

process is already in progress.¹ The coupling between the computer modeling and the physical modeling should increase the likelihood of arriving at a plausible physical explanation of geological features in accord with Scriptural accounts of the Genesis Flood.

References

- ¹Voss, H.D., M.E. Clark, R. Taubold, J. Osterbur, T. Dalton, and E. Gruschow, 1980. Investigation of a global flood using a large circular flume. In preparation.
²Hirt, C.W., B.D. Nichols, and N.C. Romero, 1975. SOLA—a numerical solution algorithm for transient fluid flows. Los Alamos Scientific Lab., Rept. LA-5852.

- ³Wiegel, R.L., 1964. Oceanographical engineering. Prentice-Hall.
⁴Laitone, E.V., 1959. Water waves IV, shallow water waves. University of California Engineering Research Technical Report 82-11.
⁵Laitone, E.V., 1960. The second approximation to cnoidal and solitary waves. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 9, part 3, 430-444.
⁶Williamson, H., 1972. Hidden-line plotting program. *Communications of the A.C.M.* 15 (2): 100-103.
⁷Kim, S.T., and J.J. Lee, 1977. Numerical solutions of viscous KdV equations—application in water waves. (In) *Proceedings of the Symposium on Applications of Computer Methods in Engineering* (Ed. L.C. Wellford, Jr.) 1, 347-355.
⁸Hendershott, M.C., 1973. Ocean tides. *EOS, Transactions of the American Geophysical Union* 76-86.
⁹Nelson, B.C., 1931. The deluge story in stone. Bethany Fellowship, Inc. Publishers, Minneapolis.

THE WARM EARTH FALLACY

GLENN R. MORTON*

Received 11 June, 1979

An analysis of the assumptions which must be made when ancient climate is inferred from the fossil record reveals that one must accept the Principle of Uniformitarianism and quite possibly the Theory of Evolution in order to determine the climate. Under the assumption that the earth has undergone a worldwide flood of a year's duration, it is impossible to determine what the pre-flood climate was like. The implications of this are that all current flood models which attempt to satisfy the warm earth criteria may be satisfying a situation which never existed.

For over fifty years one of the most firmly accepted creationist doctrines has been that the earth before the flood had a uniformly mild climate. Whitcomb and Morris have no less than eight quotations from three authorities attesting to the universal warmth of various ancient geologic periods.¹ Smith presents evidence in favor of the warm earth theory.² Rehwinke³ as well as Whitcomb and Morris cites coal as evidence of the warmth of the prediluvial world. In fact Whitcomb and Morris state that,

"A universal warm, moist climate alone explains the evidence."⁴

Dillow cites limestone deposits in the higher latitudes, palm trees in Alaska, crocodiles in New Jersey, and frozen ripe fruit found in the New Siberian Islands as evidence of this mild climate. In fact he makes a temperature estimate of the pre-flood world based upon the fossils found at various latitudes.⁵

Other examples are easily brought to mind. Fossil tropical breadfruit found, along with magnolias, laurels, ferns, and sequoias, 300 miles north of the Arctic Circle.⁶ The Byrd expedition discovered fossil ferns at latitude 87° S.⁷ Obviously, such facts strongly compel a researcher to accept the idea that the polar regions were considerably warmer in the past than they are presently. There just seems to be no way any such animals and plants could have lived in these regions under present climatic regimes.

However, an analysis of the assumptions which one must make to determine the pre-flood climate shows that they are totally incompatible with the assumption

of a worldwide flood. The reason for this is that in order to infer climate from the fossil record one must implicitly accept the Principle of Uniformitarianism.

Two assumptions must be made before climatic information can be deduced. First, it must be assumed that the habitats of the fossil species being studied are of the same kind as can be observed to be inhabited by the living representatives today. In other words, the habitat has not changed. This is the first form of this assumption. When the case occurs that there are no living representatives in a fossil assemblage, it must be assumed that the habitat is similar to that of the nearest living "relatives". This is the second form of the first assumption. Few creationists would have problems accepting it in its first form; but they should feel uncomfortable with its second form. In accepting it in its second form as stated, one is implicitly accepting evolution; because only in the theory of evolution are there any relatives! One could escape this by assuming that God created similar forms to occupy similar environments, but he must be careful in making this assumption. With the wide climatic tolerances observed within various genera, this assumption is shaky at best.

It is only by using this second form that any climatic inferences can be made, e.g. from dinosaurs. There are no living representatives; but the reptiles, being structurally similar to these ancient creatures (although this has been questioned) are used as the models. Thus it is concluded that the dinosaurs must have been cold-blooded and lived in more temperate climes. By this reasoning, then, the dinosaur footprints on Svalbard means that the area was once warm.⁸ Accepting this conclusion is uncomfortably close to accepting evolution also.

*Mr. Glenn R. Morton lives at 3313 Clavmore, Plano, Texas 75075.

The second assumption which must be made before it is possible for climate to be deduced is that a species lived in close proximity to the place where it is buried. That this assumption is necessary is obvious; but in making it one automatically excludes the possibility that a worldwide flood mixed up the plants and animals before their burial. This second assumption is actually a corollary of the Principle of Uniformitarianism. Thus the creationist who accepts the climatic conclusions of uniformitarianists is implicitly accepting uniformity and in danger of unwittingly accepting evolution—the two ideas most contradictory to everything creationists believe.

It is quite possible, moreover, that in accepting the idea of a warm pre-flood climate, we are throwing away some very good evidence for the flood itself. First, it is obvious that these plants and animals could not possibly have lived under Arctic conditions; and so they need explaining. The flood is a perfect explanation for these fossils; because during a worldwide flood the plant material, especially since it can float, could have been widely dispersed over the entire world. Just how far this dispersal could have been is seen when it is realized that a floating island of vegetation, given open sea-room, could completely circumnavigate the present earth in a year with a velocity of only three miles per hour.

The fact that vegetation was carried during the flood in precisely this manner is implied very strongly in Genesis 8:11. The bird brought back a freshly picked leaf which quite obviously had not been carried on the ark. Is it possible that the reason that the flora assemblages for many of the geologic ages are so uniform from pole to pole is due to this type of dispersal?^{9,10} Any animals which obtained temporary safety upon any of the many floating islands of vegetation which had enough strength to support them would also be subject to this widespread dispersal.

Thus, by rejecting the idea that the world before the flood must have been universally warm, we gain a greater evidence in favor of the deluge.

This inconsistency in creationist thought appears quite often whenever coal deposits are discussed. Generally coal is considered evidence of a uniformly warm climate because of its wide latitudinal occurrence and the supposed tropical conditions for its formation. How-

ever, if coal is to be used as a climatic "thermometer" the plants would have to have grown near where the deposit is located. After coal is used to prove the warmth of the climate, author after author will then argue that the material which formed the coal was washed into its present location. These two arguments concerning coal are based upon mutually exclusive ideas of coal formation.

Implications and Conclusions

The first implication of this analysis is that creationist thought may have been sidetracked for over fifty years attempting to form flood models which satisfy a warm pre-diluvial climate when no such satisfaction was necessary. It was largely due to the warm earth fallacy that the Tilted Earth Axis and Vapor Canopy models were advanced. The second implication of the analysis is that if we need not satisfy the warm earth conditions other flood models can be investigated with the hope that one will be found which will answer more of our questions about the flood.

These results obviously do not prove that the earth was not universally warm. It may or may not have been. What they do show is that under the assumption of a worldwide flood we will never be able to determine the pre-flood climate with any certainty.

References

- ¹Whitcomb, John C., and Henry M. Morris, 1961. *The Genesis Flood*. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Pp. 243-245.
- ²Smith, A. E. Wilder, 1968. *Man's origin, man's destiny*. Harold Shaw Publishers, Wheaton, Illinois. P. 120.
- ³Rehinkle, Alfred M., 1951. *The Flood*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri. Pp. 7-8.
- ⁴Whitcomb and Morris, *op. cit.*, p. 245.
- ⁵Dillow, Joseph C., 1978. *Earth's pre-Flood vapor canopy*. Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary. Pp. 156-162. See also articles by Dillow in the *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 1977-1980.
- ⁶Arnold, Chester, A., 1947. *An introduction to paleobotany*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York. P. 397.
- ⁷Schwarzbach, Martin, 1963 (translated by Richard O. Muir). *Climates of the past*. D. Van Nostrand Co., Toronto. P. 156.
- ⁸Dott, Robert H., and Roger L. Batten, 1971. *Evolution of the Earth*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., St. Louis. P. 384.
- ⁹*Ibid.*, p. 298.
- ¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 385. See also Whitcomb and Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-245.

Belief—and More

(Continued from page 56)

think that we do understand. But works of God which are not to be seen now, for instance creation of a new type of animal, become focal points of doubt. For a wise person, knowledge of the world imparts appreciation of the One who made the world.

References

- ¹Orgel, L. E., 1973. *The origin of life, molecules and natural selection*. John Wiley and Sons, New York. P. 183.
- ²Keith, Arthur, 1949. *Evolution and ethics*. G. P. Putnam's, New York. P. 230.
- ³Oparin, A., 1941. *Life, its origin, nature, and development*. Academic Press, New York. P. 37.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

"There is one point connected with Mr. Darwin's explanation of the bright colours of flowers which I have never seen referred to. The assumed attractiveness of bright colours to insects would appear to involve the supposition that the colour-vision of insects is approximately the same as our own. Surely this is a good deal to take for granted, when it is known that even among ourselves colour-vision varies greatly, and that no inconsiderable number of persons exist to whom, for example, the red of the scarlet geranium is no bright colour at all, but almost a match with the leaves."

Lord Rayleigh, in a letter in *Nature*, 1874