

The Great Dinosaur Mystery Solved!



Book Review

By Greg Neyman

© 2005, Answers In Creation

Located at www.answersincreation.org/the_great_dinosaur_mystery_solved.htm

The book *The Great Dinosaur Mystery Solved!*, is by Ken Ham. The edition being reviewed is a paperback, Fifth Printing, April 2005, ISBN Number 0-89051-282-5.

This book is aimed specifically at youth. Answers in Genesis knows that the key to keeping their children young earth creationists when they grow older is to reach them while they are young, and what better way to do it than through dinosaurs. This book testifies to the indoctrination methods of the young earth creationist leaders.

The format of the book is a little odd, with the chapter on dinosaur history going from page 18 to 87, yet it is interspersed with data from individual species. The material from each species is placed appropriately, and the odd layout actually reads quite well. Almost half of the book is the appendices, which gives quotes and sources for dinosaur material.

In the introduction, we clearly see the intention of the book. In the bottom paragraph on page 9, Ham says "...when one takes the events of history as given in the Bible, as well as the doctrines of Christianity, that an entire WAY OF THINKING can actually be developed that can be applied to all areas of the created universe." (The words in all caps are that way in the book.) Note that Ham is saying that you can "develop" a way of thinking about it to fit the Bible. This is an admission that by itself, the evidence clearly points to an old earth. The evidence must be twisted to fit the Bible's young earth timeline.

Old earth creationists do not have this problem. We do not have to "develop" a way to twist the plain evidence of science, so that it appears to be old...it is old! Ham would no doubt claim that we are "reinterpreting" the Scriptures to make it fit the old earth evidence. We are all free, as Christians, to interpret the Bible. If someone else gets it wrong, should we not correct it?

What are we reinterpreting? There are only three real issues here that we are reinterpreting. One is the Hebrew word for day, Yom. This can be interpreted as days or long ages. Young earth creationists will point to rules for translating the word Yom...but these rules were invented by young earth theologians to support their cause...there is no evidence of these rules existing prior to the rise of the modern young earth movement. For more, see Word Study: Yom (www.answersincreation.org/word_study_yom.htm).

The second issue is death before sin. Nowhere does the Bible claim that there was no animal death before Adam sinned. The young earth arguments against death before sin are only valid within young earth circles...again, a creation of a doctrine to support their own view of creation. For more, see the topic Death Before Sin (www.answersincreation.org/death_before_sin.htm). The final issue is the Flood, which most old earth creationists interpret as local in size, yet universal in effect. The words of Genesis allow this as a possible interpretation, even when taking the account literally (see www.answersincreation.org/floodlist.htm).

When you examine it further, it is really death before sin that is driving the other two issues. If there were no objection to death before sin, then the length of days, and the flood which supposedly killed the animals, become non-issues.

As is typical with young earth books, Ham uses quotes from scientific sources, which cast doubt upon the secular scientists' solutions to the quoted problems. He uses these quotes effectively to set up [straw-man arguments](#), so that when he provides the solution to these so-called problems, the young earth reader will accept them as "gospel." Due to the nature of the young earth culture, readers are expected to blindly accept the words of this so-called expert. Due to the fascination of dinosaurs in our culture, it will effectively teach young earth believers many false conclusions about dinosaurs. Old earth creationists should know the truth behind these claims so that they can answer the young earth arguments with ease.

Keep in mind that this book is written for a younger audience, and it does not get too technical. As such, it is quite easy to provide rebuttals for the claims (concerning dinosaurs, it is also easy to rebut the technical articles). Since this book is used by many homeschoolers, it is critical to reach them with proper dinosaur information that is not tainted by the false young earth theories.

Although he paints a picture that old earth creationism is contrary to the Bible, this simply is not true...it is contrary to the young earth interpretations of the Bible. One can believe in an old earth (with or without evolution), and still believe in an inerrant, infallible Word of God. Conservative Christianity and old earth creationism can easily go hand-in-hand. May God bless you as you study this portion of His creation.

What Happened to the Dinosaurs? (Page 11)

Ham says the Bible can be used to as a basis for explaining dinosaurs in terms of thousands of years of history. This is true, but only if you ignore all of the scientific evidence which indicates the dinosaurs lived millions of years ago. How much of the scientific evidence indicates the dinosaurs lived millions of years ago? All of it. There is no evidence that dinosaurs lived only thousands of years ago.

The only place you will see a dinosaur claim for thousands of years ago is within young earth creationist circles. None of the claims made by these so called scientists stands up to scrutiny, and are easily shown to be false. This is what happens when you pre-suppose that the earth is young, and then twist the evidence to match your notions. We will examine a few of these claims in this book, but if you want to jump right into more dinosaur articles, check out the Dinosaur section (www.answersincreation.org/dino.htm).

Are Dinosaurs a Mystery? (Page 11)

Of course there are mysteries with the dinosaurs. No man has ever seen one. We reconstruct what we can of their lives, given the scant evidence we have from fossils and trace fossils. Ham claims they are only a mystery if you accept the evolutionary story of their history. He is merely blowing smoke. Secular scientists have a very good picture of dinosaur life, and the mysteries are few. Interestingly, he uses a quote, and indents it, but only the first part of the first sentence is a quote...the rest is part of Ham's discussion.

Yet, the rest stays indented for some reason. I assume this is poor editing from the author and publisher, or perhaps it was done for effect.

After a brief discussion, he concludes with “All these ideas are guesses and make dinosaurs a great mystery!” He makes it sound like dinosaur scientists are making wild guesses. In reality, not much guesswork is involved. Where scientists have to fill in the gaps, it is a highly-educated guess. They rely upon many sources of information, such as other comparable fossils, trace fossils, radiometric dating, stratigraphic position, and other’s research into the species in question. It’s not like they don’t have a clue...they have many sources of data for comparison to make their estimates. Of course, they sometimes are proven wrong after new evidence is uncovered. This is a natural part of the scientific method...when new discoveries are made, old theories are discarded. Young earth creationists love to point out errors in theories. However, this is merely the scientific method at work. The discarding of bad theories cannot be used to imply a young earth is correct...all the evidence still indicates millions of years. (In reality, there is no such thing as a bad theory...only bad data that led to the theory.)

Why are the Two Views so Different? (Page 14)

Ham argues that “scientists try to connect the fossils they find to the past.” Of course they do. All the evidence supports them being millions of years old. Young earth creationists try to dismantle the evidence, and come up with alternate theories, but they are all flawed. This is because they start with the assumption that the earth is only 6,000 years old, and then they try to make the evidence fit. They try to take scientific truth, and make it match biblical truth (their “interpretation” of the Bible), and as a result, they so butcher the science that it is laughable. Why then, do young earth creationists accept it? This is a cultural issue...they were raised believing in a young earth, and they have always been taught to ignore any evidence which is contrary to this interpretation. To see a simple description of how they do this, read Morton’s Demon (www.answersincreation.org/mortond.htm). They are unwilling to rationally consider any alternatives.

On page 15, Ham says “The Bible is THE HISTORY BOOK OF THE UNIVERSE from the very beginning.” True...but it varies depending on who is interpreting it.

Ham oversimplifies the two views on page 16, saying there are only two choices (there are many). He says its either the Christian World View or the Secular World View (evolutionary history). However, Progressive Creationists reject evolution, yet they are old earth creationists. Ham intends the Christian view to mean young earth, but it can also mean old earth creationists. We accept the literal reading of the creation account, just as young earth creationists do...but for Progressive Creationists, there is no need to twist the science to fit a preconceived notion about the age of the earth...it is a much better fit to the Bible than young earth creationism.

Ham says that if you accept the biblical view of history, you will reach the young earth explanation for dinosaurs back on page 13. This is simply not true. Progressive Creationists accept the biblical view of history, and conclude that the earth is old. Even if you believe God used evolution to create (Theistic Evolution), you can still read Genesis literally, and thus you also can accept the biblical view of history. As usual, Ham is presenting this choice as an either/or scenario...either you accept the biblical view (and a

young earth), or you don't (you reject the biblical view and accept an old earth). You can accept an old earth, and the biblical view, and be a very conservative Christian at the same time. The simplistic explanation given by Ham is simply not the truth.

Which View is Right? (Page 17)

Early in this section Ham mentions the death before the Fall of man issue. This is the main reason that young earth creationists feel they must reject the old earth, and twist the evidence to fit their own theories. God told Adam in Genesis 2:17,

But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

Using a common, literal interpretation, when Adam ate the fruit, he should have died physically that day. Did Adam die the same day he ate the fruit? No, he did not. There are only two possibilities. First, God lied to Adam. We know that God cannot lie, so this is not the case. The only possible alternative left is that God did not mean physical death, but spiritual. When Adam ate the fruit, he sinned, which caused separation between him and God, or spiritual death. Based on this verse, it is conclusive that the Fall of Man did not bring physical death into the world. The verses used to support this position can all be explained in light of spiritual death. Physical death, because of its inability to separate us from God, is not the issue (There will be more about this verse later in the review).

Ham says "Also, if there really was a global flood, this will have a direct bearing on a Christian view of geologic history." Speaking as a Christian, and as a geologist by training (B.S. in Geology), I can state with 100 percent certainty that there is absolutely no geologic evidence for a global flood. Ham's statement reflects the poor approach of young earth creation theorists to the scientific evidence. Young earth creationist geologists, such as Steve Austin of the Institute for Creation Research, approach geology with the presupposition that the earth is young. As a scientist, he should approach the evidence from geology, come to a conclusion for how old it is, and then compare it to the Bible to see if they agree. Billy Graham said "The Bible is not a book of science. The Bible is a book of Redemption..." The Bible is scientifically accurate, when interpreted with an old earth position, but in the end, we should not get hung up on the creation...redemption through Jesus is the main issue. Unfortunately, young earth creationists, in focusing on these side issues, and presenting them as an either/or choice, have driven millions away from the church. It need not be so! You can accept both the Bible and science.

Ham says that if you "start with the Bible to build a framework of thinking, one can consistently interpret the evidence concerning dinosaurs and construct a history that can be logically defended." You can do this with old earth creationism also, although I'm certain that is not what Ham intends. Yes, you can come to a young earth conclusion, if you drastically twist the evidence, and ignore the evidence you cannot twist...but it cannot be logically defended as Ham claims. All one needs to do is look at this review, and the many other rebuttals on the Answers In Creation website.

Dinosaur History (Page 18)

How Do We Know Dinosaurs Ever Existed? (Page 18)

Ham presents it as young earth creationists vs. evolutionists. However, it should be noted that progressive creationists are not evolutionists. Ham and his ministry Answers in Genesis constantly refer to all non-young earth creationists as evolutionists, even though he must know this is not true. I'm not sure why they prefer to stereotype all non young earth creationists as evolutionists.

Ham claims that old earth proponents obtain their dates by indirect dating methods. This is true. He goes on to state that other scientists have shown that they cannot be trusted. This part is not true. So-called young earth creationist scientists have tried to point out errors in the dating methods, but these claims have all been shown to be false and misleading. To disprove the dating methods, they have to pick and choose from the data, finding several bad dates out of thousands, and using these to cast doubt upon dating as a whole. For more on radiometric dating, and the deceitful young earth tactics, see Radiometric Dating (www.answersincreation.org/radiometricdating.htm).

Next Ham says that there is evidence that dinosaur bones are not old at all. He refers to the now famous T-rex red blood cells from a specimen found in Montana. There were no red blood cells in this specimen. For more, see T-Rex Blood (www.answersincreation.org/trexblood.htm).

On page 20, he mentions the "fresh" dinosaur bones found by a young earth expedition in Alaska. The fossil bed in question, the Liscomb, has been mined for dinosaur fossils since its discovery in 1961. The bones in some cases are not fully fossilized, but they are anything but fresh. None have ever been discovered with soft tissue (except the ones that young earth creationists supposedly found...rather suspicious!). The bones have been significantly diagenetically altered (by their deposition environment). No DNA has ever been recovered from these bones.

If it is true that young earth creationists discovered bones with ligaments still attached, you would think they would publish a technical paper on this topic to prove the earth is young. They have not. What did the young earth creationists do with these bones with ligaments? Were they given to competent scientists who are qualified to perform research on them? They appear to have either disappeared, or were left in the field! That's an odd way to treat a valuable dinosaur find! The disappearance of these bones makes it impossible for anyone to accept that they ever existed in the first place.

It is entirely possible for bones to not be 100 percent fossilized after millions of years. There are many variables with the turning of a bone into a fossil...age of the fossil is not the most important of these.

At the end of this section, he says death before sin would undermine the entire gospel. This is only true from the young earth perspective, which is a flawed interpretation of Death Before Sin. Millions of Christians testify to their full belief in the Gospel, and in millions of years of death before Adam sinned. Physical death is not the issue with Adam's sin...only spiritual death is important, since it is only spiritual death that can separate you from God.

What Did Dinosaurs Look Like? (Page 21)

Yes, scientists make assumptions concerning what dinosaurs looked like. However, these assumptions are based on many years of study. Scientists who reconstruct animals from fossils are well trained in anatomy and biology, and are highly qualified to make such “educated assumptions.” Paleontologists also understand that all these assumptions are just that...they do not preach them as 100 percent accurate of the animal being portrayed. There is no deceit intended on the part of these scientists.

Where/When? (Page 22)

The evidence for transitional fossils is scant, and thus the lines of descent are estimated by those involved in showing the evolution of the dinosaurs. There is no intended deceit by the scientists, as everyone understands the limitations. Given the nature of fossils, and their difficulty in becoming preserved, a lack of transitional fossils is not unexpected. Keep in mind that a “lack of evidence” for one theory (evolution) does not “prove another theory” (a young earth).

Ham briefly touches on the Hebrew word for day, “yom.” More can be read about this in Word Study: Yom (www.answersincreation.org/word_study_yom.htm). Ham claims the dinosaurs were made on Day Six of creation, about 6,000 years ago.

Tyrannosaurus Rex (Page 25)

Ham says that “we know that originally T. rex was a vegetarian.” His sole evidence for this is Genesis 1:30. Yes, God gave the green plants for food, but He did not prohibit the eating of meat in this verse. The Hebrew word for meat can also be translated food, so nothing can be implied about the plants being considered “meat.” Ham goes on to mention the T-Rex’s teeth possibly being designed for melons, gourds, etc. One would not need six inch serrated teeth to open a melon.

To solve the T-Rex tooth problem, Ham takes the standard young earth approach...the Curse from the Fall may have resulted in changes to their structure, either by starting a degenerative process or by deliberate design. There is no evidence to support this claim. There will be a longer discussion on the Curse further into this review.

Ham briefly touches on several issues, such as musculature, the speed of T-Rex, the forearms, and the facts surrounding the discovery and naming of T-Rex and several specimens, none of which has any relevance for the age of the earth debate.

A minor note...he quotes Dr. John Horner as saying nobody has found a skeleton of a young T-Rex. This quote is from 1993, and Ham wrote the book in 1998. At the time of the writing of the book, a juvenile T-Rex was discovered in South Dakota (www.geocities.com/CapeCanaveral/Galaxy/8152/babyrex.html).

Who Discovered Dinosaurs (Page 30)

Ham attributes the discovery of dinosaurs to Adam, who named them, and the rediscovery of them to the scientists which came along within the last 300 years. It is obvious from the fossil record that Adam never saw a live dinosaur. As we will see in a

later section on dragons, many of the legends for these beasts were probably the result of someone discovering a skeleton of a dinosaur. In this sense, mankind has known about these giant creatures for thousands of years, but it is only in the last 300 that serious scientific study has been accomplished on them.

Dinosaurs With People? (Page 31)

Ham claims that “there is a lot of historical evidence that dinosaurs did live with humans.” He will revisit this topic later in the book. However, when we examine it, you will see that Ham’s evidence is nonexistent. He goes on to say that Christians “can authoritatively state that dinosaurs did live with people! This can be declared on the bases of the authority of the Word of God.” The Bible makes no claims of man and dinosaurs living together. For more on this issue, check out the commentary on Job 40-41 (www.answersincreation.org/job4041a.htm) and the Dinosaur section (www.answersincreation.org/dino.htm).

Where Did the Word Dinosaur Come From? (Page 32)

There is not much of interest here.

Is There Another Word for Dinosaur? (Page 33)

Ham poses the question, “Could the stories about dragons actually be accounts of encounters with what we now call dinosaurs?”

The Dragon (Page 34)

Ham claims that the bible talks about dragons as real animals. He uses two verses to support his claim, Psalm 91:13 and Isaiah 43:20. The Hebrew word translated dragon is tannîym. According to Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance, it is;

“a marine or land monster, i.e. sea-serpent or jackal; dragon, sea-monster, serpent, whale.”

The King James Version, which he quotes, is the only major version to translate it as “dragon.” The New American Standard (NAS), regarded by scholars as the most literal version, uses “serpent” in Psalm 91 and “jackel” in Isaiah 43. The New International Version and Amplified Version agree with the NAS. The New King James Version also corrects the KJV version, using “serpent” and “jackel.”

Incredibly, Ham tells the story of the discovery of Baryonyx. The story has absolutely nothing to do with dragons! In the end, he says “...you just might be looking at the skeleton of one of the dragons from English history and legend (e.g., Sir George the Dragon Slayer) or one of the dragons spoken of in the Bible.” He could have easily made the same claim with T-Rex, Allosaurus, or other theropods.

Dragons per se have never been proven to exist. In all likelihood, people of the past discovered dinosaur fossils and came up with these legends to accompany them. It is no

surprise, given the number of dinosaur fossils coming out of China, that China's culture is dominated by the dragon figure. This does not in any way prove that dinosaurs and man lived together.

He goes on to mention the flag of the country of Wales (page 38), and their dragon on the flag. One cannot possibly make an argument that dragons existed because the Welsh put it on their flags! This ties into the discussion of the dragon, and Baryonyx, on pages 35-37 (see above).

Several other dragon legends are mentioned;

Gilgamesh. A search of the Gilgamesh epic revealed no references to a dragon. Perhaps this is another story about Gilgamesh that is outside of the famous epic.

England (St. George). A story based on a fairy tale. For more, see Dragons were dinosaurs (http://wiki.cotch.net/index.php/Dragons_were_dinosaurs).

A tenth-century Irishman who encountered Stegosaurus. This one is found on young earth websites, but I could find no references in secular literature. The Irishman probably found a dinosaur fossil, and made up a story to go with it. The ancient Celts were prolific storytellers, leading to many fairy tales. Generally, it is not a good idea to formulate scientific conclusions based on fairy tales.

The Italian Peasant story. This story was easy to find on the internet...it was all over the young earth creationists websites. No credible scientific websites contained any information. There are two possibilities. First, it was not a small dragon, but something else such as a lizard of some type. Second, it could have been a work of fiction. The author of the work was a prolific writer of scientific texts. I'm trying to verify if he wrote any fiction. The author is most famous for his writings on evidences for the unicorn, thus the accuracy of this dragon report is suspect. Since we have no physical evidence to support this claim, it means nothing.

One final thing to consider...in the Dark Ages and Medieval Europe, it was common to impress the ladies with tales of grand encounters, such as slaying of dragons. There is no actual physical evidence of any of these dragons. Without the physical evidence, all we have are apparently fictitious tales.

Ham mentions that the Hebrew word for dragon is mentioned 21 times in the Bible. However, it is only translated as "dragon" consistently by the King James Version, which is a product of medieval England, which at the time could be considered full of fairy tales about dragons and princes and knights in shining armor. Where other versions use "dragon," it refers to place names (Nehemiah 2:13), or sea serpents (Isaiah 27:1) (not your classic dragon image), or "serpent" or "monster" (Jeremiah 51:34).

As you can see, since young earth creationists cannot get any scientific evidence to back up their claims, they have turned to fairy-tales to prove their theory of a young earth.

He goes on to claim there are two passages where the dragon lived on land. Again, this is a King James only issue. In both verses, all the major translations, including the

New King James, use the word “jackel” and not “dragon.” (The KJV also uses “unicorn”, another throwback to medieval times).

Plesiosaur (Page 40)

I agree that plesiosaurs were created during the events described in the fifth day of creation. However, no time reference can be established due to the days being long ages. To Ham’s credit, he notes that they are not true dinosaurs. However, other creationists, such as Kent Hovind, fail to notice this simple fact. Ham continues with a description of the plesiosaur, which is generic and has no bearing upon the age of the earth debate. He alludes to the possibility that some may still be alive today. This is a possibility, although unproven. A discovery of a live plesiosaur would not, however, prove a young earth. For more, see Plesiosaurs – What If? (www.answersincreation.org/plesiosaur.htm).

Leviathan (Page 44)

Ham relates Kronosaurus to Leviathan. He gives the text of Job 41:1-34 in full, and then goes into a discussion of the discovery, the specimens, its swimming ability, and feeding habits. There is no possible way to connect Kronosaurus to Leviathan...it is all conjecture on the part of Ham.

Pteranodon (Page 49)

Next Ham discusses the flying dinosaurs, using Isaiah 30:6 as a possible Biblical reference to them. The Hebrew words here for “fiery flying serpent” is sârâph ‘ûwph. The first word is translated as burning serpent, with the second word responsible for the “flying.” The New International translates it as indicating poisonous snakes, and this is likely, because the Hebrew word for burning serpent can also be translated as poisonous snake. There is no evidence to link flying dinosaurs to this verse, and any connection is merely guesswork.

Ham states they were created on Day Five, (or, for the old earth believer, during the creative events represented by Day Five). He goes into a discussion of the discovery of these creatures and the crest of Pteranodon. He repeats the Isaiah 30:6 claim, and Ham even admits it is figurative, weakening his argument.

What Did Dinosaurs Eat? How Did They Behave? (Page 53)

What did dinosaurs eat? Whatever they wanted to! As expected, Ham turns this into a discussion of death before the fall. We have already covered this earlier, so there is no need to discuss it here. He mentions coprolites, and the fact that scientists can tell what a dinosaur ate by examining them. This is true. I have one sitting on my desk as I type this. Many reveal signs of a carnivorous diet. Some creationists believe there was no animal death prior to the flood, and even Ham mentions this possibility, but he is non-committal.

Some dinosaur fossils, which some young earth proponents say were killed in the flood, show evidence of being chewed on by other dinosaurs. Combined with evidence from the coprolites, they give clear evidence that animals were carnivorous prior to the so-called worldwide Flood.

Young earth creationists commonly point to animals with sharp teeth, which eat only vegetables and fruits. Sure, there are examples, but just because they eat fruit now does not mean they have always eaten fruit. The two examples given (fruit bat, panda) are just two out of many thousands of species with carnivorous teeth. You cannot argue that just because two are vegetarian, that the rest could have been. This is no different than me saying that since I have prehensile hands, and the chimpanzee has prehensile hands, then my ancestors must have used them to swing from trees. They are both behavioral actions based on body structure, and any mention of what they were used for millions of years ago is merely a guess.

Ham makes the claim that “everything changed because of sin.” Let’s look at this a little closer. There are three aspects to the curse...the curse upon the serpent, the curse upon Eve, and the curse upon Adam. The serpent’s curse could be taken two ways...as only upon Satan, or upon the snakes. In either case, the focus is narrow...the animal kingdom as a whole is not cursed here (Genesis 3:14-15).

Eve’s curse is for an increase in pain in childbearing and in a desire for her husband, for him to rule over her (Genesis 3:16). Again, there is nothing here that affects the animal kingdom.

Adam’s curse does affect the rest of creation (Genesis 3:17-19). God says;

Cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life. Both thorns and thistles it shall grow for you; and you shall eat the plants of the field; by the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground, because from it you were taken; for you are dust, and to dust you shall return.

Again, no animals are involved in this curse. Also note carefully the wording at the beginning, “Cursed is the ground because of you.” God did not curse the ground...it is cursed because of man’s interaction with it. How do we treat our environment today? Pollution, hunting animals to extinction, greenhouse gases, to name a few. The world is cursed because of man...not because of God.

Aside from snakes, the Bible does not say that God cursed the animal kingdom. The animal kingdom is affected by man’s curse, as man damages the creation. God did nothing after the curse to make some animals carnivorous. He mentions Henry Morris, who talks about the possibility of animals developing carnivorous teeth after the Fall. There is no indication this is true. If this were true, then we should have fossils of T-Rex’s with molar teeth! Have you ever seen one?

He mentions Romans 8:22, where Paul says the creation is groaning. I agree...under man’s abusive nature, through pollution, overkilling of species, and other harmful effects, the world is suffering. It is suffering as a result of man’s oppression...not God’s curse upon the creation. It is an indirect effect of God’s curse upon Adam.

Carnivorous Animal Discussion (Page 55)

He mentions Genesis 6:12;

And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. (KJV)

This is used to claim that after the curse, some animals may have even started to eat one another, thus they were corrupt in their ways (is this “animal sin?”). The main meaning for the Hebrew word for flesh, *bâsâr*, is person or man. The Hebrew dictionary gives no indication that this refers to animal flesh. God is not talking about the corruption of the animal kingdom, but about man’s corruption. This is corrected in some other translations (NIV, “people”; Amplified, “humanity”).

Genesis 9:2 is mentioned, where God says the animals will fear man. There is no indication of a change in diet for the animals. The verse only refers to the animal’s fear of man, and not dietary behavior. To use it to support a dietary claim for animals prior to the flood is inappropriate.

Why Do We Find Dinosaur Fossils (Page 57)

Ham makes the claim that evolutionists are now using catastrophic means to understand fossil burial. He then says, “Evolutionists now are basically saying that the fossil record formed quickly, but over millions of years!” This is an oversimplification of the evolutionist position. Yes, some fossils are buried quickly...but not all! One example is fossil fish in the Green River Formation in Wyoming, which are buried slowly over many years. The fossils survived because of the anoxic conditions of the water which prevented predators from feeding on the fish. Also, the simple statement implies a specific event, such as a flood, hurricane, or volcanic eruption. Under normal conditions, such as an animal dying on land, preservation is possible when the animal is washed into a fluvial system and buried over many months. It’s not all instantaneous burial as Ham would have the reader believe.

Next, Ham makes the case that there must have been two of every kind of dinosaur on the ark...I love it when young earth creationists do this! He claims that very small juvenile dinosaurs could have been taken on the ark. He uses the “kind” argument to say there was no need for one of each of the 600+ dinosaur species. For instance, one sauropod, one large theropod (T-rex), one raptor, one stegosauria, etc, is all you need. He says the multiplication of the dinosaurs after the Flood is not evolution, since it involves no new genetic material. It still involves the rapid reordering of genetic material through speciation, and thus it is a selective use of a portion of evolution. Evolutionists see little difference...its still evolution. However, that’s not the issue. Since YECs claim the dinosaurs were mostly wiped out in the flood, the speciation we see would have occurred between the creation and the flood.

The real issue for dinosaurs and the ark does not happen until they get off the ark...more on that later.

Stegosaurus (Page 60)

Ham gives a general description of the Stegosaurus. He starts out with the creation account, reeling in the young earth reader by tying Stegosaurus to Day Six. At the end, he mentions the picture on page 60...and makes the emotional appeal that it would have been easy for Noah to take such a cute baby on the ark, which is no larger than your fist. Unfortunately, babies require much more care and feeding, thus increasing the burden upon Noah, which few young earth creationist researchers take into account in their ark studies.

Number of 'Kinds' of Dinosaurs (Page 65)

Ham comes to the conclusion that there were about 50 "kinds" of dinosaurs which needed to be taken on the ark. He ties this to the Ark study done by Morris and Whitcomb in their book *The Genesis Flood*. They claim you can fit 75,000 animals on one floor of the ark. With 75,000 animals, each person in Noah's family (a total of eight) would care for 9,375 animals daily. Assuming that Noah and his family slept 8 hours, and fed themselves for one hour, that leaves them 15 hours to care for the animals. Since nobody can work 15 hours straight, let's give them four 15 minute breaks, bringing them down to 14 hours. Subtract one more hour for "other tasks," bringing us to a total of 13 hours. There are 780 minutes in 13 hours. This equates to 5 seconds per animal. Does this seem feasible? You can imagine that watering alone would take up all your 5 seconds. Also keep in mind the fact that it was low-tech...there's no plumbing taking water to the various parts of the ship. You could probably carry water in a wheelbarrow or some other device, but every 5-10 animals, you would make a trip back to the water tanks, which would surely take several minutes. Then you have to remove waste and feed the animals. And this is only one of the three floors of the ark!

The dinosaurs not on the ark drowned, thus the millions of fossil dinosaurs we have in the rocks. However, these dinosaur fossils are all several thousand feet above the rock layers supposedly deposited at the start of the flood. For instance, the layers you see in the Grand Canyon are said to be flood deposits. There are no dinosaurs in these layers. It's not until you get two layers stratigraphically above the Grand Canyon rocks that you encounter the first dinosaur fossils. Thus, somehow they survived over a mile of deposition before the flood wiped them out. They must be excellent swimmers! Also, all the trace fossil evidence, such as footprints, trackways, eggs, etc, are all in these layers, several miles above the first flood deposited layers. This is inconsistent with a global flood occurring only thousands of years ago, and has never been addressed by young earth theorists (what they can't solve, they ignore).

Is There Any Evidence of Dinosaurs Living After the Flood? (Page 66) (Alternate Title, "NOAH...Watch Out for that T-REX!")

The short answer is no...because there is no evidence for a global flood. Ham says the dinosaurs came out of the ark, and found a different world. In fact, since the land would have been stripped of vegetation, none of the animals would have any food to eat.

Noah would have to feed the animals for several years after the flood, but this food requirement is not accounted for in the volume studies of the ark.

When the animals left the ark, what did all the carnivores eat? There were seven pairs of the cattle “kind,” and no doubt other species, that would have been the food source for the thousands of carnivores. For instance, a tiger kills about once a week. If it preyed on cattle, the fourteen cattle kind would be killed by the tiger in only 14 weeks. Expand this to all the carnivores, and you see the problem. Throw in the carnivorous dinosaurs, such as raptors and T-rex, and the problem multiplies. The animals on the ark, after they disembarked, would be the food source for the carnivores. The animals that got off the ark, and in all likelihood, Noah and his family, would be dead within the first few months. The fact that I am here...alive and typing this webpage, is testimony that the young earth flood model is not correct. Praise the Lord that He didn't use a global flood!

Ham then refers to Job, and his description of behemoth in Job 40. For a discussion on this passage of scripture, see Job 40-41 (www.answersincreation.org/job4041a.htm.)

Behemoth (Page 69)

Using the large sauropods, Ham gives a description of them (mostly Brachiosaurus), and equates it to behemoth. In reality, the Hebrew word does not indicate what it is...it just means a large quadruped animal. He can no more claim that it was a dinosaur, than we can claim it was a hippopotamus.

Reasons for Extinction (Page 74)

Ham blames a number of extinctions on the Flood, and the post-Flood conditions, although there is no actual evidence to tie them to the Flood. Yes, many animals were killed in the fossil record by floods, but there is no way of knowing “which flood” caused it. Secular scientists have causes for extinctions, which fit the evidence better than the flood model.

He does not go into secular models for extinction. He claims the dinosaur extinction was post-Flood, and the likely cause of it was man...despite the fact that not a single piece of evidence indicates man and dinosaurs were alive at the same time! Ham states it “matter of factly”, with no discussion of this theory, hoping the reader will blindly accept his statements as fact. Keep in mind this book is aimed at youth, who are taught to respect authority figures such as Ham, and accept their words as truth. Therefore, in the culture that is “young earth creationism,” no explanation is needed.

Triceratops (Page 76)

Ham gives a description of Triceratops and the history of its discovery. He equates the finding of 500 skulls and bones to the flood...but without having witnessed the event that caused their death, Ham is merely guessing that the global Flood killed them. Yes, there are many dinosaurs in so-called dinosaur graveyards...but there are many more that are not in graveyards. Sure, I can buy the fact that a flood killed them...but which flood? There are evidences for many floods in the rocks...all of them separate events, and not the result of a single worldwide flood. There is no geologic evidence for a worldwide

flood. The rocks of the world would be very different from what are now if there was a global flood.

Are Dinosaurs Extinct? (Page 81)

He says geologists have been “severely embarrassed several times when, after having declared animals to be extinct, they have discovered them alive and well.” He is referring to “living fossils,” and I’ve never seen the type of embarrassment he refers to. We are excited when we find animals alive that were thought to be dead. This characterizing of such an event being embarrassing is not true. Ham desires geologists to be embarrassed and disgraced, but we are alive and well, and happy as a clam!

Ham goes on to mention present-day dinosaur sightings...none of which have been verified. As is typical of young earth dinosaur claims, he relies upon the cave paintings done by American Indians. However, such drawings do not mean the Indians saw a living dinosaur. For a rebuttal of this claim, see Paleontology Pioneers (www.answersincreation.org/pioneers.htm).

He mentions the Loch Ness monster, saying it could possibly be a plesiosaur. I agree. For more on this claim, see Plesiosaurs: What If? (www.answersincreation.org/plesiosaur.htm). He goes on to mention that finding a T-rex alive in the jungle would not embarrass the young earth creationist. It would not embarrass the old earth creationist, nor the evolutionist, either. We would all jump for joy! Of course, the YECs would jump on this as evidence for a young earth, but it would not be. This would merely be one more living fossil. Instead of arguing living fossils here, please check out the article Living Fossils (www.answersincreation.org/livingfossil.htm).

Next, he discusses the dinosaur to bird evolutionary link. He dismisses one dinosaur with feathers found in 1996...yet this ignores the many more that are clearly feathered dinosaurs that have been found since (Ham’s book is a little out of date). If dinosaurs evolved from birds...great. If not, that’s great too! It has no bearing on the age of the earth, nor upon the doctrines of the Bible.

Ham then goes into a short discussion on the cold-blooded/warm-blooded debate. He mentions a bone study which concluded that dinosaurs were cold-blooded. However, there are equally valid studies indicating the warm-bloodedness of dinosaurs, also based on the bones. The truth is probably a mixture...some species were, some were not. The small theropods, from which birds are said to evolve, present easy evidence for warm-bloodedness. He goes on to mention studies on the fingers of birds and dinosaurs, which supposedly proves birds could not have evolved from dinosaurs. Unfortunately, Ham is only presenting one side of the argument. There is much more evidence to indicate they did. It will always be a topic of debate. In reality, it doesn’t matter! God created them, and however he decided to do it is fine with me...this stuff is interesting, but we shouldn’t get wrapped around the axle over it.

He sums it up with “There is NO evidence dinosaurs evolved into birds.” Actually, the evidence is quite good. There is “no” evidence that Ham is willing to recognize...such a recognition would be contrary to his young earth viewpoint. Whether or not it is true, Ham MUST deny it...thus he has reached the conclusion first, and then sets out to twist the evidence to support his conclusion. This science in reverse is

contrary to the scientific method, and casts doubt upon all young earth creation scientists. For more, see Creation Scientist? (www.answersincreation.org/scientist.htm)

Why Does It Matter? (Page 86)

He tries to tie a person's belief in evolution to how they view the Bible. He says that the teachings of evolution in our education system have a great deal to do with why many will not listen to the Gospel. I agree, but for different reasons.

Young earth creationists, and the churches they are in, have presented this topic as an either/or scenario. Either you accept that God did it in six days, or you reject the creation account and the Bible. Young earth creationists are alarmed about people who go into schools, and learn about evolution and long ages, and then they see the earth is old, so they abandon the Bible. They learned this from their young earth teaching. They were taught that you cannot accept both. In reality, you can.

Because of this either/or mentality, many have left the church...and we have the young earth community to blame for this exodus of people. Over the past century, I would venture to say that young earth creationism has driven many millions away from the church...many more than have come into the church through their efforts. We are working now to undue this damage. Old earth creationism has shown that you can accept the creation account in the Bible, as a literal, historical record, and it does not conflict with the scientific evidence. We need to focus on the real reason for the Bible, the salvation of mankind through Jesus Christ. Billy Graham sums it up best...

I don't think that there's any conflict at all between science today and the Scriptures. I think that we have misinterpreted the Scriptures many times and we've tried to make the Scriptures say things they weren't meant to say, I think that we have made a mistake by thinking the Bible is a scientific book. The Bible is not a book of science. The Bible is a book of Redemption, and of course I accept the Creation story. I believe that God did create the universe. I believe that God created man, and whether it came by an evolutionary process and at a certain point He took this person or being and made him a living soul or not, does not change the fact that God did create man. ... whichever way God did it makes no difference as to what man is and man's relationship to God.

The Implications (Page 87)

Why Is There Right and Wrong? (Page 87)

What Is Marriage All About? (Page 88)

For the most part I agree with Ham here. He says the more people reject Genesis, the worse our cultural situation is. I agree...I just wish Ham would realize how much damage the young earth movement has done to the church, and that they are the main reason people reject Genesis (see the discussion for Why Does It Matter? (Page 86 in Ham's book).

Foundations Under Attack (Page 90)

Ham says the “evolutionary teaching on dinosaurs is an attack on the foundations of Christianity.” Not at all...one can accept that God used evolution to create, and accept Genesis as literal truth. Evolutionary teaching is contrary to the young earth theory, but it is merely a scientific theory. Its purpose is not to attack the Bible. Sure, there are atheistic evolutionists who use it as such, but that does not summarize the whole of evolution.

Ham says the foundation is attacked. The foundation of the Bible is Jesus Christ, and salvation through Him is the only real important issue. Creation is a side issue, which has no bearing upon one’s salvation. Believe what you want about creation...young earth, old earth, theistic evolution, gap theory...whatever. Do you have Jesus? That’s the only real issue in God’s eyes.

Ham says the biblical doctrine of origins is foundational to all other biblical doctrines. Prior to the young earth movement, there was no “doctrine of creation.” It was an addition to the church over the last 125 years. For more, see [The Doctrine of Creation \(www.answersincreation.org/doctrine.htm\)](http://www.answersincreation.org/doctrine.htm).

Ham gives no real reasons to support his doctrinal claim...he just states it matter of factly for the young earth reader to accept blindly.

Millions of Years and the Gospel (Page 92)

Ham goes back to the death before sin issue. He says that accepting millions of years of death is contrary to the Bible, and that the Bible makes it clear that death was a result of sin. We have already dismissed this poor Biblical interpretation in the earlier discussions of this book. For anyone wishing to review it, check out the Death Before Sin article section (www.answersincreation.org/death_before_sin.htm).

Interestingly, concerning Genesis 2:17, where God told Adam he would die that day, Ham says the Hebrew word for death implies it would be a “process of dying.” Young earth creationists like to use the analogy of a grandmother...if an old lady was reading Genesis, and it said “day,” then the grandmother would plainly read it as a 24-hour day. True. Using the same logic, when God said in Genesis 2:17 that Adam would die the day he ate the fruit, the same grandmother must come to the conclusion that Adam would have dropped dead when he bit the fruit. It works for them in Genesis 1, with the days of creation...why not in Genesis 2:17?

In Genesis 2:17, Ham goes to the meaning of the Hebrew word to explain it away. Old earth creationists go to the meaning of the Hebrew word for “day” to explain it in terms of long ages. What’s the difference? If Ham is free to use the Hebrew to reinterpret Genesis 2:17, we are free to use the Hebrew to reinterpret “day.” Yet, Ham and the young earth creationists deny that we can do this! It’s the same thing they are doing for Genesis 2:17! Are young earth creationists the only ones allowed to examine the original Hebrew! Of course, they do not see this hypocritical activity on their part.

Ham then uses the shedding of blood argument. Basically, the shedding of blood prior to Adam would destroy the foundation of atonement. In atonement, the shedding of blood is done for a specific purpose...to atone for sins. Clearly, not all blood shedding is

done for sin (some is a result of sin!). Shedding of blood prior to Adam has nothing to do with sin, as it was not done for atonement for sin.

He briefly mentions the new heaven and new earth, and how it will be restored to how it was at the creation. This state of restoration will be to the conditions in the Garden of Eden, and not the world in general. The Garden of Eden was once a perfect place. The world is not addressed as perfect...only the Garden. The creation as a whole was “very good” (not “perfect”).

If the world were perfect (free of death and decay), then why did God create a special place called Eden, and place man there? If the whole world were perfect, there was no need for Eden! God had foreknowledge of man's fall, and created Eden to show man a glimpse of heaven. He would one day restore this perfection in heaven. Outside the gates of Eden, the world was different. It was also perfect, but in a different sense. It had a perfectly functioning ecosystem, able to self-renew. This was just as God planned it.

Missionary Lizards (Page 94)

Ham claims that dinosaurs are used to brainwash people into believing evolution. Although I like to refrain from using the term brainwash, in reality, that is exactly how the young earth movement sustains itself...by brainwashing their youth into believing in a false theory. This book is part of that effort. It is used in homeschools and in church schools to indoctrinate children. It is not necessary. There are plenty of alternatives to this non-scientific propaganda. Give the children the evidence...if the young earth evidence really is strong enough, let it stand up to the scrutiny of the other theories...may the best theory win! Speaking from experience as a homeschooling father, young earth creationism loses every time the evidence is examined impartially.

Ham says “Sadly, I have found over and over that people, particularly students at schools and colleges and universities, say that because of evolution, the Bible must be wrong.” This is the influence of the young earthers making them choose between one or the other. You can believe in an old earth, with or without evolution, and believe in a literal Genesis creation account. Again, this testifies to the millions that young earth creationism has driven from the churches.

Ham discusses how many churches, who have accepted evolutionary teachings, cannot defend the book of Genesis. I agree. We have many liberal churches that do not take the Bible literally, and their members cannot defend their beliefs. We have always had these liberals...always will have them. However, they don't prove that evolution weakens the church or the Bible. There are many who believe in evolution, and are strong, conservative Christians. Yes, you can have your cake and eat it too!

Ham says many Christians are confused about what to teach their children. This is a direct result of the young earth movement and the either/or choice they present concerning creation. If we teach our children that an old earth is not contrary to the creation account, this problem goes away!

Ham shows his blind ignorance in the closing paragraphs. He claims that “Christians can show the world that the evolutionist story about dinosaurs cannot be defended, but the biblical account presents a logically defensible account that makes sense of the evidence.” The young earth viewpoint makes a mockery of the evidence, and is scientific garbage. The only way to believe it is to put some blinders on that eliminates the old

earth evidence (for more on how this happens, read Morton's Demon (www.answersincreation.org/mortond.htm)). In his rose-colored glasses world, he actually believes this. In reality, the world would laugh at the young earth theory, and they have no chance of converting someone to Christianity through the use of their science (unless the person is uneducated in scientific matters).

What Is A Christian? (Page 97)

How Can I Become a Christian? (Page 97)

What Do I Need to Do? (Page 100)

How Can I Be Sure That I Am A Christian? (Page 103)

There are no major problems here, as long as you realize that you don't have to believe in a young earth to become a Christian.

The Consequences of Compromise (Page 104)

In reality, the only consequence is that you will be free from the unnecessary burden of believing in a false young earth creation account. He paints a picture using an illustration of a father-son conversation, based on his either/or scenario. Again, you can accept an old earth, with or without evolution, and believe in a literal Genesis creation account. If understood properly, there are no negative consequences of old earth belief.

Appendices (Page 107)

Appendix A contains the footnotes for the main section of the book, and appendix B contains other references for research. I'm surprised to see so many references to secular dinosaur works, although in the young earth culture, it is highly doubtful that any young earth creationist would research it more fully...to do so would be "examining the works of the devil" as some young earth creationists put it. The references are merely there to make the book look more scientific than it really is.