

Excerpt from *Creation's Tiny Mystery* by Robert V. Gentry, pp. 334-338 (1992).

Reprinted by permission of Earth Science Associations. All rights reserved.

Comments on Geological Objections

Using the assumption of uniformity, evolutionary geologists have presumed to say that all rocks formed by natural processes over the duration of earth history. But three facts--the Po-halo evidence for creation, the failure to synthesize granite experimentally, and melted granite cooling to rhyolite in the earth--show beyond doubt that this presumption is false and that vast quantities of rocks were created and cannot be duplicated by natural processes. Evolution is in a crisis. The publication of *Creation's Tiny Mystery* has resurrected the Po-halo evidence for creation from the pages of premier scientific research journals and brought it to the attention of elected officials and the general public. Just as significantly, this book also reveals the failure of scientists to publish a refutation of that evidence in those same scientific journals. In other words, evolutionists have nothing scientifically credible to counter this evidence for creation. This dilemma led them to disseminate a biased, confused picture of my results in two of their publications.

In the evolutionist magazines, *Creation/Evolution* [XX,8, no. 1, 13 (1988)] and *Jour. Geol. Education* [36, 1 (1988)], an amateur geologist attempted to disprove a creation origin of Canadian Precambrian rocks by selectively quoting professional evolutionary geologists on the supposed geologic history of some Po-halo-containing rocks near Bancroft, Ontario. These quotes closely interweave the mineralogical descriptions of the rocks with the uniformitarian interpretation of their origin and thus leave the false impression that the presumed evolutionary origin of those rocks is as scientifically valid as the mineralogical facts. This failure to separate fact from evolutionary theory is a pitfall that has, over the past century, led many sincere geologists to erroneously believe that evolution is valid. The Po-halo evidence for creation points the way out of this pit for it shows that evolution's basic premise of the uniformitarian principle is false.

One example of how this assumption leads to incorrect geological conclusions

about the Po-halo evidence for creation is discussed on pages 331-333 [Ref.1]. But the main focus here concerns the writings of this evolutionist who, before the UT [Ref. 2] forum, widely claimed that granite had been synthesized on television. Unfortunately, his advisers did not fully inform him of the scientific aspects of Po halos, and consequently he failed to distinguish between scientific fact and conclusions based on evolutionary assumptions. This is evident by the complete dependence on uniformitarian geology to criticize the evidence for creation in the two publications cited above. To my knowledge the errors about my results contained in these publications have not been publicly retracted as of early 1992 even though the errors in them were discussed at length in this book's second (1988) edition. I am thus obliged to respond to them again in this edition, especially in view of the fact that the same errors were repeated at the Second ICC in 1990. (See [Creation's Tiny Mysteries](#) for additional comments about the Second ICC material.) In what follows the atheistic/evolutionist magazines cited above are referred to as C/E and JGE, followed by respective page numbers, which pertain to the remark under discussion.

In particular, these articles

1. Claim (C/E 18; JGE 5) that I identified some halo-containing rocks as granites when in fact my report (Gentry et al. 1974) correctly states they were from a pegmatite;
2. Imply (C/E 17-21, 23; JGE 4-7) that certain crystalline rocks which geologists classify as "intrusive" discount a creation origin for those rocks, but actually my creation model (pp. 133, 185, 325-326) includes these among the rock types that were created;
3. Claim (C/E 20-26; JGE 10) that cross-cutting relationships show that halo-containing rocks were the last rocks to form in the Bancroft area, but they fail to recognize this too is perfectly in harmony with my creation model (pp. 133, 184, 325-326), which envisions a continual series of geologically oriented creative events throughout the 24-hour period of Day 1 (and possibly Day 3 as well);
4. Claim (C/E 18; JGE 11) that regional metamorphism had to be "explained" to me, which is a not only a patronizing inaccuracy but also one that ignores metamorphism being part of my creation model (see pp. 184, 185 in this and earlier editions of this book);
5. Quote an evolutionary geologist as an authority on how certain rocks formed when, in fact, excerpts from the quote (C/E 18; JGE 5) reveal that geologist is only speculating: "The author believes that ... has ... been

largely derived..." The author feels that the deposit is therefore best classed as..." "Its mode of origin is in dispute";

6. Imply (C/E 19; JGE 7) that many of my mica samples have undergone metamorphism but neglect to say that the writer has never seen any of my hundreds of specimens. And for the record, the ones I do have from Bancroft are not metamorphosed;
7. Wrongly claim (C/E 25; JGE 9) my book has an error on the rate of lava cooling; also claim (JGE 11) that I equate dikes and rhyolite with granite, which is opposite of the view stated in this and earlier editions of this book (see pp. 130-131)[Ref. 3],
8. Cite (JGE 10) Eichelberger (p.131, in this book) to imply that granite can form at great depth, but Eichelberger never responded to my letter as to whether he had implied this;
9. Question (C/E 22; JGE 10) why I chose the 3-minute half-life of Po-218 as the measure of time for creation when this has been explained many times in my reports and in this book (see pp. 23-37);
10. Show (C/E 29) a picture of a road cut and imply that the exposed rocks could only have formed by evolutionary processes, when these rock types were--and still are--expressly included in my creation model as described herein and in earlier editions (pp. 133-134; 325-326);
11. Use (C/E 22; JGE 8) the terms "metasediments," "metavolcanics," and "metamorphosed intrusive gneiss complex," in an evolutionary context in a futile attempt to deny a creation origin of Canadian Precambrian rocks; in a further effort to deny creation it is implied that these rocks contain fossils, first by parenthetically mentioning (C/E 22) "fossil soil"--which in checking the cited reference I find is only an inference with no substantiated evidence whatsoever to suggest that the soil actually contains visible fossils--and then by citing (C/E 27; JGE II) a "personal communication" from an evolutionist to imply that "stromatolites" (fossil algae mats) exist on certain rocks near Bancroft. The author fails to acknowledge the report [H. J. Hoffman, *Precambrian Fossils, Pseudofossils, and Problematica in Canada, Geological Survey of Canada, Bulletin 189, 30-34, (1971)*] which questions their authenticity, but does admit (C/E 28) that these structures do not contain any organic matter that authentic stromatolites always exhibit. This admission of nonexistent organic matter is repeated in the Second ICC material. Clearly, if the structures at Bancroft were genuine stromatolites, they would contain organic matter. [I digress to add a similar absence of crucial evidence occurs in the presumed finding of fossil brachiopods in granite made by two Soviet scientists (*USSR Acad. of Sciences, Doklady,*

Earth Sciences, 188, 33, 1970). My written inquiry to the Soviet Union and database search at UT in Knoxville revealed nothing that would confirm this report. This is not surprising considering that uncertainties in the authors' identification of their fossils' is readily apparent from the report itself. "Among the many ovoids extracted from granite we noticed comparatively few that had any specific shape," and "It is hard to identify altered brachiopods found in equally altered rocks."]

12. Repeatedly attempt (C/E 20; JGE 8) to establish an age sequence for Precambrian rocks but fail to state that all the radiometric dates being cited are based on the fallacious uniformitarian principle;
13. Wrongly infer (C/E 21; JGE 7) that betafite may be responsible for Po halos, because (i) betafite like all U minerals produces a U halo, not a Po halo, and (ii) x-ray and mass analyses show significant amounts of U in U-halo centers, but not in Po-halo centers;
14. Imply (JGE 3) that former museum curator Louis Moyd made detrimental remarks about my understanding of certain rocks, but my conversation with Louis in December 1987 revealed his is untrue;
15. Express an uncertainty (JGE 3) on where Po halos are found, which must be identified as a straw-man issue because the whole reason the author attempted to disprove a creation origin of the rocks at Bancroft was that I had reported Po halos are found there;
16. Lament (JGE 8) that I have disregarded what Dalrymple and others have repeatedly "told me" about the age and origin of granites;
17. Wishfully claim (C/E 19,20, 25-27; JGE 7,10) that geology can explain large crystal sizes in pegmatites even though geologists cannot synthesize a hand-sized crystal of the commonly occurring biotite, much less those mica crystals that weigh over 100 tons (which at the UT forum I noted were clear evidence of creation).

These numerous inaccuracies and my responses to them are important because this spokesman for evolution freely acknowledges having received considerable assistance from professional geologists. In fact, his collaboration with one of those geologists resulted in the repetition of many of the same inaccuracies at the Second ICC (See [Creation's Tiny Mysteries](#)) These errors represent the best collective effort that eminent evolutionists--and others opposed to my results--can make against the Po-halo evidence for creation. But nowhere is their collaborative failure to deal with this evidence more apparent than in the material that admittedly was "deliberately omitted" (C/E 31) from the discussions in both the C/E and JGE articles. Specifically omitted from those articles (C/E, 31) is the discussion of coalified-wood halos, the young-earth

implications of lead/helium retention in granite, and the failure to artificially synthesize granite. All these are said to be left out "because of space limitations." (Similar omissions occurred at the Second ICC.) But if these publications

(i) do not refute the evidence for creation--the Po halos in granites, (ii) omit the strongest evidences for a young age of the earth--the halos in coalified wood, and the lead/helium retention in granites, (iii) fail to retract the claim of granite synthesis that was made prior to the UT forum, and (iv) interpret field geology according to the fallacious uniformitarian principle, then how could it possibly be concluded that the evidence for creation is invalid? The fact is, perhaps without fully realizing it, the author was apparently advised to make some amazing admissions in his concluding comments. The following are quotes from the *Creation/Evolution* publication:

"Still, we must give Gentry his due. Nothing in geology fully explains the apparent occurrence of the Po halos as described by Gentry. They do remain a minor mystery in the field of physics. But this does not mean that no explanations are possible or that it is time to throw in the towel and invoke the 'god of the gaps.' The generation, preservation and alteration of the radioactive halos involve complex physical processes that are not yet understood, and it is quite possible that they are not primordial Po halos at all. Other explanations include..." (C/E 31)

Here the author concedes the possibility of primordial Po halos--in other words, creation. The "other explanations" are those which Dalrymple has proposed, and these have all been refuted in this book (pp. 299-303). The next quote is even more explicit regarding instant creation:

"So the 'basement rocks' in which Gentry found his halos turn out not to be 'basement rocks' at all. In fact, they appear in rocks that formed much later than Earth's oldest rocks. This fact alone tells us that the rocks bearing [Po] halos, even if instantly created, have no bearing on the origin and age of Earth." (C/E 30)

First, it is true that the basement crystalline rocks were created. But as I said before, not all created rocks are at "basement" level. Some, such as Mt. Rushmore and El Capitan, are easily visible at the surface. Secondly, this evolutionist's reference to the oldest rocks is based on his use of spurious

radioactive dates for those rocks. In my creation model the rocks at Bancroft are part of the oldest rocks because they are part of those created on Day I of creation week. Lastly, even though we see here the admission of the possibility of certain rocks being "instantly created," the opposition to creation is so strong that it is also claimed this would have "no bearing on the origin" of the earth! One final quote:

"Furthermore, he [Gentry] is forced to invoke the supernatural to explain away physical evidence that points to a tremendous amount of geological activity over a long period of time in this region where he found the halos. Since Gentry's God can do anything, he concludes that God created the region to have the features of age and activity that it exhibits and that he made 'Genesis rock' look for all the world like a recent intrusion, thereby fooling thousands of geologists." (C/E 30)

The Creator God is the source of all truth. He didn't make the rocks to have the features of great age. Geologists come to the wrong conclusions about the age and origin of the earth because of their acceptance of uniformity as the basis for interpreting the past. God made the rocks to appear as they are--the undeniable result of a recent creation. Nevertheless, for confirmed evolutionists God's created works will ever remain just a matter of dispute. For others, though, *Creation's Tiny Mystery* will be the key that reveals the consistency between the Genesis account and the record of creation etched within Earth's primordial rocks.

References

1. This refers to pages in *Creation's Tiny Mystery*.
2. The forum Gentry refers to took place in the Alumni Gym at the University of Tennessee on April 13, 1987. The transcript of this forum is reprinted in *Creation's Tiny Mystery*, pp. 197-199, (1992).
3. See *Creation's Tiny Mystery*.