

Persistent Patterns of Immature Academic Skepticism Toward the Bible: Evidence from Archaeology, Genetics, Psychology, and the Modern Academy

Richard Hewitt, Lost Tribes Institute (2025)

Abstract

For more than a century, certain academic traditions have treated the Bible as unreliable until forced by evidence to reconsider. This pattern shows up in archaeology, ancient history, genetics, psychology, and even institutional ethics. Over and over, confident scholarly dismissals of scripture collapse when new discoveries appear. This essay reviews some of the clearest examples and argues that a long-standing bias—not the data—has driven many of the academy's mistakes. As evidence accumulates, the biblical record repeatedly proves more accurate than its critics expected. Meanwhile, modern academic institutions display the very moral and intellectual decay Scripture warns about when arrogance replaces faith.

1. Archaeology: A Long Line of Premature Dismissals

One of the clearest patterns in modern scholarship is the habit of confidently denying biblical claims—and then quietly reversing course when evidence forces the issue.

The Hittites - For decades, scholars dismissed the Hittites as a fictional people invented by biblical writers. This changed completely after excavations at Boğazköy uncovered tens of thousands of tablets documenting a large, international empire (Bryce, 2005). The Bible was right; the academy was not.

Belshazzar - Until the mid-1800s, Belshazzar was considered a “biblical mistake.” Then cuneiform tablets confirmed that he was co-regent with his father Nabonidus, exactly as Daniel portrays in scripture (Dougherty, 1929).

King David - Minimalist scholars argued for years that David was legendary. The Tel Dan inscription (Biran & Naveh, 1995) ended that debate. Once again, the “scholarly consensus” was undone by a piece of stone, but not after the masses were taught to the contrary.

Other reversals

- Sargon II: once labeled mythical, later confirmed by palace inscriptions (Luckenbill, 1927).
- The Ketef Hinnom scrolls, like the Dead Sea Scrolls, are early Hebrew texts showing biblical material was centuries older than critics assumed (Tigay, 1999).
- Hezekiah’s water tunnel was mocked by some critics, then discovered with an inscription matching the biblical account (Rainey & Notley, 2006).

These aren’t isolated mistakes. They form a consistent pattern:

Doubt first, evidence later, and then the correction rarely acknowledged by those who apparently don’t value history.

2. Jericho and Chronology: When Theory Overrides Data

Kathleen Kenyon’s 1950s excavations at Jericho became famous for “disproving” the biblical conquest. Her conclusion—that the city fell too early for Joshua—was treated as settled fact.

Later analysis, especially Wood (1990), showed that her pottery dating and stratigraphy were incomplete and the city actually fits the biblical timeline. Yet for decades scholars repeated Kenyon’s conclusion because it supported the preferred narrative: *the biblical account of the conquest never happened*.

A similar pattern appears in debates over the United Monarchy. Finkelstein’s (1996) “Low Chronology” minimized the power of David and Solomon, despite growing archaeological evidence—from Khirbet Qeiyafa, the Ophel, and copper mining at Khirbet en-Nahas—which supports a functioning 10th-century kingdom (Mazar, 2010; Levine, 2021). Again, the resistance to adjusting the narrative is ideological, not evidential. And academia’s slow corrections signal their lack of interest in historical truth.

3. The Exodus Debate: Circular Logic Masquerading as Method

The dominant academic approach insists on a late date for the Exodus. Then, when evidence for an early date, matching the biblical chronology appears—such as the Semitic demographics at Avaris, infant burials matching Exodus 1, or early alphabetic

inscriptions in the Sinai, it gets dismissed because it doesn't match the late date (Hoffmeier, 2005; Kitchen, 2003). This is circular reasoning:

1. "The Exodus must be late."
2. "Therefore evidence supporting an early date is irrelevant."
3. "Because there is no early evidence, the Exodus must be late."

This approach protects the conclusion from the beginning. It has very little to do with the actual data, science, or sincere scholarship.

4. Jungian Archetypes and the Convenient Erasure of History

Throughout the 20th century, Jung's idea of "archetypes" helped scholars avoid the obvious historical question: *Why do so many cultures have stories that strongly resemble biblical events?*

Instead of exploring real historical diffusion—through Phoenician trade, Assyrian deportations, Babylonian exile, or general human migration—many scholars waved away correlating traditions or legends as examples of Jung's "collective unconscious" theory. The theory was unfalsifiable, but it protected the assumption that biblical narratives were mythic rather than historical (Segal, 1998). This again reflects the same biased explanations that avoid an honest biblical application to history.

5. Genetics: When DNA Undercuts the Academic Consensus

The Lemba people of southern Africa preserve a set of practices and traditions pointing to ancient Israelite origins. Scholars long dismissed these claims as "invented tradition." Then genetics revealed that their priestly line carries the Cohen Modal Haplotype—the same paternal marker found among Jewish kohanim (Thomas et al., 2000). The academic reaction was predictable: rapid attempts to reinterpret or downplay the findings. But the data stood firm. Once again, the Bible was treated as unlikely—until DNA said otherwise.

6. Psychology and Sociology: Biblical Ethics Work

One of the most striking developments of the past 30 years is how strongly empirical data support biblical moral teachings.

Forgiveness: Meta-analyses show that forgiveness-based interventions—directly shaped by Jesus' teachings—produce some of the most reliable therapeutic improvements in clinical psychology (Wade et al., 2014).

Monogamy: Cross-cultural research demonstrates that societies rooted in monogamy show reduced violence, greater stability, and higher long-term prosperity (Henrich et al., 2012). This is exactly what the biblical vision prescribes.

Mental and social health: The rise of permissive sexual ethics, extreme individualism, and moral relativism has correlated with spikes in loneliness, anxiety, and depression—especially among younger generations (Twenge, 2017).

The data repeatedly confirm that biblical ethics promote human flourishing and happiness.

7. The Darkening Effect: How Anti-Biblical Bias Shapes Society

As academia pushes biblical texts to the margins, society becomes less able to understand its own cultural roots. The result is increasing moral confusion: soaring rates of anxiety, family instability, ideological extremism, and institutional distrust.

This is not accidental. When a culture abandons the worldview that shaped its moral backbone, consequences follow—exactly as the biblical writers warned (Romans 1; Proverbs 29:18).

Woodberry's (2012) remains the most rigorously controlled study in political science on the origins of liberal democracy. After examining every conceivable variable across 142 countries, the strongest statistical predictor of healthy democracy was exposure to Protestant missionaries—who taught people to read so they could read the Bible for themselves. The Bible created mass literacy, mass literacy created democracy, democracy created prosperity. This causal chain is politically inconvenient, so it is rarely emphasised in curricula.

8. Harvard: A Case Study in Institutional Collapse

Harvard began as a deeply biblical institution. Its original motto, *Veritas Christo et Ecclesiae*, acknowledged that truth cannot be separated from Christ. That moral focus led Harvard to the pinnacle of academic prestige, but then moral orientation changed. Today, Harvard has turned against the very book that shaped its excellence. As a consequence, it has been battered by a cascade of scandals that expose deep fissures in its commitment to integrity, free speech, and ethical leadership. Plagiarism has emerged as a particularly damning theme, with a series of high-profile cases eroding trust in the institution's scholarly standards. Claudine Gay, Harvard's president, resigned in January 2024 after revelations of extensive plagiarism in her academic papers and dissertation, including unacknowledged overlaps with other scholars' work. This was

swiftly followed by accusations against Sherri Ann Charleston, the university's chief diversity officer, for lifting passages in her publications; researcher Ameet Shah for data fabrication; and Shirley Greene, a Title IX coordinator, who plagiarized over 40 sections in her 2008 dissertation. Perhaps the most ironic of these was Francesca Gino, the Tandon Family Professor at Harvard Business School, renowned for her research on honesty and ethical decision-making, who was charged for falsifying data in four papers. These incidents have fueled congressional inquiries and donor revolts, painting Harvard as a den of thieves.

Compounding the academic rot were explosive controversies over genocidal rhetoric and campus culture. In December 2023, Gay's congressional testimony—where she equivocated on whether calls for the "genocide of Jews" violated Harvard's policies, accelerating her downfall. At the vortex of this storm stands Larry Summers, who has long condemned hypocrisy in others — slamming Trump and accusing universities (including Harvard) of selective moral outrage. Yet Epstein emails recently reveal Summers himself confiding in the convicted sex offender for years, seeking romantic advice on an affair with a mentee (with racially tinged banter), and then turning to funnel undisclosed funds to his wife's foundation. The academic who publicly branded others with a modern "scarlet letter of shame" now wears his own: a glaring mark of academia's low standards. Maybe Harvard should return to its biblical origins.

At this point, Jesus' words in Matthew 7 are not commentary—they are diagnosis:

"Every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit...
Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.
Therefore, by their fruits you will know them."
—Matthew 7:17–20 (ESV)

Academia has spent generations judging the Bible. Now the Bible judges academia. And its verdict is simple: the fruit is rotten.

9. The Peer-Review Crisis: The Modern Academy Questions Its Own Reliability

Retractions of peer-reviewed papers have exploded in recent years—from under 500 per year in 2000 to several thousand in 2023 (Brainard & You, 2024). Most of these are due to misconduct, not honest error. Studies show widespread fabrication, falsification, and p-hacking (Fanelli, 2009; Ioannidis, 2005). Even elite journals (Nature, Science, The Lancet, PNAS) repeatedly publish studies that fail replication. The same academic culture that once dismissed the Hittites, Belshazzar, and the House of David as unhistorical myths now presides over an unprecedented collapse in the reliability of its own peer-reviewed literature.

It is ironic that the same academic culture that dismissed the Bible as “unreliable” now struggles to trust its own literature.

This ongoing crisis reflects academia’s inability to properly evaluate biblical content. In an era when peer-reviewed science—equipped with statistical software, replication checks, data-availability mandates, and plagiarism-detection algorithms—still routinely publishes and defends fraudulent results for years, the 19th- and 20th-century confidence that the Hebrew Bible must be fiction created by later generations begins to look less like scholarship and more like institutional tabloids. The archaeological record, by contrast, has no papermill factories, no citation cartels, and no pressure to “publish or perish.” It simply accumulates, slowly, until the textual witness it vindicates can no longer be ignored. The contrast is instructive: the Bible has survived 2,500 years of scrutiny with its historical core repeatedly strengthened despite the “storms”. Modern academia’s weak grasp of science forces it to retract its claims at an accelerating rate.

Academia needs the Bible’s protagonist, who claims:

“Therefore everyone who hears these words of mine and puts them into practice is like a wise man who built his house on the rock. The rain came down, the streams rose, and the winds blew and beat against that house; yet it did not fall, because it had its foundation on the rock. But everyone who hears these words of mine and does not put them into practice is like a foolish man who built his house on sand. The rain came down, the streams rose, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell with a great crash.”

Conclusion

Across archaeology, genetics, psychology, sociology, and institutional ethics, the same pattern emerges: scholarly overconfidence, biblical skepticism, and repeated reversal once biblical evidence accumulates. The issue is not the data. It is a long-standing academic bias.

The solution is simple: evaluate the Bible the same way we evaluate every other ancient source. No special hostility, no special exemptions. When we do, the evidence tends to fall in the Bible’s favor.

Until that shift happens, academia will continue to face the same cycle—premature dismissal, forced correction, and silent retreat—while the biblical text remains steady.

References

- Atzmon, G., & Ostrer, H. (2010). *Complex genetic history of Jewish populations*. *Nature*, 466(7303), 380–384.
- Biran, A., & Naveh, J. (1995). The Tel Dan inscription: A new fragment. *Israel Exploration Journal*, 45(1), 1–18.
- Brainard, J., & You, J. (2024). What a massive database of retracted papers reveals about science publishing. *Science*, 383(6671), 18–21.
- Bryce, T. (2005). *The kingdom of the Hittites* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Dougherty, R. (1929). *Nabonidus and Belshazzar*. Yale University Press.
- Fanelli, D. (2009). How many scientists fabricate and falsify research? *PLoS ONE*, 4(5), e5738.
- Finkelstein, I. (1996). The archaeology of the United Monarchy. *Levant*, 28, 177–187.
- Grens, K. (2023). Harvard professor accused of data manipulation. *The Scientist*.
- Hammer, M. F., et al. (2009). Extended Y chromosome haplotypes resolve multiple and unique lineages of Jewish priestly families. *Human Genetics*, 126(5), 707–717.
- Henrich, J., et al. (2012). The puzzle of monogamous marriage. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 367(1589), 657–669.
- Hoffmeier, J. K. (2005). *Israel in Egypt: The evidence for the authenticity of the Exodus tradition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ioannidis, J. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8), e124.
- Kitchen, K. A. (2003). *On the reliability of the Old Testament*. Eerdmans.
- Luckenbill, D. D. (1927). *Ancient records of Assyria and Babylonia*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mazar, A. (2010). *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible*. Yale University Press.
- Oransky, I., & Marcus, A. (2022). Fraud, plagiarism, and the paper mill problem. *Retraction Watch*.
- Rainey, A. F., & Notley, R. S. (2006). *The sacred bridge*. Carta.
- Segal, R. (1998). *Jung on mythology*. Princeton University Press.
- Thomas, M. G., et al. (2000). Y chromosomes traveling south: The Cohen Modal Haplotype and the Lemba. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 66, 674–686.
- Tigay, J. (1999). The significance of the Ketef Hinnom inscriptions. *Biblical Archaeology Review*.
- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen*. Atria Books.
- Wade, N. G., et al. (2014). Meta-analysis of forgiveness therapy interventions. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 82(1), 154–170.
- Wood, B. (1990). Did the Israelites conquer Jericho? *Biblical Archaeology Review*.

