

**Sulfuric Acid Cave Formation**  
**By Greg Neyman**  
**© Answers In Creation**



First Published 31 January 2003  
Answers In Creation Website  
[www.answersincreation.org/sulfuric.htm](http://www.answersincreation.org/sulfuric.htm)

Michael Oard has proposed the theory that Sulfuric Acid can cause rapid cave formation.<sup>1</sup> Why? The problem is that the young earth creationist must prove that the limestone caves of the world were formed in the short amount of time from the Flood of Noah to today, or about 4,500 years.

The theory he is attacking is the fact that Carbonic Acid is the material responsible for the dissolving of the limestone into ground water, so that it can form caves, and stalactites/stalagmites. He attacks this theory as being "old." But, we can see these processes at work, so we know that carbonic acid is to blame for caves.

The new theory uses sulfuric acid, and the author claims that sulfuric acid has been primarily responsible for excavating at least 10% of the caves in the Guadeloupe Mountains of southeastern New Mexico and west Texas. He goes on to say, *"What this means for creationists is that cave formation, in at least some cases, was much more rapid, since sulfuric acid is much stronger than carbonic acid. Sulfuric acid dissolution is not only postulated for the caves in the Guadeloupe Mountains, but it is thought that 10 % of known major caves worldwide were carved out by sulfuric acid."*

That's great...what about the other 90%? If you keep reading his article, he will "jump to conclusions" about the other 90%. He states, *"It is possible that many more than the postulated 10% of caves worldwide were formed by sulfuric acid dissolution, because these types of caves are recognized in dry areas where some of the dissolution products remain in the cave. However, in humid climates, the reactants may have been washed out of the cave. So, it is difficult to know whether a cave in a humid climate was excavated by sulfuric acid."*

While interesting, this is far from conclusive...unfortunately, a lot of scientific research by young earth scientists use such "jumps" towards their assumption of a 6,000 year old earth. He claims that in humid climates the reactants may have washed away...an easy cop-out, because nothing can be proved.

The author concludes with a treatise on radiometric dating. For a more accurate picture of radiometric dating, check out [www.answersincreation.org/dating.htm](http://www.answersincreation.org/dating.htm). Any radiometric dating must be taken with a grain of salt. Of interest here, though, is the first reference I have seen to paleomagnetic dating, a more reliable method that I haven't seen critiqued by young-earth scientists. Even taking the youngest date of 750,000 years, the 6,000-year-old earth is impossible to prove.

## **Conclusion**

While interesting, this article is far from convincing. When put into the context of the entire creation scenario, you realize that Noah's Flood cannot produce the limestone and other rock layers seen in God's creation. Knowing that these limestones have been around for millions of years proves their slow formation as previously proposed by geologists.

<sup>1</sup> [answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/tj/v12n3\\_caves.asp](http://answersingenesis.org/home/area/magazines/tj/v12n3_caves.asp)