

# Discussion of the Subsurface Images Project of Noah's Ark

## NOAHSARKSCANS.NZ

Lorence G. Collins

August 15, 2020

### Discussion

In order to understand what side-sonar images produced by John Larsen indicate in the link <http://noahsarkscans.nz/> readers of this article need to know (1) what the geology of the layers are which has the shape of a stream-lined boat (supposed **Noah's ark**) with a supposed "stern" that points toward **Mount Judy** in the distance and a supposed somewhat blunted "bow" of the ark at the opposite end and (2) how this geology is affected by an analysis of many kinds of evidence that reveal how this supposed Noah's ark actually is not a fossilized remains of Noah's ark. Readers are also referred to the following two links for additional information and labelled images of various features of the supposed ark:

<http://www.csun.edu/~vcgeo005/Sutton%20Hoo%2014.pdf> and  
<http://www.csun.edu/~vcgeo005/Dogu.pdf>

### The Supposed Gunnels

On the opposite side of the "ark" away from the **Visitor Center** is a dike of black volcanic basalt that stands up as a resistant wall which Ron Wyatt and others thought was petrified wood that formed the gunnels on that side of the ark, but if that were true, then such an equivalent black wall (former gunnels) should be on the other side of the ark that is now a cliff that faces toward the **Visitor Center**. But no such black rock exists there because it never was petrified wood of the former gunnels of **Noah's ark**.

### Chemical Analyses of Supposed Petrified Wood and Iron Brackets

Ron Wyatt hired a company to do chemical analyses to determine what was in samples that he identified as either (a) petrified wood in the supposed wooden gunnels, flooring, beams, columns, and decking or (b) iron rivets and brackets that held the wood in the ark together. The company reported their analyses in percentages of iron (Fe), magnesium (Mg), aluminum (Al), calcium (Ca), and titanium (Ti). Ron Wyatt then assumed that these analyses represented actual metals, and, therefore, to him the petrified wood contained such metals and that the

supposed iron rivets and brackets consisted of metal alloys that Noah forged in a furnace. But what was reported by the company are the elements (as ions in various minerals and not native metals) that **(a)** are in the same proportions (weight percentages) as are found in volcanic basalt instead of wood, which is nearly 100 percent silica ( $\text{SiO}_2$ ), and **(b)** what is found in cemented concentrations of magnetite (iron oxide) that once occurred in the basalt.

The magnetite grains were cemented together in one place that looks a bit like an iron bracket, but if this were truly an iron bracket used by Noah with rivets to hold the ark walls in place, there should have been many thousands of them to hold the ark together, and only one was found. The magnetite grains once were in volcanic basalt, and this basalt was weathered and eroded to release the magnetite grains to be washed by streams into the sedimentary layers that compose most of the ark. Local concentrations of the magnetite grains become further oxidized to look like rusted iron metal flakes (limonite, a hydrated iron oxide) with a yellow-brown rusty color. Magnetite grains become concentrated in aggregate masses because it is a mineral that is magnetic and attracts itself into clots and clusters.

### **Iron-bearing Structures Projecting from the Bow**

Using metal detectors, Wyatt and others, including David Fasold, found that iron-bearing structures extended 20 to 50 feet beyond the end of the "bow," and these structures in this place should have made no sense to them. But, actually, the metal detectors were detecting parallel streams of placer-deposited concentrations of heavy (iron-bearing) magnetite grains that were washed out of the interior of the supposed ark. Magnetite normally also contains small percentages of magnesium and titanium. In the chemical analyses, aluminum would occur in adjacent clay minerals, and calcium would occur in the matrix in calcite (calcium carbonate), both of which help cement the magnetite grains together.

### **Rectangular Joint Systems Traced by Yellow Ribbons**

In similar uses of the metal detectors, Wyatt and others placed yellow ribbons (shown in the link) along the joint system on top of the supposed ark to mark the positions of supposed former walls of rooms where the metal detectors found the presence of iron (presumed to be in iron brackets and rivets) that held the walls in place. However, all that is detected is where rain water has washed tiny, iron-bearing magnetite grains into the joints where these grains then became concentrated and rusted. In none of these places was any iron brackets ever found in great abundance, and Wyatt found only one such supposed bracket, and even it did not have the right shape to be a usable iron bracket.

## **How the Supposed Noah's Ark Got its Stream-lined Shape**

To understand the side-solar images shown in the link, readers need to know that there are dikes of basalt and scattered masses of basalt in various places along the length of the supposed ark. One hidden mass of basalt occurs at the pointed end of the supposed "stern," and this mass was hard, resistant, and anchored so that mudflows and avalanche debris coming down from the slopes of **Mount Judy** split and flowed around it to produce the streamline shape of the supposed Noah's ark (see aerial view in the two links). But other masses of basalt occur hidden along the length of the ark and show up as dark shadows in the side-sonar images.

## **The White Lenticular Limestone as a Layer that Impaled the Ark**

There is a lenticular white limestone layer that occurs at the halfway point between the supposed "bow" and "stern." Ron Wyatt suggested that the pointed end of the limestone layer was a place where the ark was impaled when the ark slid down from **Mount Judy** to stop its downward sliding. However, drilling shows that this limestone layer does not end in a sharp point, but in the third dimension, it extends through and below the "ark" surface and occurs on both sides of the supposed ark structure as a continuous layer in and beyond the ark. This same limestone occurs in outcrops near the Visitor Center. The ark never was impaled on limestone. Moreover, limestone is relatively soft (hardness 3 on Moh's hardness scale) and has no physical strength, and if Noah's heavy ark did slide down onto this limestone layer, the limestone would have been smashed into hundreds of pieces of broken rock.

## **The Rock Layers in the Cliff Facing the Visitor Center**

When the side of the cliff facing the **Visitor Center** is closely examined, three different layers of nearly horizontal sedimentary rocks on top of each other can be seen that extend toward the "stern," and these rock layers are mostly composed of stream-deposited mud and silt with occasional pebbles and boulders of basalt or concentrations of them in some places (interpreted as ballast for the ark by Wyatt). At the highest level on top of these three different layers is a thin horizontal white sandstone layer that forms a cap-rock resistant to erosion that extends from the white limestone layer toward the "stern."

## **The Rocks from the Limestone to the Stern of the Supposed Noah's Ark**

The lenticular limestone layer, described above, truncates these horizontal layers that extend toward the "stern" at right angles in what geologists call an "*angular unconformity*." On the other side of this limestone layer toward the

"stern" are other mud layers interlayered with basalt lava flows or dikes that are oriented in the same nearly vertical direction as the white limestone layer. Therefore, the side-sonar images reveal where the vertical limestone layer is, where the low-density mud layers are (that look like rooms in the ark or walls of rooms), and where the very dense basalt masses are that show up as darker areas on the side-sonar images. There is no possibility that actual empty spaces (rooms) or walls of former rooms occur below the upper surface of the supposed ark. The curved layers in lighter and darker shades in the side-sonar images merely represent different degrees to which feldspar grains have been altered to clay minerals away from places where water has penetrated along fractures in the rocks that is discussed in the next paragraph. The different degrees in shades of color reflect the different densities and hydration of the rock in different layers.

### **The Supposed "Ribs" of the Ark**

The supposed "ribs" of the ark shown in the NZ link are not casts of former "ribs" but the result of differential weathering processes along vertical joints that extend through the horizontal layers on the cliff facing the **Visitor Center**. These supposed casts of former "ribs" are also side views of the joint system marked by yellow ribbons on top of the supposed "ark." At any rate, in these horizontal layers were feldspar grains that were physically eroded out of volcanic rocks in distant places and transported as eroded fragments to produce some of the sediment in these horizontal layers. Then, later through geologic time, when stresses (such as earthquakes) were applied to the rocks to produce the joint system, rain water could then move down through the joints and caused the feldspar grains to be weathered to make hydrated softer clay minerals that are more easily eroded away. That is, differential erosion of softer places along the joints in comparison to less erosion where feldspar grains are not yet changed to clay results in what appears to be former casts of "ribs" of the ark.

### **Formation of the Cliff Facing the Visitor Center and Iron Flakes In It**

The cliff facing the **Visitor Center** that supposedly is the opposite gunnel-side of the former **Noah's ark** and which has the supposed casts of "ribs" that are exposed there – exists there as a cliff because its face is one side of a joint plane that was oriented parallel to the cliff face. It was a place of weakness because the alteration of feldspar grains (hardness 6 on a Moh's hardness scale) in the horizontal layers along and adjacent to this joint formed soft clay (hardness 1), so that when a earthquake occurred, a large mass of the horizontal layers broke along this vertical joint. This breakage allowed this large mass to slide down and away from where it once was to produce the cliff. Because the surface of the cliff was

one side of the joint plane, the joint was a place where rain water carried tiny magnetite grains down along the joint to form aggregate masses that oxidized as flakes of limonite that had a shiny rusty yellow-brown surface that appeared to be like rusted iron metal to Ron Wyatt and others. Therefore, he and others thought these flakes were remnants of iron metal brackets and rivets, but they were merely flakes of oxidized magnetite concentrations. Wyatt and others could have put a yellow ribbon on the top of this cliff (prior to when the block slid) to trace the position of this joint that their metal detectors could have indicated the many iron-bearing flakes (limonite/magnetite) that occurred along this joint.

## **Conclusion**

All the above explanations give a logical answer as to why this streamlined structure in eastern Turkey looks like it should be the fossilized remnant of **Noah's ark** and why side-sonar images give the appearance as if once hollow rooms with vertical walls existed below the supposed ark deck. However, it is quite clear from the information given above that Noah did not build an Ark with volcanic basalt as its gunnels, flooring, columns, and decks and that supposed walls in the ark were not held together by iron brackets and rivets because such are composed of altered magnetite grains and not any metallic iron. On that basis, the many illustrations of views obtained by using side-sonar equipment cannot be evidence for former rooms in Noah's Ark when the Ark just does not exist at this site. The rooms are purely fictitious imaginations in order to fit the model that young-Earth creationists want to believe.