

TOWARDS A BIBLICAL APPROACH TO KNOWLEDGE

- with application to Origins¹

by R H Johnston

True knowledge is in Christ

For the Christian, the basis of all true knowledge and wisdom is God Himself. Paul desired the Colossians truly to know God's mystery, Christ Jesus, "*in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*" (Colossians 2:1-3) (All direct quotations from NASB unless otherwise indicated). The Christian's faith and confidence in God causes him to believe what God has said. This is a position and attitude entirely opposed to the question which Satan asked Eve in the garden "Did God say...?" (Genesis 3:1). For this reason, when a Christian considers any question he must do so from the basis of his faith. This reflects Paul's attitude in Romans 1:16-17: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in it *the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith*; as it is written, "*but the righteous man shall live by faith.*" On the basis of the existing faith which the maturing Christian has in God, his faith continually develops and he lives ever more righteously, to become mature in Christ (Ephesians 4:13). Faith is one of the triumvirate "Faith, Hope and Love" which last for ever (1 Corinthians 13:13). Knowledge, on the other hand, regarded as of supreme importance by the Greeks, and by the world of today, is something which will pass away: this is because it will ultimately prove to be incomplete, and consequently uselessly irrelevant (1 Corinthians 13:8-12).

Can Christian adopt any other position than reliance on God?

To live in any other position than in a continuing on-going confidence (i.e. faith) in what God has said is always a disaster for the Christian, for it takes him away from the only ground upon which his own receipt of the divine righteousness which is from God rests (Romans). Psalm 1 shows that there is no compromise possible between the positions - either we keep what God has said continuously before us to inform all our conduct, with eternal life as the result, or, by adopting

¹ This paper was originally written in 1997 to address how to reconcile the Christian's understanding of scripture and his use of scientific knowledge in pursuit of a scientific but Biblical model of how the Earth was created and more specifically how the geological record fits with the Bible record of Noah's Flood. At the time I was involved in a Christian group of scientists seeking such a model compatible with a truly global Flood. In 2006 I concluded that this was not possible, but a large scale regional Flood in the Middle East was fully compatible with the Genesis account and the geological record.

the ways of the world, we become as light and as useful as chaff and perish. Let no one think there is a third way.

Can we be truly "objective" in our thinking?

These issues are inescapable, and they fundamentally affect the Christian approach to knowledge. The modern "scientific" standpoint, which seeks to establish knowledge without reference to divine revelation, has undoubtedly been remarkably successful in those areas which relate to what can be currently physically measured and observed, and especially in terms of the technological applications which result - this is because any errors are quickly revealed by the failure of the technology to work. But this should not deceive us into thinking it is equally reliable as a method of gaining knowledge in areas where feed-back is limited or lacking². This is not to say that scientific study of the things which God has created cannot provide (approximately) true information, but unless divine revelation provides the right context for the knowledge, the information may be misinterpreted (especially if the knowledge relates to something outside our immediate environment), or misapplied (e.g. to make weapons of destruction). Knowledge that is not built on the foundation of Christ is like a house which lacks a foundation: it can provide a shelter for a time, but it is not secure long-term.

Thomas Aquinas taught that man was capable of using his reason to obtain true knowledge about God. The Reformers rightly strove to reject this idea, saying that human reasoning had been corrupted by being subject to the consequences of the Fall, and expressed it in the form of their doctrine of "total depravity" - i.e. that every part of man's nature was marred by the Fall and incapable of righteousness or knowing the Truth unaided. However, it is very difficult for anyone to change his way of thinking, and the Scholastic philosophy of Aquinas in fact formed the epistemology of the Reformation and the Renaissance, giving rise to systematic theology and modern science.

This way of thinking places a great emphasis on "objectivity" - the idea that people can examine about ideas and facts dispassionately and, by human reason,

² Much modern supposedly scientific knowledge is of this type. Early science involved easily repeatable experiments undertaken under laboratory conditions, where it was relatively easy to eliminate confounding influences that might affect the results (e.g. Hooke's law of 1660 which discovered that, subject to conditions, deformation of a spring was proportional to stress). Today, much scientific research uses observations over which the scientist has no control, and elaborate statistical techniques attempt to determine correlations in the hope of determining causal relationships. From such results scientific "models" of the processes are constructed, but often these cannot be adequately tested for their predictive power. These problems are most acute in researching the distant past, and distant locations (as in geology and astronomy) or predicting the future (such as climate change), where assumptions that may be adequate enough on Earth at the present time may not be appropriate for the purpose.

come to the same conclusions about them regardless of their personal positions and presuppositions, and can achieve this without the aid of divine revelation. Within the authoritarian monolithic culture of the medieval Catholic Church, it was not surprising that their philosophers should believe this was possible, since they were all subject to the same cultural assumptions. After the Reformation, and especially with the development of Rationalism, this common set of cultural assumptions began to crumble, so that the idea of the objectivity of human reason was increasingly criticised by philosophers. Philosophers abandoned the quest for objective philosophical truth based on human reason during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries³.

Science, however, did not follow the trend of philosophical thinking towards subjectivity, but remained wedded to the ideas of certainty and objectivity well into the twentieth century, and even today, most people, and even practising scientists, believe that the results which are obtained by science are value neutral and that the same results will be obtained irrespective of who does the research. In applied science and technology, even though this is not true, the test of whether the idea "works" provides a filter to remove those ideas which most obviously do not work: this selective process is imperfect, and many demonstrably false ideas have surprisingly wide currency. In pure science, particularly when the ideas concern matters which cannot be measured on the earth now, such correctives do not exist, and false ideas are far more widespread. Thus the idea of "absolute" objectivity based on unaided human reason is a mirage.

However, in spite of these difficulties, the world of today - regrettably even in Christian circles - regards "scientific objectivity" as the primary, and usually the only, reliable means of assessing right from wrong and truth from falsehood. When examples of science's failures are pointed out, the work in question is normally regarded as being "bad science", or "scientific fraud", rather than as an inherent problem stemming from the flaws in the underlying philosophy. Philosophers of science increasingly recognise the subjective nature of science itself, but this has not yet had any serious impact on the concept of "objective thinking", in science at least.

³ Objectivity came under especially severe attack from philosophers from the 1960s, resulting in the rise of post-modernism which claims that all knowledge is socially constructed and can be arbitrarily altered at will. There is some truth, in as far that how we respond to the world depends on our world-view, which is socially constructed. Nevertheless such world views necessarily must engage as the world as it actually is, if they are not to become so detached from reality that human life fails to continue. Current Western worldviews undoubtedly are dysfunctional, as they are not sustainable in the long term not least because of fertility rates being well below replacement rate. Science, and more especially technology, have so far been least affected by post-modernism because – to work - they have to be grounded in the objective reality of the universe that God created.

It should now be apparent from this discussion, that there is no neutral position which may be adopted from which anyone can examine "objectively" the claims of the Bible, against the "facts" of cosmology, geology or archaeology. As far as the Christian is concerned, if he adopts such a position he has abandoned the position of "believing God" (Romans 4:3), and has uncritically embraced the mind-set of the world (contrast Romans 12:2). Indeed, he has turned to another god - viz. the god of objectivity (i.e. reliance on human reasoning), which, like all idols, is a god which cannot deliver what it promises. "You shall have no other gods before Me." (Exodus 20:3).

Unfortunately, this is precisely what has happened in Christian "creation science", especially in America, where the scientific methodology has been adopted wholesale in order to circumvent the American constitutional prohibition of religion in publicly funded schools (an interesting question itself within the context of this present paper), and so get creationist material into those schools. Proverbs 26:5 (*"Answer a fool according to his folly, Lest he be wise in his own eyes"* (RSV)) shows that there is a place for the Christian to prove the folly of other people's positions by using the fool's presuppositions and argument base to prove his inconsistency. Jesus did this in His conflicts with His opponents - as for example concerning healing on the Sabbath (Matthew 12:10-12). But this approach must never become the Christian's **normal** way of operating, because if he does he will become like the fool: *"Do not answer a fool according to his folly, Lest you also be like him"* (Proverbs 26:4). Unfortunately, by adopting and customarily using the methodology of secular science in the hope of establishing the veracity of scripture **apart from faith in God**, Christians have abandoned the only basis for truly reliable knowledge, and, moreover, will never find the place of certainty, security and conviction which they seek.

So what attitude should the Christian adopt?

The Apostle John faced the dangerous Gnostic heresy when he wrote 1 John. The Gnostics (this word derives from the Greek for knowledge) were taking their stand on subjective experiences - false knowledge - which were, in fact, not from God. He therefore emphasises the true **divine** objectivity of the gospel. 1 John 1:1-3 reads: *"What was from the beginning, what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we beheld and our hands handled, concerning the Word of Life- and the life was manifested, and we have seen and bear witness and proclaim to you the eternal life, which was with the Father and was manifested to us- what we have seen and heard we proclaim to you also, that you also may have fellowship with us; and indeed our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ."*

Some parts of this passage are strikingly reminiscent of the methodology of science - *"what we have seen with our eyes, what we beheld and our hands*

handled", showing that there is a place for such seeing, measuring and touching (compare Psalm 111:2). But note carefully what modern science seeks to deny. John starts with "*what we have heard*", but science emphatically rejects revelation on the grounds of its subjectivity (i.e. that it is not available to all). John shows that the Christian has to start with revelation, and that the seeing, perceiving and touching are to confirm what we have **already heard with faith**. This does not mean that we can believe whatever we like, just because it suits us - it is not a "blind" or irrational faith, like that of the Gnostics John was denouncing. John is telling his readers that revelation which does not conform to what we can see and touch is false: this should be compared with the Biblical tests of prophecy (e.g. Deuteronomy 18:18-22). Thus the test of a genuine revelation is that it does prove consistent with what we can see, measure and touch. The methodology for demonstrating such consistency is essentially that of ordinary science, but this is carried out from a secure divine foundation. In practice our limited knowledge makes it inevitable that inconsistencies will appear between the observable facts and the revelation: these are instructive and must be handled appropriately (See Annex 1).

The other fundamental difference between the biblical and secular scientific approaches concerns the purpose and objective of the knowledge so acquired and confirmed. John sees knowledge as concerning the "Word of Life", and that it should lead to eternal life for all who receive it; science by contrast has no interest in bringing divine life to people, but, in theory at least, seeks to keep the knowledge at a materialistic level. In practice, however, people find the materialist agenda far too severe, which is why the parts of science which most attract people, whether scientists or not, are those parts which have **metaphysical implications** - such as cosmology and evolution. This demonstrates that metaphysical considerations - the exercise of faith - are always associated with the pursuit of knowledge.

If therefore Christians are to be faithful to God, and bring ourselves and others into the true knowledge and wisdom which are in Christ, we must adopt John's epistemological basis - divine revelation confirmed by what we can see, measure and touch, with the objective of bringing ourselves and others to the faith which brings eternal life. Nothing less will do. If the Christian is gaining knowledge but it is not producing faith which is being expressed in holiness of life (2 Timothy 3:16-17) and the fruit of the Spirit (Galatians 5:22-23), then the origin of the revelation and knowledge which he has obtained must be seriously questioned (James 3:13-18).

How does this apply to the question of origins?

Scripture shows that strictly scientific approaches **cannot** bring true knowledge which leads to eternal life, for, "*By faith we understand that the worlds were*

prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things which are visible" (Hebrews 10:3). Romans 10:8-17 shows that this faith is engendered by proclamation by a preacher, proclaiming the word of Christ. This is not confined to so-called "religious truth" - it is true of **all** truth. It is always a matter of faith: the attempt to reach truth by works will always fail to meet the human need for truth which is lived out. Real truth, of any sort, obtained within the divine context, leads to freedom (John 8:32). Even if someone discovers some facts or understanding by works, it will not give him the faith to **receive** the truth which the facts contain, the truth that leads to the eternal life which is the proper ultimate objective of knowledge. Knowledge puffs up, love builds up (1 Corinthians 8:1); knowledge will pass away, so knowledge must become transformed into Faith, Hope or Love if it is to have any eternal value. Thus the evangelical objective of any examination of origins, is to generate faith (whether for the first time in the unbeliever, or towards the fullness of the stature of Christ (Ephesians 4:13) in the Christian), and this must always be the priority. Scientific facts and "objectivity" alone cannot do this.

Nor can, even "fully Christianised", science provide a secure support for the Bible. Science can never compel belief. The search for a final scientific explanation of origins which will unequivocally support the Bible accounts is a vain hope. Not only is scientific knowledge always "partial", but it is always changing, and those who rely upon it are resting their feet on shifting sands which may be swept away at any time. This is a place of insecurity. The true foundation is always Christ (1 Corinthians 3:11). The Christian's faith must rest in God alone, not even in the Bible, still less in a scientific support for the Bible.

How does the Bible handle the issues which are of concern to science?

The Bible is not particularly interested in giving us **technical** knowledge about the physical world or of the past. God's objective is to create and develop our faith, to help us understand His nature, and, insofar as it is helpful, our own nature. God's dealings with men are its theme, and when we get scientific, biographical, geological or archaeological information⁴ in the Bible, it is always incidental to the main objective. It is therefore not surprising that we only find hints about what has happened in the past, and that they usually have a very personal significance. We need to be aware of this, and try to take a rather similar

⁴ Moreover such information is often more apparent than real. The Bible is not a "primary source" of information. Rather it is using such information to tell a larger story, about God, the world and man's place in it and man's relationship to God, or in other words to promote a particular worldview. The scientific, biographical, geological or archaeological information is wholly subsumed and adapted to that purpose, and to that purpose alone. The Hebrews who wrote and subsequently edited the scriptures were not interested in those topics for their own sake, and were hence likely to be Cavalier about adapting them to suit the purposes of the narrative.

standpoint in the way we handle these issues. God is concerned to create that faith in us which will enable us to live well, avoid the sins of the past, and be prepared for what is to come. The scriptures provide a memorial of God's dealings with men in the past (Psalm 1:4), and are provided to equip the man of God for every good work (2 Timothy 3:16-17), not to provide fuel for speculation (2 Timothy 2:23).

⁵The Bible is written in natural language, and it deals with situations, the background details of which were well known to the people present. To make the morally important points, there was no need (in most cases) to say whether it was raining, or hot or cold, what kinds of food were normally eaten, or what were the

⁵ In the 1997 version of this paper this paragraph started: "This is not to say that what we find recorded in the Bible about these subjects is not true. They are not "made up" stories in which the details and the "laws of nature" can be arbitrarily adjusted to suit the needs of the story, as in science fiction. The details which are given are true, if sometimes tantalisingly incomplete. The Bible is written in natural language, and it deals with situations,..." In 2006 I realised that this not only could be, but almost certainly was, demanding far too much of the Bible text.

That it was never intended as an objective documentary record of "facts" is shown by the repeated re-editing of the Bible through time. (*There is no serious doubt about this: the last major such editing was after the Babylonian exile, under Ezra, who "gave the sense" of the book of the law (i.e. the Pentateuch) (Nehemiah 8:8) to the people, and (from textual evidence) added this interpretation to the text.*) Its purpose is to provide a meaningful God-centred framework to explain what people knew and could see and provide appropriate guidance for living. As the circumstances of the people changed that framework needed adjustment to suit.

It also needed to continue to be *understandable*. For instance, if I want to communicate specialist scientific information that is outside someone else's current knowledge and understanding, if they are to understand me at all, I must re-express that knowledge in terms they do understand, and typically that is done by providing suitable analogies. The analogy stories could have the full appearance of being factual, yet not only be wholly fictional constructions as regards their details, but fall short of a fully correct statement of the actual facts as I know them. Pressing the details of those analogies beyond their intention could lead to completely wrong conclusions.

The unseen and as yet not understood can be expressed **only in analogies** of what has been seen and understood. This is unavoidable. In particular this is central to understanding any statements about God and His acts of Creation. We have not seen God (directly) and we were not present at Creation, or at any other of the Biblical events of a kind that are beyond our own direct experiences.

So the ancient authors are seeking to express their insights in words they and their hearers can understand. In scientific terms, they were providing "models" of reality in order to make sense of that reality, in much the same way as a modern scientist seeks to do. The main difference is that the Hebrew authors sought to provide that understanding as it related the Hebrew people to their God expressed in natural language, whereas a modern scientist seeks to explain that same reality materialistically expressed in specialist vocabulary and mathematics. The scientists' models are not the reality itself; nor are those of the Bible.

designs of the clothes or pots. It would be no different if we were writing the Bible stories now. When old people set out to describe their life as a child to their grandchildren, they emphasise the things which differ: things which have not changed remain unmentioned. Climate change is usually relatively slow, and so passes without comment, but we must also remember that the more variable the climate and the environment, then the greater the changes which can occur without raising comment. Also the more traumatic a person's experiences, the less willing they are to talk about them: when my Grandfather came home after five years in the First World War trenches, he never once spoke about his experiences. This might account for the understated account of the Flood and the lack of commentary on the unstable period after the Flood⁶.

Conclusion: people must live by faith

We must therefore accept what God says on the basis of faith⁷. That God is our Creator is a matter of faith (Hebrews 11:3) - it cannot ultimately be proved. The Bible is a record of God's dealings with men - that is what is important to emphasise, with a view to men increasing in their faith in God, with its end, eternal life. What we find in scripture is a record which clearly relates man's sin to God's judgement. "*What you sow, so shall you reap*" is the lesson which is "writ large" across the Bible's pages. The Flood, Babel and their aftermath show the awesomely horrific power of God's judgement on human sin. There is no doubt about these things, even though men choose to ignore them (2 Peter 3). God is the same yesterday, today and for ever, so who can doubt that, apart from God's grace, and the exercise of faith that leads to salvation, there must be a final judgement on human sin at the end of time for those who refuse to repent.

How much is it reasonable to expect to know about the Creation of the World and the early history of the Earth?⁸

⁶ In 1997 I understood the Bible to be saying that the Genesis Flood was fully global, as we would now understand "global", and so found the lack of any reference to post-Flood geological instability inexplicable. Rather the olive branch and Noah's vineyard point to relative climatic and geological stability. This with other Genesis evidence, suggest the Flood was confined to the then known world, as described (and delimited) in Genesis 10.

⁷ The 1997 paper added optimistically "and expect the Bible to give us true but incomplete information about the past".

⁸ In 1997 I was heavily involved in a research group developing a better fully global Flood model based on principles of ecological recolonisation, and which envisaged much of the geological record as formed after the Flood. (As we did more research assuming the Flood was global, then it occurred ever further down the geological record. Although much that was useful had been learned it became increasingly apparent that a global Flood during human history was hopelessly incompatible with the observed geological evidence, which led me to re-examine both the text of Genesis and its purpose, and I concluded from Genesis that a tectonically generated Regional Flood in the Middle East was most consistent with all the

There are many "simple" things we do not know, as God made clear to Job in Job 38-41. The only way forward is if God instructs us (Job 42:4), and we will only be instructed if we are prepared to humbly accept our ignorance and do not criticise or refuse to accept what He has revealed in scripture⁹. Not only must we accept that we do not know many things, but that many of them we will **never** know. We must become content not to know, and recognise that it is not good for us to know everything (Genesis 3:5). What is important is that we "*know Him who has been from the beginning*" (1 John 2:13), who created it all and presently upholds it by his word of power. For in Christ is all wisdom and knowledge, and it is Him we proclaim, that others may have faith. Only faith, hope and love last for ever, and it is these we must seek.

Annex 1: Dealing with inconsistencies between our revelation and the facts

If we discover that inconsistency exists between the revelation we received and the observable facts, then either our revelation is faulty or there is something which we do not know, or are not correctly interpreting, concerning the things we can see and touch. To an extent this will always be the case, since human knowledge is always partial. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between those mismatches that are fundamentally important and those that can be accepted for the time being. Such discrepancies are not confined to creation or scientific issues, they occur quite generally in the Christian life. In general, Christians are not very good at resolving them honestly - the classic example, the problem of unanswered prayer, has spawned a vast variety of fudges and evasions.

Unless the Christian is generally in the habit of facing these general issues of faith which face him in his daily life honestly, he is unlikely to make progress on the more distant and less easily tested issues which relate to creation. This is why it is important that the Christian's understanding of creation is fully integrated

geological and Biblical evidence.) I was certainly too sanguine in 1997 about the possibility of understanding scientifically the details of the Creation and the early history of the earth. I should have been far more humbled, as Job was, by God's questioning in Job 38-41, which reveals inherent limits to human knowledge. A literalist reading plus a mistaken view of the literary purpose of Genesis combined with modern scientific knowledge had made me arrogantly over-confident when I wrote: "It follows from the faith which we have in God, that the history of the earth and the genealogies of men are exactly as they are portrayed in scripture, for "if it were not so I would have told you" (John 14:2). We can have full confidence, like Jesus, to declare the historical truth of the story of the Creation, of Adam and Eve, Noah and the Flood etc. All the details of geology, archaeology etc. could all be perfectly fitted together with scripture, if only we sufficiently understood the means and methods which God used, and could see for ourselves the historical events which happened. We may hope to fit together only enough to be sure that we are not being deceived by a form of Gnosticism (1 John 1:1-3)."

⁹ It is however to rightly handle the word of truth (2 Timothy 2:15), understanding it as it was originally intended to be understood.

with his general understanding of God's character and His dealings with men: if his understanding is based on consistent and compatible Biblical principles which he is living out, in the Spirit, from faith to faith in his own life, then errors in understanding God's revelation concerning more difficult subjects are less likely.

For many Christians, even creationists, their creation theology is something separate, and is pursued within a physical, technical, and materialistic context rather than via God's dealings with men. It is therefore not properly integrated with the rest of their understanding of God, and is consequently not being lived out as a part of their living by faith. For some, their generally faulty view of God leads to a faulty creation theology. Thus correct understanding of the biblical and divine context of God's creation, and His involvement with it, should precede any "scientific" investigation - i.e. we need to know first what God said.

To develop an understanding of creation within a good general Biblical framework, it is essential to identify what are the **Biblically** important features - that is, what is important in terms of its implications for the **moral** relationship between man and God - this is after all what the Bible is mainly about. As with the rest of the Christian's understanding of the ways of God (compare Acts 20:27), this framework should depend mainly on **stable** factors based on direct commands, or general Biblical principles that can be proved generally from scripture, in preference to arguments that depend on complex deductive chains of argument from "proof texts". Such general principles, which can be adduced from many Biblical examples, like, for example, "If a man sins, then God judges him", principles which are of **moral** import, are far more reliable than, for example, attempts to discover if the Bible provides evidence that the sea-level was constant after the Flood. The constancy or otherwise of the sea level is a **technical** issue, and not a matter of **essential** Biblical importance, in that no **moral** consequence concerning the relationship of man and God depends on such a constancy or otherwise. The Bible is therefore not very likely to provide answers to such technical questions¹⁰.

Once these Biblical principles are established, we can then see how the scientific "facts" fit in with them. We must give greater weight to facts which are important to the Biblical story (e.g. all land life extinguished by the Flood¹¹), and to those scientific facts which are the most certainly proved (i.e. which do not depend on long chains of inference). Of course, this is a cyclic feed-back process between the revelation and the science as understanding of the scriptures and of the science develops. But the key feature of the process is the "ground of faith".

¹⁰ I now doubt if it can be used to attempt such questions at all, for the reasons given in earlier footnotes.

¹¹ In the case of a regional Flood, the preservation of animal life on the ark can be seen as ensuring rapid recolonisation of the devastated area, and God's post-Flood provision for Noah.

Whilst the Christian must never become blind to contrary evidence, and be willing to revise his opinions, he should not be **unduly** swayed by adverse data, especially if it is not of overriding importance. There will always be facts which seem to conflict with each other and with his present understanding. He must make an honest attempt to identify them, and check if they are really important, but often he must live with them. This attitude to conflicting evidence is, of course, normal scientific practice.

Adoption of the wrong scriptural model can have serious implications, and will result in mishandling of the scientific data.¹² People often have reasons for not accepting evidence that stares them in the face, reasons that have nothing to do with that particular piece of evidence. In dealing with people, we must always identify and address the "inhibitors" to change.

These notes are not comprehensive but should stimulate personal bible study. Every effort has been made to be accurate, but the reader should test everything in accord with the example of Acts 17:11 and the command of 1 Thessalonians 5:21. Errors, or queries which are unresolved after consulting the LORD, should be referred to the author (email: rhjbibpap@rhj.org.uk). (Edition dates: 7.7.1997, 9.7.1997, 16.7.1997, 2.10.1997; v6 major revision – largely by footnotes 8.9.2018)

© R H Johnston 1997, 2018. This paper may **only** be copied **in its entirety** for private non-commercial use. All other usage requires the written permission of the author.

¹² The 1997 paper continued, to address a specific live issue at the time: “For example, the supporters of post-Cretaceous end of Flood models are probably unwilling to consider an earlier end of Flood because their interpretation of Biblical texts suggests that the sea-level never subsequently exceeded what it was at the end of the Flood. (As already suggested, such a technical interpretation of scripture is inappropriate because it lacks moral import.) Because they then (understandably) seek a geological model consistent with this interpretation, they are not very willing to consider evidence which is inconsistent with it, and which would undermine their scriptural position. Consequently, adverse **geological** evidence - if it is something which they regard as a minor detail - is insufficient to cause them to change their opinion. Thus, if they are to change their opinion, they need help to reassess the flawed theology from which their prejudice arises; only then will they become willing to consider the implications of the geology. This is, of course, the same problem arises when dealing with supporters of "gap theoretic", long-age or evolutionary models.”