deposits. Often a long series of events is indicated for the geologic history of an area showing a lengthy period of time. I have observed a series of these erosion surfaces in the Grand Canyon - southern Utah area between and even within formations. I have also seen many instances of unconformities in southern California which exhibits a very complex geologic history.

5. Organic reefs take time to grow.

There are many instances of fossil algae and coral reefs which clearly show that they have grown in the place in which they are found in the middle of thick sedimentary sequences. These show that the area was under shallow water at the time with conditions peaceful enough for a reef to grow. A reef takes hundreds, if not thousands, of years to grow.

Creationist writers claim these reefs were picked up in their entirety by the flood and redeposited in another location (horizontally, right-side-up, unbroken and with all the surroundings common to reefs). One of our staff members personally investigated the famous Permian reef in the Guadalupe Mountains of Texas and found it to be in the place it originally grew. So here is proof that these formations were not deposited in any catastrophe.

6. Mud cracks, rain prints, ripple marks, eolian cross bedding and animal tracks show normal depositional conditions.

These phenomena are fossilized in various shales and sandstones throughout the geologic column. They show that various conditions were extant at the time of deposition such as shallow moving water, shallow standing water that later dries out, sand dunes, etc. They do not show deep water or flood conditions. There is a kind of ripple mark that can be made in deep water, but this kind can be distinguished from the oscillation ripples made by wave action in shallow water. Animal tracks are abundant in the Permian Coconino Sandstone in Arizona, among other places. If the entire Paleozoic and Mesozoic were put down in one flood, the animals would have long since drowned by the time these layers were deposited. Instead, they show normal animal activities on solid ground.

7. Fossil trees found in upright position in one formation.

There are a number of locations around the world where fossil tree trunks have been found complete with roots in upright position in the place they grew. Groves of fossil trees have been uncovered in Glasgow, Scotland, in the Carboniferous; and Gilboa, New York in the Devonian. In the Triassic Petrified Forest in Arizona, there are standing tree trunks which investigators have found to be in the same place in which they grew.

These show that life at the time these strata were deposited was going on in a normal way. Certainly one would not find a series of standing tree trunks in a flood layer. They would be in all sorts of positions.

Of course there had to be some sort of flood or volcanic activity to bury these living trees and preserve them, but this came after these normal periods which were at least of sufficient duration for these trees to grow.

8. Fragments of a solidified lower formation in an upper formation.

There are at least two locations in Utah where pebbles of older strata can be found embedded in later formations. In Iron County, Utah, the upper surface of the Kaibab Limestone is an erosion surface upon which a coarse conglomerate was laid down containing worn fragments of Paleozoic fossils. The overlying strata also contain Triassic fossils. So here we have an example of a Mesozoic stratum having been deposited with already hardened Paleozoic material that had been reworked and worn, showing that there was a considerable interval between the times of the Paleozoic and the Mesozoic strata were deposited. After the Paleozoic fossils were originally deposited and covered by other strata, they were hardened, and later uplifted and cut through by erosion. The fossils were rounded as pebbles in a stream and redeposited in another area where the Mesozoic material was being laid down.

See me?

We have a similar thing in our college collection. One of our staff members found in Mesozoic deposits in Wyoming some gastroliths (dinosaur stomach stones). One of these contained a Paleozoic brachiopod. The brachiopod must have been fossilized a long time before the dinosaur swallowed the colorful chert pebble in which it was found. Chert is deposited in the ocean (slowly, since chert is a chemical deposit). Then the area had to be uplifted and eroded. Chert pebbles were washed down to where the dinosaurs found them. There is no doubt that they are gastroliths, but even if one doesn't accept this, the fact remains that we have here a Paleozoic fossil contained in a pebble that was found in a Mesozoic stratum. There must have been a considerable interval of time involved.

9. Continental drift and sea-floor spreading.

During the past two decades a wealth of data from a number of lines of investigation has virtually confirmed the theory of continental drift. Also confirmed is the theory of sea-floor spreading which is directly related to continental drift. According to this latter theory fresh basaltic material wells up along the mid-ocean ridges and solidifies, half of it being transported toward one continent and the other half in the opposite direction toward another continent. This sea floor spreading takes place in all of the major ocean areas. In the case of the North and South Atlantic Oceans, the continents of North and South America have drifted away from Europe and Africa as the ocean floor was spreading apart, though not necessarily as rapidly. From all evidence these continents began to break up and separate during the Mesozoic.

The rocks comprising the ocean floor are youngest at the mid-ocean ridge and become progressively older in either direction on approaching a continent. Thus these rocks range in age all the way from the Cretaceous (right after the continental break-up) along the margins of the continents to Recent along the ocean ridges. A remarkable phenomenon was recorded in these rocks of continuously varying age. This was revealed by the study of paleomagnetism. Exhaustive studies have been made of all the world's oceans by ships trailing magnetometers. These instruments record the orientation of the magnetic minerals in the basalt of the ocean floor. These minerals show the direction at the time they were solidified of the north and south magnetic poles. There were found to be a series of paired bands of like and unlike magnetic orientation on either side of the ocean ridge. The first pair adjacent to the ridge is oriented to show the north and south magnetic poles in their present locations. The second pair shows the magnetic poles in reversed position. The third pair shows them again in normal position. And so on all across the ocean to the continents. This shows that the north and south magnetic poles have reversed themselves a number of times during the history of the earth! Incredible? Yes, but there is no other explanation. These exhaustive studies have revealed a series of 171 magnetic reversals just since the Cretaceous! And not just in one ocean, but almost the entire ocean area of the earth contains the same record. These paired bands of magnetic orientation vary in

thickness showing varying periods of time at any given magnetic orientation. Thus there is a definite pattern of thick and thin bands. This pattern makes it possible to corrolate these bands from one ocean to another like matching tree rings from one tree to another. Almost perfect corrolation of these bands is evident worldwide! Therefore, it can be shown that the sea floors have been spreading at fairly uniform rates since the Cretaceous. It also confirms the general picture of magnetic reversals and the fact it is a worldwide phenomenon, not local.

Just what does it take to reverse the earth's magnetic field? No one really knows what produces the magnetic field of the earth, but it is theorized that there is a dynamo action in the liquid metal core of the earth. Convection currents produce electric currents which give rise to the magnetic field. Anyway it would not be reasonable to expect anything massive like the earth to have rapid fluctuations in its magnetic field, let alone a complete reversal in polarity.

We have in the ocean bottoms a continuous record from the Cretaceous to the present. Can we reasonably condense this period containing 171 reversals into a few thousand years? Although it may not extend back the 76 million years claimed, it is evident that this period is considerably longer than we used to believe. Whatever the period, we have a continuous sequence showing a relatively constant rate of spreading. Another confirmation of magnetic reversals is found in the ocean sediments themselves. As a magnetic particle settles in the water it orients itself according to the Earth's magnetic field. The Magnetic orientation in core samples of ocean sediments can be determined. Core samples from around the world reveal the same thick-thin banded pattern as is found in the sea floor basalt. This shows a constant rate of sedimentation. Deep sea sediments are very thin as sedimentation takes place very slowly in the ocean. This is another indication of a long time period.

Yet another confirmation of magnetic reversals was found by paleomagnetic studies of terrestrial lava flows from several locations around the world. The same pattern is revealed during the last 10 reversals. The ages of these specimens were determined by radioactive dating to put them into the proper sequence. This sequence has been determined to extend back  $3\frac{1}{2}$  million years. The absolute ages may not be altogether accurate, but the sequence of ages is probably about right because of the agreement to the general pattern. Though not stated in the article, the relative ages of specimens from each location were probably determined by superposition before any age determinations by radioactive means were made.

So here we have another sequence of ages, a definite indication of time and a confirmation of the latter portion of the ocean bottom sequence.

One interesting thought is where does man fit into this picture? Did man ever experience any magnetic reversals? What would happen

during a magnetic reversal? The magnetic field of the earth would decrease until it disappeared completely before increasing again with opposite polarity. One purpose of the magnetic field of the earth is to protect man from the full strength of cosmic radiation. During any reversal there would be a period of perhaps many years with little or no magnetic field. Could man survive the full impact of cosmic rays for an extended period? I would doubt it. I would, therefore, place the creation of man during the present cycle with the magnetic north where it is today. That would place the creation of man during the Pleistocene instead of the Upper Cretaceous. If the latter were true he would have had to survive most of these 171 magnetic reversals. Placing the creation of man in the Pleistocene brings up the interesting possibility of mammals and angiosperms before Adam. X

Many more reasons could be given, but it should be apparent by now that catastrophism alone can not account for the entire geologic column. The history of the earth is by no means as simple as we had at one time thought. The more one studies it, the more one realizes how incredibly complex it is. And why shouldn't it be? It was God who thought it out--the same God who created life. There is nothing simple about life!

I realize that we who have taught science over the years are guilty of promulgating this error that the entire geologic column resulted from two floods. We have taught it to those who are now writing and teaching others. I have had my part in it. I used to be very dogmatic as long as I was ignorant of the facts. But when the facts became known to me I was forced to change my mind and repent of this error.

It is interesting to note that others have independently come to some of the same conclusions I have. In his studies in archaeology, Dr. Hoeh has come to the conclusion that Noah's Flood left only thin deposits in many places and none in others. Not all strata from Upper Cretaceous on up were Noah's Flood deposits. Other processes were responsible for them. In fact he believes that most of the Tertiary in the Middle East is pre-Adamic. The same thing would appear to be true in Southern California and other locations from my observations.

That brings us to the point of what can properly be included in proving the existence of God by geology. As I said, the material from page 10 to 25 is excellent. This would form the backbone of a good discussion. Just show that fossils do not prove evolution, but on the contrary creation. If the idea of creation by stages seems too controversial, leave it out. Don't be dogmatic about when various species were created before Adam, nor in which destruction they became extinct. These things are not revealed in the Bible, and they are not essential to prove the existence of God. The essential thing is that they were created, and an act of creation demands a creator!