

Creation Science Hall of Fame
Peer Review Group on
Three Theories Of The Genesis Flood

The “*Catastrophic Plate Tectonics*”

The “*Crystalline Canopy Theory*”

The “*Hydroplate Theory*”

By

Pastor Roy Saxman, Ph.D.

Table of Content

Introduction	3
Part One - "Catastrophic Plate Tectonics"	5
Part Two - "Crystalline Canopy Theory"	12
Part Three - "The Hydroplate Theory"	30
Conclusion	57
Footnotes	63

Peer Review Panel Three Theories Of The Genesis Flood

Introduction

My name is Roy Saxman Jr., Ph.D. I am an Associate Pastor in Virginia Beach, VA at Tidewater Area Christian Fellowship. I have earned a Bachelor's and Master's degree in Theology, and an earned Doctorate of Philosophy (In Ministry). I was also a founding member of the Origin Science Association in Virginia Beach, VA. I can remember the very first book dealing with the area of Creation Science was Dr. John Whitcomb's "The World That Perished." I found this book at the Elim Bible Institute bookstore while I was attending there. Through it I was also introduced to the book "The Young Earth" by Dr. John Morris and then the writings of Dr. Henry Morris and others. I have read and studied many books dealing with Creation and the Genesis Flood over the years along with other works in the area of Creation Science. Other than high school classes in general science, biology, chemistry, and physics I have had no other formal training in these areas. Other than working in the Research Department at Eastman Kodak doing experiments dealing with the coating for printing plates, both metal plates and then later paper plates. So I am familiar with doing experiments and charting their results. What else I learned I have learned by self study and talking with people that were formally trained in specific areas of science who held degrees in those areas including, chemistry, physics, geology, astronomy and other areas. While I have formal training in many areas of Biblical Studies I do not necessarily agree with all that was taught in those areas. I personally believe before attempting to delve into these areas using a scientific perspective a

person must know what they believe and why they believe it from Scripture (this also applies to studying other peoples works about the Bible). I myself spent the first five years as a Christian studying nothing but Scripture, the only aids I had were prayer, the guidance of the Holy Spirit and also my mentor who would direct me to Scripture to answer the questions I had. So by the time I attended Elim Bible Institute I knew who I was in Christ and what and why I believed the way I did. Now down through the years as God's Spirit would show me more about a specific area of Scripture my knowledge increased and yes some things changed others were reinforced. I am very honored to be included in with those of the peer review group for this endeavor. Enough about me at this point.

Now it is time to move on to the three theories that were presented to us and share what I learned, what I disagree with, and the questions that I wrote down as I read each of the two main papers and the book that were originally sent to us. While I have read all that was sent, I may or may not include anything from them. Seeing as I don't have any scientific training formally beyond high school, I will be coming from the prospective of a Biblical Scholar and a layman in the scientific area. Hopefully what I write here will be of value to our task at hand. I am entering into this prayerfully so that I stay in the correct attitude in what I say so that it will edify all who read this.

Part One - “*Catastrophic Plate Tectonics*”
from the Fifth International Conference on Creationism

I really can not say why I chose to review this theory first, but nonetheless it is the one that I started with. Maybe it is because it was one of the shorter ones and at that time I was extremely busy with helping teach a course at the church. As I read this paper right from the very beginning I had questions. I had hoped that as I continued to read Dr. John Baumgardner’s paper I would find answers to the questions that I had written down, but to no avail. Maybe the question that I have are just too basic and therefore were not covered, or because of the way the answers I was looking for were worded differently than I expected, I may have missed the answers completely. But nonetheless it’s time to delve into the questions that I have about this theory.

One of the first things I notice and began wondering about is in the very first paragraph “the Abstract.” In this paragraph the following caught my attention: “The crucial piece of the puzzle has come from laboratory experiments that have carefully measured the way in which silicate minerals deform under conditions of high temperature and high stress.”¹ This material is addressed again in “the introduction” with a little bit more detail, but my question is still valid. My question is: I was wondering about these experiments, first, where they were when a sample of the silicate minerals were subjected to high temperatures and high stress and then those results were scaled up mathematically. Or were they experiments that were done totally with math or possibly as a computer simulation? The reason I ask these questions is that if all this was totally done with either math or a computer simulation

it is entirely possible that things were adjusted to make sure that the end results are exactly what their theory states. This why I was wondering how these laboratory experiments were done.

Then the second question in the abstract comes from the 2D & 3D simulations, because both of these simulations are total dependent upon mathematical formulas put into a computer.² My question is has there ever been any physical experiments done to see if there are any unforeseen variables that aren't being considered? The reason I ask this is because of being involved in photography since 1962 and doing extensive study and trying things on my own I have found that sometimes, things that the experts say will not work actually will work. One example I encountered was while I was a photographer in the Navy. I need to photograph stress crack on an aircraft bolt under black light (UV light). All the books that were available to us on the ship told us how to set up to photograph, but then they said that it would take a series of trial and error shots to get the correct exposure. They had in large capital letters the fact that you couldn't use a light meter to get the correct exposure because the did not work while using black light. So I used the light meter just to get close (I thought), because I was using a 4"X5" View Camera, I took my light reading right from the ground glass used for viewing and focusing. When I processed the film the exposure was one hundred percent correct the very first time. Now this is not the only example I could give, but it does show the point that sometimes someone trying something that the experts say can't happen, does happen. And I know that math can be figured out to come out with the results that one wants if the work on it long

enough. Along these same lines there is an example of this within the paper itself. “On the other hand, a moderately accurate guess for the initial state is absolutely essential in this type of numerical model if the final state is to bear any reasonable resemblance to today’s Earth. So I have chosen, for purposes of this illustrative calculation, to begin from a state for which we have at least a few reliable constraints in order to obtain at the end a result that somewhat resembles today’s world. I believe this calculation, even though it does not reach back to the very beginning of the actual cataclysm, nevertheless provides useful insight into the dynamics involved and reveals many details that otherwise might not be apparent. Hopefully, with sufficient effort it will be possible in the future to realize a pre-Paleozoic initial state suitably reliable to model the entire catastrophe.”³ In other words, at least to me this is saying I started at the point I wanted to end up and then worked things backwards to get to the starting point. Even though I am not an ace computer programmer, I do know some basic programming. And in writing the program it may take many different attempts to get the program to come up with the results that the program is being designed to produce. And what was written in the article by Dr. Baumgardner sure sound like that is was the person did in order to get his computer models to work correctly.

In the last paragraph under the Discussion section Dr. Baumgardner seems to be using a theory that God set things in motion and than God didn’t have to do anything else for it to come to pass because it was all set in motion from the very beginning. (“A deist believes that God exists and created the world, but does not interfere with

His creation.”⁴ Dr. Baumgardner wrote: “What about the triggering mechanism for the runaway of the mantle’s boundary layers? In my opinion the simplest possibility is that the initial state from which the runaway emerged was built into the Earth as God originally formed it. In fact, I believe this almost certainly had to have been the case. It is also plausible that the Earth’s mantle had been grinding inexorably toward catastrophe during all the 1650 or so years from when Adam disobeyed until “all the fountains of the great deep were broken up,” such that no separate trigger immediately prior to the Flood event itself was even necessary¹⁶⁵ For lack of any more specific information about how the cataclysm was triggered, I personally prefer this simple hypothesis.”⁶ I can understand how Dr. Baumgardner comes to this conclusion as a scientist. But I am not totally convinced that his conclusion can be backed by Scripture. One main reason I say this is because we know from Genesis 1:31 God said that all He had created was very good. So if it was very good there would not have been any flaws in it. The Scripture also lets us know that God knew what He was doing in Creation. “The LORD by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding hath he established the heavens. By his knowledge the depths are broken up, and the clouds drop down the dew.” Proverbs 3:19-20⁷. Because man was made with a free will, what would have happened if Noah had not agreed to do what God wanted? Would the flood have happened anyway because God had set it in motion in the creation? Or because of Noah’s refusal God now would have had to alter His plans and stop what had been set in motion until He could find another person? Because if He didn’t stop the flood every man, woman and child on planet earth would have died in the flood that was just waiting for the time that had been set

in the creation. And then God would not be as wise as would needed to do the job correctly. But because of His Omniscience God and fore planning from eternity past He knew that Noah would be willing to follow the plan of God and heed His warning and build the ark, and that it would be completed in correct time for what would follow.

Dr. Baumgardner in the conclusion states the following: "Part of the answer no doubt is that much of geology focuses on the local detail and is not so directly concerned with big-picture issues. Another part of the answer, however, I believe is that a conceptual model that could account for the magnitude and character of the geological change implied by the observations was simply not available. But with the development of plate tectonics during the 1960's, this situation changed. For the first time in human history a conceptual framework existed that could account for large-scale tectonic change in a coherent manner. A piece of the framework still lacking at that point was a detailed understanding of the deformation properties of mantle rock. But methodical laboratory experiments over the last 35 years have largely removed this barrier. It is now clear that silicates, like metals, display a rich array of deformation behavior, including dramatic weakening at high temperature and moderate levels of stress. With numerical methods now available it is straightforward to show, upon including these deformation properties, that mantles of planets like the Earth have the potential for catastrophic runaway of the material that form their thermal boundary layers."⁸ Like I mentioned earlier I had wondered if there were actual experiments that were then scaled up mathematically, With the very last

sentence in the above paragraph my part of my answer was delivered because the author states “With numerical methods now available....” He does not let the reader know if the methods he is referring to is pure math, a computer simulation or a combination of the two.

After reading and listening to the other e-mails and other things that came by different people within the peer review group. I didn't really find anything that adequately answered any of the questions that I have presented here. Now it must be remembered I am coming from the viewpoint of a layman a lot of the math is beyond my full understanding but I am able to grasp the basics of this theory fairly easily. But I must say in conclusion that this theory does not meet the circumstances surrounding the Genesis Flood as recorded in Scripture. The only possible connection to the Genesis Flood that I see is that the “Plate Tectonic” theory may and I use this advisedly is the breaking up of the fountains of the deep, But even with this, this theory could be incorporated within with the “Hydroplate Theory”⁹ of Dr. Brown. This theory does not really address the are of the water that comes from the windows of heaven. It is postulated that the water from the fountains of the deep was expelled from the ocean with enough speed to be propelled into the atmosphere and space, with some of the water falling back to the earth as rain. To me this sounds exactly like what Dr. Brown expounds in his theory with the waters of the ocean being expelled into the atmosphere and space. But with both of these theories, even if this is true, how could there be enough water to cover the earth's highest land point (at that time) to a depth of about twenty-four feet with the subtraction of the water that was propelled

into space? So, NO! the “Catastrophic Plate Tectonics” does not answer the questions set forth to be answered by the Peer Review Panel.

Part Two - “Crystalline Canopy Theory”

I read this paper with great expectations because I can remember hearing about this, but not necessarily using these same words way back when I was a young Christian in the mid-sixties. So I was glad that I would be getting some more detailed information than I had found down through the years. While I did find lots of information and a ton of details, I still have a several questions that cause me concern.

As I started reading Dr. Baugh’s paper in the introduction I read a couple of things that I had not heard of before. The first was Colin Russell’s article in which Dr. Baugh quotes Russell ““Science is deeply indebted to Christianity” and then goes on to say for scientifically consistent concepts involved in its basic tenets.””¹⁰ I personally have always believed that all true scientific facts will line up with the word of God. The second was the comment about sound being able to become light in the presence of water. I did a quick search online and found that Sonoluminescence has been done many times since the article first appeared in Scientific American in 1995.¹¹ This seem very logical from the stand point that both light and sound are both part of the “electromagnetic spectrum” just at different frequencies. While sound is not visible to the human eye unless it is first put through something like an oscilloscope or other audio instrument. To me it makes sense in light of what I like to call God’s Operating System, This system has been presented to us in Genesis 1 and throughout the Scriptures. When we stop and really think about it everything that

has happened in the physical world by God has been produced by words. God either spoke it directly into existence or he used a person who was willing to follow His direction and speak the words He wanted which then allowed God's Spirit to produce what God wanted to happen, such as the prophets.

One of the first things I noticed did not cause a question for me, but was actually information that would be helpful while looking at the rest of the this paper by Dr. Carl Baugh, he doesn't go on to explain in detail the meanings of the words (see below). I find it interesting that at the end of the Introduction section, Dr. Baugh brings up three words and mentioned that there are definitive distinctions in the Hebrew meanings of these words. The words mention are "create" (bara), "make" (asah), "form" (yatsar), and "establish" (k/quwn),¹² *but then doesn't say what the distinctions are or why they are important to this article.* I understand that basically the word "bara" means to create out of nothing or as some use the Latin phrase "creatio ex nihilo." I like to be a little bit more specific by saying that the word create in Genesis 1:1 means to bring into existence out of nothing that can be perceived by the five physical senses. The Word of God tells us that God created the world with wisdom and understanding (Proverbs 3:19).¹³ Where the word "bara" has to do with speaking something into existence, the word "yatsar" means to form something by squeezing it into the desired shape (such as Adam's body). And the word "k/quwn" means to stand or the action of rising up and or strengthening. And so the word k/quwn has to strengthening something that has already been created or formed. For me these points would have been helpful to be included within the paper instead of having to go to an outside source to see what distinctions are, also that way it

would be easier to refer back to if a person needed to during the reading of the paper. I went to a Bible Software program called PCStudy Bible (one of the upper end programs with many reference works of both Hebrew and Greek. Nonetheless even without the explanation of each word, this is important information presented by Dr. Baugh.

In the section titled “Ancient Firmament Concepts” in the first paragraph quoting Josephus, Dr. Baugh, relays the following: “He also placed a crystalline firmament around it, and put together in a manner agreeable to the earth, and fitted it for giving moisture and rain and affording the advantage of dews.”^{11(Footnote From the Book)}¹⁴ While this is a direct quote from Josephus writings, it does not agree with what is recorded in Genesis. Please check out the following Scriptures. “And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the LORD God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and *there was* not a man to till the ground. But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.” (Genesis 2:5-6). And the first time that rain was falling on the earth is found in Genesis 7:11-12 In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.¹⁵ Maybe it is just me but I would much rather take the witness of Scripture than the witness of a person who was writing from tradition. I understand that in this section Dr. Baugh is just reporting on ancient concepts, but to me this point still needs to be presented at this time before it is lost in the core of the

paper. Continuing in the same vain the following statement shows up: “In contradistinction, the Hebrew concept refers to the **Earth (Josephus)**, the crystalline **firmament (Josephus, Targums, and Midrash)**, and the expanded **heavens (Josephus, Targums, and Midrash)** as being distinctive entities, yet each interrelated and each containing water from the first day of creation. Of notable distinction was the crystalline firmament whose structure would benefit the Earth by stimulating the production of moisture and heavy dews (dews that sometimes condensed as light rain).”¹⁶ Again I would to what I stated above including the Scripture references, but to me this statement again is nothing more an assumption about there being light rain.

Next I came across the following “Ezekiel’s summation of the visual effects involving the three distinctions is found in Chapter 10, verse 1: “Then I looked, and, behold, in the firmament that was above the head[s] of the cherubim there appeared over them as it were a sapphire stone, as the appearance of the likeness of a throne” (Ezekiel 10:1). It is possible that the radiation from the throne in the expanse was transferred through the crystalline firmament, visually and acoustically affecting the worshippers below.”^{15(Footnote From the Book)}¹⁷ As I read this it appears to me that the statement by David Bassett is an assumption because there is nothing that I can find within the chapter of Ezekiel that would indicated that firmament was crystalline, or had any visual or acoustic properties that had any affect on the worshippers mentioned. At least to me these are assumptions made both by Dr. Baugh and David Bassett in that neither one of them have ever seen the crystalline firmament that they are

saying existed. And besides that, no where in Scripture does it specifically say that the firmament was crystalline in nature nor have any special visual or acoustic properties. In doing a quick word study of Ezekiel 10:1 using PCStudy Bible by BibleSoft I found the following. “Firmament OT:7549 רָקִיעַ **raqiya`** (raw-kee'-ah); from OT:7554; properly, an expanse, i.e. the firmament or (apparently) visible arch of the sky: **KJV** - firmament.¹⁸ “Firmament OT:7549 רָקִיעַ: **rāqiya`**: A masculine noun meaning an expanse, the firmament, an extended surface. Literally, this word refers to a great expanse and, in particular, the vault of the heavens above the earth. It denotes the literal sky that stretches from horizon to horizon (Genesis 1:6-8); the heavens above that contain the sun, moon, and stars (Genesis 1:14); or any vaulted ceiling or expanse that stands above (Ezekiel 10:1). By extension, the psalmist uses the word to refer to the infinite and sweeping power of the Lord (Psalms 150:1).¹⁹ “Firmament OT:7554 רָקַע: **rāqa`**: A verb meaning to beat, to stamp, to stretch out. The fundamental picture is that of a smith pounding a piece of metal that in turn causes the metal to spread out as it flattens. This word conveys the action of flattening metal for some specific use (Exodus 39:3); stamping one's foot on the ground as a symbol of displeasure (Ezekiel 6:11); the laying out of the earth in creation (Isaiah 42:5); and the flattening of an enemy (2 Samuel 22:43).²⁰ To me the use of this reference of the word “firmament” as being made up of metal is an assumption that can not be proved scientifically, more about this later in this section of this paper.

Continuing along in the same vain, I found the following. Then in looking at the commentaries within PCStudy Bible I found the following about Genesis 1:6. "*And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.*"

Let there be a firmament, [*raaqiya*] - expansion. Our version, following the Septuagint and Vulgate, uses the word "firmament," which gives an erroneous view of the meaning of the Hebrew term, which comes from a root that signifies to 'beat,' to 'spread out.' If the Hebrew word, in the primary sense of 'a thing beat out,' did point, as many allege, to a metallic plate, it was, like the Greek *stereooma*, or the Latin firmamentum, to express the idea of stability and of splendour, not at all of a solid arch, and was used to designate the blue ethereal vault above us, corresponding with a common, familiar use of the word 'heaven.' Any expressions that are found in Scripture conveying the idea of a solid, permanent dome are used only in the poetical books (Job 26:11; 37:18; Ps. 28:23), or in the language of daily life (Genesis 7:11), the lively imagination of the Hebrews comparing the heaven above us—according to the aspect in which they viewed it—sometimes to a curtain or tent spread out (Psalms 104:2; Isaiah 40:22), and at other times to a molten looking-glass. But such figurative terms no more expressed their real conceptions of the visible heavens than modern travelers in Palestine, who often describe it as 'molten lead,' or ourselves, who speak of it as a canopy, thereby indicate our views of its true nature.

God made the firmament. The verb [*'aasaah*] being used here which means to make, prepare, arrange, etc. (Proverbs 8:27-29), shows that the atmosphere was not now for the first time brought into existence by the will of God; but that it was cleared of the dense mists which, previous to the second day, had surrounded the globe.

Divided the waters under the firmament from the waters above the firmament. "The waters under the firmament" are understood to be those mentioned in Genesis 1:10, and by "the waters above the firmament," a reference must be made to those which, in the form of clouds and vapour, are known to lodge in the atmosphere (Judges 5:4; Job 26:8; 38:34; Psalms 18:11; 104:3; Jeremiah 10:13), and were then formed. There is a remarkable precision in the language employed, when it is borne in mind that the command, "Let it divide the waters from the waters," was given previous to the appearance of dry land. The expansion by heat of a dark and turbid atmosphere would produce the effect, that while the larger and heavier mass of the vast deep which covered the surface of the earth would remain below, the more volatile portion of the waters would fly off into the upper regions, and thus "divide the waters from the waters." That the Hebrews were acquainted with the natural process of evaporation by which "the waters above the firmament" were supplied, is abundantly evident from Genesis 11:6; 1 Kings 18:44; so that there is not a shadow of reason for the cavil about

their gross ignorance in conceiving the existence of a celestial ocean which was supported on the solid vault of heaven.

Previous to the dawn of this day (the atmosphere being saturated with an excess of humidity), the watery vapours fell so low as to press upon or come in contact with the surface of the earth. There was no boundary line; the one appeared to merge into the other. Now God "made," i.e., 'prepared,' the firmament by the expansive influence of heat, so that it carried up the lighter parts of the waters which overspread the earth's surface, and kept them suspended in the visible heavens. The command was, "Let it divide" - literally, 'Let it be dividing,' or continue to divide. The separation between the waters on the earth, and the clouds, which are the bearers of moisture in the sky, was to be a complete and permanent one.

Called the firmament Heaven. In the highest sense of the term this word denotes the place of the divine residence; but it is frequently and familiarly applied to designate that aerial canopy that surmounts the earth.²¹

And I also found the following. "Genesis 1:6

Verse 6. - *Day two*. The work of this day consisted in the formation of that immense gaseous ocean, called the atmosphere, by which the earth is encircled. **And God said, Let there be a firmament** (*rakiya*, an expand, from *rakah*, to beat out; LXX., στερέωμα; Vulgate,

firmamentum) **in the midst of the waters.** To affirm with Knobel, Gesenius, and others that the Hebrews supposed the atmospheric heavens to be a metallic substance (Exodus 24:10), a vault fixed on the water-flood which surrounds the earth (Proverbs 8:27), firm as a molten looking-glass (Job 37:18), borne by the highest mountains, which are therefore called the pillars and foundations of heaven (2 Samuel 22:8), and having doors and windows (Genesis 7:11; 28:17; Psalms 78:23), is to confound poetical metaphor with literal prose, optical and phenomenal language with strict scientific statement. The Vulgate and English translations of *rakiya* may convey the idea of solidity, though it is doubtful if στερέωμα (LXX.) does not signify that which *makes* firm as well as that which is made firm (McCaul, Wordsworth, W. Lewis), thus referring to the well-known scientific fact that the atmosphere by its weight upon the waters of the sea keeps them down, and by its pressure against our bodies keeps them up; but it is certain that not *solidity*, but *expansiveness*, is the idea represented by *rakiya* (cf. Scottish, tax, to stretch; Job 37:18; Psalms 104:2; Isaiah 40:22).

"The firmament, expanse of liquid, pure,

Transparent, elemental air, diffused

In circuit to the uttermost convex Of this great round."

(Milton, 'Par. Lost,' Bk. 7.)

And let it divide the waters from the waters. What these waters were, which were designed to be parted by the atmospheric firmament, is explained in the verse which follows.”²²

I looked at both of the commentaries used above to see how they handled the word “firmament” as found in Ezekiel 10:1, in both cases neither commentary even mentions the firmament instead they both deal with the rest of the verse. So to me these writers appear to feel that the word “firmament” was not the important part of this verse that Dr. Baugh and David Basset seem to imply.

The next thing that I have questions about is within the “Universe’s Optical Axis of Rotation” section of this paper. In this section Dr. Baugh quotes from a paper put out by the University of Rochester in April 1997. Here is what Dr. Baugh wrote in the paper.

“Universe's Optical Axis of Rotation”

The universe might be behaving like a birefringent crystal in which light moving in one direction behaves differently from light traveling in another direction.

“The team made the finding by studying the polarization (orientation of electric fields) of radio waves from 160 distant galaxies as measured in previous experiments by astronomers around the world. Nodland and

Ralston found that the plane of polarization of the light rotates like a corkscrew as the light travels through space, and that the orientation of the universal axis that they've discovered is key to the amount of rotation. The rotation of polarization depends on the angle at which the light moves relative to the axis and on the distance the light travels before being measured. The effect is crudely analogous to that of a crystal that twists light depending on the direction light is traveling through the crystal. ... The data indicate that light actually travels through space at two slightly different speeds.”

“All Space is Not Equal: Physicists Find Axis that Gives the Universe Orientation,” *University of Rochester News*, April 17, 1997.

“Surprisingly, we [Borge Nodland of the University of Rochester, NY, and John P. Ralston of the University of Kansas] found that a wave’s polarization plane undergoes an additional rotation that is very different from Faraday rotation. The amazing thing is that the new rotation depends on the *direction* the wave moves through space. This is reminiscent of how a birefringent –or electromagnetically *anisotropic*- crystal changes the polarization plane of light passing through it in a way that depends on the direction the light travels through the crystal...”²³

By doing a search online I was able to find the paper mention from the University of Rochester.²⁴ A couple of statements by Nodland that I think should have been included so the reader would have a clear understanding of the scientists involved in these experiments and their motivation for doing the experiments. First, "Scientists have long theorized that the Big Bang was completely symmetric. Says Nodland: "Perhaps it was not a perfect Big Bang, but a Big Bang with a twist to space and time." Such a twist would be seen today as a ripple of non-uniformity, perhaps as the axis (an "axis of anisotropy") represents." Second, ""Questions about the universe and our role in it have fascinated Nodland ever since he can remember, filling his mind as he took long hikes while growing up in his native Norway. "I've always had a passionate interest in the universe and its origins," he says. "We're on a little planet going around some burning mass that we call a sun, in a certain region of space. What is this space, and why are we here? The universe is amazing, and I want to know the most I can about it.""²⁵ At least to me by referring to the "Big Bang Theory" and then also saying that the ripple of non-uniformity creates a problem. First the Big Bang Theory unless Nodland means by this that God said it, and "**BANG**" there it was I have a problem because then he is definitely referring to the evolutionary use of the "Big Bang Theory." Second, the ripple of non-uniformity creates a problem because of what the Scripture says in Genesis 1:31 where God saw everything He made and it was very good. The only possible way that I can see that a ripple of non-uniformity could be explained at all by Scripture is that it was one of the possible things that was corrupted when man fell.

In the supplement provide in Dr. Baugh's paper there are several things that I have questions and comments about. The first is found in the section titled "6. Conductive and Convective Heating of the Atmosphere due to the Canopy." In the first paragraph we find: "Since there would have been no air currents presumed to have existed in the pre-Flood earth (there would have been no source for pressure differentials within the stable atmospheric environment, enclosed by the canopy), there would not have been any *convective* heating of the atmosphere."²⁶ I have problems with this first since the author uses the word "presumed" to me that means he is starting with the answer he wants and not necessarily what was in fact true. While I am not a formally trained scientist, I believe there was a source for a pressure differential within the atmosphere. I know from reading and also having friends that are pilots that as the air near the ground is heated because of the ground absorbing and reflecting light it creates what are know as thermals and because of the hot air rising both birds and glider pilots use these thermals to climb to a higher altitude. And at some point this hot air cools down and falls to the ground thus creating an air current the very same thing would have been taking place before the flood. And the movement of the hot and cool air would thus provide the pressure differential needed to produce air currents. Than I have another question that I do not have the expertise to answer. Would not the same be true of the world before the flood as it is today in that the higher one goes in the atmosphere the cooler the temperature?

In order to ask my next question from the supplement first I need to share one thing from the body of the paper in this supplement. From the body of the paper “Their work demonstrates that a 2-cm-thick Silicate Sugilite Crystalline Canopy could be suspended eleven miles above the pre-Flood Earth.^{34(Footnote From the Book)»27} The model envisions a 95% radius to the Earth under pre-Flood conditions. In further consideration, if we propose a 1-cm-thick canopy suspended ten miles above a pre-Flood Earth with a 95% radius, the energy required to keep it suspended is appreciably less.” Then from the supplement “As stated earlier in the body of this paper, the pre-Flood earth is considered to have its distance between the core and the surface reduced to 95%, so the essential data for the pre-Flood earth are contained in the following Table 2-S”²⁸ Now my question. If the fountains of the deep were released, would that not mean that the dry land sank? The reason I ask this is that with volume of water needed for the flood the caverns would be so large and the pressure that the water was under, once released and these caverns drained of the water would not the roof of most of them collapse and in doing so would not the land level be lower than what it started at?

The next thing I wondered about is found in the section titled: “*Crystalline Candidate # 2: Canopy as Metastable Hydrogen Lattice.*”²⁹ In the second paragraph the following is stated: “Free hydrogen is usually understood to be a gas, but it is specifically listed as a metal at the top of the Periodic Table of Elements (Group 1A – Alkali Metals). Metastable hydrogen has been discussed among physicists as theoretically holding the potential to maintain its crystalline metallic structure

following the metastacizing process.^{36(Footnote From the Book)} This potential is illustrated similar to diamond carbon atoms maintaining their crystalline structure after extreme pressures and high energies have been released.”³⁰ I wondered how much pressure would be needed to turn hydrogen gas to a metal. On the internet I found an article that stated it would take a pressure of 220 GPA (gigapascals). So I then found an program to convert GPA³¹ to Pounds Per Square Inch³² (PSI). using this program I found that taking the GPA value and converting it to PSI it would take 31,908,302.3006 PSI to change hydrogen gas into something that at least had metallic properties, it did not say that the hydrogen was actually turned into a metal and the moment the pressure was lowered to 200 GPA it reverted back to a gas. So to me that means that the pressure required would have had to have been sustained from the creation of the firmament to the day it was destroyed at the time of the flood. Not only that but how much pressure would have been exerted on the atmosphere and people and anything else alive at during all that time because the 220 GPA would be needed on both sides of the crystalline canopy? That is unless God provided a miracle! Then following not to much later in the supplement it is brought out that “*Nature* reported that chemists [F]ound that oxygen and hydrogen carefully pressurized in a diamond anvil container to 76,000 atmospheres at room temperature resisted explosive condensation into droplets of water. Instead, the gaseous molecules appeared to cluster quietly into a 14-atom compound containing three molecules of oxygen and four molecules of hydrogen... [T]he spectroscopic measurements made of the pressurized oxygen-hydrogen mixture “are almost identical” to those of the separate elements in solid form.^{50(Footnote From Internet Site)} As

discussed previously, the extreme pressures required could be compensated by intense magnetic energies. This candidate, too, remains an option.”³³ Being the layman that I am when it comes to this area of science I wondered how much pressure in pounds would 76,000 atmospheres be. As I remember from my ninth grade science class one atmosphere equals 14.7 pounds per square inch at sea level. So then using $76,000 \times 14.7 = 1,117,200$ pounds per square inch. That is an awful lot of pressure to be placed on the human and animal bodies! How can the body handle that much pressure especially when one adds the amount of pressure required to change hydrogen gas into a metal, seeing as it requires 31,908,302.3006 PSI? But then I wanted to look at a statement at the end of this quote. “As discussed previously, the extreme pressures required could be compensated by intense magnetic energies.” see above in this paragraph. So I traced this statement back to “2. Earth’s magnetic force on the canopy” where it says the following “So what remains is to obtain an appropriate value of the magnetic field strength at the canopy, B_{cp} . As stated above, it is estimated that B_{cp} , would have a magnitude of about 2000 G (see Appendix S.2 for details).”³⁴ Again I am not a machination So I will not even try to explain the math used here, but I do have one last question for this area. How much magnetic force and all living things on the Earth endure?

There is one last thing I would like to address from Dr Baugh’s paper and that is in the conclusion. Within the second paragraph there are things I agree with, but there is also one thing that I can not agree with. First the paragraph in question is as follows: “The mechanism that triggered the Flood was the voice of God in

judgmental disruption of Earth's internal structure.¹³⁶(Footnote From the Book) This mechanism simultaneously disrupted the raqiya in its structure as a localized microcosm (canopy suspended over Earth) and as a universal macrocosm (expanse of space). "The skies sent out a sound."¹³⁷(Footnote From the Book) As a consequence "The stars are not pure in [God's] sight."¹³⁸(Footnote From the Book)³⁵ First, let me say that I agree it was God's Voice that started the flood. Yes, it had to disrupt Earth's internal structure because the fountains of the deep were let loose. But I can not agree with Dr. Baugh's use of Job 25:5 to prove that the stars are not pure in [God's] sight. Lets look at this verse in context. Job 25:1-6 Then answered Bildad the Shuhite, and said, Dominion and fear *are* with him, he maketh peace in his high places. Is there any number of his armies? and upon whom doth not his light arise? How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean *that is* born of a woman? **Behold even to the moon, and it shineth not; yea, the stars are not pure in his sight.** (Emphasis added) How much less man, *that is* a worm? and the son of man, *which is* a worm? Note that this verse is in the context of Bildad in answering Job statement in chapters 23 & 24. While it is true that Bildad said **Behold even to the moon, and it shineth not; yea, the stars are not pure in his sight.** (Emphasis added), it does not mean that this is the truth. Because then it would mean that what God said in Genesis 1:31 was incorrect. It must be remembered that there are things that are truly stated in Scripture, and then there are things that are truth. Job 25:5 is truly stated along with many other Scripture. While on the other hand Genesis 1 and John 1:1 and many other Scriptures are truth. Like Jesus said Thy Word is Truth

(John 17:17) That is God's Words, not necessarily words spoken by others in Scripture.

I am at the point of stating my conclusion that this theory only addresses one element of the flood the waters that came through the windows of heaven. And to me when a person uses words like "assume" and "presume" it means "I'm starting where I want to end and then I'm going to use those things that will help me prove that point by working backwards and finding what supports my theory." To me there are so many points within this theory that would require the conclusion that God had to perform a series of several miracles so that the "Crystalline Canopy Theory" would work the way it is presented. So, no! This theory can not be supported as being the only one to completely explain the Genesis Flood. But parts of it may explain the part of Genesis that talks about the windows of heaven being opened.

Part Three - "The Hydroplate Theory"

I don't totally know why I waited to work on this theory last, but partly it was because it was the last to arrive in my possession, and partly because of the volume of material to read and consider. But as I read I ended up with more and more questions. I probably will not put all of them in this paper, but the ones I do will be of the most importance to me and hopefully to others also. The ones I choose not to include are not unimportant but just the fact that to include them would increase the size of my response dramatically.

I am going to start of this section by quoting a paragraph by Dr. Brown. "Part II will show, in ways an interested layman can understand, the flaws in these geologic explanations and that *a global flood, with vast and unique consequences, did occur.* For example, coal, oil, and methane did not form over hundreds of millions of years; they formed in months. Fossils and layered strata did not form over a billion years; they formed in months. The Grand Canyon did not form in millions of years; it formed in weeks. Major mountain ranges did not form over hundreds of millions of years; each formed in hours. These statements may appear shocking, until one has examined the evidence in Part II. You will be hard-pressed to find anyone willing to debate these matters with someone who understands the flood. [See pages 516-519.]³⁶ With this quote I was expecting something simple enough that a person like me or someone with even less understanding of this subject would be able to grasp,

but there is a lot of stuff that is discussed in a way that is anything but at the layman level. More about this as things come up within Dr. Brown's writings.

In a paragraph titled "Layered Fossils," Dr. Brown writes, "Fossils rarely form today, because dead plants and animals decay before they are buried in enough sediments to preserve their shapes. We certainly do not observe fossils forming in layered strata that can be traced over thousands of square miles. How, then, did so many fossils form? It will soon become apparent why animals and plants were trapped and buried in sediments that were quickly cemented to form the fossil record and why fossils of sea life are found on every major mountain range."³⁷ To me even as a teenager I knew that heaviest things settled out of water first and then the next lighter and so on until the lightest particles settle and then the water above is clear. So I have always believed since I was a Christian and started looking at the Biblical account and comparing it to what my science teacher was saying I saw a definite problem. There was no way that it took millions of years to lay down all the sediment at covered the fossils. Because just like today they would have decayed and many small animals would have gnawed at the bones and destroyed them long before they could have been fossilized. A modern example would be every year male whitetail deer shed their antlers. By the end of spring one would be very fortunate to find even large enough pieces to tell what they were. I have found this out myself because of being a hunter and being in the woods in the springtime. As to the fact that there are fossils of sea animals high in every mountain ranges around the world. I wonder is this is because of what Scripture says in Genesis about the land being

divided in the days of Peleg.³⁸ Now I know some say that this was the same as the dividing of the promise land to the Children of Israel. But could it also refer to when the continent broke up into the continents that we know today and were moved to their present position?

The next thing that I want to bring out is a subject that I have mentioned earlier in this paper, but Dr. Brown not only mentions it but goes into more detail as to why it is needed. He brings it up under the heading of “How to Evaluate Theories.” In the first paragraph he states, “To explain scientifically an unobserved event that cannot be repeated, we must first assume the conditions existing before that event. From these assumed starting conditions, we then try to determine what should happen according to the laws of physics. Three criteria should be used to evaluate the proposed explanation.”³⁹(Footnote From the Book) He then proceeds to explain the three criteria, first, the process, second, (*Parsimony* here means “the use of few assumptions.”⁴⁰(Footnote From the Book) third, prediction.⁴⁰ As before when I hear an author using the word assume or assumptions I have problems because to me when the author is just guessing and hoping that people will overlook it. Because he is starting with a set up that is favorable to his theory so that it is put forward in the best possible light.

Moving along in the same section I found the following. “Scientific explanations are never certain or final, and the overused word “prove” is never justified except possibly in mathematics or a court of law. Science is even less certain when dealing

with ancient, unrepeatable events, because other starting conditions might work as well or better than the proposed starting conditions. Maybe we have overlooked a physical consequence or have improperly applied the laws of physics. Certainly, we can never consider all possibilities or have all the data. So, to try to scientifically understand unobservable, unrepeatable events, we must consider many sets of starting conditions, estimate their consequences based on physical laws, and then see how well those consequences meet the above three criteria. Ancient records, such as the Mosaic account in the Bible or legends, do not give **scientific** support for the truth or falsity of an ancient event. Such records may provide important **historical** support to people with confidence in a particular ancient record. This, however, is not science. Here in Part II, we will focus on science.”⁴² While I do understand that Dr. Brown is producing a book to better help the average non-believing person and scientist to feel that this book is put forth in a non-threatening way to their point of view I must protest a statement at the end of the above quote. Just so everyone knows I am not attacking Dr. Brown, just the words he chose to use. Here is the statement I am referring to, “Ancient records, such as the Mosaic account in the Bible or legends, do not give **scientific** support for the truth or falsity of an ancient event. Such records may provide important **historical** support to people with confidence in a particular ancient record. This, however, is not science.” With this statement it appears that the Word of God is to be considered less important than any scientific theory that may be put forth, at least this is the way it appears to me. The reason I say this is that the section as written would have been complete without this statement even being present or the last sentence of the quote

above. Also it appears as a way to appeal to people who do not recognize Scripture as being important.

Dr. Brown in the section “The Hydroplate Theory: Key Assumptions,” starts out with “Assumption 1: Subterranean Water,” where he puts forth that there were huge deposits of water about 10 miles below the earth’s surface in what I would call gigantic underground caves.⁴³ To me this would basically be the same thing that is found in Genesis when it says the fountains of the deep were broken up.⁴⁴ While it may not be a completely scientific explanation of what happened at least to me the Scripture is talking about the same thing because there had to be a storage place for all the water that was released.

The following statement had me thinking, “The rupture began with a microscopic crack at the earth’s surface. Because stresses in such cracks are concentrated at each end of the crack, both ends grew rapidly—at about 3 miles per second.⁴¹(footnote from the book) Within seconds, this crack penetrated down to the subterranean chamber and then followed the path of least resistance. The rupture probably completed its path around the earth in about 2 hours.⁴²(footnote from the book) Initial stresses were largely relieved when one end of the crack ran into the path left by the other end. In other words, the crack traveled a path that intersected itself at a large angle, forming a “T” on the opposite side of the earth from where the rupture began.

As the crack raced around the earth along a great-circle path, the 10-mile-thick crust opened like a rip in a tightly stretched cloth. Pressure in the subterranean chamber directly beneath the rupture suddenly dropped to nearly atmospheric pressure. This caused supercritical water to explode with great violence out of the 10-mile-deep “slit” that wrapped around the earth like the seam of a baseball.”⁴⁵ As I took time to ponder this (actually over a days time) I ended up thinking this through and ended up with the following question. What is the process at this point the would stop the entire area of the crust within this crack from being ripped off and flung into space instead of just the super heated water under the extremely high pressure to only come out at the point of the crack? To me Dr. Brown is saying that this rupture acted like a nozzle of a hose or maybe a jet engine, instead of acting like a balloon when a hole is punched in it.

Another statement I have problems with is: “All along this globe-circling rupture, whose path approximates today’s Mid-Oceanic Ridge,^{43(Footnote from the book)} a fountain of water jetted supersonically into *and far above* the atmosphere. Some of the water fragmented into an “ocean” of droplets that fell as rain great distances away. This produced torrential rains such as the earth has never experienced—before or after.”⁴⁶ The problems with this statement is because in effect it is putting Scripture in a very bad light. This statement is saying that either God didn’t tell Moses the truth, or Moses didn’t hear God correct when he wrote the book of Genesis, because it is saying that the windows of heaven that were opened were actually nothing more than the water that went up came back down as the rain that produced the flood.

Now moving on to the section called “The Origins of Ocean Trenches, Earthquakes, And the Ring of Fire.” I found the following statement and I can definitely agree with it. “Plate tectonic theory claims that earthquakes occur when plates rub against each other, temporarily lock, and then jerk loose. If so, why are some powerful earthquakes far from plate boundaries?^{9(Footnote From the Book)} Why do local earthquakes sometimes occur when water is forced into the ground after large water reservoirs are built and filled?^{10(Footnote From the Book)} Following the 2004 Sumatran earthquake and tsunami that killed 230,000 people, why was there a permanent drop in the pull of gravity below the epicenter? According to plate tectonics, the mass should not have changed. This was measured very precisely by the GRACE satellite system.^{11(Footnote From the Book)}⁴⁷ So true when the news reported that an earthquake took place about 450 miles below ground level....⁴⁸

In the section titled “Magma Production and Movement,” I found the following statement. “Earth’s magma began to be produced during the flood. [See “**Melting the Inner Earth**” on pages 541–544.] The magma’s final volume was more than 120 times greater than all the water in today’s oceans! With so much more liquid rock inside the earth than liquid water on earth, we need to understand how magma forms and why it moves.”⁴⁹ As I was reading the very first sentence of this statement I had a question come to mind. That question is Dr. Brown saying that before the flood the earth’s whole core was solid? Then I thought why would not there have been any magma before the flood? Unfortunately I do not have the knowledge to

answer these questions, but I would someday like to find the answers to these questions.

I can sort of see what Dr. Brown is saying in the next thing I will mention, but I still do have a question, first here is the paragraph in question. "Suppose the inner earth initially had a more uniform mixture of minerals. Heating would first melt minerals with lower melting temperatures, which would allow denser grains to settle and lighter grains to rise, a process called *gravitational settling*. This would generate much more heat and produce more faulting, melting, and gravitational settling. After many such cycles, the earth's core would form with solid, denser minerals (containing iron and nickel) settling to form the inner core and the melt forming the liquid outer core. Shifting so much mass toward the center of the earth and doubling the density of the rock melting below the crossover depth would increase earth's rotational speed. Today, the earth spins 365.256 times each year, but there are historical reasons for concluding that a year once had 360 days.³⁵(Footnote From the Book) [For details, see "Melting the Inner Earth" on pages 541–544.].⁵⁰ I can agree with the statement about lighter minerals to rise within the core and the heavier minerals to drift towards the center of the core. But my question is about were Dr. Brown states that the heavier minerals would form with solid denser minerals, would not those minerals also be in more of a liquid state because of the increased heat and immense pressure at the depth the core is at?

I can totally agree with the following statement, “Both the hydroplate theory and the plate tectonic theory are explained as their advocates would explain the theories. One should critically question every detail of both theories, and not accept either until all available evidence has been considered.”⁵² This sound advice no matter what theory a person is examining.

In quoting Dr. Chamberlin, Dr. Brown shares something very important that all those seeking the truth need to remember whether they are looking at scientific theories or a scholar or theologian looking into Scripture. “Multiple Working Hypotheses. Dr. Thomas Crowder Chamberlin, former president of the University of Wisconsin and the first head of the Geology Department at the University of Chicago, published a famous paper^{103(Footnote From the Book)} in which he warned researchers not to let one hypothesis dominate their thinking. Instead, they should always have or seek multiple working hypotheses. Chamberlin stated that by testing competing hypotheses or theories, we sharpen our analytical skills, develop thoroughness, reduce biases, and learn to discriminate and think independently, not simply memorize and conform.

Chamberlin said the danger of teaching only one explanation is especially great in the earth sciences, where much remains to be learned. Both the plate tectonic theory and the hydroplate theory claim to explain ocean trenches, earthquakes, and the Ring of Fire. The plate tectonic theory dominates the earth sciences. A recent survey of scientists selected it as the most significant theory of the 20th century.

Undoubtedly, Darwin's theory of organic evolution would be voted as the most significant theory of the 19th century. Both dominate, despite growing recognition of their scientific problems, because schools and the media ignore competing explanations. Chamberlin warned about the comfort of conformity." As dedicated people we need to remember this quote as we continue to study in the field that God shows us from now on. Don't allow yourself to become target fixated (A term used for combat pilots who become so focused on their target that they lose sight of all else including them colliding with their target).

As I read the following I had a question flash through my mind, before I share the question here is the paragraph in question. "The hydroplate theory, supported by hundreds of other evidences, easily explains ripples on the Continental Divide. Sediments, eroded by the escaping subterranean waters during the flood, were quickly deposited through those waters. On the continents, the deposits average more than a mile in thickness. Liquefaction sorted most of them into the prominent layers we see today, and fluttering hydroplates produced gigantic waves, causing ripples even on the deep seafloor. The compression event buckled, crushed, and lifted the Rocky Mountains in hours. (That lifting of the seafloor up through the water also produced a powerful, ripple-producing flow.) Prior to the flood, supercritical water in the subterranean chambers dissolved and uniformly spread cementing agents, such as silica and calcium carbonate, throughout the water. Months and years after the flood, the warm flood waters cooled, so those minerals came out of solution, lodged as precipitated solids (or cement) in the tiniest spaces between

sedimentary grains. What were the forces, energy, and mechanism that produced ripples on the Continental Divide? Gravity, the kinetic energy of massive hydroplates sliding downhill, and buckling.”⁵⁴ The question that I have actually comes from this one sentence. “Months and years after the flood, the warm flood waters cooled, so those minerals came out of solution, lodged as precipitated solids (or cement) in the tiniest spaces between sedimentary grains.”⁵⁵ My question is this, If the flood waters were saturated with the minerals mentioned above and they stayed in solution for months or maybe even years. Where did the clean water come from that Noah and his family and all the animals need to live before all these extra minerals came out of solution? I am not sure but to my way of thinking the water would have been very alkaline. And maybe to alkaline to drink everyday.

Moving on to the section titled “The Origin of the Grand Canyon,” I can agree with the statement in the third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of this section. “Probably the foremost question visitors have is, “How did this happen?” Bruce Babbitt, former Governor of Arizona (1978–1987) and U.S. Secretary of the Interior (1993–2001), relates the answer given by John Hance. In 1883, Hance became the first non-Native American to live at the canyon. He was one of the canyon’s most colorful personalities, tour guides, and explorers.

Children loved John Hance, and to them he always explained how the canyon came into being. “I dug it,” he would say simply. This story worked well for years until one little four-year-old girl asked seriously, “And where did you put the dirt?” Hance had

no ready answer; he never used that story again. But it bothered him the rest of his life, and when he was dying he whispered to his waiting friends, "Where do you suppose I could have put that dirt?"^{74(Footnote From the Book)}

That question still bothers geologists, because if the Colorado River carved the canyon, as commonly assumed, there should be a gigantic river delta where the Colorado River enters the Gulf of California. Instead, the delta is relatively tiny.⁵⁵ This is a great question where did all the dirt go? See figure 136 later on in this section of the book.⁵⁶

Within this section there is an area title "Details Relating to Mckee's Proposal," In Number "53. *Forces, Energy, and Mechanisms*. Since 1960, geologists have claimed that plate tectonics provides the forces, energy, and mechanisms that made the Grand Canyon.^{78(Footnote From the Book)} Supposedly, a subducting plate, which has since vanished, dove from the Pacific Ocean down about 1,000 miles into the mantle and 1,000 miles eastward. These geologists admit that the plate acted differently from any other plate; it crushed and buckled the Rocky Mountains^{79(Footnote From the Book)} but only lifted the Colorado Plateau. Never explained is why the mountains' layers crushed and buckled but an adjacent plateau and its horizontal layers rose."⁵⁷ Even if this were true, how would one be able to prove it? There is no possible way because there was no one alive during that period of time that would have known what was going on. So this statement is nothing but another assumption.

In another area titled “Details Relating to Hunt’s Proposal,” in Number 60 we find the following. “68. *Other.* Hunt’s explanation is based primarily on his claim that the early Colorado River flowed far south of its present course and ponded in a large basin north of Kingman, Arizona. To support this contention, Hunt cited a Ph.D. thesis being written by Richard Young. Young had concluded that the 70-mile-long channel into this lake sloped in a direction that would not have allowed the flow that Hunt wanted. Hunt simply claimed the opposite and cited Young as supporting his view. Young, inexperienced and intimidated by the senior Hunt, admits that he acquiesced and reworded his conclusion in a fuzzy way that let Hunt reach his desired conclusion.^{88(Footnote From the Book)} Young has admitted that his true conclusion was “enough to falsify the core of Hunt’s theory.”^{89(Footnote From the Book)} Unfortunately, stature and the desire to advance sometimes trump truth.”⁵⁸ As I read this I thought this Doctoral candidate showed that he was more willing to support Hunt’s work than stand for the truth that his thesis actually supported. But you know what we see the same thing with some scientists who falsify their data in order to prove their point, all one has to do is a quick Google search to find examples. Here is one example I found “Stem-cell researcher guilty of falsifying data - A former member of one of the highest-profile teams in stem-cell biology has been found guilty of falsifying results, after **New Scientist** questioned the findings.

Last year, the work of researchers led by Catherine Verfaillie of the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis became mired in controversy, after **New Scientist** pointed to irregularities in their published results.”

Now an expert panel called in by the university to investigate has ruled that a PhD student on the team, Morayma Reyes, falsified data.⁵⁸

In the section titled “The Origin of Limestone,” I found the following, “2. *How were sediments cemented to form rocks?* Specifically, how were large quantities of cementing agents (usually limestone and silica) produced, transported, and deposited, often quite uniformly, between sedimentary grains worldwide? Especially perplexing has been finding the source of so much silica and the water to distribute it. Geologists call this “the quartz problem.”⁴(Footnote From the Book) I do have a question. If there was that much calcium and carbon released into the surface water would it have not killed all the fish in the water, let alone the heat that would have been present?

Within the section titled “Frozen Mammoths,” subsection “Theories Attempting to Explain Frozen Mammoths” one finds the area “Hydroplate Theory,” which states “*Hydroplate Theory*. [For a more detailed description of the hydroplate theory, read pages 111–149.] On that terrible day, the rupture of the earth’s crust passed between what is now Siberia and Alaska in minutes. Jetting water from the fountains

of the great deep first fell as rain. During the next few hours, some of the accelerating and expanding subterranean water that went above the atmosphere (where the effective temperature is several hundred degrees below zero Fahrenheit) froze and fell as hail.¹¹⁹(Footnote From the Book) Some animals were suddenly buried, suffocated, frozen, and compressed by tons of cold, muddy ice crystals from the gigantic “hail storm.” Dirt in this ice prevented it from floating as the flood waters submerged these regions after days and weeks. Blankets of this muddy ice, hundreds of feet thick, insulated and preserved many animals during the flood phase. As the topmost layers of ice melted, the dirt in that ice remained and settled—blanketing and further insulating the deeper ice and buried animals.”⁵⁹ As I look at this I must again say this is just Dr Brown’s assumption as this is a major part of his theory, he is relying upon this being considered a fact and not just a assumption of his theory.

There is one part of the story of the frozen mammoths that I really have to question. Under this area it has been proposed that at the beginning of the flood that all of a sudden the temperature dropped to a -150 degrees so that the mammoths were frozen rapidly. that cause me to think of two questions that I did not find addressed. There is an area titled, “Why Did It Get So Cold So Quickly?” “Let’s put aside all possible explanations for the frozen mammoths and just ask what must happen for atmospheric temperatures to drop to at least -150°F (so rapidly that large animals and the food in their warm bodies are preserved).

Temperatures can drop for several reasons: chemical reactions, reduction of heat from the Sun, transfer of heat, *expansion of a gas, or evaporation of a liquid*. First, let's eliminate a few possibilities. Chemical reactions within the atmosphere have trivial thermal consequences. Could the Sun have suddenly put out less heat, thereby lowering the temperature of Siberia and Alaska? That happens every night, but temperatures drop too slowly."⁶⁰ My questions are: Would not this temperature over extended periods of time killed any animal alive including every Human? That is unless God provided a miracle that involved a warm pocket for them. But then there is also the problem that all of the water on earth would have frozen locking the ark in the ice.

In the area "Final Thoughts" of this section on "Frozen Mammoths" in the very first paragraph even though Dr. Brown is applying what he says to on area of study, really it should be remembered and applied to any area of study including Biblical Studies. Here is what he wrote: "Earth science students are frequently discouraged from considering alternative explanations such as we have examined concerning the frozen mammoths. ***Too often, students are told what to think, not taught how to think...***"⁶¹ I can personally agree with this because of some of the teachers I had well attending Bible College many years ago. But I must also say that some of the teachers I had at this same Bible College taught a person how to think and showed them various schools of thought upon many Biblical areas. To those teachers I am very grateful, because even to this day I still remember their classes and their teachings.

In the section titled “The Origin of Comets,” in the very first paragraph Dr. Brown states the following. “SUMMARY: Past explanations for how comets began have serious problems. After a review of some facts concerning comets, a new explanation for comet origins will be proposed and tested. It appears that the fountains of the great deep and the sustained power of an “ocean” of high-pressure, supercritical water jetting into the vacuum of space launched, as the flood began, the material that became comets. Other known forces would have assembled the expelled rocks and muddy droplets into larger bodies resembling comets in size, number, density, composition, spin, texture, strength, chemistry (organic and inorganic), and orbital characteristics. After a comparison of theories with evidence, problems with the earlier explanations will become obvious.”⁶² Even before reading all of this paragraph, I wrote the following based on previous statements within the book. Here is what I wrote about the paragraph above along with a question. I can almost hear it now Dr. Brown is going to say that comets are the results of the water and dirt that was thrown into space. But my question would be if this happened, what gravitational forces were required to bring those comets back around to where they could be seen from earth, especially Halley's Comet?

“In 1998, billions of tons of water-ice mixed with the soil were found in deep craters near the Moon’s poles. As one writer visualized it, *Comets raining from the sky left pockets of frozen water at the north and south poles of the moon, billions of tons more than previously believed, Los Alamos National Laboratory researchers have found.*^{6(Footnote From the Book)} Later, thin traces of water were found at all lunar latitudes

by three different spacecraft.^{7(Footnote From the Book)} Comets are a likely source, but this raises perplexing questions. Ice should evaporate from the Moon faster than comets currently deposit it, so why does so much ice remain?^{8(Footnote From the Book)} Also, recently deposited ice has been discovered in permanently shadowed craters on Mercury,^{9(Footnote From the Book)} the closest planet to the Sun. Ice that near the Sun is even more difficult to explain.⁶³ Being that this is true Where did this water come from? A Comet, or the flood? Should we also not find this same type of ice patterns on other planets and moons throughout the solar system if the ice came from the flood or the comets as proposed by Dr. Brown? The reason for this last question is that if the mid-atlantic and mid-pacific rifts circle the earth there would be a 360 pattern for this water and other material to fly off into space. To me it would be interesting to capture some of this ice and have it analyzed to see if the trace minerals are the same as those found in ice cores of the same age. Otherwise all we have is speculation about this subject.

Here we have it! Just like I mentioned above Dr. Brown would say that all the comets came from earth. "Hydroplate Theory. Comets are literally out of this world. As the flood began, the extreme pressure in the interconnected subterranean chambers and the power of supercritical water exploding into the vacuum of space launched material that later merged to become about 50,000 comets, totaling less than 1% of the water in the chambers. (These numbers will be derived later.) This water was rich in heavy hydrogen, as will be explained in the chapter on "The Origin of Earth's

Radioactivity” beginning on page 355. As subterranean water escaped, the chambers’ pillars were crushed and broken. Also, the 10-mile-high walls along the rupture were unstable, because granitic rock is not strong enough to support a cliff greater than 5 miles high.⁶⁵(Footnote From the Book) The bottom portions of the walls were crushed into large blocks which were swept up and launched by the fountains of the great deep. Carried up with the water were eroded dirt particles, minerals that form only in scalding-hot, high pressure, liquid water, pulverized organic matter (especially cellulose from pre-flood forests), and even bacteria.⁶⁴

Another direct example of what I mentioned above is: “How could so many comets have recently hit the Moon and planet Mercury that ice remains today? Ice on the Moon, and certainly on hot Mercury, should disappear faster than comets deposit it today. However, if the material that formed 50,000 comets were ejected recently from Earth and an “ocean” of water vapor was injected into the inner solar system, the problem disappears. On Mars, comet impacts created brief saltwater flows, which then carved “erosion” channels. [See Figure 180 on page 341.]⁶⁵ I do have a question why is this water only injected into the inner solar system? The reason I ask this is because during my science classes in high school I was taught that an object in motion will stay in motion until acted upon by an outside force. Is Dr. Brown implying that gravitational force would have limited all the water in every direction from leaving the inner solar system? I, myself do not have enough knowledge in this area to answer this question, but I would sure like to find out the answer. But not in technical terms, noticeably in layman’s terms.

Looking at “Table 14. Evidence vs. Theories: Origin of Comets” on page 303 of Dr. Browns book one notice a section on the left side labeled “Near-Parabolic Comets.” a couple of pages later there is an explanation. “3. Near-Parabolic Comets. Because the same event launched all comets from Earth, those we see falling from the farthest distance (near-parabolic comets) are falling back for the first time and with similar energy. Other comets, launched with slightly more velocity, will soon be detected.”⁶⁶ Again I thought of the question seeing as an object in motion stays in motion until acted upon by an outside source. What outside source or sources acted upon these objects that caused them to have an orbit that would have allowed them to return to the area of the earth, certainly it wasn't earths gravity since these comets are coming from well outside the area of earths gravity influencing them?

In this next quote from the book, I know I am in way over my head, but I still have a question that may or may not make sense to many. “6. Jupiter’s Family. A bullet fired straight up slows to almost zero velocity near the top of its trajectory—its farthest point from Earth. A comet also moves very slowly near its aphelion. If a comet’s aphelion is ever near Jupiter during any orbit, Jupiter’s large gravity will pull the nearly stationary comet steadily toward Jupiter. Because a comet spends a relatively long time near its farthest point, Jupiter’s gravity acts strongly for an equally long time, gently pulling the nearly stationary comet toward Jupiter’s orbit. Even a comet’s orbital plane is slowly but steadily aligned with Jupiter’s. Thus, aphelions of short-period comets tend to be pulled toward Jupiter’s nearly circular orbit, regardless of whether the aphelion is inside, outside, above, or below that circle. The closer a

comet's aphelion is to Jupiter's orbit, the more likely it is that the comet will be rapidly drawn toward Jupiter's orbit. [See Figure 166.] One can think of Jupiter's mass as being spread out in a hoop that coincides with Jupiter's orbit. (This "hoop analogy" simplifies the analysis of many long-term gravitational effects.) Comets feel more pull toward the nearest part of the hoop."⁶⁷ Being a target shoot I can easily understand the analogy of the bullet to a comet and its speed slowing to almost zero at the top of its trajectory. I personally have used this knowledge for years while shooting at targets that are swinging back and forth as the target comes to a stop at the top of its trajectory making it easier to hit. But do have the following question. Would not it depend on where Jupiter is on its orbit in relation to where the comet is when it approaches the "hoop?" Otherwise the further away the planet is the less the gravitational pull on the comet and thus have less effect upon its orbital path. At least this seems reasonable to me. Please let me know if my thinking is correct on this matter.

Again I come to a point where I must say that this paragraph is not needed to accomplish what Dr. Brown is trying to bring out. "Some might say that comets were created along with the Sun, Moon, and stars, but that view cannot by itself qualify as a scientific theory. Good scientific theories relate and explain, through well-established cause-and effect relationships (the laws of physics), many otherwise strange observations. Little, if any, historical or scientific evidence supports *or refutes* the proposal that comets were created in the beginning. Such claims raise many questions about strange comet characteristics and patterns. The simplest

explanation that is consistent with the laws of physics and explains many diverse, otherwise puzzling, observations is probably the best—regardless of the starting point. [See “How Can the Study of Creation Be Scientific?” on page 406.]⁶⁸ In other words let put God into a box. Science is a better way of explaining things. Or because we can't explain it by science it just can not have happened that way. Again this paragraph is putting the Bible in a very bad light and saying the God isn't either powerful enough or wise enough to create everything in creation in a way that science cannot answer. I have big problems with this, This paragraph does not really add anything to what is being said in this section. Therefore this is an unnecessary paragraph unless you are trying to put it in so that you can show other scientists that you are more mainstream then they may think.

I must thank Dr. Brown for the following: “Widely publicized claims have been made that at least 100 meteorites from Mars have been found. With international media coverage in 1996, a few scientists also proposed that one of these meteorites, named ALH84001, contained fossils of primitive life. Later studies rejected that claim. *The wormy-looking shapes discovered in a meteorite [supposedly] from Mars turned out to be purely mineralogical and never were alive.*^{116(Footnote From the Book)»69}

With this statement in italics Dr. Brown does a service to anyone who reads this part of his book, because the general public never heard this part of the story about the meteorites from Mars. All Scientists touted was the fact that they had found proof of life on Mars. Again Thank you Dr. Brown for this service.

I have a comment on the following paragraph: “Could those 100 meteorites have come from Mars? To escape the gravity of Mars requires a launch velocity of *3 miles per second*. Additional velocity is then needed to transfer to an orbit intersecting Earth, 34–236 million miles away. Supposedly, one or more asteroids slammed into Mars and blasted off millions of meteoroids. Millions are needed, because less than one in a million^{120(Footnote From the Book)} would ever hit Earth, be large enough to survive reentry, be found, be turned over to scientists, and be analyzed in detail. Besides, if meteorites can come to Earth from Mars, many more should have come from the Moon—but haven’t.^{121(Footnote From the Book)} Furthermore, all the so-called Martian meteorites are magnetic,^{122(Footnote From the Book)} whereas Mars has no magnetic field.”⁷⁰

Would it possible that when the meteorites impact the earth that the sharp blow of the impact imparted a magnetism to the iron within the meteor? The reason I bring this up that while working as a sheet metal mechanic if I dropped a screw, bolt, washer, or nut in to area I couldn’t reach easily and didn’t have a magnet. I would take a piece of steel or iron long enough to reach the part and strike it on a hard surface several times, because doing this would impart a magnetic field strong enough to lift the part up to the point that I could reach it. This is a trick that I had learned from my grandfather way back in the mid to late fifties, he was a master machinist and tool maker.

With my very limited knowledge in the are of radioactivity I will not be commenting much on this section of Dr. Brown’s book. But I reading I did find something very interesting to me. “Helium Retention in Zircons. Uranium and thorium usually decay

by emitting alpha particles. Each alpha particle is a helium nucleus that quickly attracts two electrons and becomes a helium atom (4He). The helium gas produced in zircons by uranium and thorium decay should diffuse out relatively quickly, because helium does not combine chemically with other atoms, and it is extremely small—the second smallest of all elements by mass, and the smallest by volume!”⁷¹ Within this paragraph is a statement that I had never heard before in any science class I had ever taken including Chemistry. That statement is: “because helium does not combine chemically with other atoms...”⁷² This is something that should be taught in High School Science classes throughout the United States.

“So, the big bang produced the three lightest chemical elements: hydrogen (including deuterium), helium, and lithium. Later, after stars evolved, the next 23 lightest chemical elements evolved deep in stars. Hundreds of millions of years later, all other chemical elements must have been produced by supernovas, because temperatures a hundred times greater than those in stars are required.¹⁰¹(Footnote From the Book)»⁷³ If there was only the three elements at this time what process was used to produce the heavier elements? Even Charles Seife admits this. Would not the heat of the stars destroyed these other elements as they were made in the stars if in fact they were made this way at all. The laws of thermal dynamics states that things left to themselves break down, not move to a higher state. Here is Seife statement: “We are all made of starstuff. The big bang created hydrogen, helium, and a little bit of lithium and other light atoms. But everything else—the carbon, oxygen, and other

elements that make up animals, plants, and Earth itself—was made by stars. The problem is that physicists aren't quite sure how stars did it.^{102(Footnote From the Book)„74}

Within the section titled “Evidence Requiring an Explanation,” I found the following: “2. CE: The various scales (such as time, temperature, and size) required—for example, in and around stars hundreds of thousands of times more massive than earth—are so large that experimental support for chemical evolution is necessarily limited. Experiments using particle colliders allow investigation of the interactions of subatomic particles traveling at very great speeds. By using computer simulations and extrapolating the results of experiments to larger scales, we can draw conclusions about the kinds of elements that would have been produced at extremely high temperatures inside huge stars billions of years ago.”⁷⁵ Again I am finding a problem that I have mentioned earlier in this paper. The only problem I see with this paragraph involves the use of only computer simulations of something and then extrapolating the results is the fact that the math can be fudged to get the results a person wants by working from the answer backwards towards the theory that needs to be proved. And as mentioned before some scientists have gotten into trouble doing this kind of thing. I also know Dr. Brown is only reporting on something someone else has put out for their theory and not necessarily what Dr. Brown would agree with.

In the area titled “Final Thoughts,” The following paragraph was found. “No doubt, the almost unimaginable size and power of the flood are other reasons for our failure

to understand the flood and its many consequences—such as earth’s radioactivity. We all tend to constrain our thinking to familiar events, so it is a challenge to grasp the magnitude of the events unleashed when all the fountains of the great deep erupted and to recognize that the entire earth’s crust was once a gigantic nuclear reactor. Reprocessing all available evidence and various proposed explanations will take time, but we should attempt to follow the evidence.”⁷⁶ Within this paragraph I see one very huge assumption and that is: “... to recognize that the entire earth’s crust was once a gigantic nuclear reactor.”⁷⁷ Again having worked in the sheet metal area I did work some in the nuclear area on ships. But before doing that there were some basic classes that I had to pass. In those classes one of the things that I learned was that a certain amount of radioactive material had to be present to start the reaction (if I remember correctly this is known as critical mass). But then there also had to be something to control the reaction otherwise you had a runaway ending in a meltdown. Finally something was needed to stop the reaction. So my question is: What was the mechanism for each of these steps and that would have kept Noah and his entire family and all the animals safe in the ark?

Even though I have left out many of the things I found not only in Dr. Brown’s theory, there are some from each of the other two theories that we were charged to look at. I know that almost all of the things I did mention were in the form of questions. I believe that they are questions that maybe the author of that theory may want to check out, because sometimes we get caught up in thinking everyone we are reaching is at the level of knowledge that we possess. But as a teacher of God’s

Word I know that there are many, many times that I must use many more words to explain something from God's Word because the people I ministering to would not understand it if I only used theological terms. So now lets move on the conclusion for this paper.

Conclusion

As I approached each of these theories I first read in their entirety the actual file that was supplied by Creation Science Hall of Fame Peer Review Panel as sent by the Secretary. Then I would check out some of the other materials that other members of this peer review group suggested. But unfortunately being a full time Pastor I was limited somewhat in the time I could devote to each theory. But overall I must say each theory made me think to see how each can be applied to the Flood account in the Book of Genesis.

Again I must remind the reader of this paper that I am not a formally trained scientist. And like a friend of mine who holds a fifth degree black belt in Karate say about me I know just enough to be dangerous and get in all kinds of trouble. All kidding aside I have tried to come to each of the three theories in a serious manner. I pray that this has come across not only in the questions I asked, but in the comments that I have made also.

I am not going to go into great detail to summarize everything that I have already put in this paper. But I will be trying to explain why I came to the conclusion I did for each of these theories. I understand some of the work involved in putting a theory together because putting classes together for two Bible Colleges and many sermons, but especially after completing my dissertation.

The first theory is “Catastrophic Plate Tectonics” by Dr. John Baumgardner. While this theory may not be as popular as some others, there may be some common elements with the “Hydroplate Theory” by Dr. Walt Brown in that both theories deal with the different plates and how they acted at the beginning and during the flood. The Plate Tectonics theory says that the plates floating on the magma and then a sudden rupture of the mantle allowed the magma to jet water that filled the openings into steam and shoot it upward and thus taking the ocean water up into the atmosphere at supersonic speed, which is how the rain was produced. Remember I am putting this in terms as I understand the theory not necessarily what would be considered scientifically correct. Now this is just how I see this theory. It “MAY” be a possible way in which the fountains of the deep were opened, but I still have one major question: What caused the runaway to start and what caused the runaway to stop? And again, while saying that that he wants to honor God, he also says the way to do it is through science. I believe the way to honor God in the way that is being announced in this theory one should be to seek God for his wisdom in this matter instead pop out every theory instead of seeking God for the one that will lead to the correct answer. Remember what the Scripture says “*It is the glory of God to conceal a thing: but the honour of kings is to search out a matter.*”⁷⁷ But one must search out the one who concealed the thing in the first place to be able to search it out using wisdom. Over all I must say that the “Catastrophic Plate Tectonics” theory only deals with one part of the Genesis Flood “The fountains of the great deep were opened.” In Genesis it talks about the “fountains of the great deep were opened and the fountains of the great deep were stopped.”⁷⁸ It does not even attempt to address the

Scripture in Genesis that deals with the “Windows of Heaven being opened,” and “The windows of Heaven were stopped.”⁷⁹ That is other than saying that the rain was caused when the fountains of the great deep were opened.

The next theory that was looked at was the “Crystalline Canopy Theory” by Dr. Carl Baugh. This theory to me at least is dealing strictly with the windows of heaven being opened as the Scripture says in the above paragraph. I am not going to go through all the problems I found with this theory. But I will mention again I have problems with the math that deals with the canopy being metallic hydrogen in dealing with the pressure need to even come close to the point where hydrogen goes from a gas to a solid. I mean over 32,000,000 pounds per square inch, that much pressure would crush all living things on the earth at the time. According to the website “Marine-Conservation.org,” on the page titled Places In The Sea. It states: “Imagine the deepest, darkest place on Earth—an underwater trench plummeting to a depth of 35,800 feet, nearly seven miles below the ocean surface. The Mariana Trench is one of the least explored places on Earth. Deep enough to swallow Mt. Everest, the Mariana Trench was first pinpointed in 1951 by the British Survey ship Challenger II. Known since as Challenger Deep, it was not visited for nearly ten years. Jacques Piccard and Don Walsh descended in a submersible called the Trieste, which could withstand over 16,000 pounds of pressure per square inch.”⁸⁰ Which is 2000 times lower in pressure than is required to turn hydrogen into a solid than is at the bottom of the Mariana Trench at the deepest point. Then there is the problem of the magnetic field that would needed to keep the canopy in position. In

the paper Dr. Baugh stated that it would require a magnetic field strength of 2,000 G. Today the field strength is ranges from .25 to .65 G.⁸¹ Which would mean that to have a magnetic field which is anywhere from 8,000 to 3077 Gs more strength than today. My question is still what damage would this much magnetic strength do to the human body not alone to any other living being?

With all this being said, I have come to the conclusion that the “Crystalline Canopy Theory” by Dr. Carl Baugh does not prove anything as dealing with the Genesis Flood. While parts of this theory may in some way point to something that God actually used to create a canopy, if God used one. Also like I have already mentioned the theory tried to address only one aspect of the Genesis Flood.

Moving along to the last of the Theories the “Hydroplate Theory” by Dr. Walt Brown. I really appreciate the fact that Dr. Brown was willing to share with us a copy of his book that included this theory. I going through the huge volume of material provided I found many things that I could agree with, but also many things that I had questions about and even some thing that I disagreed with Biblically. I brought all that out in the main body of this paper. Again while I can not say anything about the math that is include within the 319 pages because I’m not qualified to address that area.

It is hard to figure out what important things should be included in the conclusion as there is so much material to consider. I remember as I was looking at the table of

contents for the area of the pages we were to consider, how come Dr Brown seems to be taking so many rabbit trails? But as I read I was able to see what he was trying to bring out, even when I disagreed with his premise. Overall as I read and checked out not only this theory but some of the other materials that others of the peer review group sent I came to the conclusion that while this theory purports to cover all the reasons for the Genesis Flood. In fact it doesn't it is mainly dealing with the part that deals with the fountains of the great deep opening. Part of this theory tries to say that all the water involved in the flood came from the fountains of the deep and the ocean waters. Much of water being blasted into the upper atmosphere and then falling as rain, I can not say definitely but to me it is implied that this was also the opening of the windows of heaven.

As far as some of the other aspects that Dr. Brown went into I have addressed my concerns and any possible agreement within the body of this paper. A couple of those areas are the mammoths, and other animals that were buried and then either mummified or turned into fossils was because of the rain and mud and also because the temperature dropped rapidly to a -150 degrees. Another is the radioactive materials that were supposedly created at the time of the flood, again see the body of this paper for details. Lastly was the creation of the Grand Canyon and the area around it, again see the details in the body of this paper.

So for the "Hydroplate Theory," again I must say that my conclusion is that this theory is address only one part of the Genesis Flood, and that is the opening of the

fountains of the great deep. It may be possible that some of what Dr. Brown has brought out was or may even point to something that God used to either start or stop the Genesis Flood. But only God knows that for sure.

If a person considers all three theories at one time, yes, both parts of the Genesis flood are addressed. BUT, even considering this there are too many problems within each theory to say that any combination of these theories could be an answer to how God brought the Genesis Flood into being, let alone show where all the excess water went to at the end of the flood. And if it went back into the area where the fountains of the great deep came from, what caused that to happen?

Like I wrote earlier anyone looking seriously into the how and why of the Genesis Flood needs to stop and seek the Father for His guidance so that He will show them how the Genesis Flood was started and stopped?

It is now time to bring this paper to a close. I pray that what I have written will be of some value to the peer review group. By bringing out questions that may not have been considered before or just in the fact that a Biblical aspect to the Genesis Flood was brought back into a clearer focus.

Footnotes

- 1Dr. Baumgardner “*Catastrophic Plate Tectonics*” from the Fifth International Conference on Creationism, p. 1.
2Ibid., p1.
3Ibid., p9.
4<http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20120811052230AA86Mdk>
5Note 16 Horstemeyer, M.F., and Baumgardner, J.R., What Initiated the Flood Cataclysm?, in Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Creationism, Walsh, R.E., Editor, 2003, Creation Science Fellowship, Pittsburgh, PA, this volume.
6Dr. Baumgardner “*Catastrophic Plate Tectonics*” from the Fifth International Conference on Creationism p12.
7PCStudy Bible KJV of the Bible.
8Dr. Baumgardner “*Catastrophic Plate Tectonics*” from the Fifth International Conference on Creationism p12.
9Dr. Walter Brown, In *The Beginning, Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, Draft of 9th edition as of June 10, 2013 CD-ROM.
10Dr. Carl Baugh Creation Evidence Museum, Crystalline Canopy Theory, (Colin Russell, *Nature*, Vol. 308, April 26, 1984, p. 777), p. 1.
11<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=the-bubbles-produced-by-u>, Last Accessed January 3, 2014.
12Dr. Carl Baugh Creation Evidence Museum, Crystalline Canopy Theory, p. 2.
13PCStudy Bible KJV of the Bible.
14Dr. Carl Baugh Creation Evidence Museum, Crystalline Canopy Theory, p. 3. Footnote 11 - Josephus, Book I, Chapter I.
15PCStudy Bible KJV of the Bible.
16Dr. Carl Baugh Creation Evidence Museum, Crystalline Canopy Theory, p. 3.
17Ibid., p. 4. Footnote 15 (David V. Bassett, personnel correspondence calling attention to Ezekiel's vision, December 6, 2008).
18PCStudy Bible KJV of the Bible. (Biblesoft's New Exhaustive Strong's Numbers and Concordance with Expanded Greek-Hebrew Dictionary. Copyright © 1994, 2003, 2006 Biblesoft, Inc. and International Bible Translators, Inc.).
19Ibid., (from *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: Old Testament* Copyright © 2003 by AMG Publishers. All rights reserved.).
20Ibid., (from *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: Old Testament* Copyright © 2003 by AMG Publishers. All rights reserved.).
21Ibid., (from Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown Commentary, Electronic Database. Copyright © 1997, 2003, 2005, 2006 by Biblesoft, Inc. All rights reserved.).
22Ibid., (from *The Pulpit Commentary, Electronic Database*. Copyright © 2001, 2003, 2005, 2006 by Biblesoft, Inc. All rights reserved.).
23Dr. Carl Baugh Creation Evidence Museum, Crystalline Canopy Theory, p. 5-6. (*Physics News Graphics*, American Institute of Physics. www.aip.org/png/html/birefrin.htm)
24Source: <http://www.rochester.edu/pr/releases/phys/borge.htm> (Last Accessed January 3, 2014).
25Ibid.
26Dr. Carl Baugh Creation Evidence Museum, Crystalline Canopy Theory, p. 12-13.
27Ibid., p. 8., Footnote 34 - (Edward Boudreaux and Eric Baxter, “A New Model of the Earth's Pre-Flood Canopy,” *God Created the Earth*,” Rocky Mountain Creation Fellowship, P. O. Box 3451, Littleton, CO 80161-3451, p. 116)
28Ibid., p. 8.
29Ibid., p. 15.
30Ibid., Footnote 36 - (Frederic Goldman, “Another Milestone in the Solid State,” *MOSAIC*, Volume 22, Number 2, Summer 1991, p. 25).
31Source - (<http://phys.org/news/2011-11-pair-hydrogen-metal.html>) (Last Accessed January 3, 2014).
32Source - (<http://www.unitconversion.org/pressure/gigapascals-to-psi-conversion.html>)
33Dr. Carl Baugh Creation Evidence Museum, Crystalline Canopy Theory, p. 17. Footnote 50 - (R. Lipkin, “Squeezing H2 and O2 yields New Compound,” *Science News*, Vol 148, November 4, 1995, p. 293, reported in *Nature*, Nov. 2 by chemists Paul Loubeyre and Rene Le Toullec of the University of Paris)
34Ibid., p. 10. Note Appendix S2 - P. 13-15.
35Ibid., P. 28 - Footnotes - (136 (Psalm 46:6); 137 (Psalm 77:17); 138 (Job 25:5))
36Dr. Walter Brown, In *The Beginning, Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, Draft of 9th Edition as of June 10, 2013., p. 109 In the book, p. 117 in the PDF file.
37Ibid., p. 121 In the book, p. 129 in the PDF file.
38PCStudy Bible KJV of the Bible. (Genesis 10:25).
39Dr. Walter Brown, In *The Beginning, Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, Draft of 9th Edition as of June 10, 2013., p. 122 In the Book, p. 130 In the PDF file.

40Ibid.

41Ibid., p. 122-123 In the Book, p. 130-131 In the PDF file.

42Ibid., p. 123 In the Book, p. 131 In the PDF file.

43Ibid.

44PCStudy Bible KJV of the Bible. (Genesis 7:11).

45Dr. Walter Brown, *In The Beginning, Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, Draft of 9th Edition as of June 10, 2013., p. 124-125 In the Book, p. 132-133 In the PDF file.

46Ibid., p. 125 In the Book, p. 133 In the PDF file.

47Ibid., p. 152 In the Book, p. 160 In the PDF file.

48<http://www.icr.org/article/7864/> (Last Access January 17, 2014).

49Dr. Walter Brown, *In The Beginning, Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, Draft of 9th Edition as of June 10, 2013., p. 154 In the Book, p. 162 In the PDF file.

50Ibid., p. 158 In the Book, p. 166 In the PDF file.

51Ibid.

52Ibid., p. 162 In the Book, p. 170 In the PDF file.

53Ibid., p. 175 In the Book, p. 183 In the PDF file.

54Ibid., p. 201 In the Book, p. 209 In the PDF file.

55Ibid.

56Ibid., p. 233 In the Book, p. 241 In the PDF file.

57Ibid., p. 235 In the Book, p. 243 In the PDF file.

58<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn14886-stemcell-researcher-guilty-of-falsifying-data.html> - (Last Accessed January 22, 2014).

59Dr. Walter Brown, *In The Beginning, Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, Draft of 9th Edition as of June 10, 2013., p. 275 In the Book, p. 267 In the PDF file.

60Ibid., p. 270 In the Book, p. 278 In the PDF file.

61Ibid., p. 281 In the Book, p. 289 In the PDF file.

62Ibid., p. 291 In the Book, p. 299 In the PDF file.

63Ibid., p. 292 In the Book, p. 300 In the PDF file.

64Ibid., p. 300 In the Book, p. 308 In the PDF file.

65Ibid., p. 303 In the Book, p. 311 In the PDF file.

66Ibid., p. 305 In the Book, p. 313 In the PDF file.

67Ibid., p. 307 In the Book, p. 315 In the PDF file.

68Ibid., p. 313 In the Book, p. 321 In the PDF file.

69Ibid., p. 342 In the Book, p. 350 In the PDF file.

70Ibid.

71Ibid., p. 361 In the Book, p. 369 In the PDF file.

72Ibid.

73Ibid., p. 373 In the Book, p. 382 In the PDF file.

74Ibid., p. 373-374 In the Book, p. 381-382 In the PDF file.

75Ibid., p. 374 In the Book, p. 382 In the PDF file.

76Ibid., p. 387 In the Book, p. 395 In the PDF file.

77PCStudy Bible KJV of the Bible. (Proverbs 25:2).

78Ibid., Genesis 7:11; Genesis 8:2)

79Ibid.

80http://www.marine-conservation.org/media/shining_sea/place_wpacific_mariana.htm - (Last Accessed January 28, 2014).

81http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth%27s_magnetic_field - (Last Accessed January 14, 2014).