

7

The Hydroplanet Model

- 7.1 Magma Planet to Hydroplanet
- 7.2 Celestial Water
- 7.3 Hydrospheres
- 7.4 The Crystallization Process
- 7.5 A New Geology
- 7.6 The Hydroplanet Earth
- 7.7 Hydrology Redefined
- 7.8 The Hydrocrater Model
- 7.9 The Crater Debate
- 7.10 The Meteorite Model
- 7.11 The Arizona Hydrocrater Evidence
- 7.12 The Impact to Hydrocrater Evidence
- 7.13 The Hydromoon Evidence
- 7.14 The Hydrocomet Evidence
- 7.15 The Hydroid Evidence
- 7.16 More Hydroplanet Evidence
- 7.17 The Hydroplanet Frontier

During the 1700s, science notables; Newton, Hooke, Halley, and others were rising stars. New discoveries abounded, but some ideas, like the *knowledge* that there were *only* five extra-terrestrial planets orbiting the Sun, were solidly established and no one expected any revision to that well-known *fact*. Then, on March 13, 1781, Sir William Herschel made the spectacular discovery of the planet Uranus. He had not been the first to see the planet, but because of accepted tradition, it had escaped recognition until that fateful day.

We are not so different today, self-satisfied in our belief that ‘we now know’ so much about nature that we sometimes miss the obvious. Science writer Bob Berman concluded:

“...to duplicate the shock of Uranus’s discovery, we’d have to stumble upon something that would shatter cherished, long-held beliefs, instantly revealing that we had been dead wrong

“The history of how Earth’s interior evolved, and how it accounts for many aspects of our planet’s behavior, remains largely unwritten. Taking **water** into account could well help to explain a great deal more.”

David Stevenson

about some universally accepted tenet of reality. But as science and technology advance with **exponential rapidity**, our capacity for astonishment shrinks to **near zero**.” Note 7.0a

We have a false sense of security because of the mingling of science and technology. If modern science is moving in “exponential rapidity” or with great speed in the *wrong* direction, there is no reason that our capacity for astonishment could ever *shrink* to “near zero.” Clearly, modern geology has missed something even more momentous than the discovery of a new planet, the realization that the Earth is *not* a magma planet.

The idea of a hot, molten Earth is not a terribly old idea; it was first seriously considered just over two hundred years ago by James Hutton. Since then, it has become one of the principle pillars that all of modern science is built upon. Today, this dogma is so deeply entrenched and so completely accepted that *no modern scientist* questions the revered magma planet tenet, and nobody is looking at the mountain of evidence that demonstrates otherwise.

Is it possible that such a well-known theory is wrong? Mary Hill, senior geologist with the California Division of Mines and Geology, said the following

in her book *Geology of the Sierra Nevada*:

“Some of the theories we have today may seem as ridiculous tomorrow as the idea that earthquakes are caused by a great turtle shaking the Earth on its back. Such an idea of the Earth was once held by millions of people. We call it primitive; **yet our current theories may be just as far from the truth**.” Note 7.0b

