

## Post-Flood animals live above their dead Flood relatives

Michael Oard questions if Marcus Ross is right to conclude that North American mammals did not live above their dead Flood relatives.<sup>1</sup> The discussion is about whether the post-Flood boundary is somewhere beneath or above those fossils. If the boundary is beneath, that implies that God allowed huge watery catastrophes to create numerous fossils post-Flood. That also means that no fossils of those mammals were deposited in North America during the Flood. Both consequences are undesirable. I therefore am glad that Oard posits a much higher boundary. But I am missing the most essential and fundamental aspect. Wouldn't the Creator have had a plan by creating, flooding, and recreating?

Ecological zonation was almost certainly created in Creation Week.<sup>2</sup> So, as the pronghorn antelope was living in North America before the Flood, it is there where its fossils can be found.<sup>3</sup> And, after the Flood, the Creator brought the pronghorn antelope back to North America. It lives there today because it fits into His original plan.

So, in Creation Week, He created the animals to live in their specific biotopes. After the Flood, He recreated specific biotopes for them. He returned the animals from the Ark to their recreated habitats.<sup>4,5</sup> Because God is the same 'yesterday and today', He brought the animals indeed back "to their same continent of origin".<sup>6</sup>

Creationists may therefore continue to vigorously defend that the fossils and the strata testify to the Flood, just as the church has always professed.<sup>7,8</sup>

I don't want to play this card too dogmatically, as the Flood could have washed animals away, whereafter they became fossilized on different continents. Also, God could have decided to bring animals to different continents after the Flood for reasons unknown to us. I just want to prevent creationists from making too rigid, and probably false, conclusions by examining boundary-crossing taxa.

I would like to stress that it is perfectly reasonable that biogeography before the Flood would be identical to biogeography after the Flood. That animals now live on the layers of Earth containing Flood fossils of conspecifics is what might be expected.

Stef Heerema

Assen

NETHERLANDS

### References

- Oard, M.J., Did post-Flood North American mammals live above their dead Flood relatives? *J. Creation* 36(3):106–113, 2022.
- Zuill, H., *Ecology, biodiversity and Creation*, *J. Creation* 14(2):82–90, 2000.
- Oard, ref 1, p. 107.
- Heerema, S.J., The marsupial fossil record is not compelling evidence for a K–Pg Flood Boundary, *CRSQ* 56(4):264–265, 2020.
- Taylor, G., Marsupials in Australia—an act of God? *J. Creation* 37(1):3–6, 2023.
- Ross, M., *Evaluating potential post-Flood boundaries with biostratigraphy—the Pliocene/Pleistocene boundary*, *J. Creation* 26(2):82–87, 2012; p. 82. Quoted in Oard, ref. 1, p. 107.
- Tertullian, *On the Pallium* 2.3.
- Pseudo-Eustathius, *Commentary on the Hexameron*.

### » Michael J. Oard replies:

I thank Stef Heerema for his comments on my article. I agree that it is unlikely that huge post-Flood watery catastrophes would bury and fossilize tens of millions of mammals across the globe. As far as it being unlikely that Flood mammals would be deposited in North America, a closer look would show that many of these Tertiary Flood

mammals in North America are also found on other continents. So, it is no big deal for post-Flood mammals to have lived above these Tertiary mammals.

Ross had mentioned the pronghorn as being on North America in both Flood (Tertiary) and post-Flood time (Pleistocene). This is likely his best example. But I noticed Heerema called it an antelope, although the classification system does not. But the pronghorn is so close to an antelope that if we consider it an antelope, then they are found on all continents, except South America, in both the Tertiary and the Pleistocene. This would eliminate the uniqueness of North America.

I do believe in vertical and horizontal ecological zonation before the Flood, and animals were buried by habitat. However, I see no need to accept that God 're-homed' animals after the Flood at their pre-Flood locations. The mammals would have spread from the Ark, differentiating into various species, genera, etc. in the process. And I do not think that pre-Flood and Flood continents are necessarily the same.

Regardless, a closer analysis weakens Ross's argument that specific post-Flood mammals rounded the Bering Land Bridge, where winters would have been much warmer early in the Ice Age, and died over their pre-Flood ancestors from the Flood. Of more significance is, what were the kinds on the Ark, and how do they relate to the kinds before the Flood? I am still contemplating this issue.

Michael J. Oard

Bozeman, MT

UNITED STATES of AMERICA