

ON CREATION WITH AN APPEARANCE OF AGE

FRANK L. MARSH*

Received 12 August 1977

Creationists have sometimes hesitated to maintain the doctrine of creation with apparent age, fearing that to do so might seem to be to hold that God has deceived men. But there is no deceit, since God has stated the truth plainly in revelation. Besides, it would be impossible for anything to have been created at all without features which could be taken as indications of age.

Recent discussions in the *Quarterly* about the doctrine of creation with apparent age¹ remind me of correspondence which I once had with Dobzhansky, consisting of an exchange of seven or eight letters each way. He wrote that he could not believe in a literal Genesis because to accept the Genesis account would be a blasphemous act. He noted that Genesis clearly stated that living things had originated by special creation, but he affirmed the natural evidence for organic evolution is so overwhelming all we can do is conclude that Genesis is a myth. He said his concept of God was that a Supreme Being would not originate living things by special creation in such a way as to witness so completely for organic evolution, and thereby deceive man. In his opinion it would be blasphemous to stand for special creation today.

Of course, one does well to believe that God is truthful. But I can not believe that there is anything untruthful, or deceitful, in God's act of creation a few thousand years ago.

From the reading of Genesis, obviously it was God's intent to enjoy close, face-to-face communion with Adam and Eve. See Gen. 3:8-22. This close association, with its accompanying explanation of natural things, was absolutely necessary for man's correct orientation in the natural world. Modern scientists have quite generally drifted so far from the original relationship as to spurn special revelation, and to declare the essential basic natural facts provided man in the Bible to be no more than myths. God provided the facts Adam needed for a correct understanding of nature, and Adam and following heads of households passed them on by memory from generation to generation for the first twenty-five hundred years, that is, until the facts about origins were revealed to Moses and put in writing by him in Genesis.² Most unfortunately the pride, and accumulating misinformation of man leads him to ignore the Bible, and concurrently to feel progressively more self-sufficient in all areas of knowledge.

Apparent Age in Adam's Time

I am of the opinion that it is very essential for natural scientists frequently to meditate on Adam's situation in that early and perfect world. He learned the story of origins from the Creator. To get at the facts let us assume that some time soon after Adam's creation on Day Six (Gen. 1:27 NASB), the Creator said to him, "Adam, look about you. There is not an object in this landscape that is more than three days (evenings and mornings; 24-hour periods) old." (As far into the week

as the morning of Day Three, no dry land was to be found. Gen. 1:9.)

Assume that Adam replied, "Lord you have given me this wonderful mind and these marvelous physical senses. Now suppose I study this matter open-mindedly and learn if your statement is correct."

Assume that Adam began his careful study of age by examining his own body. If he were to hypothesize that he had become mature (of marriageable age, Gen. 1:27) by normal (to us) growth processes, then he could reasonably conclude that he had lived at least twenty-five years. If his basic assumptions were correct, then by the agreement of proof from several ways of determining age, such as anatomical structure, physiological activity, and psychological maturity, he would "know" that he was more than three days old.

Assume that Adam continued his study and observed mature fruit trees (Gen. 1:12) which apparently were several years old. He observed great water animals (Gen. 1:21) possibly apparently sixty years old. He observed mountains (Gen. 7:19) and spreading plains with rivers (Gen. 2:10-14), erosion plains which some think require millions of years to form. If he had examined trees, I believe he would have found annual rings, and that if he had dated minerals radioactively it is possible that apparent ages of even millions of years would have been found.

After all this careful open-minded study of the Edenic world, Adam could have returned to the Creator and with great sincerity said, "Lord, I'm sorry to have to say this, but this landscape is much older than you think!"

If it had been available to him, it is very likely Adam could have had the confirmation of all our most sophisticated modern scientific apparatus in the matter of great age. Suppose this apparatus had been available to Adam, and that in making his report, he had invited the Creator to have a seat, and then had taken an hour and a half with tables, charts, and photographs, showing the agreement of inorganic radioactive time clocks, of fission-track data, of effects of solar wind in eroding moon craters, etc., etc., that our earth *had* to be at least four and one-half billion years old. Would the Creator have been impressed? Would all these data on age of the open-minded method have constituted *natural truth*?

Scriptural Evidence

Who would have been correct in such an imagined situation—the Creator, "nothing in the landscape over three days old," or Adam, after the results of open-minded study were all in? The Scriptures help us here:

Gen. 1:1: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Matt. 19:4-6 NASB: "... he who

Frank L. Marsh, Ph.D., is Professor Emeritus of Biology at Andrews University, and lives at 216 Hillcrest Drive, Berrien Springs, Michigan 49103.

created them from (at, in) the beginning made them male and female" (the Creator speaking; see also Mark 10:6). Apparently our solar system and Adam and Eve were created in the same great event—the same six days, Creation Week. Ex. 20:11: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." Ps. 33:9: "For he spake and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast."

Apparently before Creation Week no part of our solar system was in existence, and during the six days, at the spoken work of the Creator, all basic types (kinds) of plants and animals came into being. There was no evolution of living things through millions of years. Bible chronology (Bible history) shows us that Creation Week was nearer 6,000 than either 5,000 or 7,000 years ago. There was perhaps no written divine revelation, as such, for the first twenty-five hundred years of earth history, from Adam to Moses. God's revelations were relayed by memory from father to son. Then the Bible was written during the next sixteen hundred years from Moses to John the Revelator. (But see Reference 2.)

Why could Adam not believe what he thought he saw on the subject of age of the landscape? The answer stands clearly revealed in special revelation (the Bible). Our earth was created, along with the living forms with which it was furnished, with an *appearance of age*. Adam's open-minded method could bring the right answers for innumerable problems, *provided the phenomenon under study was not complicated by the factor of geological age*. The same situation holds for us today.

Effects of the Flood

There are a few basic questions which each modern scientist must face if he is concerned with age dating. We live on an earth which came into being in an *unnatural* way and which had an *appearance of age*. Then some sixteen centuries after Creation Week our earth's surface was destroyed by a terrific *unnatural* cataclysm which we call Noah's "Flood." In this cataclysm water, wind, earth movements, and volcanism were used in *unnatural* ways. The magnitude of the destructive nature of these forces upon the surface of our earth is indicated by the *centering* of many great earthquakes *below* a depth of 400 miles.³ The cataclysmic nature of Noah's "Flood" goes beyond the limits of our understanding and wildest imagination. The turbulent waters may have reached depths of as much as eleven miles (as in the valley of the Ganges?), but other forces disrupted the surface on down to a depth of over 400 miles.

On the Length of the Days of Creation Week

Creationists sometimes say that the days of Creation Week were days of twenty-four hours. In so saying they are, of course, right in what they mean; but the statement may not be very useful. In fact, it would be useful only were "hour" defined independently. If an hour is a

The Necessity of Revelation

How only can we know the natural truth about the age of our earth? Adam could learn that truth only by special revelation. Today our students of earth science are studying an earth which came into being *unnaturally* with an *appearance of age*. Some sixteen centuries after that creation the surface of this earth was utterly destroyed (more here and less over there) by the *unnatural* activities of Noah's "Flood." Today it is fair to ask, How is it possible now to determine *in natural ways* the age of a surface which was both created and destroyed in *unnatural ways*? I submit the thesis that until man accepts the necessity of special revelation regarding our natural world, he will never know the truth about the age of our earth or the origin of life upon it.

My sympathies go out to our young scientists in this skeptical day. I, as a Bible-believing creationist, associated for nine years in a total of four non-church-related universities, know from first-hand experience what these young students face. They wish not to be a laughing stock before their more mature scientific colleagues. But in the matter of age determination each Bible-believing scientist will have to choose between accepting the untruths which inevitably result from acceptance of the uniformitarian myth—and thereby enjoying the approval of his more mature skeptical colleagues, or taking the consequences of standing firmly for the truth of the simple declarations of Genesis.

How strongly the natural man wants to believe everything he thinks he sees! But regarding age, Adam could not do that, even in a perfect world, and still he was very happy! Our own love for truth should help us follow his example. For many years I have steered my bark away from areas of study where geological age is involved, and still find the world full of challenging problems awaiting open-minded study. A semblance of uniformity existed from Adam to Noah's "Flood," and again from Noah's "Flood" to our day. I am a fairly reasonable uniformitarian for those two periods. However, I depend entirely on divine revelation (1) with regard to the work of Creation Week, and (2) with regard to the destruction and relaying of our earth's surface in Noah's Flood.

References

- ¹Worrad, Lewis H., Jr., 1977. God does not deceive men. *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 13 (4):199-201.
- ²Or, it may be, as some have held, that Moses edited Genesis from written records which had come down from the patriarchs. See, e.g., Wiseman, P.J., 1946. *New discoveries in Babylonia about Genesis*. Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, London.
- ³Howell, B.F., 1959. *Introduction to geophysics*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York. Section on seismology.

twenty-fourth of a day, then any kind of day whatsoever is of necessity one of twenty-four hours.

Is a better statement about the days of Creation not provided by Genesis 1:5, which says, in the Hebrew, something like: ". . . and the evening and the morning were one day"? In other words, a day consists of a period of darkness and a period of light.