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TITANIC ARCHAEOLOGIST FINDS PROOF OF NOAH'S FLOOD

by Peter Heck

*So how will the secular anti-Christian scientists handle this one?*

Peter, tell you what: why don't you just calm down, set the jumbo size Jesus sunglasses down the table, and tell us what has you bubbling over with excitement?

*I’ve talked a number of times about how the entire Darwinian molecules to man evolutionary model rests tenuously upon the necessity of a billions of years old universe.*

Peter, cosmologists have *proven* that the Universe is billions of years old. Biologists have *proven* that evolution has occurred, and is still occurring in all life on Earth. The only thing that is "tenuous" is your rejection of reality.

It's sad that a grown man like you can call proven scientific fact "tenuous," and at the same time, refuse to see that that word perfectly describes your own worldview; one based on the writings of ancient, ignorant goat herders.

*Without that kind of time, their theory is simply unsustainable.*

Peter, but as I just pointed out, scientific evidence from different fields of science has proven that we have had that kind of time; so evolutionary theory is sustainable.

*As a result, they write into texts, teach in college courses and maintain a constant media and pop culture drumbeat repeating the unsubstantiated assumption that the universe is billions of years old.*

Peter, I know this might hurt your head a bit, but think about what you just said. Do you really believe that America (a Christian country as you call it) would produce textbooks for kids, and teach college courses to adults that contradicted their own scriptures ... if science couldn't prove it was true?

That's insane. The *only* reason a Christian country would do that would be if the scientific evidence were beyond reasonable doubt.

*By doing that, they lay the groundwork without allowing any debate for the groundwork.*

Peter, the debate ended long ago. The fact that religious nut jobs, like yourself, refuse to accept reality is your problem ... not our children's problem.

*It sets up a situation where they can weave a narrative about world history and science that rests entirely upon a faulty premise.*

Peter, that narrative about world history and science is woven from provable scientific fact. That's quite an improvement over the way it used to be, when we wove our narrative from holy books written by men who thought the Sun was orbiting the Earth.

*But they never allow discussion about the premise –*

Peter, you are lying. There are science vs. religion debates going on all over the world. You know this because you are involved in this culture war. So you have no excuse for the fib you just told.

*they dismiss anyone who questions it, challenges it or brings it up. They mock them, deride them, and run them out of town…*

Peter, I don't think that people like you should be mocked, derided, or run out of town. I think you should be given the psychiatric counseling you so desperately need.

*much in the same way the scientific establishment (and church) once did that with those who said the earth was round.*

Peter, in those days the Church had a slightly different response to those who dared to challenge their dogma. It didn't involve mocking, deriding, or running out of town ... it involved execution.

*Millions of schoolchildren are taught to believe that the layers of rock we see in the Grand Canyon and other places were millions of years worth of sediment slowly laid down by dying plants and animals and elements.*

Peter, that's true. That's called "geology."

Let's compare that to what you learn in Church: things like, snakes can talk; the sun froze in the sky once for 24 hours; and a non-union carpenter once water skied across a lake ... without a boat.

I think the children are better off with geology.

*The Grand Canyon, in particular, is a prime example – we’re told – of what a little bit of water can do over a long period of time.*

Peter, "we're told?" So you don't believe it? You seriously don't understand the basics of erosion?

Dude, you have been spending way too much time in Bible Study.

*But suppose that weren’t true. Suppose the Grand Canyon were actually an example of what a lot of water – I mean, A LOT of water – in a short amount of time can do? What if these layers of sediment weren’t laid down over millions of years, but rather a matter of moments?*

Peter, you don't have to worry just about Secularists; there are millions of Christians laughing at you right now. Even they understand the absurdity of what you just said. Scientists know how sedimentation works. Obviously ... you don't.

*These are the kinds of questions young earth scientists have been shouting at the top of their lungs for years –*

Peter, shouting at the top of their lungs is exactly what people always resort to, when they have no evidence at all.

*only to be drowned out in a sea of derision from those rabid disciples of Darwin who have an antipathy for free inquiry and actual science.*

Peter, that one put me on the floor. A Ghost Worshipper accusing scientists of antipathy towards free inquiry and science?

That was priceless, Peter.

*Nevermind that such a reality would explain quite a bit about why we find trees jutting across supposed millions of years of rock layers, or creatures who are separated from their own tracks in the sediment by supposedly millions of years of rock layers. The Darwinists won’t have any of it. Those are just fools who ask those questions and make those points.*

Peter, it's not so much asking those questions that makes you a fool. It's refusing to accept the answers when they contradict what you desperately want to believe ... that makes you a fool.

*But now, what happens when it’s not just ‘fools’ saying that story of a global flood is scientific, but one of the most respected archaeologists in the history of the world? Check this story out from ABC News:*

Wow Peter, this sounds pretty serious. Maybe after 2,000 years of frustration, your time has finally come. So whatcha got?

*The story of Noah's Ark and the Great Flood is one of the most famous from the Bible, and now an acclaimed underwater archaeologist thinks he has found proof that the biblical flood was actually based on real events. In an interview with Christiane Amanpour for ABC News, Robert Ballard, one of the world's best-known underwater archaeologists, talked about his findings. His team is probing the depths of the Black Sea off the coast of Turkey in search of traces of an ancient civilization hidden underwater since the time of Noah. In case you don’t know, Robert Ballard is the man who found the Titanic, and is the most famous undersea archaeologist of all time.*

Peter, so all the scientists whose findings dispute your ancient holy book are Secular anti-Christian Darwinists, while this guy, Ballard, is the greatest thing since Jesus Christ?

Let's find out why.

*When you read the article, you’ll find Ballard isn’t outing himself as any kind of young earth scientist, but the implications of what he is finding makes that point irrelevant.*

Peter, what evidence do you have that Ballard is even religious?

Maybe you should consider the possibility that there is nothing for him to "out."

*"We went in there to look for the flood," he said. "Not just a slow moving, advancing rise of sea level, but a really big flood that then stayed... The land that went under stayed under."*

Peter, Ballard made it clear in the article that he wasn't looking for the global flood of the Bible, but a really big local flood as hypothesized by two Columbia University scientists who believed that the flood water came from the Mediterranean Sea.

Peter, you are one very dishonest little Ghost Worshipper, aren't you?

*Four hundred feet below the surface, they unearthed an ancient shoreline, proof to Ballard that a catastrophic event did happen in the Black Sea.*

Peter, you are trying to manipulate your audience again. You are hoping they will connect "catastrophic" with "Noah's flood." But the catastrophic flood Ballard was searching for was only a local flood.

*By carbon dating shells found along the shoreline, Ballard said he believes they have established a timeline for that catastrophic event,*

Peter, it's too bad you Young-Earth Creationists don't accept carbon dating.

Say what? Oh, you're going to accept it just this one time?

Gee, what a shock.

*which he estimates happened around 5,000 BC.*

Peter, now you're argument is really dead. According to Young-Earth Creationists the world was created around 4000 B.C.E. This dating puts the flood 1,000 years before God created the Earth. Bad news dude. Hey, here's an idea for you: Islam is always on the lookout for a good-looking sheep.

*Some experts believe this was around the time when Noah's flood could have occurred.*

Peter, they've got to be kidding. If the Earth were created around 4000 B.C.E. then Noah's flood occurred around 2300 B.C.E. That's not even close to 5000 B.C.E. Exactly which experts think the flood occurred around 5000 B.C.E.?

I want names and numbers, Peter.

*"It probably was a bad day," Ballard said. "At some magic moment, it broke through and flooded this place violently, and a lot of real estate, 150,000 square kilometers of land, went under."*

Peter, does that sound like Ballard is taking about a worldwide deluge?

No, it doesn't. You are misrepresenting his work to make it conform to your religious delusions.

*Put simply, the reality of a global flood would dramatically alter our understanding of geology, archaeology, and as a consequence, world history.*

Peter, where in the article do you see anything about a global flood?

You must be wearing your Bible Blinders again.

*Many Christians have talked about how a discovery of Noah’s Ark would be the most consequential find in history because of what it would signal to the scientific community.*

Actually Peter, Christians claim they find the Ark about every 5 years. Funny how "you people" develop Alzheimer's when reminded about all the fraudulent claims.

*Perhaps this is actually better [than discovering Noah's Ark].*

Well Peter, at least this isn't a hoax. It is simply the usual case of desperate Christian apologists dishonestly trying to misrepresent an honest scientific investigation. Same old story we've heard a thousand times before.

*Evidence of a global flood will create some significant issues for the anti-Christian scientists who are continually trying to keep their monopoly on what theories and explanations are considered “scientific.”*

Peter, when you find that evidence ... then we'll talk. Also, you are hiding from your audience the fact that many of those scientists are Christians. You know this, yet you are purposely trying to give a false impression that all scientists are motivated by anti-religious feelings rather than by evidence.

Peter, if there is an honest thought in your mind, it must be in solitary confinement.

*In other words, the scientific credibility of the scientific credibility police will be called into serious question.*

Peter, the only thing this essay called into question ... was your honesty. And Peter, this essay also answered that question.

Now for a bonus feature

Peter, you'll like this so stay around. Fox News, the propaganda arm for the Christian Far Right, makes a feeble attempt to pass itself off as a news source. Here is their version of the ABC interview. Look at how Fox edited the story for its religious base:

ABC

*"Ballard asked, 'The question is, was there a mother of all floods?' According to a controversial theory proposed by two Columbia University scientists, there really was one in the Black Sea region. They believe that the now-salty Black Sea was once an isolated freshwater lake surrounded by farmland, until it was flooded by an enormous wall of water from the rising Mediterranean Sea. The force of the water was two hundred times that of Niagara Falls, sweeping away everything in its path."*

FOX

*until an enormous wall of water from the Mediterranean 200 times more powerful than Niagara Falls swept it and everything else away. Including Noah and his ark.*

Look at what Fox News added at the end for its fans. Neither Ballard nor the Columbia University scientists said that. Was that classic Fox News Journalism or what?

Now let's look at a part of the story that Peter left out:

*"The theory goes on to suggest that the story of this traumatic event, seared into the collective memory of the survivors, was passed down from generation to generation and eventually inspired the biblical account of Noah."*

So the theory is that a local flood inspired the biblical account. That's quite the opposite of what Peter is claiming. I wonder why Peter left that part of the story out?

Let's see what else Peter left out:

*"Noah is described in the Bible as a family man, a father of three, who is about to celebrate his 600th birthday.*

*Rabbi Burt Visotzky, a professor of Talmud and Rabbinics at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York said, "In the early chapters of Genesis, people live 800 years, 700 years, 900 years. Those are mythic numbers, those are way too big. We don't quite know what to do with that. So sometimes those large numbers, I think, also serve to reinforce the mystery of the text."*

I'm pretty sure I can guess why Peter left that part out of his analysis. Now for another distortion from Fox News:

ABC

*"Some of the details of the Noah story seem mythical, so many biblical scholars believe the story of Noah and the Ark was inspired by the legendary flood stories of nearby Mesopotamia, in particular "The Epic of Gilgamesh." These ancient narratives were already being passed down from one generation to the next, centuries before Noah appeared in the Bible."*

FOX

*"Some archaeologists have supported the story of Noah, citing similar details passed along in narratives from Mesopotamian times, notably 'the Epic of Gilgamesh'.”*

It's hard to believe that there are still people out there who consider Fox News a valid source of news. That last comparison made it crystal clear that journalistic integrity is nonexistent at Fox.

How about one more Fox distortion for the road?

ABC

*"At first Ballard's team found piles of ancient pottery, but then they made an even more important discovery. Last year, Ballard discovered a vessel and one of its crew members in the Black Sea. Ballared said, "That is a perfectly preserved ancient shipwreck in all its wood, looks like a lumber yard. But if you look closely, you will see the femur bone and actually a molar."*

FOX

*"Ballard says his team has found not just the shore and the shells, but pottery and even shipwrecks,*

Fox News turned one shipwreck into multiple shipwrecks; and then look what they added:

*evidence, Ballard says, that the theory is correct."*

Ballard was talking about the Columbia University theory. Fox news wrote it to give the impression that Ballard was referring to the theory of Noah's flood.

Now look at what ABC reported, but Fox completely omitted from their version:

*"The shipwreck was in surprisingly good condition, preserved because the Black Sea has almost no oxygen in it, which slows down the process of decay, but it does not date back as far as the story of Noah."*

I am so shocked - I can't imagine why Fox omitted that part. That was the most important part. But it gets worse. Look what else Fox omitted:

*Ballard said, "The oldest shipwreck that we have discovered so far of that area is around 500 BC. But the question is you just keep searching. It's a matter of statistics."*

That ship was dated thousands of years after Noah's flood. So it couldn't possibly have anything to do with the biblical account.

This gives you an idea of the mental capacity of the Fox News audience. Basically you have millions of adults at the cerebral level of children ... pretty much like Peter Heck.

http://www.peterheck.com/peterheck/features/view/33478/titanic\_archaeologist\_finds\_proof\_of\_noah\_s\_flood

http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/evidence-suggests-biblical-great-flood-noahs-time-happened/story?id=17884533

http://www.foxnews.com/science/2012/12/12/archaeologist-claims-evidence-noahs-biblical-flood/
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THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

Marine Animals Could Hold the Key to Looking Young

Sea cucumbers and sea urchins are able to change the elasticity of collagen within their bodies, and could hold the key to maintaining a youthful appearance. The researchers investigated the genes of marine creatures such as sea urchins and sea cucumbers, known as echinoderms. They found the genes for "messenger molecules" known as peptides, which are released by cells and tell other cells in their bodies what to do.

The most exciting discovery was finding genes encoding peptides that cause rapid stiffening or softening of collagen in the body wall of sea cucumbers. As humans get older, changes in collagen cause wrinkling of the skin, so if it can be learned how peptides cause the body wall of a sea cucumber to quickly become stiff or soft then research might lead to new ways to keeping skin looking young and healthy.

Scientists analysed the DNA sequences of thousands of genes in the purple sea urchin and the edible sea cucumber and specifically searched for genes encoding peptide messenger molecules.

Rapid advances in technology used to sequence genes made the research possible. When the human genome was sequenced over a decade ago it cost millions of dollars -- now all of the genes in an animal can be sequenced for just a few thousand dollars.

Researchers also found that sea urchins have a peptide that is very similar to calcitonin, a hormone that regulates our bones to make sure that they remain strong. So it will be fascinating to find out if calcitonin-type peptides have a similar sort of role in spiny-skinned creatures like sea urchins.

These types of advances in basic science are fascinating in their own right but they are also important because they underpin the medical breakthroughs that lead to improvement in the quality of people's lives.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

FAMOUS QUOTES

Bertolt Brecht (1898 –1956) 58 years.

He was a German poet, playwright, and theatre director.

"The aim of science is not to open the door to infinite wisdom

but to set a limit to infinite error."