

## Why Pharaoh Hatshepsut is not to be equated to the Queen of Sheba

In his article in issue 24(2), Clarke states that equating Hatshepsut to the Queen of Sheba is a pillar of Velikovsky. But this is not so. The pillar of Velikovsky is the need for revising the timeline downward, and this is abundantly clear in the latter's writings. If Clarke also believes that the timeline needs to be revised downward, one has to wonder why he is so critical of Velikovsky. Hatshepsut is merely a side show to the main event, and Clarke is knocking down a straw man.

I do agree with Clarke that the facts simply do not support Hatshepsut as the Queen of Sheba, contrary to what Down says. For one thing, the people, animals, and huts depicted in her tomb reliefs cannot be from Solomon's kingdom.<sup>1</sup> One might question why ships would be needed for a trip from Egypt to Jerusalem. Moreover, there is no evidence that I can find that Hatshepsut herself ever went to Punt. The famous description and reliefs of the expedition, left to us on her tomb, clearly indicate that she sent this expedition to Punt,<sup>2</sup> something that neither Clarke nor Down mention, oddly. Where did we get the idea that she herself went? If she had gone in person, one would have expected that she would be prominently shown many times in the drawings of the Punt expedition, since Egyptian pharaohs are not noted for being shy, but she is totally missing (except after the ships returned). Indeed, one would be surprised if the pharaoh of Egypt herself would risk heading off on a bold and potentially dangerous expedition to this mysterious land, and be gone for an indefinite period of time. Keeping a grip on the rule of Egypt was hard enough at best, considering that the country tended to fall apart at the slightest opportunity. (Our romantic view of Egypt as a mostly unified country is rather a myth,

as a careful study of its history shows, and we do well to be skeptical of the unsubstantiated and self-serving claims to ruling the entire country made by various pharaohs.)

However, I strongly contest Clarke's statement that the rejection of Velikovsky's revised chronology was not simply due to "establishment bias or anti-biblical agendas". That is exactly the reason why the mainstream historians and Egyptologists so forcefully 'attacked' Velikovsky. He was daring to question their precious chronology, and even show that the Bible might be right on some things.

The whole point is that in being the first in recent times to show the need to revise the accepted secular timeline of history, Velikovsky was a brilliant and courageous man, ahead of his time. How easy for all others after him to take 'pot shots' at details they disagree with. Somehow Clarke's anti-Velikovsky rhetoric rings hollow. All of us who are working on timeline revision should recognize that we owe Velikovsky for lighting the way.

If Clarke is preparing more articles aimed against Velikovsky, this will only serve to add to the numerous 'attacks' on Velikovsky since 1952. I am curious to know what Clarke's own preferred timeline is.

Anne Habermehl  
Cortland, NY

UNITED STATES of AMERICA

### References

1. Moritz, G.L., Dominy, N. and Ikram, S., Baboons, Stable Isotopes, and the Location of Punt, *61<sup>st</sup> Annual Meeting of The American Research Center in Egypt*, Oakland, CA, 23–25 April 2010. Scientists have narrowed down the source of the baboons gifted to Queen Hatshepsut (mummified after their death) to the region between Ethiopia and Eritrea. See online report of this event at [arce.org/events/annualmeeting/2010highlights](http://arce.org/events/annualmeeting/2010highlights).
2. Breasted, J.H., *Ancient Records of Egypt: Vol. II The Eighteenth Dynasty*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1906; pp. 102–122. For example, when the expedition returned from Punt, the god Amun said: "They have brought all the marvels, every beautiful thing of God's-Land, for which thy majesty sent them [emphasis mine]".

Patrick Clarke replies:

I would like to thank Habermehl for taking the time to write. I will respond in a slightly different order to that set out in her letter, which I note does not actually attempt to deal with much, if any, of the substance within my article.

It seems inappropriate to accuse others of being anti-Velikovsky as if the man were some paragon of scholarly virtue; a major part of the problem lay with Velikovsky himself. He was not trained as a Sumerologist, neither as an Egyptologist, but that is not the main point; it is that being not content with limiting himself to the sometimes restrictive facts, he allowed his imagination to range far and wide. His speculations often outran his observations. That is precisely the point of my writing the first of a long series of articles demonstrating just that.

As I wrote in reply to David Down,<sup>1</sup> it is not about discrediting the man. If his works are, however, of consistently poor scholarship or worse, as my series of articles will continue to show, then inevitably they serve to discredit him *themselves*. But that is hardly a justification to 'shoot the messenger' who exposes poor scholarship, or to impugn the motives of anyone doing so. The key question for readers of a scholarly journal like this should be whether the criticisms are valid or not.

This is why I am not impressed by Habermehl's view that Velikovsky was a brave pioneer, because it is hardly relevant. My concern (and I suggest it should be the prime concern for everyone in this matter) is whether the works of Velikovsky are in fact based on sound scholarship, and all the indications are that they are not. The historians and Egyptologists that Habermehl attacks were merely pointing out the obvious; she is speculating about their motives. It would be equally irrelevant to speculate about the motives of Velikovsky, who was an atheist.



Relief at Karnak's 'Red Chapel' depicting Hatshepsut (left) and the goddess Seshat (right), and not Solomon and the Queen of Sheba as proposed by Muslim author Ossama Alsaadawi.

So the point here is whether the criticisms of his work are valid, and nothing Habermehl says in her letter has addressed this. I would encourage her to reread the section in my article where Sachs, an eminent cuneiformist, challenged Velikovsky's non-existent scholarship in this area way back in 1961. Velikovsky had 19 years in which to respond and failed to do so. So the claim that "various and sundry people have been knocking him [Velikovsky]" and "this grows wearisome" is again hardly relevant. It is not wearisome at all for seekers of the truth.

Surely Habermehl is not suggesting that I have the right to point out failures in a model *only* if I have put my own model forward first? The Bible must be the inerrant and authoritative starting point for any creationist enquiry on all subjects. For my part, I have steadfastly maintained that the conventional (i.e. long-age) chronologies for the *entire* Ancient Near East are manifestly in error and in certain cases (i.e. Egypt) by several centuries. My position is further made clear in the Erratum, of issue 24(2), p. 43.

I appreciate Habermehl's agreement with my overall contention

re Hatshepsut and Sheba, although why Hatshepsut's "keeping a grip on the rule of Egypt" should be of concern is not apparent. It has no bearing on my article. For the record, Queen Elizabeth I of England (surely a comparable example) had a protector in Sir Francis Walsingham: Hatshepsut had her 'Walsinghams' in Senemut and his deputy Thuity. That is why both rulers survived as long as they did. After the death of the three Egyptians, their tombs and memorials were severely damaged, not, it seems, by Thutmose III, but by political opponents exacting belated revenge.

It seems hard to understand, too, how anyone familiar with Velikovsky can claim that the Hatshepsut/Sheba synchronisation was "merely a sideshow", as Habermehl claims. Velikovsky certainly did not think so; he actually spent a full 38 pages<sup>2</sup> in his book<sup>3</sup> labouring this very point.

Habermehl says that the H-S matter cannot be 'a pillar' because something else, in her view, is 'the pillar' (emphases added for clarity). This is confusing, and only has the effect of muddying the concept of what someone's foundational belief or supposition is, *cf.* the well-known philosophical concept of 'pillars'—these purport to support a conclusion. No thesis, including Velikovsky's, will stand without mutually supportive pillars of thought and argumentation to support it. Remove some, or all, of these pillars and the structure will collapse. If the two pillars, Hatshepsut/Sheba and Thutmose/Shishak, collapse so too does Velikovsky's chronology. It's as simple as that. However, that does not mean that therefore no revised chronology is possible, which may be the basic concern that is causing supporters of the Velikovskian Inspired Chronology (VIC) so much anxiety.

In any case, if truth means having to go 'back to the drawing board' in any

area, then so be it. A manmade system, argument or model may, for a time, appear to be highly useful in defending God's Word, but it is not that Word itself. We need to beware if we start to feel threatened by criticisms of any 'favoured argument' in creationism, because it may reflect an emotional commitment to the argument—or even sometimes to the person or persons putting it forward. If our presupposition is that His Word is truth, but one attempted 'harmonisation' fails, it doesn't mean that the Bible is in error. It should motivate us to search more diligently for answers that *do* accord with the historical facts, knowing that such answers are there. And in the light of that, we may discover that our original attempt at harmonisation was not actually the 'failure' we first thought it to be.

Concerning Habermehl's apparent irritation at the arguments emerging one issue of the *Journal* at a time, I am constrained by word number restrictions when writing in this *Journal*, as would be true for most similar ones.<sup>4</sup> It would be my preference to refute these Velikovskian arguments in one comprehensive effort. It would also make the abject failure of the VIC more immediately apparent, and probably avoid some of these exchanges in the process. But absent the greater freedom of, for example, books and lectures, I can deal with this only one subject at a time.

The point made at the end of my letter to Down is worth repeating here. Unless we defend the Word of God with a high regard for truth and scholarship, we risk discrediting the very thing we seek to uphold.

Patrick Clarke  
Éréac, Bretagne  
FRANCE

## References

1. Patrick Clarke replies, Letters to the Editor, *J. Creation* 24(3):40, 2010.
2. This equates to over 10% of the book proper (act. 11.6%). Clearly Velikovsky did not think it a sideshow.

3. Velikovsky, I., *Ages in Chaos*, Chapter 3, pp. 99–136, Abacus Edition, Sphere Books Ltd., [Where? City? Country?] 1973.
4. See any *Journal of Creation*: Instructions to Authors.

## Mature creation and seeing distant starlight

I am writing in regards to Don DeYoung's article in issue 24(3) where he argues for a mature creation as an explanation for the history of Genesis to align with modern cosmological observations. He rightly says that such a view is not refutable, and nor is a time dilation universe. He says also that all creationist worldviews contain some level of mature creation, which I agree with. The problem, though, that he does not address is the issue of false information in starlight. He claims the idea that God 'created the light in transit' is ok because it is equivalent to the mature creation of our sun or even to adult forms of life created on Earth. On some level this may be true, but the 'light in transit' remains a problem in terms of God's truthfulness. No doubt Don believes God to be 100% truthful, yet he sees no problem with false information in the light in transit, excusing it as being nevertheless true in the mind of God. But there is a problem still. In Psalm 91 (and other passages in the Bible) we are told that the heavens tell us of God's workmanship. Is this also only in the mind of God? Are all in the astrophysical heavens part of a big light show that has no reality such as we can discover with the rest of our senses here on Earth? I don't think so. So how do you justify 'light in transit' that does not relate back to real events in the past history of this universe?

If you want to take the approach of the least number of assumptions, an Occam's Razor,<sup>1</sup> a law of economy, then I would say that a time dilation model is a far simpler and better answer. For example, I could construct a cosmogony where the Creator makes the sun, the moon, the planets and all

the stars and galaxies on Day 4 of Creation Week, according to Genesis 1.<sup>2</sup> But he slows clocks on Earth during that day only. He makes some galaxies initially and spreads them out throughout the universe, like unfurling a flag or tent, not any stretching of the fabric of space, time or space-time. He continues creating throughout the Earth Day 4 of Creation Week but, as measured by astronomical clocks, that would have taken ten or more billion years of current Earth time. God creates at this point and can do as He likes. All the light we see today has travelled from the distant reaches of the cosmos. It all represents real events that occurred on those stars it came from. Nothing is 'in the mind of God' only. They are all real events. We can believe it to be true and the laws of nature (creation) are valid. After all, they are God's laws.

God simply created during Day 4, while Earth clocks ran nearly a trillion times slower than clocks in the rest of the universe. After Day 4 was finished, He set Earth clocks to run at the same rate as cosmic clocks, and you would not be able tell any difference from astronomical observations. However, that would be untestable today. It would be consistent with all we observe and also with the Genesis text but it would not have any 'light created in transit' assumption. So far in this I have only made one assumption—God created, *ex nihilo*, for some of the galaxies, at least, and they were created in various stages and during various times of Day 4. But that is quite consistent with the Genesis account, and all we see in the starlight *is* true history.

We don't even need to say He used a general relativistic time dilation mechanism, resulting from an expanding universe that was or was not accelerating at some time in the past. The universe does not need to be expanding at all, it could be static. You would only need to explain the many verses in the Bible which seem to say God spread out the heavens, but a plain reading of those verses would suggest that it was simply like rolling out and setting up a tent, and not that the tent was stretched out like a balloon. You

could not refute that either—even the Tolman test<sup>3</sup> on whether the universe is expanding or static, independent of cosmology, can not distinguish. The data fit either the standard model (expanding) or a static universe just as well, once all assumptions are taken into account. Also quasar oscillations show no evidence of time dilation as a function of redshift, and hence distance, if the cosmological distance interpretation for the Hubble Law is correct.

It seems that there is one fact we can rely on—the Hubble Law applies to galaxies, relating their magnitudes (and hence distance) with their redshifts. But you cannot irrefutably say the universe is expanding from that. Such expansion has never been observed in a lab environment. So a static universe, where the Hubble Law is valid, due to some as yet unknown other mechanism, though many ideas have been proposed, is as good as any. Maybe it is even the simplest.

And if we want to solve the big unknowns, the problems for the standard consensus<sup>4</sup> model of the origin and structure of the universe, the LCDM big bang inflation model, then a static universe like that described above could work. In that universe there is no exotic<sup>5</sup> dark matter, no dark energy,<sup>6</sup> no inflation (without a mechanism to start and stop it), no need to assign the source of the cosmic microwave background radiation to the cosmic fireball called the last scattering surface of the big bang (with wrinkles that were too small<sup>7</sup> and casting no shadows<sup>8</sup>) and no expansion.<sup>9</sup> All these 'unknowns' of big bang cosmology vanish. You even get a few side benefits—the horizon problem<sup>10</sup> is solved because the universe can be much bigger than we observe, but you just choose an age in astronomically measured time sufficiently long enough—finite but long enough for all the radiation to mix up throughout the whole universe and get a perfect black-body curve from the thermalisation of all the energy confined in the finite universe. Also one has no worries with the flatness problem because God simply creates