

in my opinion unwise to suggest that academic writing needs to be limited to post graduate authors. Most self-respecting journals have clearly defined policies that review materials prior to publication, and *Journal of Creation*'s peer review system is no exception.

I understand that Mr Crookston is unhappy with a few points raised in my article.

He objects quite rightly to the view that suggests that languages tend to become simpler. I continue to hold that the Proto-Indo-European language is superior in sophistication and consistency. However, I do not agree that the trend is for languages to become simpler. In fact, I would argue that usually languages tend to become less consistent, and therefore more complex. English is a good example. While learning English at high school in The Netherlands, we consistently struggled with irregular verbs, exceptions to rules, etc.

Mr Crookston points to the issues related to pidgin and Creoles. He is right in pointing out that there have been pidgins which have become stable, and it could be argued that this is evidence of inconsistency leading to consistency. However, to my knowledge none of these languages have the sophistication and subtlety in the grammar as the Proto-Indo-European language.

I agree with Mr Crookston that Language direction is not uniform. However I still hold that language changes we observe today cannot properly explain the consistency and sophistication of the Proto-Indo-European language. Mr Crookston's objections have failed to persuade me otherwise.

K.J. Duursma
Eastbourne, East Sussex,
UNITED KINGDOM

Problems with 'Searching for Moses'

This letter is in response to the article about finding Moses in archaeology.¹ I have many problems with the paper. First of all, Sir Flinders Petrie is

often referred to. He was a very early archaeologist and by all current standards a terrible one, so stop referring to him as if he was THE authority. Most of his findings have been discounted or revised by later archaeologists who were much more competent in the field. Secondly, if you move the 12th dynasty forward 350 years, you have to move the rest of them forward by the same increment as well. This would place the New Kingdom (the 18th and 19th Dynasties) existing from roughly 1200 BC to 950 BC. This creates a huge problem because the New Kingdom dynasties exerted control over all of the Southern Levant from Egypt proper to Aram, which completely encompasses Israel. This presence is very well documented in the findings of Ami Mazar in Beth Shean. In fact that city during the New Kingdom was the seat of Egyptian power in the northern reaches of their empire. There is a governor's palace there in which many important artifacts were found, the most important of which was the Seti I stele. In any case, the Bible never talks about the Israelites being completely conquered by the Egyptians and being under Egyptian control for a period of 300–350 years until the time of Solomon. Israel's chief enemies at this time were the Philistines in the South and the Canaanites in the North, as is well documented in the book of Judges and other places as well.

We also have the Merneptah stele which is dated to 1207 BC. This stele reveals that Israel was in the land at that time and that he fought them. That doesn't contradict David Down's argument, except that Merneptah was a pharaoh of the 19th Dynasty. Now how can a 19th Dynasty king be carving a stele if he is in the 13th dynasty?

And lastly, the pyramids were built by the 3rd–6th dynasties of Egypt in the Early Bronze age and the Old Kingdom of Egypt. These dynasties existed from 2500–2200 BC. Before Abraham there may have been Semitic people there, but they were not Israelites. And contrary to David Down's statement about the generally accepted time of their construction, no prominent archaeologist with any credibility in the field would agree with that statement. They would

agree with what I said.

Basically, while the finds are nice, trying to change the chronology to fit the Exodus in with the right Egyptian dynasty by changing the chronology creates so many problems that it is preposterous and impossible to justify the consequences of the change. Therefore, it is not the Egyptian chronology that needs to be changed. You just need to find a better explanation. I am a Christian and a student studying Archaeology at Wheaton College. I too do not know the answer to this discrepancy, but I do know what the answer is not. And it is not what was proposed in 'Searching for Moses'.

J.D.A.
Wheaton, IL
United States of America

References

1. Down, D., Searching for Moses, *Journal of Creation* 15(1):53–57, 2001.

David Down replies:

I would like to point out to J.D.A. that I did not invent this revised chronology. It was first proposed by Dr Velikovsky fifty years ago and has been accepted by some other scholars since then. It is presently being taught at Cambridge University by England's top archaeologist, Lord Colin Renfrew.

Yes, it does mean that other dates have to be reduced and that includes the 18th dynasty, but that is a bonus because it brings Thutmose III down to the time of Solomon and Rehoboam and identifies him as the Shishak of 1 Kings 14:25. I would like to invite J.D.A. to come with me on my annual visit to Egypt next April and I would be glad to point out to him the items Thutmose took from the temple at Jerusalem. They are clearly depicted on the wall of his shrine at Karnak.

As for Bethshan, Dr Ami Mazar is a very good friend of mine and I worked with him in his excavations at Bethshan. He holds to the traditional dates but these are by no means set in concrete. There is no question that Egypt controlled Bethshan, but J.D.A.

should not read too much into the Bible record which concentrates on events within Israel and Judah. Samaria had an Egyptian governor, Amon, in the days of King Ahab (1 Kings 22:25), and Pharaoh Necho appointed Jehoiakim to be king in Jerusalem (2 Chronicles 36:4). The extent of Egyptian control of Israel and Judah is not spelled out in Kings and Chronicles because that was irrelevant to the moral theme of the Bible records.

I would also be happy to take J.D.A. to the Egyptian Museum in Cairo and show him the Merneptah stela, and the little footnote at the bottom of the inscription which says 'Israel is destroyed, her seed is no more'. Does he really think that if Merneptah had invaded Israel this is all he would have to say about it. I can assure you he would have wanted to get more mileage out of it than a tiny postscript at the bottom of his stela describing at great length his expulsion of the Libyans from Egypt. Merneptah was simply commenting on the conquest of Samaria by the Assyrians in 722 BC which provides another anchor point for a revised chronology.

Finally, a word about Sir Flinders Petrie. I am not dependent on him for authority but I would defend his reputation. Petrie was a brilliant scholar who pioneered modern archaeology. J.D.A.'s professors at Wheaton have apparently been knocking him but he is still highly regarded in archaeological circles. Many of his methods are still being followed.

David Down
Hornsby, New South Wales
AUSTRALIA

A creationist cosmology in a galactocentric universe

I appreciate John Harnett commenting on my galactocentric cosmic creation model.¹ However, he errs in discussing the effects of the outer

galactic shell. He thus misses one of the outstanding features of my model—light from the distant shell is gravitationally redshifted at all points interior to the shell and in particular becomes the 2.73 K Cosmic Blackbody Radiation (CBR) at our location near the universal Centre. So instead of the shell presenting an Olber's paradox type of problem, as John claims, it actually accounts for the origin of the 2.73 K CBR as gravitationally redshifted light that everywhere interior to the shell produces blackbody cavity radiation and in particular the 2.73 K near the Centre.²

He also makes a big issue of the density of the outer shell being that of a galaxy. However, this is exactly the condition invoked for the outer shell that greatly strengthens my model in every way. That is, the outer shell is actually a distant shell of galaxies composed of just H. So instead of being weakened by this condition, my model is instead strongly affirmed.²

John also errs when he claims my model is much the same as the hot big bang model. It is impossible for this to be true because big bang's fundamental premise is that the universe is governed by spacetime expansion and expansion redshifts. In contrast, in my model, Hubble redshifts are a combination of relativistic Doppler shifts due to the outward recession of the galaxies through space, plus gravitational redshifts due to the effects of the vacuum. So my model invokes conditions that are directly opposed to big bang's spacetime expansion and expansion redshifts.²

I also differ with John concerning his view that God's Word favours the stretching of space, which accords with galaxies being co-moving entities carried by the expansion. This is the picture required by the big bang model and by Russ Humphreys' and Carmeli's models. As John recognizes, in my cosmic model space is not expanding; instead, galaxies are physically receding from the nearby Centre. I believe this concept equally well fits the biblical description of the stretching out of the heavens.

All the above, and much more,

should have gone to the worldwide scientific community on 28 February 2001, when I attempted to post on the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) scientific arXiv ten scientific papers describing in great detail why big bang's fundamental assumptions are demonstrably wrong and also many details of my new cosmic model. However, all those papers were deleted prior to being released and my password taken away. Since then LANL, the National Science Foundation and Cornell University—which took over the arXiv from LANL—have conspired to continue the censorship of those papers. A summary of this censorship as well as the original ten papers—each with the arXiv number they received in anticipation of being released—may be found on my website.² That site also contains citations to my two papers on the same topic that I managed to post on the CERN archive before it closed to accepting contributions from outside scientists such as me.

Robert Gentry
Knoxville, TN
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

References

1. Harnett, J.G., A creationist cosmology in a galactocentric universe, *Journal of Creation* 19(1):73–81, 2005.
2. My website at <www.orionfdn.org> contains the ten scientific papers deleted by Los Alamos in February 2001 as well as correspondence from LANL, the NSF and Cornell University relating to the continuing censorship. It also contains references to the two papers I posted on CERN (European Organization for Nuclear Research) and a relatively recent paper on my cosmic model, 'Collapse of Big Bang Cosmology and the Emergence of the New Cosmic Center Model of the Universe', published in the December 2004 issue of *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith*. It also contains references to presentations on these topics that I have made at fairly recent American Physical Society meetings.