

woody's (aka our current TrueChristiantm) post in text. Breaks inserted to help define separate thoughts.

13. Alright! Geology time. Circle up, kids.... Flood myths?

O.K. let's go. Se says that 1) there's lots of flood myths, (2) not all civilizations have them (3) "they are often quite different", (4) the Bible is disproven by the Pygmy account (5) and Bible believers would have you believe that as long as a myth says "flood", then it's theirs."

To which I respond: (1) there is a flood story in many cultures around the world in deed (2) Not all civilizations have them, but all civilizations with ancient roots do, to my knowledge (can she name two ancient cultures who that do not, for documentation porpoises?),

The Hawaiian, the Chinese, the Indians (including a "Tower of Babel"), the Babylonians and about 270 more legends from antiquity of nothing but worldwide floods.

(3) They are all different in some way, yet share significant commonalities which indicate a "primary source" vent (one that cannot really be used is the preservation of all animals on the boats because this is only logical if you're about to have a earth destroying flood).

For examples: The Hawaiian, the Chinese, the Toltec and the Babylonian and the biblical account all describe a world wide flood that covered the highest mountains, and killed all of the people but those who were on the boat (note: that all were killed but those on the boat is a good indication that the father family of all ancient cultures was the one that was safe on the boat),

the Hawaiian and the biblical account say that the flood came because of the wickedness of those who were drowned, both the Chinese and the biblical account have a dove returning with an olive branch in it's mouth as a sign of hope (even the ancient Chinese character for "boat" is composed of the caricatures for "vessel", "eight" and "one person" (see "The Discovery of Genesis" p. xii),

both the Toltec and the biblical account say that the world before the flood lasted for about 2000 years and the confusion and spread of languages from a "zacuali" (or "great tower"), they even claim that they traveled across the ocean with fellow "Toltecian" speakers to Mexico after the breakup of the language groups. (Note: There are other tremendous parallels that can be seen between the biblical account and the remaining 260 some that I have not listed.)

They are not considered proof but contributing evidence by Bible scholars. They are remarkably similar, but are surely different as is to be expected from everyone claiming that it was theirs and no one else's grand father that survived.

(4) The bible will not nor ever has been disproved or even supported by the Pygmy account you are referring to, if you're representing their story accurately as you heard it. No matter what it says you cannot say that it "makes the Judeo-Christian myth on several accounts" when she does not accept that it happened and she does not say that every myth proves every other myth wrong when they disagree (what if they did agree on something?). Logically (and you cannot refute this fact) either they are all wrong on several points or only one right on all points. Right?

Now to the legend. It, according to you, says that it is not a "Noaic-flood" story, but a creation of man story and it claims there was no water before the creation of man in direct contradiction with the bible, which says that god gathered the waters together in seas on the second day. It also says that water covered the earth when the first man emerged from the tree.

Why she think the pygmies were right I'll never know, though I'm sure she does not (Every attack addressed thoroughly so far)

(5) Yet, she claims that some one trying to support the Bible used it. I can vindicate that it mentions a "world wide flood" but that seems to be where all similarity stops. We do not claim that every story with "flood" is ours.

Only "worldwide floods" are of any interest whatsoever and even those legends are known by almost everyone who knows anything about "etribiblical worldwide floods" knows that they do not agree 100% with the Bible, let along each other. Think before you speak for your own sake.

14. O.K., river floods are not worldwide. Sure they knew about floods but no ones going to mistake one of those comparatively tiny things with a global flood even after the compounded interpolation of the centuries.

Name two instances documented in history where a local event was turned into a tragedy that wiped out all of mankind or even something that was exaggerated out of proportion (excluding the Bible which you presently accept as being a fraudulated document to begin with (e.g. "lies" and "deciet"; a very unfounded claim; list two events in the Bible which have evidence that actually proves them not to have happened not just raising vague doubts like you tried to do this time)). It looks like she's destroyed the possibility that the flood ever happened in her own conceit so far.

15. Now lets look at the degree holder's opinion on geological catastrophism. She'll be looking for the "flood" in rock strata detected to 4400 years ago (when the biblical flood happened) and should, for the most part, be right beneath our feet. However, this assumption has a giant problem in thought.

The problem is that if the evolutionary dating of the strata is correct then the Bible is not true. The Bible clearly teaches that the world was created by God about 6,000 years ago.

Evolutionism teaches that the earth is about 4.6 billion years old (though the dates have changed dramatically in the last few years to allow for more biological evolution to take place, for instance, in 1770 it was accepted that the earth was 70,000 years old and then in 1905 it was 2 billion years old, and in 1969 it was 3.5 billion years old, looks like we're aging 21 million years per year)

The two ideas are incompatible. So, we can see that obviously, if the Bible is right about God and, thus, the flood and the date of creation, she cannot be looking for "evidence" in evolutionary time charts of billions of years. This is a duce of a logical fallacy. But I do admit that we must find some evidence outside the pages of the Bible to prove and try the Bible's claim.

16. Dose the "theist's" claim depend on every believe in evolutionism accepting uniformitarianism? No, again, He claims that evidence is merely in opposition to such a belief.

Why did she not have the courage to critically evaluate any of the evidence he proposes? Granted "modern scientists" believe in "catastrophic events" and I'm not sure that she could name two geologists in the 1800s that believed that volcanoes never erupted and earth quakes never occurred in the earth's millions of years long pre-history. She'll be hard pressed to find such a nut. The Father of Geology (with whom she is familiar, or has, at least, heard of him in her geology degree program) was a believer in the Noaic Flood and provide much indelible evidence in his book "_". He evidently did not believe that the layers too millions of years to form.

A "magical uniform lake" would be your known by her as the prebiotic universal ocean from which she thinks her ancestry was jump-started. That is, if she's an evolutionist.

18. Dr. Donald Paton says that there is a layer of sedimentary rock approximately 1.5 miles thick covering all of the continent, and I'm sure she will agree, though she may disagree on how it got there. And she must also concur that it is not of every layer of her beloved "geologic time chart" in all places (though the same time would have passed in the Grand Canyon as it did in Dover, England).

It does not even show up with all of the layers in one place thus far discovered (if it does ever, please name it) Dose a world wide flood need a flood deposit all over the earth. Simply, no (see note _)

Picture a world covered by clay; doesn't sound like the "density sorted" flood deposits to me either. Let me know if that ever happens in a small-scale flood. Usually all kinds of similar layers are formed. Remember, it is all now sedimentary rock. Has she ever ween one of these layers that start with rocks at the bottom and smaller stuff on top? Not very likely. Seems that if it is sedimentary rock it would not be individual pieces anymore. It would have been nice if she would have documented or even provided a link to two such

examples on her post, but at this point I think that it safe to say that “there is no such luck”. Really? There were floods between the “millions of years”? Then how come there are zero erosion marks between the layers of the great rock layer.