

The biblical minimum and maximum age of the earth

In the *Journal of Creation* article, ‘The biblical minimum and maximum age of the earth’, by Chris Hardy and Robert Carter, vol. 28(2):89–96, 2014, it states:

“And Clarke rejects Austin’s, and Ashton and Down’s, attempts at linking biblical chronology to Egyptian chronology because they base their ideas on Velikovsky, whom he claims has been thoroughly discredited.”

This statement concerning Clarke’s rejection of my biblical chronology because my ideas were supposedly based upon Velikovsky is decidedly wrong. I ask Hardy and Carter the question: “Where has Clarke claimed, in any one of his articles, that I have linked my biblical chronology to Egyptian chronology on the ideas of Velikovsky?” Surely the onus is on Hardy and Carter to reference even one article that makes this claim if their statement is to be believed. To my knowledge Clarke has not even seen, studied, or referred to my biblical chronology of the Old Testament (which is different, anyhow, from Velikovsky’s). Have Hardy and Carter studied Velikovsky’s chronology and compared it to mine? In my first 3–4 articles that were published in *Journal of Creation*, there is not a shred of evidence that Velikovsky’s chronology ever even entered my mind, so how could I find a basis for ideas of an ‘unchanged’ chronology from an ‘unknown source’? Philip Mauro’s interpretation of the Scripture in *The Wonders of Bible Chronology*, also Martin Anstey’s *The Romance of Bible Chronology*, were the ‘basis of ideas’ for these articles, and many

times I have replied to letters, articles, etc. from these sources.

In certain places in my articles I have agreed that Velikovsky’s dates of events have synchronized with my chronological dates of events, but these synchronizations were not the basis of my chronology.

I am asking, please, for Hardy and Carter, in reference to my biblical chronology, to completely retract their above statement if they cannot provide the requested evidence to support it.

David Austin
Tweed Heads South,
New South Wales,
AUSTRALIA

» Robert Carter replies:

It was our intention to stay as far away from the middle of these disputes as possible while at the same time drawing a ring around the various parties. We did include a brief description of the state of the art and a summary of only a few of the various contentions concerning biblical chronology, however, and this is what Austin has focused on. While his letter has nothing to do with our methodology or conclusions, Austin does raise an objection that we need to answer.

In ‘The Queen of Sheba and the Ethiopian problem’,¹ Clarke discusses Austin’s views thus:

“The central argument of David Austin’s 2012 Viewpoint in this Journal, ‘The Queen of the South’ is ‘the Queen of Egypt’² (hereafter QSQE).”

Then, in the next paragraph:

“The core of the QSQE this: if Jesus’ ‘Queen of the South’ can be linked to Daniel’s ‘King of the North’ (Syria), and ‘King of the South’ (Egypt), the Queen of the South must be Egyptian also. It all sounds very straightforward, but as we shall see, linking this idea to the notion of this queen being monarch

of Egypt and of a land or region called Æthiopia by Greek and Roman historians is not as simple as followers of Velikovsky’s revision would have us believe.”

And, in the third-to-last paragraph:

“If Velikovskians are as secure in their beliefs as they claim to be, they should easily be able to see off counter views such as mine without resorting to the sorts of fallacious and, at times, quite inappropriate tactics that, I have to say, have been rampant within the QSQE.”

These are direct references to Clarke thinking Austin has based his views (at least on the subject of the Queen of the South/Sheba/Egypt) on Velikovsky. But if on this one subject, and since Clarke directly accuses adherents to the QSQE of being ‘Velikovskian’, it is an easy extrapolation to link Austin’s entire biblical chronology to Velikovsky *in the mind of Clarke*. Thus, we have no need to retract anything and there is no reason to debate the matter here. This is an issue between Austin and Clarke and we would encourage Austin to take it up with him in these pages. We regret that we did not include this reference in our article as it would also have taken the onus off of us to prove why

Clarke rejects Austin’s views on at least this matter.

Robert W. Carter
CMI
UNITED STATES of AMERICA

References

1. Clarke, P., The Queen of Sheba and the Ethiopian problem, *J. Creation* 27(2):55–61, 2013; creation.com/images/pdfs/tj/j27_2/j27_2_55-61.pdf.
2. Here he references Austin, D., ‘The Queen of the South’ is ‘the Queen of Egypt’, *J. Creation* 26(3):79, 2012; creation.com/images/pdfs/tj/j26_3/j26_3_79-84.pdf.