

Empirical data support for seafloor spreading and CPT

I enjoyed the latest *J. Creation* 30(1) as usual, and would like to make comment on an overview by Timothy Clarey for a response by him or any one else who feels qualified to comment.

I agree with the majority of the article but want to comment on the timing of the event—particularly referring to figure 4 in the article, which shows the correlation of the families of oils and their similarities between Brazil and West Africa. My comments and deductions from this are that maybe the Catastrophic Plate Tectonics (CPT) event occurred after the Flood as the geology that formed the oil is most likely to have come from the Flood and therefore seems to have happened before the splitting of the continents. There is, I believe, evidence in the sedimentary layers of both continents that it maybe happened either late in the Flood or after the Flood. Further evidence would need to be gathered from the geology of these areas about which layers were continuous through these regions and which ones may have been deposited after the continental split occurred.

I do not know the details of the timeline of how CPT occurs and whether it would be possible for it to initiate in the oceans and cause flooding over the whole earth before continental separation happened, and whether there would be a gap of at least six months to allow enough time for sedimentation and consolidation to precede the continental separation. The other thing to be considered is whether the newly formed sediments would have slumped and deformed

when splitting occurred. This is likely to have been when fine grained layers with some water still in them were split before they became solidified. However, the evidence for this may be concealed by subsequent erosion, unless the slumping happened over a large area. If the sediments were soft, they would have been very susceptible to erosion anyway.

If these investigations showed that CPT could only occur after, or in, the very late stages of the Flood, then we would still be looking for a trigger for the Flood, but it would not mean that CPT did not occur, but just that it may have happened as a result of instability that had been caused by the Flood, rather than being the causal agent.

The other thing that seems to me to have happened mostly after the Flood is the large amount of volcanic activity. Certainly some happened during the Flood, but there was likely, to my mind (without doing an actual investigation, which may prove me wrong), a large amount continuing on immediately after the Flood judging by the presence of volcanic layers on top of the sedimentary layers.

If anyone knows of information that would shed light onto any of these matters I would appreciate your input.

Ralph Bazley
Warner, Queensland
AUSTRALIA

Timothy L. Clarey replies:

I would like to address a few of the comments and questions about CPT that were brought up in the preceding letter. First, most advocates for CPT believe movement of the tectonic plates was a major factor in both the initiation of the Flood and inundation of the continents.¹ Therefore, most plate movement is thought to have occurred during the Flood itself and not after. Rapid plate movement after the Flood would have been disastrous for land life as tsunami-like waves

would have continued to develop as a result of plate motion.²

The uplift of the newly created ocean ridge (Mid-Ocean Ridge) and crust in between South America and Africa is also believed to have contributed to the flooding of the continents. The formation of new crust causes uplift of the seafloor from below and displaces even more water onto the continents.³ There are differing opinions, however, even among CPT supporters, on whether the plates had ceased moving or were still moving rapidly when the Flood ended. A lot of this depends on where you draw the Flood/post-Flood boundary in the geologic record.

Secondly, I have been gathering substantial amounts of oil well and seismic information on the sediments across North America, Africa, and South America, including the offshore continental shelf regions. Although unpublished to date, the results are beginning to clarify a global Flood sedimentation model. Sediments began to accumulate off West Africa and eastern South America simultaneously as rifting began. These data confirm that the various oil source rocks were deposited after the South American and African continents began to split. And it follows that there was no depo-centre for sediment accumulation along the edges of the continents prior to the separation. Africa and South America split fairly late in the rising portion of the Flood (still pre-Day 150), during deposition of Cretaceous system strata. Later plate movement during the Flood further separated these oil source rocks and created more new seafloor in between and placed additional sediment on top of the source rocks.

Finally, I do not see a lot of soft-sediment slumping associated with the splitting of the continents, as postulated. Normal faulting is common on the shelf margins, but very little, if any, large-scale, soft-sediment deformation is observed.

Although faulted, the sediment layers seemed to have stayed relatively coherent as deposited. Later widespread sheet-like erosion during the receding water phase (post-Day 150) moved tremendous amounts of recently deposited sediment from the continents out onto these oil source rocks, burying them even deeper and placing them into the oil-generation window.

Timothy L. Clarey
Dallas, TX
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

References

1. Snelling, A.A., Geophysical issues; in: Boyd, S.W. and Snelling, A.A. (Eds.), *Grappling with the Chronology of the Genesis Flood*, Master Books, Green Forest, AR, pp. 111–144, 2014.
2. Baumgardner, J.R., Numerical modeling of the large-scale erosion, sediment transport, and deposition processes of the Genesis Flood, *Answers Research J.* **9**:1–24, 2016.
3. Clarey, T.L., Empirical data support seafloor spreading and catastrophic plate tectonics, *J. Creation* **30**(1):76–82, 2016.