

Creation Science Book Review

Frozen In Time

Appendices / Summary

Review by [Greg Neyman](#)

© Answers in Creation

First Published 7 September 2005

Appendix 1

Confusion of Elephant and Mammoth Classification

This appendix discusses the classification of mammoths and elephants, and their possibility of interbreeding. This argument stems from the young earth creation science requirement to have the “elephant kind” on the ark, with the elephant and mammoths splitting sometime after disembarkation from the ark. It also gives the picture of the young earth acceptance of rapid evolutionary processes, in order to develop separate species within a hundred years. Aside from this amusing concept, there is nothing in this section that impacts the age of the earth debate. More on this in the Appendix 3 section.

Appendix 2

Possible Explanations for Disharmonious Associations

In short, there are no problems with the old earth theory for explaining disharmonious associations. He specifically argues against the glacial/interglacial mixing. He says there should be evidence of sediment mixing. While this would provide solid evidence, it does not rule out anything. When you consider the transition periods for the glacial/interglacial interchanges, the time frame is unknown, but is probably as little as hundreds of years. If you have lived for 80 years, you can go outside and see zero deposition in locations around your house. As animals died over this time frame, their bones would be in the exact same stratigraphic location. If Oard could tie this argument to the deposition rate, then he may have an argument, but as it is, with deposition rates unknown, it is useless.

Secondly, he argues that the mixing hypothesis assumes warm-loving animals could migrate beyond their climatic limits. This is actually a mixing of two theories...one being the glacial/interglacial mixing, and one being the migratory behavior. In the glacial/interglacial mixing, the transition occurs over several hundred years. In migrations, it occurs annually. What is at stake here is the glacial/interglacial, not migration.

Third, he says the mixing should have carried over into the Holocene (today). Not true. He says the "Why would the supposed frequent mixing of sediments suddenly stop at the end of the Ice Age?" The key word is "supposed." As you see above from the deposition argument, if you

don't know the deposition rate, you cannot "suppose" how much sediment is mixed, if any at all.

Fourth, Oard says the disharmonious associations are found within the glacial and interglacial periods. Again, this ties directly into deposition. As territories change based on climate, there would appear to be constant disharmonious associations. Locations with high deposition rates would be the only locations where this could be distinguished. Yes, there are many evidences for disharmonious associations, but there are also many evidences for the opposite.

Appendix 3

The Elephant Kind

This argument is a continuation from Appendix 1. It stems from the requirement to fit all the animals on the ark, and is not based on actual fact. The size of the ark makes this a requirement, not the scientific data.

It is interesting to note that Oard leans toward Jonathan Sarfati's explanation of the elephant kind, by including the Order Proboscidea. However, they don't realize that this opens a real can of worms for young earth creationism. By claiming these are all one kind at the "order" level, there is nothing to prevent the claim that order rank could be used in explaining other animal kinds. For example, this would mean that the

common ancestor of man and chimpanzees would qualify as a "kind." In other words, there was no need to take chimps, apes, monkeys, or any other primate on the ark, as they would evolve from Noah and his family. Somehow, I don't think Noah and his family would appreciate this explanation! For more, see [this article](#).

Appendix 4

Woolly Mammoths – Flood or Ice Age?

In this section, he mentions the division among young earth creationists. Some believe the Flood killed the mammoths, while Oard and others believe it is the Ice Age. Naturally, Oard is trying to convince other young earth creationists to rally around his model. There is nothing of significance for old earth creationists here.

Summary

Overall, this book has presented some good information about the difficulties of interpreting the mammoth. Despite this wealth of information which will impress the young earth reader, there is nothing of significance which would cause one to pause and consider that the young earth creation science model is correct. The uniformitarian model does have answers for these problems. The answers may be debated,

and not universally agreed upon by all, but that does not make them wrong.

We have clear evidence from ice cores of multiple glaciations, and over 700,000 years' worth of ice accumulation. When you combine this with other geological evidences, and astronomical evidences, there is no possible way that the earth can be only 6,000–10,000 years old. The only way a person can believe in a young earth is to accept make-believe theories based on twisted scientific data. For anyone who truly investigates this matter, the solution is obvious.