

that Cainan in Luke 3:36 ever existed except as a scribal error.

Larry Pierce
Winterbourne, Ontario
CANADA

References

1. The information supporting this has been collated from *CEN Tech. J.* letters by Jonathan Sarfati and me, and posted on the AiG Website at <<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/3748.asp>>.
2. Williams, P.J., Some remarks preliminary to a biblical chronology, *CEN Tech. J.* **12**(1):98–106, 1998.

Integrating Flood models?

This contribution by A.C. McIntosh, T. Edmonston and S.T. Taylor¹ has an aura of spreading oil on the troubled waters of the Noachian Flood. Even today however, oil on the water is a bane to the ecologist, and leaves an undesirable mess to clean up. There is a need to sound out the ground we build on, for fear that we have chosen the unconsolidated site of an abandoned municipal dump! A lasting monument to the foregoing, I imagine, is the leaning tower of Pisa.

The authors display a temperature profile (attributed to Rush and Vardiman²) with the express purpose of down-playing the feasibility of the vapour canopy model, the gist of which suggests that, if the volume of ‘waters which were above the firmament’ had initially stemmed from water that exceeded the height of hip rubber boots, the biological community below would have been poached. So when Scripture says, ‘a firmament in the **midst** [Hebrew **middle**] of the waters’, we are obliged to consider it synonymous to saying, ‘a ship in the **middle** of the ocean’. That in reality would equate the ‘windows of heaven’ (from which **the Bible says**, the 40 days and 40 nights of rain fell), as just subducting sea floors, and erupting fountains of the great deep!

The fact that according to Baumgardner ‘there is presently **no ocean floor on earth that predates** [isotopically dated I suppose?³] the fossiliferous strata’ (emphasis and parenthesis mine), implies that the **entire** ocean floor subducted! As to floodwater temperatures and subduction, the present ocean floors cover 5,440,200 square miles of mantle with a sub-crustal surface temperature exceeding 2,000 °F.⁵ What exposing the waters below the firmament to such a gigantic crucible would do as to temperature, is more than I can imagine. The very existence of the waters which were above the firmament (their elevation and vapour consistency) I would suggest, is accounted for as having been necessary for the absorption and removal of earth’s primordial heat. Hence the vapour canopy (‘**the waters which were above the firmament**’)!
‘Evidence for rapid reversals has been discovered in thin lava flows.’⁴

Are we to understand from that, that each lava flow indicates an historical geomagnetic reversal? Maybe we need to get back to basic magnetism! Is it not obvious, that the magnetic direction of each succeeding flow, being thin, was in direct response to its predecessor, and not the effect of the **global** geomagnetic field? Set one magnet in any direction and overlay it with another magnet, and it matters not what direction the global field may be, those basic rudimentary laws (**like poles repel, unlike poles attract**) will apply. A sequential description then, would suggest that the magnetic elements in the initial flow of the lava (on solidifying), were set directionally. The next flow being in a fluid state, and overlaying its predecessor, before solidifying adjusted magnetically (**like poles repel, unlike poles attract**) in a reverse direction, and so on up through the subsequent flows. I have never heard of one geomagnetic reversal proposition that I felt bore the weight of the paper it was written on. The Bible says that along with the founding of the world, God created the north and the south (Psalm 89:11–12). From the foregoing it appears that it was neither well founded nor created.

Every cartographer and navigator from antiquity, can be thankful that such is not the case.

It is my hope that anyone reading reference 48 will realize that ‘the waters of Noah’ (Isaiah 54:9) certainly **did not** issue from the oceans. The flood narrative clearly gives ‘the windows of heaven’ and ‘the fountains of the great deep’ as their source. Consequently, they bear no association whatsoever with the bounds referred to in Psalm 104:9. Likewise, Jeremiah 5:22 refers to the placing of the sand for a perpetual boundary for the waters of the sea. These bounds were placed there at the gathering together on the third day of Creation and those waters have never covered the earth again!

I will reiterate ‘the waters of Noah’ (Isaiah 54:9) certainly did not issue from the oceans. The flood narrative clearly gives ‘the windows of heaven’ and ‘the fountains of the great deep’ as their source. Consequently they bear no association whatsoever with the bounds referred to in Psalm 104:9. If those sea waters, bounded on day three (Psalm 104:9), constituted ‘the waters of Noah’, the Scripture need only have said, ‘Let the waters be gathered together and let the dry land **disappear**’, and because no substantial amount of water would be added from ‘above the firmament’, the oceans would lack sea mounts, and submerged shore lines bordering continental shelves. Fully 15 % of the ocean surface covers continental shelves!⁵

William L Tompkins
Toronto, Ontario
CANADA

References

1. McIntosh, C., Edmonston T. and Taylor, S.T., Flood models: the need for an integrated approach, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):52–59, 2000.
2. McIntosh *et al.*, Ref. 1, p. 53.
3. In this context see Walker, T., Radioactive decay rate depends on chemical environment, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):4, 2000.
4. McIntosh *et al.*, Ref. 1, p. 55.
5. *Comptons New Century Encyclopedia*, Version 2.00.



Andy McIntosh et al reply:

Tompkins has two concerns about our paper:¹ 1) that we do not necessarily hold to a vapour canopy model for the origin of the 40 days rain in the Flood, and 2) that we hold that rapid geomagnetic reversals are recorded in the rock strata.

The whole thesis of both our articles in that issue of *CEN Tech. J.*^{1,2} was that every scientific model has problems, because we were not there to observe and measure what happened. Even though the Bible gives us an accurate record of what happened, there is a great amount that is not said which affects our understanding of the physical processes and the geology etc. Consequently, assumptions have to be made in any model and these need to be tested. It is our considered view that multi-disciplinary research is needed to solve these problems.

We were not necessarily discarding the vapour canopy model as presented by Whitcomb and Morris, although we do recognise that there are some difficulties with it. Vardiman and Bousselot³ at ICR, have expressed reserve about the vapour canopy model because of high surface temperatures. Not all are agreed what ‘waters above’ (Genesis 1:7) means. In the past, some have assumed this was referring to a vapour canopy, but more recently, Humphreys has suggested it means waters that have been extended to the edge of the universe. This is a possible alternative. However, a very plausible alternative is that there indeed was a vapour canopy, but coupled with much greater effects from the fountains of the great deep as proposed either by the Hydroplate theory of Brown or the tectonic activity of the Catastrophic

Plate Tectonics model. It is true that the CPT model also has problems, and the heat it produces is one of them. This was discussed in the ICC paper 1994, p. 612 under ‘spreading’. Woodmorappe’s 1998 ICC paper entitled ‘Hypercanes’, provides one possible solution to this heat problem. Our view is that we cannot be dogmatic about the mechanisms used at the Flood. Much interaction between the scientific disciplines is likely to bring us nearer the truth.

As regards the magnetic field reversals, it is possible as Tompkins suggests, that not all the reversals were global. But I would suggest that it is consistent with the notion of a precessing earth recovering from an impact (this *may* have been the cause of the Flood—but not all agree on this), to have the inner core of the earth fluctuating to such a degree that reversals took place in the early years after the Flood. Much work by Humphreys^{4,5} seems to come to this conclusion, and secular writers have also suggested quick reversals⁶.

Andy McIntosh
Steven Taylor
Tom Edmondson
Leeds
UNITED KINGDOM

References

1. McIntosh, C., Edmonston, T. and Taylor, S.T., Flood models: the need for an integrated approach, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):52–59, 2000.
2. McIntosh, C., Edmonston, T. and Taylor, S.T., Genesis and catastrophe: the Flood as the major biblical cataclysm, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):101–109, 2000.
3. Vardiman, L. and Bousselot, K., Sensitivity studies on vapour canopy temperature profiles, *Proc. 4th International Conference on Creationism*, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA, 3rd–8th Aug. 1998. Further work on the extent of the possible water vapour canopy is available through the ICR website <<http://www.icr.org/research.htm>>. Articles by Vardiman and Bousselot and others are also available on this web site.
4. Humphreys, D.R., The earth’s magnetic field is young, *Impact* **242**, Institute of Creation Research, El Cajon, California, CA 92021, USA.
5. Humphreys, D.R., Has the earth’s magnetic field ever flipped? *Creation Res. Soc. Quart.* **25**:89–94, Dec. 1988.
6. Coe, R.S. and Prevot, M., New Evidence for extraordinarily rapid change of the geomagnetic field during a reversal, *Nature*, **374**(6564):687–692, 1995.

Dinosaurs and the Flood

We wish to correct one mistake and a wrong impression given in our second article in the last edition of *Tech J.* **14**(1).¹

On p. 56, when we said ‘*Garton rightly points out that these dinosaur tracks go right through the Mesozoic into the Cainozoic ...*’, and on p. 53, it should have read ‘vertebrate tracks’, since the tracks of dinosaurs (as made clear by Garton²), are only found in the Mesozoic.

We also commented on dinosaurs possibly being trapped in floating forests. We said:

‘Garton ... suggests that large creatures (including dinosaurs) were trapped in the floating Carboniferous forests. The evidence for these vast islands of vegetation carried by the heaving seas seems to be particularly strong. Garton maintains that these creatures swarmed the inhospitable land in the final stages of the Flood. (In that he allows a few creatures to have survived the first 40 days, we presume he does not regard the “blotting out” to be fully comprehensive). This option explains the apparent anomalies....’³

A wrong impression was given here as to Garton’s view. In a private communication since, he has indicated that his reference to trapped dinosaurs was to amphibious ones, not ones which were to be necessarily destroyed in the Flood. We are thus extending this scenario, by saying it is feasible that land-based dinosaurs were also trapped in such floating forests, and were eventually buried late in the