David Larsen
Pasadena, California
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

Bill Crouse replies:

First off I would agree with David that Mt Ararat is a mountain conducive to preserving an object the size of Noah's Ark. If it were covered with volcanic rock it could easily have become fossilized, and if it were buried perpetually in ice the wood would not rot. He also mentions that the size of Ararat renders it a good hiding place. It is definitely a massive and complex volcanic structure but it is still finite. One Turkish officer in the commando force stationed in that area told me he trained his men on the mountain and there were very few places he had not been. The mountain has been searched by fixed wing plane on numerous occasions as well as by high-powered helicopter. My point is, the mountain in the last 20 years has been thoroughly searched. Previous writers have also exaggerated the size of the icecap not the mention that it has greatly shrunken in size over the last several decades. The entire icecap can easily (maybe not a good choice of words!) be searched in an afternoon. Most of this ice is moving down the mountain as several glacial fingers with the possible exception of two areas which may be stationary, but have now had preliminary checks with penetrating radar.

I am sorry that David took my dismissal of eyewitnesses as flippant. I can assure the readers of *TJ* that I spent hundreds of hours tracking down and comparing stories. I also believe I am on firm ground to dismiss most of them as not reliable (the word 'crackpot' is David's). Nowhere did I call anyone a liar, but for the record, I believe the accounts of Chuchian,[1] Liedmann,[2] Gurley, Navarra,[3] and Behling[4] are clearly not true. Two, Gurley[5] and Liedmann confessed to lying. At least one of the above suffered from mental problems. -

With regard to the WWII aviator, Vince Will, I have read his account and have no opinion. I will only say that what he saw was evidence for him. We have no photos or other evidence to corroborate his story.

I believe David misread my account of the Turkish soldiers (p.16). If they saw anything it was probably the Ark-shaped stone building on Cudi Dagh. It would have been clearer perhaps if I had written '…when they came upon what *they thought* was Noah's Ark.'

By the tone of David's letter it seems he has an emotional commitment to the Ararat site. For reasons I can't go into here, I also have emotional ties to Ararat. I wish it would be found there, and I am still intrigued by the so-called Ararat Anomaly.[6] Perhaps we will soon have a definitive answer.

Bill Crouse
Richardson, Texas
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

References

1. *Ararat Report*, February–March 1990, p. 5. For this article I spent a day with Chuchian as well as interviewing his employer and others who knew him.
2. *Ararat Report*, January 1987, p. 2. Liedmann confessed to lying before the elders and pastor of his church in Lubbock, TX, and later to the entire congregation. My source was the pastor who is currently pastor of a large church in Dallas, TX.
3. *Ararat Report*, May 1993, p. 2.
4. *Ararat Report*, May 1993, p. 4.
5. Before his death, Gurley was a subscriber to *Ararat Report* and he often corresponded. He confessed to me personally that the story he wrote about the Russian discovery was entirely fiction.
6. Maier, T.W., Anomaly or Noah's ark? *Insight* **16**(43):10–14, November 20, 2000.

Cudi Dagh not high enough ?

Bill Crouse[1] suggests there is compelling evidence, from ancient historical accounts prior to the middle of the 13th century, that Noah's Ark rested on Cudi Dagh (Cudi Dagi), a mountain in southern Turkey about 300 km south west of Mount Ararat.

Crouse cites several geological reasons why remains of the Ark might not still be on Ararat, and then seems to infer that because the remains of the Ark are not found on Ararat that it never landed there, suggesting that after a proposed sub-surface survey of the icecap; 'Ararat should be completely discounted as the final resting place of Noah's Ark'. This seems an illogical conclusion given that he has just cited several reasons why, if the Ark had landed on Ararat it would not still be there!

Crouse lists several ancient pagan, Christian, Jewish and Islamic accounts and suggests that the historical evidence from these ancient references that the Ark landed on Cudi Dagh easily outweigh historical evidence that it landed on Ararat.

I suggest that there are two geographical arguments which, when considered in the light of three passages of Scripture, may rule out Cudi Dagh as a possible resting place for the Ark.

First geographical argument

> Genesis 7:24, ' … the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days' (i.e. until day 150).
>
> Genesis 8:4, ' … the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat' (i.e. day 150).

Genesis 7:24 and 8:4 indicate, in my opinion unequivocally, that *the Ark rested on the same day that waters began to subside*.[2] The maximum

floodwater level then could have been little more than the *draft* the Ark (15 cubits/6.7 m) above the summit altitude of the mountain on which the Ark rested.

Now, the summit altitude of Cudi Dagh is 1,782 m above mean sea level.[3]

The current volume of '*free*' water in the world's oceans and seas[4] (which must be the same as the volume the floodwaters at their maximum level on day 150) when displaced onto the present land surface, would cover the Earth to a depth of about 3,000 m, almost twice the present height of Cudi Dagh.[5]

If a correction is made for the volume of sediments which would have washed off the land during Stage III of the Flood, and are now buried in off-shore sedimentary basins, this depth would be greater.

Genesis 7:24 and 8:4 and the present volume of 'free' water thus constrain the summit altitude of the mountain on which the Ark grounded to a *minimum* of about 3,000 m above sea-level. If the Ark rested on Cudi Dagh (1,782 m) as suggested, and assuming that the present relative height relationships of the mountains, and the absolute heights above mean sea-level have not changed significantly since day 150 of the Flood, the waters would have had to fall about 1,200 m before the Ark could have grounded. Even if the initial subsidence rate was ten times the average, it would take 8.8 days to fall to the level of the summit of Cudi Dagh.

Second geographical argument

> Genesis 8:5, 'And the waters decreased continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen.'

A straightforward interpretation of this passage indicates that prior to the first day of the tenth month, (i.e. day 223) no mountains were visible from the Ark, and that they became visible on the first day of the tenth month.

That the mountains 'were seen'/ 'became visible' about 74 days after the Ark grounded is indisputable.

If the Ark rested on Cudi Dagh (1,782 m) then Mount Ararat and the other high mountains surrounding it, as well as other mountains that are higher than Cudi Dagh would have been visible prior to the grounding of the Ark.

Within a radius of 50 km from Cudi Dagh there are six other mountain peaks, *all* of which are *higher than Cudi Dagh*.[3] One of them, Tanin Dalgari, only 47 km to the east of Cudi Dagh, is 3,231 m above sea level, nearly twice the altitude of Cudi Dagh!

If the Ark was resting on Cudi Dagh from day 150 on, one might assume that at least the six higher mountains within 50 km of Cudi Dagh would have been easily visible above the water horizon from day 150 to day 223.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding the geographic and Scriptural arguments outlined above the historic accounts still remain. Cudi Dagh is located at the southern edge of the Turkish mountains, at the northern end of the Mesopotamian Plain of Iraq and Syria. It is 23 km from the ancient city of Cizre (Turkey) on the Tigris river. AI Malikiyah (Syria) and Zakhiu (Iraq) are other nearby population centres.

Some travellers from the Middle East and Europe to Asia may have followed the Tigris River along the southern edge of the Turkish mountains. Cudi Dagh then may have been close to a major trade/tourist route. The inhabitants of population centres such as Cizre, AI Malikiyah and Zakhu may have realised the potential commercial benefits of having the Ark landing site and numerous associated shrines nearby.

Max J. Hunter
Charters Towers, Queensland
AUSTRALIA

References

1. Crouse, B., The landing place, *TJ* **15**(3):91–94, 2001.
2. Hunter, M.J., Scriptural constraints on the variation of water level during the Genesis Flood, *CEN Tech* J. **14**(2):91–94, 2000.
3. Road Map Turkey, 1:1,000,000, Kummerly & Frey, Bern Edition, 1989.
4. Baumgartner, A. and Reichel, E., *The World Water Balance*, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Co., Amsterdam.
5. Hunter, M.J., Is the pre-Flood/Flood boundary in the Earth's mantle? *CEN Tech. J.* **10**(3):344–357, 1996. The water depth estimate in this reference (11,710 m) assumes a flat Earth surface. In this letter the 3,000 m estimated depth is determined allowing for the volume of land above sea-level.

Bill Crouse

Bill Crouse replies:

Max Hunter's arguments about altitudes and water levels, it seems to me, are of no avail to support his case for the Ark landing on Mt. Ararat if there is no geological evidence to support it. One would certainly think that if Ararat were covered with water, even for that length of time, there would be some kind of remaining diluvium. As of now, I have seen no credible evidence presented in the proper scientific protocol to indicate otherwise. On the mountain there are no sedimentary rocks or fossils resulting from water action. The distinct layering in the southern

canyon is without a doubt from volcanic action. All the lithography on the mountain is igneous. This is supported not only by field geology but also through satellite imagery. John Baumgardner of Los Alamos National Laboratory visited the mountain on several occasions and it was his opinion that the mountain rose after the Flood.

Using water volumes and altitudes can be a rather slippery form of evidence. The Flood itself probably was so catastrophic that mountains may have been pushed up and conceivably some worn down. In other words, we cannot use present day altitudes to calculate water depth.

The Ice Age and ancient maps

I had the pleasure of attending the Creation 2001 conference near Cincinnati. After listening to Michael Oard's presentation 'Whatever Happened to the Woolly Mammoth',[1] I realized his ice age model also solved an ancient map mystery.

I was intrigued by the first chapter of Graham Hancock's book, *Fingerprints of the Gods*,[2] published in 1995. This book contains some fascinating information about some ancient maps, such as the Admiral Piri Re'is map of 1513. The Admiral himself created this map, though it is important to note that he references other ancient map sources. It centers on the South Atlantic showing Africa, South America, and most interestingly, the Princess Martha Coast of Queen Maud Land Antarctica. According to the history books, the continent of Antarctica was discovered in 1840 by the Wilkes expedition. That's right, Antarctica appeared on the map of Piri Re'is 327 years before it was 'discovered'. This enigma only became apparent after the mapping of the coastline in 1949 with the aid of modern seismic technology to 'see' through about a mile of ice which covers this area today. Mr Hancock's book includes information about the evaluation of the Piri Re'is map, by the United States Airforce in 1960, for Professor Charles H. Hapgood of Keene College, New Hampshire. I quote from the USAF letter, 'We have no idea how the data on this map can be reconciled with the supposed state of geographical knowledge in 1513.'

We must conclude that a civilization existed, and considered ancient during the admiral's time, with the means to map Antarctica. The question is, did they have a technology to acquire topographical data through the ice sheet? Or did they map the coastline before the ice covered it? The most probable explanation is that it was mapped while ice free. Hancock proposes a theory to explain how there was no ice on the Antarctic continent at the time these ancient source maps were created.

Michael Oard's ice age model is an excellent solution to the frozen mammoth mystery. His theory gains credibility from Alexander V. Lalomov's findings,[3] published in this journal. I suggest Oard's ice age model also solves the map mystery. A key element in his theory is an elevated ocean temperature. While the higher elevations are heavily glaciated, the warm ocean produces a sub-tropic climate near the coast and at lower elevations. This allows for the needed vegetation and conditions for the many warm weather animals whose remains are found in the sediments with the mammoths. The mechanism in which the ocean temperature is elevated is global, and is a result of the Flood catastrophe. It seems a reasonable proposal that while mammoths were roaming the coastal areas of the Arctic on the other side of the world, humans mapped the 'ice-free' coast of Antarctica. The existence of ancient maps showing the ice-free coastline of Antarctica serves as evidence in support of Michael Oard's model.

Jeff Van Dyke
South Carolina
USA

References

1. Hancock, G. and Santha Faiia (photographer), *Fingerprints of the Gods,* Crown Pub., May, 1995.
2. Oard, M.J., The extinction of the woolly mammoth: was it a quick freeze? *CEN Tech. J.* **14**(3):24–34, 2000.
3. Lalomov, A.V., The extinction of the woolly mammoth, *TJ* **15**(2):50, 2001.

Mountain High Maps® http://www.digiwis.com

Michael Oard replies:

I am glad that Jeff Van Dyke thought of a solution to the puzzle of some ancient maps while listening to one of my talks at Creation 2001. There are a number of maps from the Middle Ages that show the Southern Hemisphere, even the coast of Antarctica. These maps are considered by some to have been drawn in ancient times.

In my post-Flood Ice Age model, warm water would surround Antarctica for quite a while during the Ice Age.[1] Such warm water immediately after the Flood adjacent to Antarctica would result in rapid glaciation, starting in the mountains and inland. Over the next five hundred years, as the atmosphere and ocean cooled, the East and West Antarctic Ice Sheets would grow, coalesce, and eventually move out across the adjacent continental shelves and ocean. There would