

is why some evolutionists and others who question the granite-Po-halo evidence of instant creation keep wondering why God didn't provide more evidence for creation when, for over three decades, they continue to be baffled by the Po halos which do exist in these rocks.

I therefore suggest that evolutionists — and all who hold to a belief in an ancient, slowly-evolving earth — should not be surprised when the scientific truth about God leaving His fingerprints in Earth's primordial rocks begins to attract world attention. Indeed, I believe God's special stones — the granites, Earth's foundation rocks — will soon fulfil their special appointment with destiny as they cry out (Luke 19:40) in calling men everywhere back to the worship of our magnificent Creator God (Rev. 14:6-7).

Robert Gentry  
Knoxville, Tennessee  
UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA

## References

1. Gentry, R.V. 1967. Extinct radioactivity and the discovery of a new pleochroic halo. *Nature*, 213:487-490.
2. Gentry, R.V. 1968. Fossil alpha-recoil analysis of certain variant radioactive halos. *Science*, 160:1228-1230.
3. Gentry, R.V. 1971. Radiohalos: some unique Pb isotope ratios and unknown alpha radioactivity. *Science*, 173:727-731.
4. Gentry, R.V. et al., 1973. Ion microprobe confirmation of Pb isotope ratios and search for isomer precursors in polonium radiohalos. *Nature*, 244:282-283.
5. Gentry, R.V. et al., 1974. 'Spectacle' array of <sup>210</sup>Po halo radiocentres in biotite: a nuclear geophysical enigma. *Nature*, 252:564-566.
6. Gentry, R.V., 1992. *Creation's Tiny Mystery*, Earth Science Associates, Knoxville, TN, 3rd edition. See also <<http://www.halos.com>>
7. Gentry, R.V. 1974. Radiohalos in radiochronological and cosmological perspective. *Science*, 184:62-66.
8. Gentry, R.V. et al., 1976. Radiohalos and coalified wood: new evidence relating to the time of uranium introduction and coalification. *Science*, 194:315-318.
9. Wise, K.P., 1986. The way geologists date! In: *The Proceedings of the First International Conference on Creationism*, 1:135-138,

Creation Science Fellowship, Pittsburgh, PA.

10. Gentry, R.V., 1979. Time: Measured Responses. *EoS, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union*, 60:474.
11. Gentry, R.V., 1984. Radiohalos in radiochronological and cosmological perspective. In: 'Evolutionists Confront Creationists', *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Pacific Division. American Association for the Advancement of Science* 1: 38-65.
12. Gentry, R.V. 1986. Radioactive halos: implications for Creation. In: *The Proceedings of the First International Conference on Creationism*, 1:89-112.

## What is a day?

Dr Helweg<sup>1</sup> is right in saying that there is more than one meaning possible for 'day', but having spent 15 years reading and studying the story of creation with Semitic people, I assure you that not even once did it occur to them that 'day' in Genesis 1 meant anything other than a 24 hour period (give or take 12 hours; after all they are Eastern in mindset!).

If we accept verse one of the Bible as true, then to wrangle about how long a day is is asinine! Could God do it in six 24-hour days or is he a wimp?

My argument for a literal six-day creation runs as follows:

1. God is able to create everything in six days.
2. An unbiased reading of Genesis 1 leaves the reader with the clear impression that it is talking about a literal six-day period. Why would God deceive us? Could he not have said in Hebrew: 'After a very long time, God formed the sun, the moon and the stars'? Even I could say that in Hebrew!
3. Radiometric dating has been shown to be an inaccurate, unreliable means of arriving at 'absolute' dates and it *cannot be shown to be free from outside influences* which could alter the data.<sup>2</sup>
4. The fossil record is better interpreted in a diluvian framework

which is able to handle the many anomalies which crop up, without resorting to forced and far-fetched explanations of the evidence.

5. The geologic strata and features are more easily explained in a diluvian framework as well.
6. None of the other fields of scientific study (biology, genetics, astronomy, etc.) can offer any conclusive, irrefutable evidence in favour of evolution in general or millions of years in specific.
7. Given all of the above, I am now faced with a choice in which literal six-day creation has at least as good a basis as long-age creation or theistic evolution. Therefore, I *choose* to believe in the literal six days of creation. This requires much less faith than it would take to consciously deny the proofs against evolution and place my existence into the hands of blind chance.

I am very practically minded. If I chose to believe in long ages in Earth's history, what would I gain by it? The respect of a certain sector of intellectuals and scientists who choose to reject most or all of the Bible? I can live without such respect!

I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I've committed unto Him against that day when we shall meet face to face, knowing also that I followed Christ's injunction to Jairus, 'Don't be afraid, only believe.'

Mark L. Howard,  
Ceuta,  
SPAIN

## References

1. Helweg, O. J., 1997. How long an evening and morning? *CEN Tech. J.*, Vol. 11(3):299-300.
2. For points three through six I could compile an impressive list of books on these subjects from both creationist and evolutionist perspectives. However, this is only a letter, not a doctoral thesis.