book, he would have read the conclusion that Einstein '*must have been aware of the new climate of opinion*'.

Banesh Hoffmann[4] confirms Calder's conclusion. He admits Einstein made no specific mention of the Michelson-Morley experiment, but then quotes Einstein himself in his 1905 paper as talking about '*the unsuccessful attempts to discover any motion of the earth relative to the* (ether)'.

In any case, the point made in my paper stands, namely, that in reviewing the relationship of these events in historical perspective, it's certainly clear that Einstein's work in effect dispensed with the ether assumption in answer to these experimental results, even if they were not his main inspiration, nor explaining them his chief purpose.

I'd be more interested to receive competent comment on the main thesis of my paper. Perhaps I could recap by saying this presented us with a choice:—
either to follow the popular view of Einstein's work as showing that the nature of Time is such that simultaneity is relative (akin to the mutual effects of perspective) as taught by special relativity,
or to insist that the behaviour of clocks is always consistent with common sense, and that this gives the lie to the theory of special relativity as a physical solution, but shows the mathematics of relativity (following Lorentz) to be compatible with Setterfield's *c* decay hypothesis.

Brian D. (not F.) Johnston,
Leigh,
Lancashire,
ENGLAND.

REFERENCES

1. Johnston, B. D., 1990. On the compatibility of special relativity with a decreasing velocity of light. EN Tech. J., 4:186–190.
2. Evered, M., 1991. Ether or Einstein? CEN Tech. J., 5(1):91.
3. Calder, N., 1989. Einstein's Universe, Penguin Books Ltd, Harmondsworth, U.K., p. 181.
4. Hoffmann, B., 1977. Einstein, Granada Publishing Ltd (Paladin), Herts, U.K., p. 69.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF MAN

Dear Editor,

Mr Cooper's article 'The Early History of Man — Part 3. The Kings of the Ancient Britons: A Chronology'[1] has come to my notice, and I very much appreciate the theme and conclusion of the same.

However, the definiteness of his assertions in respect of Bible chronology took me by surprise. Examples are:—

(1) '*We know that Eli judged Israel between the years 1115–1075 bc* '
(2) '*We know that Samuel judged Israel for the forty year period between 1075–1035 bc* '
(3) '*Saul was king in Israel between 1030–1010 BC*'
(4) '*Again, we know that David ruled from 1010–970 BC*'
(5) '*. . . Solomon who ruled between the years 970-930 BC*'
(6) '*Ahab* was *king of Israel between 874–853 BC*'
(7) '*Isaiah was active between 740–701 BC*'

Items (4), (5) and (6) indicate that he is quoting Thiele's chronology,[2] which has been demonstrated by Aaronson[3] to be contrary to Scripture on nine counts as follows:

(1) The identity of Pul
(2) Malchut years
(3) Jubilee years
(4) The date of the accession of Hezekiah
(5) Regnal synchronisms between Judah and Israel
(6) The 'third' kingdom of Ephraim
(7) The date of the accession of Jehoram of Judah
(8) The false Tishrei reckoning for Judah
(9) The unnecessary complication of Judah and Israel each using their own system for the chronology of the other's regnal years.

I am intrigued to know the reasons why he assigns a 20 year reign to Saul and why 40 years to the judgeship of Samuel, and on what basis is Isaiah's ministry dated 740-701 BC.

C. L. Prasher,
Brighton,
ENGLAND.

The Author Replies . . .

I am very grateful for the points that Mr Prasher raises, and I note with alarm that in gathering information for the synchronisms that made the construction of the early British chronology possible, I may have inadvertently relied upon a flawed chronology of the biblical kings. I am not in the least familiar with the work of Thiele[4] or its apparent and particular dangers, although I do note that my source[5] for the biblical dates does indeed rely on him. Well done for noticing! (I have to assume, however, lacking entirely the leisure to explore the matter deeply, that your own source is itself without problems, and that Aaronson did not commit a thousand sins of his own in refuting Thiele. I doubt that even Aaronson would claim that his is the very last word on the subject.)

In mitigation, if any is needed, I would plead that my sole interest was in constructing a reasonably accurate chronology for the early British kings (something that no previous scholar has succeeded in doing these four hundred years past, or even bothered to do of late), rather than in raising dust over the somewhat controversial subject of fixing the exact dates for the kings of Israel and Judah, and the points that you raise, whether right or wrong, do not significantly affect the British chronology. Time dictates that I must leave to others already engaged in the field of

biblical chronology the task of doing battle with Thiele *et al.*, and I would ask only that fellow scholars bear patiently with me while I do battle with antagonists of my own. The research that I have undertaken is opening up entirely new fields of investigation. It is an enormous undertaking, and I can announce a most significant development, details of which should appear in a near future edition of this journal.

However, regarding the chronology of the early British kings, I can only re-echo a request that was once made by William Tyndale, a far greater scholar that I can ever hope to be, in the year 1526 when his translation of the New Testament was first published. Please . . .

> *'Count it as a thynge not havynge his full shape / but as it were borne afore hys tyme / even as a thing begunne rather than fynesshed. In tyme to come, yf God have apoynted us thereunto, we will geve it his full shape . . .'*

Bill Cooper,
Ashford,
Middlesex,
ENGLAND.

REFERENCES

1. Cooper, W. R., 1991. The early history of man — part 3. The kings of the ancient Britons: A chronology. CEN Tech. J., 5(2):139–142.
2. Thiele, E. R, 1979. A Chronology of the Hebrew Kings, Zondervan Corporation, Grand Rapids, Michigan.
3. Aaronson, B. J., 1989. The Jerusalem chronology of the Israelite monarchs, Jerusalem Institute of Ancient History, Jerusalem.
4. Thiele, Ref. 2.
5. New Bible Dictionary, Inter-Varsity Press, London, 1972, p. 223.

PRECAMBRIAN ROCKS

Dear Editor,

I would like to compliment Dr Andrew Snelling for an excellent article on where the 'Precambrian' rocks fit into creationist geology.[1] Looking at geology from the perspective of another scientific field, I too have seen the need for a total revision of standard geology. One of these reasons is because standard geology was developed from non-biblical premises, from the beginning. Those who first set up the geological column were more like progressive creationists, who believed in a time-equivalence to the fossils.[2]

There is no reason that I can see to postulate that the order of Flood deposition followed the order in the geological column. I can easily understand the 'Precambrian' rocks being laid down in the Flood not only at the same time as the 'Cambrian' rocks in some areas, but also at the same time as the 'Permian' or 'Cretaceous' rocks elsewhere. In the Rocky Mountains of Montana in the United States, 'Precambrian' rocks are found at any elevation in the mountains and directly overlie several 'young' periods of the geological time-scale. I also see little evidence of overthrusts, of which the Lewis Overthrust is but one of the many overthrusts in this state.

I have several questions that have perked my interest as I was reading Dr Snelling's article. Since there is plenty of organic carbon in the 'Precambrian', could some of this carbon be the remains of many other types of plants, besides bacteria and algae (the large plants in the Witwatersrand Group seem to be the only exception)? Could some of this carbon be the remains of animals? Has enough research been performed to know that much about the origin of this organic carbon? It is hard for me to envisage a burial environment in the Flood that entombed only algae and bacteria. If only algae and bacteria were buried in the 'Precambrian' strata, Dr Snelling's suggestion of a deep marine environment (non-uniformitarian), associated with volcanism and volcanic and chemical sedimentation, seems like a good hypothesis.

Apparently, stromatolites are the predominant organism identified in 'Precambrian' strata. If these strata have been altered by burial metamorphosis (a reasonable postulate), then why have colonies of stromatolites been preserved and not destroyed?

When I read the geological literature, I often see references to *in situ* stromatolites. I have always taken this as just another deduction, based on their evolutionary/uniformitarian model, with very little physical proof. I noticed that Dr Snelling mentioned the stromatolites in the Altyn limestone and dolomite here in Glacier Park, Montana, as likely laid down by 'storm conditions'. My next question then is, 'What evidence is available for either an *in situ* growth or a depositional mechanism for stromatolites?' If any stromatolite colonies show strong evidence for *in situ* growth, how can this be explained by a Flood mechanism?

The extension of Dr Snelling's ideas to the 'Precambrian' rocks in the Grand Canyon is a good application. I can see that the lower strata in this canyon are more controversial than I thought. I agree with Dr Snelling that the fossils found in the 'Precambrian' of the Grand Canyon imply a Flood mechanism for deposition. It also is quite probable to me that the other non-fossiliferous formations are Flood strata as well. It is hard for me to understand how any pre-Flood strata could survive the devastation and tectonic violence of the Genesis Flood. All the thick Flood sediment found all over the world had to be eroded from somewhere.

Another thought passed through my mind as I was reading this section. Apparently, the controversy is over whether the strata in question were laid down on the third day of creation or during the Flood. But why does there have to be geological activity on the earth at this time during a perfect creation? The earth was in the process of being created very good. God could have raised the dry