

# REACTIONS

*Readers are invited to submit their reactions to the articles in our journal. Please address contributions to: ORIGINS, Geoscience Research Institute, 11060 Campus St., Loma Linda, California 92350 USA.*

## **Re: Clausen: An evaluation of the use of growth lines in geochronometry, geophysics, and paleoecology (*Origins* 1:58-66)**

Number 2 of *Origins* put in its appearance yesterday, and I have been reading it as I walk to work. I note your lament that no one has yet picked Number 1 to pieces. Under such circumstances an editor naturally begins to wonder whether anybody has read the product of his labors. Such, I opine, is not the situation with *Origins*. Perhaps, in response to your lament, I should set about doing a bit of nit picking on Number 2, but as far as I have read I have found nothing to take exception to. In fact, as you may imagine, I was happily pleased that Dr. Clausen worked a good bit of astronomy into his article. In that area I can check him out, and what he writes reflects the present state of the discipline accurately and lucidly. Keep up the good work.

Raymond F. Cottrell  
*Book Editor, Review & Herald Publishing Assn.  
Washington, D.C.*

## **Re: Brand: A philosophic rationale for a creation-flood model (*Origins* 1:73-83)**

I found Dr. Brand's application of Kuhn's paradigm concept to the conflict between the creation-flood model and the uniformitarian model very interesting. I question, however, the view of the creation-flood model as a "new" paradigm challenging the established uniformitarian paradigm. Historically the creation-flood paradigm is much older and the situation is rather more like the creation-flood paradigm being the old established paradigm now almost completely defeated by the revolutionary uniformitarian paradigm. And creationists find themselves not in the position of advocating a revolution to a new paradigm but rather attempting to show that the nearly won revolution by uniformitarians was unwarranted, like a deposed ruler using guerrilla warfare and minor skirmishes to keep alive the fight while stirring up popular support for a counter-revolution.

In practice I admit that it makes little difference. Creationists were so thoroughly defeated and in fact had a paradigm so slightly developed that they could but poorly defend it. So for all practical purposes we might as well view the counter-revolution as a new revolution.

Terry L. Anderson  
*Assistant Professor of Physics  
Walla Walla College,  
College Place, Washington*