

Conclusions

The authors' critique of the claim of NAMI's discovery of a wooden structure on Mount Ararat touches the many issues involved with Ark Searching on Mount Ararat.

1. As key members of a rival Ark Searching group, the authors' critique can hardly be the independent investigation the authors correctly point out is needed to assess NAMI's claim.
2. This critique and the investigation it reports were motivated by Dr. Price's widely publicized suggestion that the NAMI announcement was based on a hoax. Far from an objective investigation, the authors were seeking evidence that NAMI's claim was based on a hoax.
3. The authors are deeply offended that NAMI did not include their geological report in the analysis of a purported wooden sample found in a cave on Mount Ararat.
4. The authors did not disassociate themselves from NAMI's team due to suspicions that the NAMI announcement was based on a hoax but because the discoverer Parasut dismissed them from the team due to their new associations with a rival Ark Searching team.
5. Dr. Price sought to be the archaeologist in charge of this discovery and was deeply offended that didn't occur. But even if NAMI and the discoverer Parasut accepted him, he would violate Turkish laws in doing so. Turkish antiquities law require that be conducted by a Turkish archaeologist. As an archaeologist, Dr. Price could work on this discovery under the authority of Dr. Belli, the Turkish archaeologist most qualified for this investigation.
6. The same antiquities laws prevent the archaeological investigations required to answer the many questions asked by the authors and others interested in this discovery, a problem that this reviewer's *Mount Ararat Discovery Foundation* has been established to solve.
7. The authors of this report appear to have found some mistakes in NAMI's report concerning a sample of possibly petrified wood found in a cave on Mount Ararat. Whatever the truth, it was not the basis of NAMI's important announcement.
8. The site investigated by the authors was lower on the mountain and far from the location of the discovery that was the basis of NAMI's announcement.
9. When carefully examined, nothing in the authors investigation or this report suggests any hoax or fraud on the part of NAMI or Parasut.
10. Dr. Price was himself victimized by 3 hoaxes: (1) the claim of his anonymous witness concerning the location of NAMI's site; (2) how this site was supposed to have been fabricated in the manner that someone, possibly involving one of the authors of the Critique had fabricated the board mentioned in this Critique; (3) a letter claimed to have been written by two brothers who worked with Parasut but in fact written by someone who had forged their names.
11. Painful losses have been sustained by NAMI, by Parasut, by Clara Wei, by Panda Lee and many others as a result of the charges of fraud that are the subject of the authors' charges and Critique. These false charges of fraud have been detrimental not just to Parasut and NAMI but to the hopes of believers everywhere that Noah's Ark may have been found.
12. Whatever the discovery is, it cannot be a recent fabrication. Those who study this ancient wooden structure should do so in such a way as to test whether the structure might be linked to some very important events in ancient human history.