

disintegrate into mud or sand, if linear extrapolation is used. If exponential decay curve fitting is applied, then the time to disintegrate is about four times 32 years, or 128 years. It is obvious that nature has never experienced 128 years of continuous torrential rainfall. We must apply some assumptions to understand this figure. If it rains one month a year, then the number of years to disintegrate will be  $12 \times 128 = 1536$  years. If it rains one week a year, then the number of years to disintegrate will be  $52 \times 128 = 6656$  years. These numbers are very conservative and reasonable. Furthermore, these numbers fall far short of what evolutionists would like to assume.

- (7) Peter Klevberg mentioned that: *'The text for the Los Angeles Abrasion Test specifically denies a direct quantitative relationship between abrasion in nature and abrasion as measured in the test'*. This statement appears self-contradictory. If laboratory data do not have a direct quantitative relationship to field data, then why would anybody waste the time and resources to do the experiments anyway! Another way to interpret the statement is that since evolution cannot tolerate short time-spans for erosion, just toss out all data that indicate young ages. This is exactly what evolutionists have been doing all these years! They cannot face the data contrary to millions of years. They must explain them away.

That is why God has placed us here, to show forth the ways of creation. One of His ways was to use a very short time-span.

Christopher Chui,  
Canoga Park, California,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

## CAINAN

Dear Editor,

I would point out to Jonathan Sarfati (CEN Tech. J., 12(1):39-40) that my letter (CEN Tech. J., 11(3):328) no more *'blatantly contradicts the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture'* than does Henry Morris in The Genesis Flood, page 281, which says of Cainan:

*'This name is found in some manuscripts of the Septuagint, and Luke may have used them in the compilation of his own record'*.

My statement that *'presumably, Luke recorded [Cainan] in Christ's ancestry'* agrees with Morris' suggestion above, allowing for his alternative suggestion that Cainan's presence was due to a scribal error (as illustrated by Sarfati).

I do agree that evangelicals should be concerned with my letter, though take notice of what I say. I will qualify my suggestion that 'Luke's' Cainan is the Kainam of Jubilees, with the concession that it is only a possibility that he leaked in via the Septuagint. Just leave him out of future debates on chronology!

Derel Briarley,  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England,  
UNITED KINGDOM.

### The Author Replies ...

There are two possibilities for evangelicals, that is, those who believe in the inerrancy of the 66 books of the Bible in their original autographs:-

- (1) Cainan was in the original and was preserved in some Septuagint manuscripts, but lost from the extant Masoretic manuscripts of the Genesis and Chronicles. Therefore the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth (John 16:13), inspired Luke to copy from it.
- (2) Cainan was **not** in the original just as the Masoretic Text indicates. Therefore the Spirit of Truth would not have inspired Luke to insert a false name. Therefore the

name must have been inserted by an early copyist, so appears in all extant manuscripts of the Gospel as well as some Septuagint manuscripts.

The Morris quote pointed out that (1) was an option (although not the option Morris favours) for an evangelical **provided he believes that Cainan is correct**. This is quite different from Briarley's suggestion that Cainan is an error but was included by Luke all the same. This is not logically possible for any writing inspired by the Spirit of Truth.

Jonathan D. Sarfati,  
Brisbane, Queensland,  
AUSTRALIA.

## DINOSAURS AND THE FLOOD

Dear Editor,

I am quoted in the paper 'Dinosaurs in the Oardic Flood' (CEN Tech. J., 12(1):56).

May I therefore make a couple of corrections. This table of Karl Popper's five stages for scientific progress was summarised by Bryan Magee, one of Karl Popper's advocates, not by myself as stated in Robinson's paper. I merely quoted from Magee. Furthermore, I quoted this summary of Popper's five stages for scientific progress because I wanted to express disagreement with it, not because I wanted to endorse it. I think that these facts were expressed adequately in my paper, and the point needs to be made that authors ought to take proper care in referencing other material.

David Malcolm,  
Maryland, New South Wales,  
AUSTRALIA.