Creation: The Time and Manner of the Earth's Creation II

Author(s): B.H. Roberts
Source: *The Truth, The Way, The Life: An Elementary Treatise on Theology (2nd Edition)*
Editor(s): John W. Welch
Published: Provo, UT: BYU Studies, 1996
Page(s): 237–245

25

Creation: The Time and Manner of the Earth's Creation II

"Creation" and God. As in the case of the time period of creation, so in the "manner" of creation, we may not wholly accept either of the theories or any of the variations of them proposed. We start, of course, with God as the Creator of the earth and its heavens. They were created at his command, and by his power, and under the operation of laws of creation. All which, however, does not require us to believe that the creation of the earth and its heavens was made instantly, as by magic, or by any absolutely new process; nor that the things "created," any more than the order, were new and for the first time produced. Both the things created and the order of their production must have been many times repeated in the multitudinous worlds of the universe, where creations in some manner have been going on eternally.

If, as we have presented the case in previous chapters, there are older worlds than ours in existence, inhabited by myriads of forms of life, vegetable and animal, such as live in the seas and fly in the air and roam over the plains and through the forests; and if, as we have set forth in previous chapters, the superior intelligences of older worlds have mastered the problems not only of interplanetary and intersolar system communication, but also of interplanetary transportation, indeed universal communication and transportation throughout the universe—then it is possible that some method of transportation may have been employed in conveying life in varied forms from other worlds to ours.

Earth life by migrations from other worlds. This theory of bringing life forms from outside our earth to ~~it~~ ***the earth*** is not without the support of scientific names of high standing. It is held by both Helmholtz[a]

---

[a]Hermann Ludwig Ferdinand von Helmholtz (1821–94) was a versatile physiologist and theoretical physicist best known for his work in physiological optics, acoustics, and the conservation of force.

and Lord Kelvin,[b] and others, in good scientific standing, viz., "that minute living creatures may have come to the earth from elsewhere, in the cracks of a meteorite or among cosmic dust." As the author of the *Outline of Science* continues:

> It must be remembered that seeds can survive prolonged exposure to very low temperatures; and spores of bacteria can survive high temperature; that seeds of ⟨planets⟩ [plants] and germs of animals in a state of "latent life" can survive prolonged drought and absence of oxygen. It is possible, according to Berthelot,[c] that as long as there is no molecular disintegration vital activities may be suspended for a time, and may afterwards recommence when appropriate conditions are restored. Therefore, one should be slow to say that a long journey through space is impossible.[d] The obvious limitation of Lord Kelvin's theory ⟨just what is stated above⟩ is that it only shifts the problem of the origin of organisms (i.e., living creatures) from the earth to elsewhere.[1]

All that need be said in answer to this alleged limitation of Lord Kelvin's theory is, that in an eternal universe, where neither life nor life forms ***may*** have any absolute beginning, all life and many forms of life being equally eternal with the eternal universe, the supposed limitations named by Thompson[e] have no existence, and consequently no problem of the origin of life or of forms of life, both being eternal.

The development of life forms. The transportation of a few forms of life, varieties from other worlds, would doubtless be sufficient from which to develop all our earth life forms; for it is certain that development of varied forms of life goes on in the vegetable and animal kingdoms of our world—a limited development, however, of life forms, each within the limits of its kind, so that from a comparatively few

---

[b]William Thomson (Baron Kelvin of Largs) (1824–1907) was an outstanding physical scientist best known for his role in initiating the theory of electromagnetic fields, and the development of the Kelvin scale of absolute temperature.

[c]Pierre Eugene Marcel Berthelot (1827–1907) was a distinguished organic and physical chemist best known for his work in synthesis of organic compounds, reaction velocity theory, and heats of reactions.

[d]Most scientists today would suggest that the x-ray and ultraviolet radiation in space would be lethal to any unprotected organisms and thus make this theory untenable. However, a few scientists still consider it viable, most notably Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramansinghe, in *Evolution from Space* (London: Dent, 1981).

[1]Thomson, *Outline of Science* 1:61.

[e]J. Arthur Thomson (1861–1933) was a professor of Natural History at the University of Aberdeen. He is credited with being one of the first to popularize the harmonization of religion and science.

forms of life there may have arisen all the multitudinous forms that have inhabited the earth. This theory of development within certain group-forms, rather than by absolute mechanical or creative evolution starting with one primeval substance, or life "stuff"—the protoplasm of the scientists—may have been the process from which has been produced and differentiated all forms of life even up to production of the human race—meaning, as to the last, production from one primeval pair.

The difference here set forth in what we shall call "the development theory" and the theory of the generally accepted evolution of science consists in this: The development theory above outlined leaves room for the operation of the great propagative and "development law," namely, that each great kingdom or subdivision of life named in Genesis 1 produces after its kind, whereas evolution in all its forms destroys that thought and holds that all the varied forms of life have been absolutely produced by evolutionary processes, and leaves no line of estoppage[f] between ~~even~~ the kingdoms, ~~the classes~~ ***orders, families, genera, classes,*** or the species of vegetable and animal life forms.[g]

Kinds of evolution. In the interest of clearness a further word as to various kinds of evolution is necessary. Three kinds are usually recognized: (1) Materialistic evolution. This denies everything but matter and motion in the evolutionary process. This I refer to as "mechanical evolution." (2) Agnostic evolution. This "postulates an 'unknown' and 'unknowable' as the basis and explanation of the process." This is the evolution basis (or lack of basis) of the Spencer, Huxley, and Fiske[h]

---

[f]*Estop* is an archaic word meaning to impede, stop up, or prohibit. Apparently Roberts coined the word estoppage in this context to mean gaps in the evolutionary process that are stopped up or uncrossable between taxa.

[g]Roberts's reasoning here is incongruent. While suggesting that life on earth developed from a "few forms" brought to earth from other worlds, he also seems to claim that because each form was to produce "after its kind," there were many taxonomic levels which could not be bridged by further development of evolution, for example, "kingdoms, orders, families, genera, classes, or the species." Such a position cannot account for the diversity of life on earth. Roberts's thesis that life developed from only a "few forms" of life would require the occurrence of development between some taxonomic levels.

[h]These three men were the most prominent of Darwin's early supporters. Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) postulated evolution many years before Darwin. His ideas influenced A. R. Wallace, who later helped Darwin develop his theory of Natural Selection. Thomas Henry Huxley (1825–95), perhaps the most vocal of Darwin's proponents, is credited with coining the word "agnostic" to describe his lack of belief in the "revealed religion" of his day, especially as it explained the

school of evolutionists—the general school of evolutionists. (3) "Theistic evolution," which assumes God or Mind in some way back of all working, with results along the unalterable line of natural law, "and by physical force exclusively"; but working, perhaps, towards some definite far-off, though unknown end, or event. This is sometimes regarded as purposeful evolution. Also it is referred to as "creative evolution" of which Henri Bergson[i] is perhaps the most prominent proponent.[2]

The great law of life. The development theory which I am setting forth as the Bible story of creation differs from both agnostic and creative or theistic evolution (mechanical or materialistic evolution is not considered at all) ~~is~~ **in** this: that both these forms of evolution start with an homogeneous substance which is differentiated into gases and liquids and solids (inorganic evolution), thence into life substance and simple forms of life; thence into more complex life forms, until there is produced by an ever differentiating process all the life forms known: whereas the development theory of this chapter and work recognizes and starts with the eternity of life—the life force; and the eternity of some life forms, and the possibilities of these forms, perhaps in embryonic status, or in their simplest forms (save as to man) are transplanted to newly created worlds there to be developed each to its highest possibilities, by propagation, and yet within and under the great law of life of Genesis 1, viz., each "after," and within, "its kind" (Gen. 1:11–12, 21, 24–25).

Bible creation: Progressive creation in Genesis.[3] The revelation of God on creation contained in Genesis 1–2 gives evidence of the existence of creation by propagative and development processes, which let us now consider.

---

creation of life on earth. In contrast, John Fiske (1842–1901) was a devout believer in God. A versatile lawyer, historian, and scientist, he is credited with presenting Darwin's ideas in a light more palatable to Christians.

[i]Henri Louis Bergson (1859–1941) was a prominent French philosopher. His most famous work, *L'Evolution Creatrice,* deals with the evolutionary theory and attributes the guiding force of evolution to an *élan vital* which has been viewed to mean both God and nature.

[2]See "Creative Evolution" by Henri Bergson; the French original is translated into English by Arthur Mitchell, Ph.D., and is published by Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1911.

[3]Compare creation account in [the] book of Moses and the book of Abraham; also in allusions to [it] in other revelations of the New Dispensation, Doctrine & Covenants passim: they will be found in agreement with the Bible.

To begin with there is in the whole chapter of first Genesis a succession of creative acts that shows the developing process:

First: The existence of chaos, material in chaotic state, void and with darkness brooding over it. Then the Spirit of God moves throughout the watery, vapory mass, and God speaks and says: Let there be light and there is light; and he divides the light from the darkness, and this was the work of the first creative day or period.

Second: And God said, let there be a firmament (i.e., division) in the midst of the waters which are under the firmament, from the waters which are above the firmament (necessarily expanse between) and the firmament was called heaven. This was the work of the second creative day or period.

Third: God also said, "Let the waters under the heaven ⟨or firmament⟩ be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so" (Gen. 1:9). The dry land was called earth, and the gathering together of the waters, sea. God also said in this period, "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, ⟨and⟩ the fruit tree yielding fruit, after his kind, . . . whose seed ⟨is⟩ [should be] in itself, . . . And the earth brought forth grass, ⟨the⟩ [every] herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed ⟨was⟩ [should be] in itself, after his kind" (Moses 2:11–12). And this was the third creative day or period.

Fourth: In the fourth creative period our earth was brought into such relationships or changed conditions *as* to other spheres that the great lights in the world system to which our earth belongs, ***produced*** our ordinary day and night ~~was produced~~. The light period being called day, and the darkness night (Gen. 1:14–19).

Fifth: In the fifth period God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life; and let the flying creatures that fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven appear. The living creatures of both the waters and the fowls of the air were to reproduce after their kind, and this "abundantly." And God in this fifth period made the beasts of the earth, after their kind; and cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth on the earth, after its own kind; and God saw that it was good.

Sixth: Then came the sixth creative period in which man was created—that is, be it remembered, formed or fashioned. And in man's production there seems to have been something special or peculiar, for God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" (Gen. 1:26). This is not said of any of the other creations; and the proposition further was that to man should be given dominion over all the rest of the creation; over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, the cattle, and

over all the earth. "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it" (Gen. 1:27–28). Every herb, vegetable and animal creation the Lord also gave unto man for his food. And God saw everything that he had made, "and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. 1:31). Thus closed the sixth creative period, followed by a seventh period, designated as a day of rest, the creation having been sufficiently completed to meet the purposes of God at that time.

Thus from chaos to the production of man, in an orderly unfolding development from lower to higher forms, from simple to constantly increasing complexity, but running throughout the whole course of such development is the iteration and reiteration that the forms of life are to produce each after his kind. When we arrive at the creation of man, undoubtedly the same creative law is followed—he is produced after his kind. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness"; which is only equivalent to saying, after our kind. This "after his kind," the law of creation, is iterated and reiterated nine times in this short chapter on creation! The emphasis must be important.[4]

Power of life in the earth, sea, and air. One other thing to be observed. The creation account says: "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth" (Gen. 1:11). "Let the earth bring forth!" As if a power was in the earth to produce life of varied forms. This in the second creative period. Let it be observed also that in this first period such mandate goes as to grasses, herbs, and fruit trees—the lower forms of life (i.e., vegetable life). Then in the fourth period, "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the [moving] creature that hath life, and fowl that ⟨they⟩ may fly above the earth in the [open] firmament" (Gen. 1:20). As if power were in the sea to produce life, and in the air to produce the living creature. "And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the ⟨air⟩ [earth]" (Gen. 1:22). Turning again to the earth, in the thirty-fourth verse, after God had said in the eleventh verse, "Let the earth bring forth grass, etc.," he now says, contemplating a larger earth life: Let the earth bring forth the living creature, the creeping thing, the lower forms of earth-animal life, and beasts of the earth, including cattle, higher forms of animal life, "after their kind." This address to

---

[4]The treatment of the creation of man for earth and especially of Adam and the kind of being he was at his advent upon the earth, is considered in chapters 30, 31, and 33, below.

earth, and sea, and again to earth, would rather indicate that these had productive life powers of varied kinds within them.

Creative development sustained by some scientists. As already stated, such a theory as to origin of living creatures upon the earth is not without advocates of sufficient high standing to command respect. Under the heading of "Origin of Living Creatures Upon the Earth," as a third answer to the question of how life originated, J. Arthur Thomson, author of the *Outline of Science* points out that some have held

> that living creatures of a very simple sort may have emerged on the earth's surface from not-living material, e.g. from some semi-fluid carbon compounds activated by ferments. The tenability of this view is suggested by the ~~adjustments~~ ***achievements*** of the synthetic chemists, who are able artificially to build up substances such as oxalic acid, indigo, salicylic acid, caffeine, and grape-sugar. We do not know, indeed, what in Nature's laboratory would take the place of the clever synthetic chemists, but there seems to be a tendency to complexity. Corpuscles form atoms,[j] atoms form molecules, small molecules large ones. . . . So far as we know of what goes on to-day, there is no evidence of spontaneous generation; organisms seem always to arise from pre-existing organisms of the same kind; where any suggestion of the contrary has been fancied, there have been flaws in the experimenting. But it is one thing to accept the verdict "omne vivum e vivo" ⟨all life from life⟩ as a fact, to which experiment has not yet discovered an exception and another thing to maintain that this must always have been true or must always remain true.[5]

This statement Mr. Thomson follows with the sympathetic paragraph which I here quote:

> If the synthetic chemists should go on surpassing themselves, if substances like white of egg should be made artificially, and if we should get more light on possible steps by which simple living creatures may have arisen from not-living materials, this would not greatly affect our general outlook on life, though it would increase our appreciation of what is often libelled as "inert" matter. If the dust of the earth did naturally give rise very long ago to living creatures, if they are in a real sense born of her and of the sunshine, then the whole world becomes more continuous and more vital, and all the inorganic groaning and travailing becomes more intelligible.[6]

---

[j]The corpuscular theory of matter first became popular in the seventeenth century. Essentially it was the belief that all matter consists of tiny particles called corpuscles. Roberts uses the term here to refer to sub-atomic particles.

[5]Thomson, *Outline of Science* 1:61–62.

[6]Thomson, *Outline of Science* 1:62.

Let this be as it may as to the origin of life in the earth, ***or at least as to some forms of it,*** it need not affect our view here set forth ~~that~~ ***as to*** life, and especially ***as to*** the higher forms of life; and ~~again~~, especially ***of*** human forms of life, ~~may have been~~ ***which beyond doubt were*** transplanted from some of the older and more highly developed worlds. And from a few ~~such forms~~ ***other*** transported ***forms of life*** to the earth, there could be development of varied kinds of life yet adhering closely to the great law of creation, so constantly repeated—"each after his kind." Not necessarily rigidly limited to stereotyped individual forms, but developing the kinds from the subdivisions of vegetable and animal kingdoms into various species through development from primeval forms; and for man a divine origin after his kind, bearing the image of God, his Father.

The "terror" of anthropomorphism. Theologians, in their efforts to provide means of escape from a too rigid anthropomorphism, would fain interpret this "image" of God to mean, not the full length portrait or image of God, but a so-called "moral image." "The likeness to God," says one commentator, "lies in the mental and moral features of man's character, such as reason, personality, free will, the capacity for communion with God."[7] But this is pure assumption on the part of the theologians—this limitation of the "image of God" to these mental and moral qualities. We have a right from the scripture record to the inclusion of the physical features as well as to the mental and moral qualities, and do not have to yield anything to the "terror of anthropomorphism," which is affected by the theologians and philosophers to maintain the conceptions of God as immaterial being, which their antecedents of bygone ages adopted from the pagan philosophies current two thousand years ago. It is no more dishonoring to God to think of him as having impressed his physical likeness upon man, than to have impressed upon him a mental and moral image. The highest development of spiritual manifestation in our earth is by a spirit in association with a body—in a word, with man. Where is spirituality more highly developed than in the case of the Lord Jesus Christ? And especially after his resurrection, when spirit and body had become indissolubly united, never again to be separated, not now separated, but still living in union, spirit and body united as it was on that sun-kissed hill in Galilee, when in that resurrected form he appeared to his disciples and stretching forth his arms, as if to embrace the heavens as well as the earth, he cried:

---

[7]Dummelow, *Commentary,* 5.

> All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. . . . And, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. (Matt. 28:18–20)

That moment God, through the Christ, was most perfectly manifested unto man; and beyond that occasion there has been no superior spiritual manifestation, no higher type given of spirit life and form than in that well-attested incident in the life of the Christ. This the manifestation or revelation of God in the flesh: for such was Jesus Christ—God manifested in the flesh. Witness the scripture: "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory" (1 Tim. 3:16). All in plain allusion to the Christ.

On this showing we may conclude that the highest development of the spiritual is in its connection with the physical, and always will be so in God's creation of man in his own image and in his own likeness, male and female. This is what God is working at in creation—as we shall see later—the bringing to pass the indissoluble union of spirit and element, in which union man can attain to his highest development and greatest joy.

And why should it be thought incredible that God should be in human form? Or derogatory to his dignity or nature? Of all life forms, man's unquestionably is ***the*** most excellent in all things; most beautiful; most convenient; most noble. Shakespeare did not overdraw the picture of man when he exclaimed of him: "How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form and moving how express and admirable! In action, how like an angel! In apprehension, how like a God!"[8]

The crowning glory of the "creation" also is he; begotten after his kind—a son of God!

---

[8]Shakespeare *Hamlet,* II, ii, 303–8.

Further references recommended by Roberts for this lesson: Bergson, *Creative Evolution;* Duncan, *New Knowledge;* Headley, *Problems of Evolution;* Howison, *The Limits of Evolution;* Kaempffort, *Science-History of the Universe,* vols. 5, 7, and 10; Kinns, *Harmony of the Bible with Science;* and Roberts, "Man's Relationship to Deity," in *Gospel*, 3d. ed.