

of promoting creationism is probably better served by several competing, plausible creationist Flood models than a prevailing one that eventually loses its explanatory power.

For instance, Walt Brown's hydroplate theory seems quite credible to me in many respects. It explains mid-oceanic ridges, how the continents fit together before the Flood, continental shelves and many other enigmatic phenomena better, I think, than catastrophic plate tectonics. Perhaps lesser-known theories like Patten's Astral Catastrophism also have value. May I suggest that future forums include young-Earth creationist authors/models outside the AiG/ICR/CRS umbrella. I would be very interested in Oard's and Baumgardner's views on Brown's model in particular.

Gordon Hohensee
Chilliwack, British Columbia
CANADA

Reducing volume below the crust

I have seen a number of articles on Plate Tectonics in *TJ* 16(1) and previous issues, but haven't seen mention of what seems to me to be an obvious evidence in support of it.

The magnetic field of the Earth is decaying and is said to be the cause of heat within the Earth. This means that as the field decays the internal temperature reduces, so the volume of the Earth is decreased. Also volcanoes expel magma and steam which reduces the volume below the crust.

Therefore if the crust remains the same size it will not have the necessary support, so something has to give. Sliding one plate under another reduces the circumference and volume and gives support to the crust. Admittedly some of this movement raises some areas—New Zealand normally goes up—but this is probably counter-balanced by the total volume that goes down, or the reduction in volume due to reducing the circumference.

When the fountains of the deep broke up, this would have caused stress on the crust, through lack of support, possibly causing plate movement, or was caused by movement, and would have been catastrophic, according to the Bible's description. As earth is heavier than water, there would be a mighty rush when a crack developed, as there is still a lot of water trapped below.

Kenneth Malley
Lower Hutt
NEW ZEALAND

Intriguing aspects worthy of further study

Baumgardner's model of rapid motions of whole continents during the Flood seems incredible but contains many intriguing aspects and explanations worthy of further study.

1. It may be worth looking at analogies between runaway subduction and other processes such as runaway chemical reactions and runaway nuclear processes.
2. Baumgardner's model would be enhanced if he could better explain what might initiate the runaway subduction. He mentions a temperature perturbation but does not suggest what could cause this, though he does point out the difficulties of theorizing about initial conditions.
3. In 'Dealing carefully with the data' he suggests 'all of the pre-Flood ocean floor has disappeared from the face of the Earth'. But looking at the movement from the Pangean distribution to the present location of the continents it would seem there should be some rather large areas of primordial ocean floor particularly in the Pacific. If available, it might be fruitful to compare any data on seafloor drilling from primordial areas with that from areas produced from seafloor spreading.
4. I am surprised that neither Baum-

gardner nor Oard refer to Genesis 1:9 which includes, 'Let the water under the sky be gathered to one place' (NIV). Of course verse 10 refers to the gathered waters or seas in the plural so the configuration is not entirely clear. However Baumgardner's initial condition of a Pangean configuration of continents with the remaining surface covered by sea seems to be more consistent with what appears to be the most obvious meaning of these words in Genesis.

Graham Fraser
Dee Why, New South Wales
AUSTRALIA

Basis for correlation needed?

I found the recent Forum on Catastrophic Plate Tectonics interesting and relevant to understanding Flood geology. I think I agree with Oard that it is a viable model, at least for part of the Flood, but this is far from proven.

Baumgardner succinctly summarises the creationist concept of successive burial of ecosystems. Such is an acknowledgment by creationists that fossils tend to follow a similar order in different areas. However, there is no basis for a precise correlation of the deposition of similar fossil assemblages in different parts of the world. The only basis evolutionists have for correlating these sequences is their belief that the evolution and the extinction of life forms were simultaneous worldwide events. The Bible makes it clear that all the different kinds were present prior to the Flood. A general similarity of fossil succession in different parts of the world may involve similar processes, but other objective criteria are needed if we are to correlate the timing of such events on a worldwide basis.

Robert Lawrence
Adelaide, South Australia
AUSTRALIA