

Critique of article: “A Scientific Paradigm for the Genesis Flood” by Ted and Kenneth Noel

Lorence Collins

April 3, 2024

Email: lorencecollins@gmail.com

Introduction

Ted Noel is the webmaster of **The Bible Only**, a web-based ministry (www.bibleonly.org). Kenneth Noel holds a degree in physics and worked as an engineer for over twenty years. On that basis, they likely have little training in geology. Their opening words of their article

file:///C:/Users/Owner/Documents/A_Scientific_Paradigm_for_the_Genesis_Fl.pdf state:

“The Bible asserts the creation of our habitable earth and the life on it occurred within a single week of seven ordinary days (Gen 1:2–2:3)³ and that a worldwide flood destroyed all terrestrial life except that preserved in the ark (Gen 6–8). Secular scholars have often scorned these accounts as being nonsensical, having little or no resemblance to the evidence preserved for us in the physical materials of the earth. Many have ridiculed any who choose to believe in a salvation based on the message contained in such an obviously fictional book.

Others have been somewhat more tolerant, while still maintaining that the Bible is not a factual record of history. ...”

They then say:

“...If the purportedly inspired record is less than completely true, how can we know what portions are true and what parts fable? The very authority of Scripture is jeopardized if the flood account is not true. ... If God has been as careful in the physical record as He has been in the written record, we should expect sufficient evidence to buttress our faith. Indeed, such is the testimony of Scripture (Ps 19:1–6, Rom 1:20). But secular science has aligned itself almost universally with an evolutionary paradigm that stands in stark contradiction to the biblical record. This schema appears to be well fleshed out, with ultimate origins described for both the universe and life.”

These authors then support their opposition to uniformitarianism and agree that the Intelligent Design proponents have the right interpretations. This is followed by:

“...It is our purpose to propose reasonable global mechanisms that can explain the physical evidence in a manner consistent with the biblical record...”

They look at the biblical record and analyze and infer

“...pre- and post-flood conditions, both geographic and climatologic. ...identify the source of the floodwaters and the mechanism of their removal from the flood. ... believe that the flood was triggered miraculously, with the remainder of the process proceeding by natural mechanisms. ...believe God would prefer to set natural processes in motion to create and

dry up the flood, as opposed to intervening multiple times to create and remove the floodwaters.

They go on to say:

“...At this point it is important to understand that we do not believe the biblical account of the flood is true because we can prove it scientifically. Rather, we believe the biblical account because it is God's word. ...”

Critique

Ted and Kenneth do not realize that secular geologists no longer say that uniformitarianism (“the present is the key to the past”) is applicable in all times but only where evidence supports its application and that radioactive dating is fully supported by careful scientific studies that take into account assumptions that are made (Dalrymple 1986). These two investigators look at the supposed weather conditions and geography pre-Flood and post-Flood, promote Baumgardner’s accelerated tectonics model, assert that the basaltic oceanic crust in both the total widths of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans were all deposited during the one-year of Noah’s flood, claim that there was only one Ice Age following Noah’s flood, believe that C-14 dating has a different explanation than what makes any logical sense, and completely fail to recognize that calendar years for a radiocarbon dating age is *totally* dependent on the C-14 calibration curve published in 2020, IntCal20. They are simply ignorant of how radiocarbon dating is done.

They simply do not know all the geological scientific evidence that clearly shows that Noah's flood cannot be global but likely was a local occurrence in southeastern Mesopotamia in early biblical times. Rather than going through their article and providing critical comments, topic by topic, the reader is referred to the following articles and links to see where their speculative ideas are in total error. See:

Apologetics:

Grand Apologetics – Errors in Science and Christian Guidance [Nr93Grand.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Bible interpretation:

Christianity and science – are they contradictory? [Am I anti-Christian \(csun.edu\)](#)

The Bible & Ancient Science: Principles of Interpretation [bas467.pdf \(ualberta.ca\)](#)

Understanding Inerrancy in the Bible and Science Not in the Bible [Nr95Inerrancy.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Carbon 14 dating:

Testing and Verifying Old Age Evidence: Lake Suigetsu Varves, Tree Rings, and Carbon-14 [Nr53Carbon.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Is there something fishy about radiocarbon dating? [Nr101Fishy.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Evolution:

Position Statement: Science, Bible, Noah's Flood, and Evolution [Nr102Position.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Coming to Terms with Evolution: A Personal Story
[Untitled Document \(ualberta.ca\)](#)

Making scientific sense in today's world [Nr85Sense.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Fossilization, Evolution, and Intelligent Design
[Nr86Fossilization.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Fischer hooks himself on disproved notions and logical fallacies in his attacks on science and evolution
[Nr114Fischer1.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Microfossil Record - *Global changes in microfossils point to deposition over deep time.* [Nr123Microfossil2.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Flood geology:

The Defeat of Flood Geology by Flood Geology [Flood geology.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Flood Geology and the Grand Canyon: A Critique [p099-115 HillMoshierColor.vp \(csun.edu\)](#)

Can Flood Geology and Catastrophic Plate Tectonics explain Sedimentary Rocks? [Collins5.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Tidal Clocks and Flood Geology [Nr82Tidal.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Ice ages:

Pleistocene Continental Glaciers: A Single Ice Age
Following a Genesis Flood or Multiple Ice Ages?
[Pleistocene glaciers.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Noah's flood:

Yes, Noah's Flood May Have Happened, But Not Over the
Whole Earth [RNCSE25.5-6cdt \(csun.edu\)](#)

More Geological Reasons Noah's Flood Did Not Happen
[Collins3.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Twenty-one Reasons Noah's Worldwide Flood Never
Happened [Nr38Reasons.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Response to Ken Ham and YouTube Comments by Andrew
Snelling [Nr42Response.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Biological Reasons Young-Earth Creationists' Worldwide
Flood Never Happened [Nr45Biological.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Good science versus bad science and the Genesis flood
story [Nr46Genflood.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Stokes' Law, Burrows, and an Ordovician Ice Age – Why
Noah's Worldwide Flood Never Happened and Why the
Earth is More Than 6,000 to 10,000 Years Old
[Nr54Stokes.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Fountains of the Great Deep and Noah's Flood
[Nr64Fountains.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Understanding Noah's Flood Story [Nr94Moses.pdf
\(csun.edu\)](#)

Why Noah's Flood Could Never Have Been Global and Deposited the Sedimentary Rocks in the Grand Canyon
[Nr99Why.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Arguments for a local Noah's flood; the Bible is NOT a Modern Science Textbook
[Nr100Arguments.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Noah's flood: Is the source of its water from the waters above?
[Nr103WatersAbove.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Radioactive dating

Critical Analysis of the book "Rethinking Radioactive Dating" by Vernon Cupps
[Nr59Cupp.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

Rapid plate tectonics:

Baumgardner's Tsunami and Rapid Plate Tectonics Model
[Nr88Baum.pdf \(csun.edu\)](#)

However, these two investigators mention the existence of chlorine in the atmosphere in the following paragraph.

"...One other feature of the lack of volcanism bears on the upper atmospheric conditions discussed earlier. The protective ozone layer in the stratosphere is broken down by chlorine from chlorofluorocarbons. With no manufactured CFCs, the only natural source of chlorine would be volcanic..."

A volcanic source is scientifically correct as described in the following article and link:

Salt in oceans:

Time to Accumulate Chloride Ions in the World's Oceans – More Than 3.6 Billion Years Creationism's Young Earth Not Supported [RNCSE25.5-6cdt \(csun.edu\)](http://RNCSE25.5-6cdt.csun.edu)

That is, it takes billions of years of volcanic eruptions to produce the amount of the chlorine ion in salt in the world's oceans, and some of the chlorine in salt (sodium chloride) has been recycled. Humans also must have had ancient marine ancestors because we tolerate and need salt to function properly in our metabolism.

Moreover, these investigators do not realize that it is impossible for the many volcanoes in the “Ring of Fire” around the Pacific Ocean to have peaks that are more than 13,000 feet high in the one year of Noah's flood or that Mauna Loa and Mauna Kea volcanoes in the main island of Hawaii have 30,000 feet of lava rising from the Pacific Ocean floor since ~4,350 years ago at the time of Noah's flood.

Hawaiian Islands

Emperor Seamount Chain and Hawaiian Ridge – Ancient Age or 4,350 Years Old [Nr61Hawaii.pdf \(csun.edu\)](http://Nr61Hawaii.pdf.csun.edu)

Conclusion

When Ted and Kenneth Noel say:

“...If the purportedly inspired record is less than completely true, how can we know what portions are true and what parts fable? The very authority of Scripture is jeopardized if the flood account is not true.”

That statement simply is not true because the Bible was not written to be a science textbook because Genesis was written by Moses to give the biblical people living in his time a wonderful theological message to say that God would not do such a flood again and provided a rainbow as evidence --- then this account does not jeopardize the whole Bible. It was written to give good theology and not describe scientifically how God did his creation. That is, God has given us two books to read. One is the Bible/theology. The other is science/nature. They are not in conflict. The first answers the questions of why and who. The second answers the questions of where, when, and how. Both are the truth because God is not a liar. Science merely informs us of how awesome God is and is not meant to replace our faith in God, the Holy Spirit, and Jesus. On that basis, it is still possible to be a Christian and say that the authors of the books in the Bible were inspired and wrote the Word of God.

Reference

Dalrymple, G. B., 1986, **Radiometric dating, geologic time, and the age of the Earth; a reply to "scientific" creationism** Open-File Report 86-110
<https://doi.org/10.3133/ofr86110>