

Krause provides clear evidence of the unfavorable reaction Gosse's book received. For example, a review in *The Geologist* stated that *Omphalos* was:

. . .unworthy of Mr. Gosse, and indeed of anybody else, in its doctrine . . .  
.the world itself is thus, like everything else, made to offer a fallacious display of an antiquity it does not possess. As if God could create anything with the impression of untruth upon it. . . .

And Charles Kingsley, the Anglican clergyman who was a good friend of Gosse, wrote to him:

If we accept the fact of absolute creation, God becomes a *Deus guidam deceptor*. I do not mean merely in the case of fossils which *pretend* to be the bones of dead animals, but in the one single case of your newly created scars on the pandanus trunk, and your newly created Adam's navel, you make God tell a lie. It is not my reason but my conscience which revolts here.

And Kingsley wrote: "I would not for a thousand pounds put your book into my children's hands."

Krause states that the belief in apparent age is an integral part of the world-view espoused by Whitcomb and Morris in their 1961 book, *The Genesis Flood* and observes:

The version of apparent age advocated by Henry Morris and his followers seems to contain a fundamental flaw that was not present in the world of Gosse. Gosse accepted the reality of the evidence for great age and explained it, in a consistent manner, as 'prochronic.' in *The Genesis Flood* and *Scientific Creationism* (to pick just two examples) however, the authors confusedly oscillate between two incompatible positions. On the one hand, the claim is made that certain evidences seem to indicate that the world is 'young.' These evidences are then accepted as being the result of processes that actually occurred in real time. Faced with other evidences that indicate that the world is 'old,' however, the apparent age doctrine is then invoked to explain why the implications of these evidences need not be accepted. This seems to be an obvious attempt to both have and eat the proverbial cake. Thus, apparent age as utilized by present age 'creationists' does not correspond to its consistent use by Gosse, but rather bears a distinctly closer resemblance to its use by the early apologists of the 19th century who, when geology was first developing, invoked apparent age primarily to explain away data that could not be otherwise reconciled with a short time scale. While this oscillation between mutually incompatible alternatives may indeed provide a quick, convenient answer to any possible objection, it hardly seems to be an adequate base upon which to build a satisfying scientific worldview.