

December 29, 2007 email from ICR to Jeremy Schooler in response to his email
December 26, 2007

From: Info [mailto:Info@ICR.org]
Sent: Saturday, December 29, 2007 12:08 PM
To: Jeremy Schooler
Subject: Do you know Walt Brown?

Dear Mr. Schooler,

Thank you for contacting ICR. We praise God that you now belong to Him! In addition to the following information, I am enclosing a general apologetic above that will help you better understand our position on creation science.

ICR does not have an official position about Walt Brown's science. However, ICR respects Dr. Walter Brown's expertise in physics, mathematics, and military logistics, and his position as a young earth creationist. Due to his physics specialty, the hydroplate theory focuses on the earth's surface and the mechanics of the separation of the continents. ICR scientists hold to the catastrophic plate tectonics theory. Both theories have a lot in common but there are a number of geological factors that play a roll in our differences on this topic. Dr. Brown has discussed his ideas with ICR scientists and for the time-being agrees to disagree. We share a common belief as Christians, as young-earth creationists, and as scientists.

In a critique of Dr. Brown's geological abilities, one of our geologists says,

Dr. Brown is a physicist (engineer?), not a geologist, nor even a geophysicist. Like Michael Oard, and many other well-meaning and sincere creationists, he has stepped way out of his field yet speaks with the same level of authority as if it were his field. His Hydroplate "theory" should never be compared with the same level of seriousness as Catastrophic Plate Tectonics. He has never welcomed peer review, or any level of criticism, as far as I know. This is a grave mistake, in my opinion. His ideas look very impressive to someone not trained, but believe me, they are utterly laughable to one who has any training in geoscience.

Dr. Brown's hydroplate theory poses some technical problems that have yet to be resolved before it could be considered for publication in ICR literature in the view of ICR scientists. Although research on both Dr. Brown's hydroplate theory and the continental drift theory is still continuing, there are many unanswered questions, such as the following:

1. Bullard's model, requiring the shrinking of Africa's area by 35% to accommodate continental fitting is not used by the conventional plate tectonics theory.
2. There is insufficient space to accommodate movement of super continental-size hydro plates around the earth's surface.
3. Water pressure from subterranean chambers would have a vertical component that displaces water into the atmosphere rather than into the oceans directly.
4. Tidal effects on the proposed chambers 10 miles below the surface would have already caused rupture in a matter of days after they were created.
5. What evidence exists for the layer of "free floating" basalt between the subterranean waters and the Earth's granite upper mantle?
6. Seismic boundaries defining ocean ridges, subduction zones, transform faults and collision zones are not accounted for by continental-size hydro plates.
7. Sea-floor spreading from a ridge axis such as the Mid-Atlantic Ridge is the foundational theory to conventional plate tectonics, and is not exclusive to the Hydroplate Theory.
8. There is a lack of evidence that leading edges from continental-size hydro plates (formed from hot magma erupting from the ridges) caused the post-flood intensely folded sedimentary rock associated with over-thrusts or transform faults.

This complex subject has historically been the object of much speculation or debate between geologists and scientists for many years.

Although, there appear to be numerous similarities between the two theories, the geophysical and seismic evidence would ultimately favor a lithosphere (such as that described in the plate tectonic theory) consisting of multiple segments or plates that are in motion with respect to one another and that are continually moving, changing shape and size.

