

January 11, 2008 Letter from Jeremy Schooler to ICR in response
to their email of January 10, 2008

----- Original Message -----

From: [Jeremy Schooler](#)

To: ICR Info (Wood)

Sent: Friday, January 11, 2008 10:08 PM

Subject: Re: Do you know Walt Brown? To Bruce Wood

Bruce,

I'm sorry to take up any more of your time but your responses require a response. I am now coming to you for a whole new reason. I am concerned for you personally as a brother in Christ.

Let me first talk briefly about your response. Like I said in my original e-mail to you "I realize this topic can become very exhaustive so I am not looking to debate or take too much of your time. I am simply inquisitive for the sake of the search for answers. I realize you are a long standing scientific institute and I am interested in your thoughts." The only reason I took the time to try to answer the eight questions you submitted as "some technical problems that have yet to be resolved before it [the hydro plate theory] could be considered for publication in ICR literature in the view of ICR scientists." is to make the point that I.C.R. has not given any serious consideration to the hydro plate theory let alone at least read the book. My lack of education and my ability to see the ignorance on ICRs behalf with my lack of said education is evidence of this (ICRs ignorance of the hydro plate theory). I am most definitely not looking to debate the two theories. I'll leave that to the pro's.

You said "I am amiss in my idea that ICR is attacking Dr. Walt Brown in any way." Let me just cut and paste the paragraph you sent me.

You are amiss in your idea that ICR is attacking Dr. Walt Brown in any way. Please reread my opening statement (with **my emphasis**):

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.**

Now let me quote the very next paragraph you wrote (with my **emphasis**).

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.

Now the quote you put in your most recent reply from your first response.

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 . . . in geoscience.

And now what you actually said. Since some of the sentence is missing.

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.

Is it just me or does all this look very deceptive?

