

OG KJELL TVETER SKRIVER ...

"We have long believed that (and explained why) one of the most dangerous attacks on biblical authority in evangelical circles today is not evolution but "progressive creationism"". (Jonathan Sarfati)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; juli 2018

"Jeg er i en ganske spesiell situasjon", skriver Kjell Johannes Tveter, Dagen 04.02.15, "Jeg møter motstand både fra ungjerd-kreasjonister og fra teistiske evolusjonister. Jeg befinner meg midt imellom. Jeg har aldri argumentert mot ungjerd-kreasjonister, og kommer heller aldri til å gjøre det. Til det har jeg altfor stor respekt for mennesker som sterkt ønsker å være bibeltro. Jeg forsøker i stedet å gjøre rede for hvor jeg står og hva jeg mener - og jeg ønsker også å være bibeltro."

Tveters seneste bok, Tro for en tid som denne - om et kristent verdensbilde, er, som hans tidligere bøker, så ymse. En kan eks.vis med utbytte og skadesløst lese kapitlet om Frankfurterskolen.

En kunne undres hvordan Tveters bøker ville artet seg om forfatteren eks.vis var kosmolog eller geolog; men han er ikke.

"Min medisinske bakgrunn har gjort det naturlig for meg å være mer opptatt av biologiske forhold enn kosmologiske. Da jeg fikk kjennskap til orfan-gener, følte jeg at de passet godt med progressiv skapelse... Ved å tilføre en eksisterende art ny informasjon i DNA i form av orfan-gener, kan dette føre til at den eksisterende arten omdannes til en helt ny art."

"... faller det naturlig å betrakte orfan-gener som et resultat av intelligent årsak. Det vil si at orfan-gener er fullt forenlig med en styrt utvikling av livet. For en kristen som ikke utelukker at jorda kan være gammel, vil orfan-gener kunne oppfattes som et uttrykk for at Gud tilfører noe av det bestående liv ny informasjon slik at nye arter kan oppstå. Det er altså dette syn som kalles progressiv skapelse."

"Opp til nå har det vært slik at hvis jorden er gammel, må livet jo ha utviklet seg, og det har vært nærliggende å konkludere med at den vanlige evolusjonslæren da er sann. I løpet av de siste 150 år har millioner mistet sin kristne tro nettopp av denne grunn. Pastorer, lærere, forkynnere, ungdomsarbeidere, osv. har nå mulighet til å vise at en Skaper er til stede uansett hvor gammel jorden er. Det er faktisk den beste forklaring på dette som moderne vitenskap har vist oss." Skriver Tveter (s.235-6).

Mulig kan han på sitt vis vise at en skaper er til stede, men samtidig avvises Skaperens vitnesbyrd om når, hva og hvordan; (om når, dvs. jordens alder, se eks.vis Mark.10,6); "Jeg forstår ... ikke hva jordas alder kan bety for kristen tro. Det er vel utelukkende menneskehetens alder som har betydning", skriver Tveter (Dagen 04.02.15), men i flg. Jesus Kristus er jordens og menneskets alder den samme og menneskets alder er etter Skriften ca. 6000 år; hvilket må antas kjent for Tveter fra avisdebatter han har deltatt i samt fra "ungjerd-tidsskrifter" j"eg abonnerer på" (Dagen); men av en eller annen årsak preller det. "Jeg makter ganske enkelt ikke å forstå eller tro at vår jord er 6000 år. Siden lys fra stjerner kan bruke millioner av lysår for å nå fram til vår jord <(1)>, ser jeg ikke bort fra at jeg ville miste troverdighet hvis jeg gir uttrykk for at jorden er under 10.000 år." (Dagen)

Tveter skriver om "å tilføre en eksisterende art ny informasjon" som kan "føre til at den eksisterende arten omdannes til en helt ny art"; Gud beskriver en skapelse "hver efter sitt slag" (1.Mos.1) for noen tusen år tilbake, og ingen har observert hverken Darwins eller Tveters fantasier utfolde seg.

"... det er en som anklager eder, Moses... hadde I trodd Moses, da hadde I trodd mig... men tror I ikke hans skrifter, hvorledes kan I da tro mine ord?"; "Når jeg har sagt eder de jordiske ting, og I ikke tror, hvorledes skal I da tro om jeg sier eder de himmelske?" (Joh.5,45-6;3,12)

Å tro Skriften, å tro Kristus, har noe å "bety for kristen tro."
"Hvor var du da jeg grunnfestet jorden?" (Job 38,4)

2

"Intelligent Design er en rent vitenskapelig retning som ikke beskjeftiger seg med teologi, og derfor ikke uttaler seg om hvem/hva som er denne intelligente designer - selv om hovedtyngden av tilhengere av Intelligent Design er kristne." (s.234-5)

"Our success, <Phillip E.> Johnson assures us, "is all but inevitable ... <because> we are making a point of elementary logic that is irresistible once it is understood..."

... their official exclusion of the God of the Bible from their discussion really leaves them no other power system for changing the hearts and minds of materialists than their own finite intellects...

Such thinking actually sets up an enormous barrier against the true Intelligent Designer of the universe, Jesus Christ the Lord. In effect, He is being told to stay out of the battle. Since ID experts believe they can handle the enemy with their own resources, He is not needed. But Christ told us: "Apart from Me you can do nothing ..."

"One of the most astounding and shocking discoveries of Intelligent Design theorists is not the almost infinite and irreducible complexity of living organisms, but the almost total resistance to the implications of this on the part of materialistic scientists." (John C. Whitcomb; Jesus Christ Our Intelligent Designer - An Evaluation of the Intelligent Design Movement; pp.17-8)

Tveter fortsetter: "En retning som kombinerer Intelligent Design med kristen tro, heter "Progressiv Skapelse". Jeg har funnet at Progressiv Skapelse passer best med det synet jeg personlig har... Hugh Ross er en amerikansk <sic> astrofysiker som har etablert en egen nettside for progressiv skapelse. Den bærer navnet "Reason <sic> To Believe". Ross har også skrevet flere bøker." (Kana- diske Hugh Norman Ross drifter California-baserte Reasons to Believe, i flg. Sarfati 2011.)

Og vi er forsåvidt over i Jonathan David Sarfati's bok Refuting Compromise - A Biblical and Scientific Refutation of "Progressive Creationism" (Billions of Years), As Popularized by Astronomer Hugh Ross (2.ed. 2011), en bok Answers in Genesis President Ken Ham antar "a classic on the same scale as <H. Morris' & J.C. Whitcomb's> The Genesis Flood."

Sarfati (p.19): "Why Write Such a "Negative" Book?

Something more must be said about why the approach in this book is necessary. In one sense, this is written with a heavy heart, and with the overriding emphasis that our intention is not personal attack. Our mandate is to defend the faith and the authority of Scripture. We have long believed that (and explained why) one of the most dangerous attacks on biblical authority in evangelical circles today is not evolution but "progressive creationism", and we aim to prove this conclusively in this book. This widespread compromise with the plain words of Scripture is capable of immense harm, precisely because it is proclaimed as being done in the name of upholding Scripture. The issue is so vital, as it involves the way we handle the very Word of God. Hopefully, the reader will see why this is no mere "side issue" or an example of a "critical spirit" toward someone who just happens to have a different (by implication legitimate) exegetical view. We need to be like the Bereans, commended by Paul in Acts 17:11, checking the Scriptures about all such matters."

Pp.280-1: "Ross concludes The Genesis Question by encouraging readers to test everything that they hear or read (GQ:192). I have taken up Ross's own suggestion and have applied it to his book. Ross' claims fail almost every test of both theology and science. As charitable as one might want to be, the following conclusion is inescapable: Hugh Ross plays fast and loose with the facts and makes seriously unsound arguments. In fact, much of what he says has been conjectured, with little thought, by others, and was also shown to be incorrect a long time ago. It is unfortunate that so many unsuspecting and sincere

Christians take Ross's teachings seriously. They may think that Ross's rather contrived synthesis of the Book of Genesis and conventional evolutionary geology has actually effected reconciliation between science and the Bible. As we have seen (and much more could be said about this), it has done no such thing. Far from it. Conventional scientific opinion has no use for any divine involvement in earth's past. And trying to make the Book of Genesis support long ages of time and a local flood is completely contrary to both the Bible and science, not to mention self-contradictory and self-defeating."

"Hugh Ross complains that creationists are "sifting science" and that "not much real science gets through". Ironically, Ross's approach of attempting to marry the Book of Genesis with large parts of the evolutionary-uniformitarian paradigm sifts both science and theology into an incoherent mess, which ends up satisfying neither science nor Scripture. Intelligent believers have, to a considerable extent, come to appreciate the efforts of creationist scientists - unlike Ross, who denigrates them (GQ:11). It is these very scientists who work tirelessly to free all of science from the rationalistic shackles which have held it for the last two centuries, and to erect a brand-new paradigm which will be faithful both to Scripture and to the actual empirical scientific evidence."

"I dag vet vi at universet har blitt til engang i en fjern fortid - for 13.8 milliarder år siden, sier vitenskapen. Universets begynnelse har fått navnet Big Bang." "Selve universets begynnelse - Big Bang - var et ørlite punkt, faktisk mindre enn kjernen i hydrogen... Hvordan kan vårt univers stamme fra et så lite punkt? Det ligger langt utenfor vår fatteevne. Det blir vanskelig - for ikke å si umulig - å komme utenom en allmektig Skaper." (s.155.157)

Alex Williams & John Hartnett (Dismantling the Big Bang p.54) forklarer: "Progressive creationists present big-bang cosmology as the only possible explanation for two apparent reasons. One is that they do not want to upset their evolutionist colleagues by making "offensive" claims about a young earth. The other is that astronomy is producing some remarkable evidences of intelligent design and they are keen to use the science for ideological purposes in evangelism."

"The big bang is a keystone of Ross's apologetics. He made up his mind as a teenager that the big bang was a fact. And then he decided that the creation days could not have been 24 hours long. Now, as an astronomer, the big bang is a crux of his apologetics." (Sarfati p.385)

Williams & Hartnett fortsetter: "Why do we take exception to these points of view? We have both scientific and theological reasons. Scientifically, we reject big-bang cosmology because it falls short of a satisfactory explanation of origins - and is, as we shall see, demonstrably wrong anyway. Theologically, we reject big-bang cosmology because it ignores the explicit eyewitness account from the Creator that He created the universe in six ordinary-length days, in the time of Adam, just several thousand years ago. These two reasons are really just one - as scientists, the Bible provides us with crucial eyewitness evidence on the question of origins and it would be irresponsible of us to ignore it."

Og pp. 304-5: "Progressive creationists hold to the idea of "biblical inerrancy," and so they have to insert the billions of years of modern cosmology into the six days of creation. As a result, God's creative acts are spread out over long periods of time, corresponding to the big-bang time-scale of cosmic history and the uniformitarian time scale of earth history. One tragic consequence of this is that, as we pointed out in the chapter on the biblical model, the connection between the cause (God commanding things to happen) and the effect (the creation coming into being) is destroyed by the intervening billions of

years. <"Another consequence is, of course, that it puts death and suffering before sin. This has enormous logical ramifications for the gospel, but also for the nature of a Creator who would call millions of years of bloodshed and suffering "all very good." (Note)>

This is not just a disruption of biblical logic; it is an insult of the first magnitude. Those who insist that billions of years intervened between God's command and the creation's response, necessarily portray God as being remote from His creation. He spoke, and it was millions or billions of years before the things happened. This is a retreat into a form of deism - the idea that God created the universe and then left it to run by itself.

Deism is probably one of the greatest insults that one could make against the God of the Bible."

"Innfor store spørsmål tror jeg man kommer lengst med ydmykhet. Ingen av oss vet og - vi forsøker å tolke etter beste evne og ut fra våre forutsetninger... Siden solen ble skapt fjerde dag, er det umulig å vite hvor lange de tre første dagene var. Det er jo solen som bestemmer døgnet's lengde. Uten sol blir det hverken morgen eller kveld. Det er derfor nærliggende å betrakte "dagene" som uttrykk for tidsepoker." (Tveter, Dagen 04.05.15)

Sarfati (p.68) nevner at "One rule of thumb is "when the plain sense makes common sense, take no other sense, lest it be nonsense"." Gud skriver det blév "aften, og det blev morgen, tredje dag", likesom det ble fjerde eller femte dag. Tveter er, slik jeg forstår ham, ikke enig. Og resten blir vel som det må. "Jeg makter ganske enkelt ikke å forstå eller tro at vår jord er 6000 år."

"Many years ago, one of us had the difficult task of confronting a Christian colleague about an adulterous relationship. When it came time for "The Bible says you shall not commit adultery," the reply came, "The Bible also says that God created the universe in six days, and you don't believe that do you?" At the time, we did not have access to the modern creationist literature, and had nothing further to say. The point of this story is that if you don't believe the first page of the Bible, then you have little reason to believe the rest of it. Our churches and theological colleges today are laced throughout with Christian unbelievers, all because they think that six-day creation is not theologically and scientifically defensible. This is not the case. Theologically, six-day creation is so important that God wrote it down with His own finger in stone in the Fourth Commandment, and scientifically, it makes perfect sense when understood within the biblical world view." (Williams & Hartnett p.20)

Tveter skriver (s.234): "Jeg har det personlige syn at å argumentere for en ung jord blant ikke-kristne kan være uheldig. Personlig har jeg den overbevisning at begrunnelser for ungjordskreasjonisme helst bør presenteres for mennesker med en robust kristen tro." Hvorefter han med tislutning gjengir en relatert ni punkts liste fra d"en meget anerkjente apologeten Norman Geisler"; herunder f.eks. "Ung jord er ikke en test på ortodoks klassisk kristendomsforståelse"; hva nå menes med det.

Sarfati igjen (pp.105.115.121.54-5): "If long-age interpretations had always been popular, then a case could be made for assuming that the Bible hints at this. But if they were absent until long ages became popular i "science", it's more likely that such interpretations were motivated by trying to reconcile the Bible with "science"."

"It's significant that the only exceptions to literal-day views are from the Alexandrian school. But an appeal to them proves far too much, because they allegorized almost everything in Scripture - far more than Ross or his conservative constituency would like!"

(Det er forøvrig også signifikativt at Tveter henter "bibelsitatene" fra en 'aleksandrinsk' bibel-versjon (Bibel 2011); (se D.J.H.; Which Bible-version does a creationist read?; kommentar-avisa.no), samt at han (s.245) promoterer Hans Johan Sagrustens bok Det store puslespillet ("Det er en godt fundert teo-

ri innen tekstforskinga på Det nye testamentet at den alexandrinske tekstforma, som finnes i Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus og enda eldre manuskripter, er den mest opprinnelige som vi har tilgang til i dag." (Sagrusten s.59)); (se D.J.H.; Sagrustens brikker; kommentar-avisa.no.))

"In any case, any non-literal views of the "forefathers" (if such actually existed) were vestiges of the Alexandrian school. This changed with the Reformation, which rejected their allegorizing tendency and returned to the grammatical-historical approach. This can be shown by its leading figures."

"If an old earth were really the teaching of Scripture, then one claim is glaringly conspicuous by its absence, that is, any claim in commentaries that the Bible unambiguously teaches long ages. Rather, the usual claim is that the biblical text appears on the surface to teach a young earth but may allow for an old earth. We never hear something like, "Yes, the decay of the earth's magnetic field and rapid reversals seem to provide scientific proof of a young earth. But we mustn't allow even the strongest science to overrule the clear teaching of the Word of God that the earth is billions of years old".

No, repeatedly we see conservative old-earthers admit that the plainest meaning of the text is young-earth creationism, but since "science" (supposedly) proves an old earth, the text must be reinterpreted. They would also claim to be using science ministerially. But another conspicuous absence is any thought by any respected Christian exegete of "long-age" interpretations until such views became popular in "science" in the early 19th century, as shown in chapter 3. This indicates that such views were not gleaned from Scripture; instead they are novel interpretations diametrically opposed to the text."

"Needless to say, most Christian 'intellectuals' have rejected creationism, in part because they do not wish to be thought of as fools for Christ. But creationist ideas have been better received among the laity." (John K. Reed, BS/MS/PhD degrees in geology; Rocks aren't Clocks p.181)

Tveter har et kapittel om "Opplysnigstidens betydning for kristen tro"; det handler ikke om geologi.

"During the 18th and early 19th centuries, new ideas swept the West. The forces of the Enlightenment were not content with "ivory tower" philosophy but pushed their new worldview aggressively into every area of life. Early on, they set their sights on the new science of geology, recognizing its strategic importance as a springboard to a more vital target - the repudiation of biblical history and the subsequent overthrow of biblical authority." (Mike Oard & John K. Reed; Rock Solid Answers p.7)

Reed igjen (pp.53.108.125.181): "... the early uniformitarians did an end run - they mumbled agreement with the rest of the Bible, but inserted a 'prehistory' before Adam and Eve walked in the garden. Thus, they did not have to deny the Bible; just muddy up the first three words <"In the beginning">.

Their stratagem worked. Theologians saw no great challenge to their turf, and gladly traded a small concession for membership in the 'smart' crowd. Soon, the idea of prehistory settled comfortably into the culture as generation after generation were taught in schools that prehistory was true, while simultaneously being taught not to worry about it in Sunday School.

But Genesis 1:1 is still there. It remained an irritant, which grew stronger as secularists began denying other parts of Scripture. Ex nihilo divine creation was always a Christian distinctive and remains so to this day. Naturalism assumes a period of billions of years before recorded history; the Bible explicitly refutes it. Evolutionary biology, big bang cosmology, and uniformitarian natural history all demand deep time, with humans appearing on the scene only at the last second. But the Bible links human history to "the beginning"; Jesus himself affirming that truth <Matt.19:4;Mark 10:6>. Although this seemingly simple logic escapes many seminary professors, it is plain enough to laymen.

Secularists understand the conflict, and jealously guard prehistory. Don't think so? Then take a 'hysteria meter' to a university soirée. It will jump if God is mentioned. It will spike if polite doubts are expressed about Darwin. But if you want to see it peg the red line, just casually let drop that the Earth is only a few thousand years old."

"For nearly a century, the public has been led to believe that radiometric dating is the one true clock." "But professional stratigraphers have known all along that the real 'clock' is biological evolution. Rocks are ordered by fossils and fossils by their evolutionary stage. This is why geologists share the panic of biologists when evolution is attacked. The credibility of the timescale is linked to that of evolution."

"Radiometric dating is not the magic hammer that can set stratigraphic boundaries for the timescale. Its weaknesses are kept under wraps; otherwise the establishment might have to admit what creationists have been saying for decades - that deep time has never been demonstrated. When it comes down to Earth's true age, an honest empiricist would confess "I don't know."

"Darwin may have built the temple walls, but the foundations were laid by geologists, and the cornerstone was the simple idea that rocks recorded billions of years of history before man appeared on the scene."

Tilbake til Oard & Reed (pp.260-1.9.8): "Uniformitarianism is a dying paradigm. Secular scientists seek to hold onto their philosophical position by pretending that the tectonic leap from Lyell back to Cuvier has no implications for the arguments for diluvialism. We have seen many revolutions in our lifetime, but the geological revolution of the past few decades holds the record for stealth. If the foundations of a discipline can be so easily overthrown, then what does that say about the integrity of the discipline? Though no one has explored the question, it is certainly curious that the decline and fall of Lyellian uniformitarianism tracks nearly exactly with the rise of modern creationism, from the publication of *The Genesis Flood* in 1961."

"... Christians are not simply content to disagree with David Hume's famous burn-everything-that's-not-science-or-math tirade, but have even had the audacity to point out that science is not even possible absent Christianity (e.g. Lisle 2009; Percy and Johnson 2004; Reed 2001; Stark 2003)."

"A new generation of Christians has come to appreciate that truth comes from God and cannot be ceded to secular science. They are striving to rebuild the ruins of the biblical worldview, the only one that has historically been able to integrate knowledge and insure truth." Og her er Kjell Johannes Tveters bok "om et kristent verdensbilde" kontraproduktiv.

"... vi må faktisk velge mellom evolusjon og skapelse", skriver Tveter (s.233); han finner det "naturlig å tro at Gud har styrt utviklingen" (s.232) hvor "den eksisterende arten omdannes til en helt ny art." (s.235) Om "Frankfurterskolens ektefødte barn", kulturmarxismen, skriver Tveter (s.135) at e"t gudsbegrep aksepteres ikke, og bekjempes med alle midler. Naturalistisk neodarwinisme er et svært nyttig redskap i denne kampen." Tveters variant av neodarwinisme, hvilken tilsidesetter Gud Skaperens vitnesbyrd i Bibelen, gjør ingen prinsipiell forskjell.

"Dr. Kjell J. Tveter har tidligere skrevet flere solide bøker om evolusjonslæren og kristen skapelsestro. Nå har han gått et skritt videre og skrevet en mer apologetisk orientert bok." "Tveter har gjort et imponerende arbeid, som både er et vekkerrop og en brannfakkell. Jeg håper særlig forkynnere, kristenledere og kristne ungdommer studerer denne boken." Håpet er Johannes Kleppas; sitert fra annet blad i Tveters bok.

Første blad i Sarfati's bok gjengir geofysiker John Baumgardner: "The veracity of God's Word has been under attack since the Garden of Eden. During the past two centuries a master stratagem of the serpent of old, as foretold by the apostle Peter, has been the proposition of uniformitarianism, the doctrine that 'all has continued just as it was from the beginning of creation.' Biological evolution is little more than a logical corollary of this more foundational (false) Enlightenment speculation about geological history. Refuting Compromise exposes Hugh Ross's astonishing endorsement of this diabolical doctrine - done, incredibly, in the guise of defending biblical authority - as the double deception it really is. Dr. Sarfati's call for Christ's church to avoid this snare is profoundly relevant to the present moment."

(For mer om "en tid som denne", se D.J.H.; Fra Martin Luther til Michael Tetzschner; - Hva ville egentlig Karl Marx?; kommentar-avisa.no.)

Avslutningsvis: Tvester har et langt tidsperspektiv på livet; "... Kambrium ... omfatter et tidsavsnitt mellom 495 og 545 millioner år tilbake. Kambrium gir oss opplysninger om livets opprinnelse... Flercellede organismer dukker opp i Kambrium." (s.230)

Samtidig har Dr. med. Tvester "under forberedelsen av boken" (s.329) lest John C. Sanford's Genetic Entropy (4.ed.2014); "From the scientists in the field who are qualified to respond - I have only heard deafening silence." (Sanford p.239)

Sanford (p.240): "The academic community has received this book, along with my other scientific publications within the last 10 years, with silence. I asked a good friend who had carefully read this book, and who happens to be a geneticist and committed evolutionist, "why don't they engage my arguments?" His answer was startling and simple, "they do not have answers". I believe he is correct. Why should I be surprised that they do not have answers? Many of them have quietly acknowledged in their own papers all the problems I have outlined. Most of the top population geneticists who went before me have recognized the basic validity of the problems that I adress in this book (see Appendix 1). I am certain that today's leaders in the field understand and privately acknowledge the problems I am addressing. The only reason I can see, regarding why they would shun open dialogue, is that they would like to treat these very fundamental theoretical problems as if they were trade secrets - not for open dialogue and not for public consideration."

Sanford fortsatt (pp.71.153-5.159-0): "Figure 4. The consequence of genetic entropy.

Dr. Crow (1997) indicated that the fitness of the human race is presently degenerating at 1-2% per generation due to the accumulation of mutations. A 1% decline in fitness per generation (beginning with a fitness of 1) is plotted for a hypothetical human population over a period of 300 generations (6,000-9,000 years). The resulting pattern seen is a classic biological decay curve. This type of progressive loss of fitness would clearly lead to dramatic degeneration of the human race within the historical timeframe."

"According to the newer study by Lynch (2010), the actual rate of decline is probably much higher - conceivably 5% per generation. Similar fitness decay curves are seen in numerous places in this book... Some of these are simply based upon genetic theory, some are based upon numerical simulations, some are based upon biological data, and some are based upon historical data. But they all show the same basic curve - a clear biological decay curve. They all agree."

"For decades evolutionary biologists have insisted on a philosophical level that natural selection is the counterforce to entropy in biological systems, and must be able to reverse biological degeneration. However, all of the best studies contradict that philosophical assumption. Mutational entropy appears to be so strong, especially within large genomes, that selection should not be

able to reverse it. This makes eventual extinction of such genomes inevitable (unless there is some undiscovered counterforce apart from selection). I have termed this fundamental problem Genetic Entropy. Genetic Entropy is not a starting axiomatic position, rather it is a logical conclusion derived from a careful analysis of how the mutation/selection process actually operates."

"A paper by a mathematician and a theologian presents some fascinating data (Holladay and Watt, 2001). Their paper compares the lifespan of early Biblical characters to how long they were born after the patriarch Noah. This Biblical data (recorded thousands of years ago) clearly reveals an exponential decay curve. The curve can only be described as biological. My colleagues and I have done a more complete analysis, producing more striking results (Figure 16). This unexpected pattern in the Biblical data is amazing. We are forced to conclude that the authors of the book of Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, and other books, either faithfully recorded an exponential decay of human life spans - or they collaborated in fabricating the data using sophisticated mathematical modeling."

"Many lines of evidence indicate that the downward curve is very real. We are dying - both as individuals and as a species."

EPILOG

"That Lyell was motivated primarily by the hatred of the Bible can easily be inferred from his associations and his letters, if not by his more cautiously worded textbook. In his textbook, the first four chapters are largely given over to discrediting his predecessors in the study of geology for holding to the authority of what he called "the Mosaic systems" and thus to Flood geology. Indications are strong that Lyell was a believer in LaPlace's evolutionary hypothesis for the origin of the solar system, as well as in the evolutionary theories of Jean Lamarck, the French botanist who was bitterly anti-Christian. Nevertheless, Lyell long maintained a superficial adherence to progressive creationism for fear of unnecessarily alienating the Christian clergy and laity in England." (Henry M. Morris; *The Long War Against God - The History and Impact of the Creation/Evolution Conflict*: Master Books ed.p.99-0)

"Stephen Jay Gould (1941-2002), himself a leading evolutionist, wrote: "Charles Lyell <(1797-1875)> was a lawyer by profession, and his book <, Principles of Geology,> is one of the most brilliant briefs ever published by an advocate ... In fact, the catastrophists were much more empirically minded than Lyell. The geologic record does seem to record catastrophes; rocks are fractured and contorted; whole faunas are wiped out. To circumvent this literal appearance, Lyell imposed his imagination upon the evidence. The geologic record, he argued, is extremely imperfect and we must interpolate into it what we can reasonably infer but cannot see. The catastrophists were the hard-nosed empiricist of their day, not the blinded theological apologists." One infamous example of Lyell's bias was his decision to ignore eyewitness accounts of the rate of erosion of Niagara Falls, and publish a different figure to suit his purpose." (Jonathan Sarfati; *The Greatest Hoax on Earth? (A response to Richard Dawkins' The Greatest Show on Earth - The Evidence for Evolution)*, p.185)

Morris igjen (pp.101-2): "Evangelicals (meaning those who accept the inerrant authority of the Bible and believe in the deity of Christ and his substitutionary death and bodily resurrection) generally "dare not call it compromise" and perhaps are not even aware of it. But compromise they have, in many, many instances. Some have accepted full-blown theistic evolution, but many more believe in either "progressive creation" or "reconstructive creation" (i.e. the so-called Gap Theory). With respect to the biblical Flood, those who advocate any of the above views (all of which accept the modern system of geological ages) must logically adopt either the Local Flood Theory or the idea of a "tranquil flood." This is necessary because a worldwide cataclysmic deluge

would have completely reworked and redeposited all the geologic strata, which supposedly were formed during the vast ages when evolution was taking place. If there ever was such a global cataclysm, the present geologic formations must have been the end result thereof, recording the stages of the Flood rather than the geological ages required by evolution.

It was because of this vital role of the Flood in earth history that belief in flood geology and global catastrophism had to be destroyed before a credible system of vast geological ages, so essential for an acceptable system of organic and human evolution, could ever be established as the reigning paradigm in the historical sciences. This, in turn, was necessary, before the true operational sciences could be captured for full-blown materialism and humanism."

I Epilogue til Coming to Grips with Genesis - Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth (pp.426.427.434.435), skriver Terry Mortenson & Thane H. Ury:

"The late Harvard biologist Ernst Mayr, a renowned atheist evolutionist, made the connection that Christians often miss: "The <Darwinian> revolution began when it became obvious that the earth was very ancient rather than having been created only 6,000 years ago. This finding was the snowball that started the whole avalanche." While the idea of millions of years was not a "finding" of science, but an invention rooted in anti-biblical assumptions about the past, we agree that the rejection of the biblical chronology set a whole chain of events in motion."

"We have shown that young-earth creationism is the historic, orthodox teaching of the Church. For 1,800 years, the almost universal belief of Christians was that God created in six literal days about 6,000 ago, and that He destroyed the world with a global Flood at the time of Noah. But in the early 19th century, deistic and atheistic geologists and astronomers, armed with anti-biblical assumptions, began to advance their old-earth and old-universetheories. There were dissenting voices, of course, but when this Pandora's box was opened in the Church, believers began to embrace gap, day-age, local Flood, and framework theories, and other tenets not immediately apparent from a natural reading of Genesis 1-11. Who can calculate the damage this has done to Christendom?"

"So, do we interpret Scripture by Scripture or do we use the outside higher authority of "science" to interpret Scripture? Will we believe the Word of God, who was there at the creation and the Flood, who knows everything, who never makes mistakes, who always tells the truth, and who inspired men to write the Scriptures without error so that Old Testament Jews, the Church fathers, the Reformers, and today's Christian would know the truth about how the creation came into existence and why it is the way it is today?"

"In the last 200 years, many in the Church have trembled at the words of the apologists for deep time. But historically, those who have worshiped the God of Abraham, Jacob, and Isaac, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, have demonstrated their loyalty by trembling at His Word. Would this be a time of soul-searching, humility, and contrition for you? The time is once again at hand for us to take the Creator at His Word. Evangelicals believe Scripture is the active voice of the only wise and living God. We thus agree that He has spoken in Genesis - that much is certain. But will we humble ourselves and reject whatever is preventing us from trembling at and believing His inerrant Word in Genesis 1-11, regardless of what the world and other believers think? That is the vital question we each must answer."

NOTE:

1. Williams & Hartnett (Dismantling the Big Bang pp.176-8) skriver:

"In 1994, Dr. Russell Humphreys published Starlight and Time <:Solving the Puzzle of Distant Starlight in a Young Universe>, an explanation of the biblical

time scale in terms of a "white hole cosmology." While Dr. Humphreys admits that it may not be the whole story, his book did bring to the attention of creationists the fact that time is not a constant, and that is enough to break the deadlock.

The principle of relativistic time dilation has been known since the early 1900s with Lorentz and Einstein. However, Dr. Humphreys was the first to apply it to the creationist time scale problem."

"The relevance to the biblical starlight problem is that variable time allows the possibility that time on earth could have run at a slower rate than time in the outer galaxies. Thus, "billions of years" could have passed in the outer galaxies while only days passed on earth. While other models have tried to achieve this same result by changing the speed of light - and the outcomes have violated other aspects of observed physical reality - the curious thing about variable time is that you wouldn't know it was happening to you ...

So when time slows down, it is only relative to some other frame of reference. As far as you are concerned, time is passing at the ordinary rate. And because all physical processes slow down at the same time, nothing seems amiss. Now one may not understand this rather puzzling phenomenon, but it has been demonstrated experimentally, so it is real."

"Can we see any suggestion of such a "variable time" scenario in the Scriptures? Yes, we can. God makes it clear that He created the whole universe in six days (Gen. 2; Exod. 20:11) but He also "stretched out" the heavens when He created them (Ps. 104:2; Isa. 42:5; 44:24; 45:12; 48:13; 51:13; Jer. 10:12; 51:15; Zech. 12:1). Now we do not know exactly what this means, but a very reasonable inference is that on creation day 4 when He made the heavenly bodies, He "stretched out" the heavens to a vast size in order to make room for all the stars and galaxies. Vast size and a constant speed of light (which, as we concluded from the c-decay debate, is required to maintain a stable universe) necessarily imply the "appearance" of a vast time scale. So the biblical cosmology does indeed imply a "young" earth and an "old" universe - God created a universe that is billions of light-years in size in only one earth day.

It is all a matter of perspective. God, as the Creator of time itself, is above and beyond all time. Time means little to Him, but the time scale He has given us is a six-day creation of the whole universe in earth time, and tucked away within day 4 - an ordinary-length day by earth time - we find the billions of years of cosmic time."

Muligens. (Hartnett skisserer senere et løsningsforslag til hva han oppfatter som et problem i Humphreys' modell.)

"It's important to note that the most widely held cosmology, the standard secular big bang theory has a problem of its own with light travel, called the horizon problem. This arises from the universe being thought to be at least ten times bigger than the distance that radiation ('light') could have travelled since the big bang, even with their billions of years timescale." (Don Batten (Ed.); The Creation Answers Book (3.ed)p.88)

"There are several ways in which the distant starlight problem might be solved." "Each of these ideas has difficulties in the details, so we should not be dogmatic. But, as stated on page 155, distant starlight cannot be used as an argument for Ross's ideas since the big bang also has a light-travel-time problem." (Sarfati; Refuting Compromise p.186)