

January 8, 2008 email from Jeremy Schooler to ICR in
response to their email of December 29, 2007

From: Jeremy Schooler [mailto:j.s.schooler@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2008 8:58 PM
To: Info
Subject: RE: Do you know Walt Brown? To Bruce Wood

Bruce Wood,

First the answer to your subject line question is no. I have never met Walt Brown or talked with him. I have come to know of Walt's theory through my pastor who is quite convinced of the hydro plate theory.

I did not plan on replying to this e-mail when I had sent you the question originally but because of the response you have given me I feel it is necessary to reply.

I must say that the fact that the I.C.R.'s critiques would begin by saying something about Walt Brown's credentials is alarming. Instead it seems wiser to talk about his theory. Since the topic of geology has been brought up, what are I.C.R.'s thoughts about Walt Brown's explanation of the Grand Canyon and how it relates to the flood?

In my mind it looks like a political attack when a person with a strong scientific and Biblically sound idea is automatically discredited because of their past experience by a scientific institute for creation research ("Christians researching sciences"). I do not mean to sound like I'm accusing you or I.C.R. but thank God for not taking that approach with us. In fact God has very often used someone that is least likely or unexpected by human peers.

On the other hand it seems to me that any body that is talking about the kinds of force that would be required to move a continent or to flood the earth with waters from the great deep (Genesis 7:11) would need an understanding of engineering. Geology does not really seem to matter when talking about these forces except to tell us about specifics about the rocks we are talking about (ie: densities, masses and locations). Geology also should help to show proof that things happened the way they did or did not. Please correct me if I'm wrong but isn't a geologist some one who studies the earth's physical history and the rocks associated with it.

I have to admit that I have not yet read the book that you included. Your book may have answered these two questions but I would like to ask them anyway. Where did the water come from? Where did the water go, according to the catastrophic plate tectonics theory?

I would now like to take a look at the eight questions you posed about the hydro plate theory. First I should make it very clear that I am by no means experienced or formally educated on this subject. Because of my lack of experience and education it is very possible that I am misrepresenting the hydro plate theory or even other facts that I am not aware of. With that said here is my layman's attempt at a reply.

1. The hydro plate theory does not hold to Edward Bullard's model of continents fitting together. Walt Brown talks about this on pages 96-97 of the seventh edition of his book. He also lists more reasons why the model does not work.

2. I do not understand this statement. This may be a bit simple but if the continents are here, is there not enough space for them?

3. That is exactly what the hydro plate theory says. Obviously there would still be some water pouring out along the crack in the crust to either side.

4. The tidal effects would have created a lot of pressure which is what the hydro plate theory says. If there was this kind of water under the crust of the earth it would have a massive amount of pressure that would easily turn the bottom (the side closest to the water chambers below) of the crust in to more like putty rather than rock. The rock would literally be pliable. It would flow into any weak spots or cracks and seal them continually. It would in a sense be like mortar between bricks sealing up any weak spots.

5. I don't know. Why do you ask? The hydro plate theory states that basalt was below the subterranean water and granite was above the water.

