

of ourselves), let us consider what the record of the rocks tells us. And, for a competent and unbiased (i.e., unbiased in favor of Creationism) summary of that record, let us note the words of the "Dean of American Paleontologists," George Gaylord Simpson, in his book *The Major Features of Evolution*. Simpson writes:

The record already acquired is amazingly good. It provides us with many detailed examples of a great variety of evolutionary phenomena on lower and intermediate levels and rather abundant data that can be used either by controlled extrapolation or on a statistical sampling basis for inferences as to phenomena on all levels up to the highest. Among the examples are many in which, beyond the slightest doubt, a species or a genus has been gradually transformed into another. Such gradual transformation is also fairly well exemplified for subfamilies and occasionally for families, as the groups are commonly ranked In spite of these examples, it remains true, as every paleontologist knows, that most new species, genera, and families appear in the record suddenly and are not led up to by known, gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences.^5

It is most important to realize what Simpson is saying. Gradual transformations leading to new species, new genera, some new subfamilies, and occasionally new families are witnessed to by the record of the rocks. However, *most* new species, genera, and families appear quite suddenly; i.e., the record of the rocks is absent of ancestors from whom they could have descended. Moreover, *practically all* new orders, classes, and phyla appear quite suddenly; i.e., without ancestors. How are these systematic deficiencies, these discontinuities, these gaps in the fossil record to be overcome? Simpson says that this can be done by extrapolation and inference from what we are able to see on lower levels to what we are not able to find on higher levels. To say that such an explanation of the systematic gaps in the record of the rocks, especially on the higher levels, is quite unsatisfactory, is to utter a gross understatement! But how then can these gaps be explained?

I would propose that the record of the rocks is a natural record of God's creative activity. I would further propose that the reason that most new