

Pondered Points About the Flood
By Greg Neyman
© Answers In Creation



First Published 17 October 2003
Answers In Creation Website
www.answersincreation.org/ponder.htm

On [Kent Hovind](#)'s website, [Creation Science Evangelism](#), Hovind gives [23 points to ponder about the flood](#). He does so with the intention of providing support for the young age of the earth, and a global flood. How do these points impact a belief in an old earth?

Some of the points have no impact whatsoever. You will see, however, that in many cases, the arguments that are given actually disprove the young earth, global flood model, and they fit well with a local flood, old earth model. We will examine them one at a time. Please open the CSE webpage by clicking the heading so you can follow along.

Points to Ponder About the Flood

1. The fact that there are over 250 flood legends from around the world has absolutely no impact upon an old-earth believer. Most old earth positions believe in a local flood event, which was universal to the people involved. In other words, to Noah and his family on the ark, they could see no land as far as they looked. To them, it was universal (use the term global, if you wish).

Since mankind was re-populated by Noah and his family, they would naturally carry this flood legend wherever their descendants went. Therefore you would expect even the Indians of the Americas, and other peoples around the globe, to have flood legends.

2. This is one of my favorite young earth creation science points from their article, because it proves an old earth! They mention that scoffers claimed that the ark was not worthy of sailing, and the young earth proponents answer this by saying that the ark was only built to float...not sail anywhere.

At this point, let's visit one of my favorite young earth creation science articles, by [Baumgardner and Barnette](#). They worked out, in an effort to prove a global flood, that a sphere covered in water would have ocean currents strong enough to erode the land, and thus create all the layers of sedimentary rock in the rock record. However, young earth creationists fail to transfer this valid, truthful research to their other theories. Therefore, we will do it for them. According to this study, the high currents (up to 194 miles per hour) are centered over the continental land masses. The ark started its journey over a continental land mass. It would have been forced away from this land mass, and sent out into the open ocean. Therefore, a young earth ark, in a global flood, HAD to be able to sail.

However, with the old earth, local flood scenario, the floating barge theory of the young earth creationists works out nicely. In reality, this argument only supports an old earth, local flood theory.

3. The size of the ark does not have any impact upon an old earth...only when you consider a young earth do you run into problems with size. Young-earth creationists try to argue the small size of the ark away by claiming that only “kinds” of animals were required. In other words, one pair of “dog-kind” was all that went on the ark, and from these two dogs all other dog-like species evolved (that’s right...evolved). Unfortunately for the young earther, you can’t get all the different types of animals from their respective “kind” without embracing evolution.

For the old-earth believer in a local flood, Noah only needed a small amount of animals for the region that was flooded. In other words, there was no Kangaroo, Koala, or Llama, or many other species, on the ark.

4. I agree. No problems for an old earth!

5. Moon pool...hmmm, sounds nice, but has nothing to do with proving the ark existed, or a global flood. Notice the author is merely speculating on this one...there is no proof the ark was build this way (I don’t recall God telling Noah, “And thou shalt build a moon pool in the middle of the ark.”)

6. The author claims the ark “may” have had drogue stones. Great, more complete speculation! Kent Hovind claims there are many found in the region where the ark landed. First, I didn’t know Kent had found the location of the ark! Second...the ark landed in the mountains of Ararat. What do you find in mountains...stones! I’m not surprised that stones have been found in the mountains!

7. Interesting, but worthless when talking about the size of the ark, when you consider point 3 above.

NOTE: Here you can see a common tactic of the young-earth creationist. They try to awe people with these amazing facts. However, this is only camouflage...to prevent them from looking into the ark, or creation, in any depth. Their audiences tend to accept whatever they say at face value, without investigating it completely. When one does, it’s obvious that the earth is old, and the flood was local. Young earth creationists make their living by inspiring people to believe in something that is false...therefore they would probably make great used-car salesmen!

8. Here is the “kind” argument. Even given this argument, the ark would still be too small. Why? While Noah was on the ark, the ocean currents mentioned above are busy making new rock layers. ALL vegetation would be stripped, and buried by the new layers. When Noah let the animals off the ark...there was nothing for them to eat! The carnivores would quickly kill off the plant eaters (just the few dinosaur species would take care of that), and there would probably be no animal life, including human, left on earth, in less than three months. Given this fact of young-earth theory, not only did Noah have to feed the animals when they were afloat, he also had to feed them for months after they were released. That’s a lot of food for the ark to carry! However, young earth ark calculations only account for the food while the ark was afloat...they do not figure the “release” food, so they come up short on their calculations.

9. Good point, no problem for an old-earth creationist.
10. No problem, I guess. However, these insects could not have stayed airborne over a year, so they must have died, and been repopulated by their eggs. The “real” reason Kent mentions this is...he can’t fit them on the ark. Also, notice that he says “thousands” of insect varieties. Unfortunately for Kent, his “kind” argument won’t work here, since insects don’t interbreed. And, even worse for Kent, there are “millions” of insect varieties, not thousands.
11. Nice to know, but no impact upon a young or old earth theory.
12. This is a standard young earth creation science argument, which is based on Genesis 1:29, Genesis 9:3, and the death before sin issue. There are no problems with believing this and believing in an old earth, if one so chooses.
13. Yes, they could have learned more from more grandparents that were alive, but that does not mean they were smarter. Having knowledge, and the ability to process and understand that knowledge (reasoning) are two different things. Also, Kent claims that they were probably more advanced. If that’s true, why don’t we see the ruins from the flood, where God destroyed all the skyscrapers, cell phone towers, etc, of these more advanced peoples? I’m sure that’s not what he means by the term “advanced,” but what exactly does it mean? (Another one of those things that a young-earth student should not question, but accept at face value from their teacher.)
14. Nice to know, but unimportant concerning the old or young earth theories.
15. This is a mis-interpretation, along with a mis-translation. Look at Psalm 104. The King James (or NIV) gives the correct translation. It is clear that the waters are doing the moving, not the mountains nor the valleys. Therefore the young earth claim that catastrophic plate tectonics, which contributed to massive mountain building during the flood, has no basis of proof in scripture (nor in science). This goes hand-in-hand with number 16. For more see [Psalm 104](#).
16. There is supposedly enough water in the oceans to cover a flat earth to a depth of 8,000 feet. Too bad the earth was not flat before the flood. Unfortunately, to reach this possibility, the ocean floors have to be lifted to the same level as the land. From Genesis Chapter 1, the oceans were assigned to their place, and as the rain started, this water would stay where it is, otherwise the rains on the earth would merely flow back down and go back into the oceans. Because of this, young-earth creationists cannot use the water of the oceans as the source of a global flood.
17. The author tries to use supposed ark sightings to inspire their followers. However, the ark has never been found, and, most likely never will. Why? Let’s go back up to point number 8. The massive ocean currents of a global flood would have stripped all vegetation from the earth. There would be no trees available for Noah and his family to build with. In all likelihood, Noah and his descendants used the valuable wood of the ark

for reconstructing their homes. In a hundred years, the ark was probably dismantled and disappeared from the earth.

Of course, one might ask how come the dove that Noah send out come back with a leaf of an olive tree. In a global flood, this would not be possible, as no vegetation would be left on earth. However, in an old-earth, local flood event, this is easily explainable. The dove merely flew outside the range of the flood to get its olive leaf.

18. The author uses Genesis 10:25 to claim that the continents were together until 100 to 300 years after the flood. Genesis 10:25 says, “And unto Eber were born two sons; the name of one was Pelag; for in his days was the earth divided; and his brothers name was Joktan.” The Hebrew word for “earth” used here is ‘erets, and can be translated as “nations” in addition to “earth” (see Isaiah 37:18, for instance). The Amplified uses the term “inhabitants.”

The Tower of Babel, where God divided the peoples and confused their languages, happens in Genesis 11. This is the most likely explanation for the “earth divided” statement. To assume that this refers to God breaking apart the continents, when there is no supporting evidence outside this verse (nor in science), is the height of arrogance for the author. In this claim, the author (Kent Hovind probably) is way out there on a limb.

Also, how would one person, standing on a continent, know that the land is dividing itself into continents? I’m certain it didn’t accelerate at a speed that you could feel! I can see Pelag saying to his wife, “Hold on dear...we’re racing towards the America’s again!”

As a final note, this is on the list of arguments which another young earth ministry, Answers in Genesis, says creationists [should not use](#).

19. Great evidence for an old earth! Try getting those rocks up there in a young-earth model! I’m not sure why Kent Hovind thinks this is evidence for a global flood...after all, he believes (from 18) that the earth divided after the flood. However, other young earth creationists, such as the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) believe the continents moved during the latter part of the flood, not 100 years later. Which young earth creationist should you believe?

This probably falls in the category of “shock and awe”...throw your believers some fantastic piece of data, and they are awed by it...even though it has nothing to do with proving a flood, or a young earth. Again, young earth creationists would make great used-car salesmen.

NOTE: Young earth creation science claims that Everest was formed from great tectonic forces, in a short amount of time, during the latter phases of the flood of Noah. However, look at their theory for the Grand Canyon rocks. They claim that the strata of the canyon are “plastic,” i.e. since they were still soft (wet), when the folds occurred, they didn’t break, but were plastic, or, they folded. Now, look at the rocks of Everest. Hmmm, you have sedimentary, fossil bearing rocks. If these rocks were still wet when Everest was pushed up, it would be impossible for them to have formed jagged peaks...if they indeed were soft and pliable as the young-earth model states, then Everest would merely be a heap of dirt, instead of the jagged rocks that it is. Using the young earth creation science model, there is no possible way that Mt. Everest could have formed during the young earth scenario. The only feasible answer is that the earth must be old, with the slow growth of creeping plates pushing into each other over millions of years.

20. Sedimentary rock is formed in water, and is found all over the world. Hmm, so what! Has nothing to do with the Ark, flood, or creation. More shock and awe!

21. Rapid burial of clams...stuff happens. I, as an old earth creationist, believe that animals are rapidly buried all the time in floods, landslides, etc. To find some in the fossil record, and claim that they are evidence for a global flood, is ridiculous. The only way that young earth creationists could claim they were killed by the global flood is to have witnessed it, and I don't think any young-earth creationists are that old. They are grasping for facts that have no bearing on flood evidence.

22. Only if you accept a young earth, based on flawed, erroneous theories. The explanation from an old earth fits much better with reality than the young earth explanation. Why is this...because young earth creation science is not based on reality.

Is there such a thing as a creation scientist? What is a scientist? A scientist uses "scientific methods" to examine things. According to Webster's Dictionary, the scientific method is "...the collection of data through observation and if possible experiment, the formulation of hypothesis, and the testing and confirmation of the hypothesis formulated." Note the scientist FIRST collects data, and then formulates the hypothesis.

However, young earth scientists do not operate by the above dictionary definition. They have reached the conclusion (hypothesis) that the earth is young FIRST, before they collect scientific data from the rocks. Only then do they try to match the scientific data to their pre-conceived age of the earth. Since the authors do not comply with the scientific method, they cannot rightly be called scientists, and at best should be referred to as "theorists." Therefore, to call someone a "Creation Scientist" is to put a title on them that they do not deserve, because they do not use the scientific method.

This is why young earth creationists are erroneous in a lot of their data. They only seek data which supports their hypothesis, and if it doesn't, they try and bend it to make it fit. This is where they get into trouble.

For rebuttal of the points, see the Note on Number 19 above for bent rock layers; for dinosaur graveyards, [see this article](#); and for poly-strata fossils, see this article.

23. Yes, true of non-Christians. No problems for an old-earth believer.

Conclusion for Points to Ponder about the Flood

As you can see, many of the points raised by the author have no impact upon old earth belief. In fact, many actually support an old earth much better than they do a young earth. Unfortunately, since there is no scientific proof of a young earth, many young earth creationists resort to presenting their audiences with facts and figures meant to inspire and awe them. If the audiences would merely investigate for themselves, they would see how empty these facts are. Unfortunately, most young-earth believers are willing to be led, rather than investigate on their own. This is mainly due to their being fed all this propaganda over the years, and they are now fully indoctrinated into this system of belief.

As an old earth creationist, you merely need to be aware of the arguments that are used to support a young earth. Since both old and young earth believers are going to heaven, there is no need to be drawn into a debate with them. They can continue to share the gospel to those who will listen to their beliefs, and we will do the same. May God bless both of our efforts to win souls for Christ.