GLOBAL WARMING

Dr. Walt Brown – www.creationscience.com

Posted here April 18, 2007

This topic evokes strong emotions and political positions, but all agree that historical records show wide swings in temperature over the centuries. Nevertheless, the net trend toward a global warming will probably continue, but for a different reason than commonly thought. We should first understand why we have so much ice on earth—7 million cubic miles, mainly in Antarctica and Greenland. If all that ice melts, sea level will rise about 200 feet.[1]

The global flood produced the special conditions that caused the ice age: *cold continents and warm oceans*. Crashing hydroplates at the end of the flood crushed and thickened continents and buckled up the earth's major mountains, making the continents temporarily higher than they are today and, therefore, colder. Also, after the flood, oceans were warmer than today, primarily because so much magma spilled onto the floor of the Pacific Ocean. Warm oceans produced extensive evaporation and precipitation, which on the cold continents produced extreme snowfall rates and built up glaciers. Heavy cloud cover and volcanic dust further cooled the continents.

Large temperature differences between cold continents and warm oceans generated strong wind systems that quickly carried the moist air up and over the continents where much of it cooled and fell as snow. Each winter's glacial advances were followed by summer's glacial retreats; these yearly cycles left marks on earth that some mistakenly associate with multiple, but conflicting numbers (4–30) of ice ages.

Historical records, described in Figure 67, show that snow depths increased recently and rapidly on Antarctica. As they did, lakes were covered and insulated from the cold antarctic air. More than 140 lakes are still unfrozen today.[2] One lake, Lake Vostok, is about as large as Lake Ontario.

For a few centuries after the flood, the warm oceans cooled and the thickened continents sank into the mantle. Both changes steadily reduced snowfall rates, so ice depths eventually peaked. As the amount of snow and ice decreased on earth, less of the sun's radiation was reflected off ice sheets and back into space. Consequently, more of the sun's heat warmed the earth. Then, even more ice melted, so the earth increasingly heated up. This cycle should continue—and accelerate.

Does mankind's burning of fossil fuels and production of greenhouse gases contribute to global warming? Of course, but no one really knows to what extent.[3] *Those who claim that man is the sole cause of global warming have not addressed the key question: Why does the earth have so much ice in the first place?* Apart from the global flood, explanations for the ice age run into scientific problems. Scientists who have studied the ice age in great detail know of these problems, but few others do.

Since the peak of the ice age, melting ice has raised sea level about 300 feet;[4] man did not cause *that* rise. (Man began increasing CO_2 emissions thousands of years later, in about 1800, at the start of the industrial revolution.) Without some unexpected development, sea level will, in a few thousand years, rise 200 more feet.

Yes, atmospheric CO_2 (carbon dioxide) is increasing, but most of it is due to the warming of oceans which releases some of the CO_2 they contain. (Our oceans contain 50 times more CO_2 than the atmosphere.) In other words, CO_2 increases did not produce much global warming; warming produced most increases in CO_2.

Those who express an opinion on the cause of global warming usually look at its effects today and, using a few clues, try to determine its cause. The hydroplate explanation for global warming looks not only from effect back to cause, but from cause directly to effect. We can have much greater confidence in our conclusion when (after considering all the data, including the ice age and its causes) the issue is seen identically in both directions. The flood also explains many other features on the earth.

Figure 67. Ancient Map Shows Recent Accumulation of Antarctic Snow and Ice. In 1929, this amazing map was discovered in Constantinople, Turkey. The map, drawn on gazelle skin, was signed in 1513 by Turkish admiral Piri Re'is [Pear ee RYE us]. The Admiral wrote on the map that it was based on 20 older maps, some dating back to the 4th Century B.C. and one reportedly used by Christopher Columbus. The Piri Re'is map shows, with great accuracy for the 16^{th} Century, parts of Africa, the Americas, and Antarctica. Surprisingly, details show that the map was made *before snow was deep enough to cover the rugged Antarctic coastline.* Forgery can be ruled out, because we have learned the shapes of those ice-covered coastlines only since the development of seismic techniques for penetrating deep ice.

First, notice on the upper right of the map the bulge of Africa and the Iberian Peninsula (today's Spain and Portugal). Next, locate a "skinny" South America. While some scales on the map are distorted and some marginal notes are incorrect, the shapes of the above features are unmistakable. Finally, in the extreme south is part of the Antarctic coast called Queen Maud Land. Today, glaciers extend far beyond, and hide, that irregular coastline.

Copies of the Piri Re'is map are held by the U.S.Library of Congress and other leading libraries. Charles Hapgood[5] has provided many details of Piri Re'is and other old maps showing Antarctica: Oronteus Finaeus, 1531; Hadju Ahmed, 1559; and Mercator, 1569. Each of these medieval maps, copied 2–3 centuries before our textbooks say Antarctica was discovered (in 1818), makes the case for a relatively ice-free Antarctica when the ancient source maps were originally drawn. The medieval maps show much lower sea levels occurred before the ice age. The hydroplate theory explains why lowered sea levels were followed by the ice age. The maps also provide additional information on Antarctica's mountain ranges, plateaus, bays, and former rivers—all of which are under a mile of ice today. Obviously, the Antarctic ice cap grew rapidly and recently, not over millions of years or before man allegedly evolved.

1. Dozens of complicating factors are involved in this estimate. For example, if floating ice melts, sea level will not rise. About 7% of earth's grounded ice is below sea level. Its melting will lower sea level slightly. Warming the oceans will thermally expand water, raising sea level even if no ice melts.

2. Sid Perkins, "Cold and Deep," *Science News*, Vol. 169, 4 February 2006, pp. 69–70.

How could Antarctica have one—or, more surprisingly, at least 140—unfrozen lakes buried under snow and ice? To answer this requires first answering two basic questions:

How could a lake form on Antarctica?

Why would it be buried and, after all these years, still unfrozen?

The flood provides an answer to the first question. When the flood waters drained into the newly formed ocean basins, every continental basin, including those on Antarctica, were left full of warm, salty water. Therefore, Antarctica had lakes immediately after the flood. Those who do not accept a global flood must find a way to warm Antarctica enough to create lakes. According to plate tectonics, Antarctica has always been at the South Pole, so proponents of that theory cannot "move" Antarctica into temperate latitudes. Volcanic activity did not provide the necessary heat, because Antarctica has few volcanoes and they are not near these 140 lakes.

Once a thin sheet of ice forms on a lake in Antarctica, a race begins between (1) ice and (2) snow. The winner will decide if the lake becomes a solid block of ice or a buried liquid lake. The ice will grow downward and thicken, at a steady but diminishing rate. Simultaneously, snow will build up above the lake. If the snow's thickness reaches about 2,000 feet before the downward growing ice touches the lake bottom, the lake will be insulated enough to retain its heat and not completely freeze; the slight amount of geothermal heat entering the bottom of the lake will prevent it from freezing solid.

Of course, the average annual air temperature, the annual rate of snowfall, and the initial depth of the lake will determine the winner. On Antarctica today, snowfall rates are typically less than 2 inches a year and the average air temperature is 20°F (-6.66°C) in the summer and -30°F (-34.44°C) in the winter. A prudent person watching the race on Antarctica today should bet on the ice, especially if the initial lake is not too deep. If the lake's initial depth is large, snow has a better chance of winning, but the first question (explaining the origin of a *deep* lake) will be even more difficult to answer for those who do not accept a global flood.

If one accepts the global flood, the first question has the answer given above. Furthermore, snowfall rates in the centuries after the flood would be orders of magnitude greater than today, and many postflood lakes would be quite deep. The lakes' water would be salty, so the more a lake freezes, the greater the salt's concentration becomes in the remaining liquid, and the lower its freezing temperature becomes. Ice growth rates would approach zero. Snow would win. [The one subsurface lake in Antarctica that has been studied most extensively has been found to have seven times the salt concentration as our oceans. See Peter T. Doran et al., "Formation and Character of an Ancient 19-Meter Ice Cover and Underlying Trapped Brine in an 'Ice-Sealed' East Antarctic Lake," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 100, No. 1, 7 January 2003, pp. 26–31.]

Given that Antarctica has at least 140 subsurface lakes, conditions must have been favorable for Antarctic lakes to form and for snow to win many races. In other words, these lakes suggest that there was a global flood followed by extreme rates of snowfall.

3. Current increases in the amount of atmospheric carbon dioxide are trivial compared to the amount spilled out as a result of the flood. [See **"The Origin of Limestone"** on pages 219-225.] *Carbon dioxide is food for plants.* That release of CO_2 helped reestablish earth's forests after the flood. Experiments conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture have shown that increasing atmospheric CO_2 by a given percent produces a much greater percentage increase in plant growth rates. [See Sherwood B. Idso, *CO_2-Climate Dialogue* (Tempe, Arizona: Laboratory of Climatology, 1987.] Certainly, increases in atmospheric CO_2 have negative consequences, but the above experiments show positive aspects as well.

4. Since 1841, increasingly accurate estimates have been made of the volume of ice on the earth at the peak of the ice age. Knowing that volume, the amount by which sea level would be lowered can be calculated. [For details, see Richard Foster Flint, *Glacial and Quaternary Geology* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971), pp. 84, 315–342.]

5. For details, see Charles H. Hapgood, *Maps of the Ancient Sea Kings* (New York: Chilton Books, 1966; reprint edition, Kempton, Illinois: Adventures Unlimited Press, 1996).

On 6 July 1960, the commander of the 8th Reconnaissance Technical Squadron, U.S. Air Force, wrote Charles Hapgood:

Dear Professor Hapgood:

Your request for evaluation of certain unusual features of the Piri Reis World Map of 1513 by this organization has been reviewed.

The claim that the lower part of the map portrays the Princess Martha Coast of Queen Maud Land Antarctica, and the Palmer Peninsula is reasonable. We find this is the most logical and in all probability the correct interpretation of the map.

The geographical detail shown in the lower part of the map agrees very remarkably with the results of the Seismic profile made across the top of the ice cap by the Swedish-British-Norwegian Antarctic Expedition of 1949. This indicates the coastline had been mapped before it was covered by the ice cap.

The ice cap in the region is now about a mile thick. We have no idea how the data on this map can be reconciled with the supposed state of geographical knowledge in 1513.

Lt. Colonel

Harold Z. Ohlmeyer

Hapgood, p. 243.