



### Andy McIntosh et al reply:

Tompkins has two concerns about our paper:<sup>1</sup> 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.*<sup>1,2</sup> 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 Bousselot<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>4,5</sup> seems to come to this conclusion, and secular writers have also suggested quick reversals<sup>6</sup>.

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. 4<sup>th</sup> 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).<sup>1</sup>

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 Garton<sup>2</sup>), 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....’<sup>3</sup>*

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

flood.

No deliberate misrepresentation was intended.

Andy C. McIntosh  
Steven Taylor  
Tom Edmondson  
Leeds  
UNITED KINGDOM

**References**

1. McIntosh, A.C., Edmondson, T. and Taylor, S., Flood models: the need for an integrated approach, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):52–59, 2000.
2. Garton, M., The pattern of fossil tracks in the geological record, *CEN Tech. J.* **10**(1):82–100, Fig. 2, 1996.
3. McIntosh *et al.*, Ref 1, p. 57.

**Correction**

William Tompkins in his letter to the Editor<sup>1</sup> refers to reference 89 in my paper,<sup>2</sup> noting that it ‘*seems to be a nonentity*’.

The reference I gave was to *CEN Tech. J.* **9**(1):94. I have checked and found that the correct reference is:

Oard, M.J., Letters to the Editor, Precambrian rocks, *CEN Tech. J.* **6**(1):94.

M.J. Hunter  
Charters Towers, Queensland  
AUSTRALIA

**References**

1. Tompkins, W., The third day — Precambrian skeletons in the closet, Letters to the Editor, *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(1):49, 2000.
2. Hunter, M.J., Is the pre-Flood/Flood boundary in the Earth’s mantle? *CEN Tech. J.* **10**(3):344–357, 1996.

**Quotes**

**Lawless science**

Men became scientific because they expected Law in Nature, and they expected Law in Nature because they believed in a Legislator. In most modern scientists this belief has died: it will be interesting to see how long their confidence in uniformity survives it. Two significant developments have already appeared—the hypothesis of a lawless sub-nature, and the surrender of the claim that science is true. We may be living nearer than we suppose to the end of the Scientific Age.

Lewis, C.S.,  
*Miracles: a preliminary study*,  
Collins, London, p. 110, 1947.

**The religion of scientism**

‘It is no more heretical to say the Universe displays purpose, as Hoyle has done, than to say that it is pointless, as Steven Weinberg has done. Both statements are metaphysical and outside science. Yet it seems that scientists are permitted by their own colleagues to say metaphysical things about lack of purpose and not the reverse. This suggests to me that science, in allowing this metaphysical notion, sees itself as religion and presumably as an atheistic religion (if you can have such a thing).’

Shallis M.  
In the eye of a storm,  
*New Scientist*  
January 19, 1984, pp. 42–43.