

ANTAGELSENS BETYDNING I EVOLUSJONS- OG KLIMAHYPOTESE

"Teorien om at sars-cov-2-viruset var lekket fra Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV), ble raskt diskreditert i store deler av forskningsverdenen og mediene som "konspirasjonsteori". En vesentlig årsak til dette var en mediekampanje i vitenskapelige tidsskrifter som The Lancet."

"Den dogmatiske avfeieingen av "lab-leak"-teorien - uten dokumentasjon mot denne eller for den påståtte konsensusteorien - overbeviste store deler av forskerverdenen til tross for at argumentasjonsformen var dypt uvitenskapelig. Brevet i The Lancet hadde en truende tone som kan ha virket intimiderende på kritiske forskere."

"Vinden har nå snudd, både i forskerkretser og i mediene. Denne historien gir foruroligende perspektiver utover pandemien. Både forskersamfunnet og mediene - institusjoner som skal målbare kritisk tenkning og åpenhet for ulike perspektiver - har her sviktet som følge av manipulasjon og politiske b hensyn. Kan ikke dette skje igjen på andre viktige områder?" (Prof. Stig S. Frøland; Aft.p. 07.06.21)

"Motstandere av evolusjonsbiologien - og mye annen vitenskap, som for eksempel den knyttet opp mot dagens klimaendringer - er i virkeligheten en trussel mot all vitenskap og hele vårt samfunn som er tuftet på den kunnskap og kompetanse vitenskapen har gitt oss. Og det gjelder enten kunnskapen bryter med hellige skrifter, eller ikke." (Prof. Nils Chr. Stenseth og prof. Mikael Fortelius; Aft.p. 25.09.17)

"Phillip Johnson's epic Darwin on Trial cut to the heart of the debate. It wasn't about evidence; it was about assumptions. And like the proverbial drunk looking for his car keys, no one searched beyond Darwin's lamppost." (Prof. Michael J. Behe; Foreword to the 20th Anniversary Edition)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; juni 2021

Per Bergene Holm (Dagen 04.06.21): "Ideologiske grunnholdninger har fått så stor innflytelse på forskningen at det knapt kan kalles vitenskap. Mest graverende er vel kjønnsforskningen, som ikke bare er basert på ideologi, men hvor ideologien strider med grunnleggende biologiske fakta. Likevel er denne forskningen, med hjelp av interesseorganisasjoner som Fri, premissleverandør for politiske beslutninger og har innpass i det meste av skoleverket og undervisningslitteraturen i hele utdanningssystemet.

Media som hevder å drive en uhildet kritisk journalistikk, driver en kampanje-journalistikk ut fra samme grunnholdning som den rådende ideologi på felt etter felt, ganske blottet for vitenskapelig eller etisk refleksjon. Den som følger med i konflikten mellom Israel og palestina-araberne, blir forstemt over den "forskning" som bedrives fra ulike norske institusjoner, og den skjeve journalistikken som utøves med alibi i denne forskningen.

Ideologiske grunnholdninger og ren antisemittisme preger mye. Den som ønsker fakta om konflikten må gå til helt andre kilder. På samme måte med teologi, evolusjonsbiologi, psykologi, historie, klimaforskning og så videre.

I stedet for en nøktern, faktabasert vitenskap, møter du en forskning som ut fra ideologiske forutsetninger bruker materialet en arbeider med i et ideologisk prosjekt, for å fremme et bestemt ideologisk mål."

To av tidens basal-løgner ('millioner av år' og karbonrelatert klimaproblem) har et vesentlig fellestrekk: "assumptions", - antagelser amalgamisert med reelle fakta og utgitt som uomtvistelig vitenskap.

"Naturalistic evolution is not merely a scientific theory; it is the official creation story of modern culture. The scientific priesthood that has authority to interpret the official creation story gains immense cultural influence thereby, which it might lose if the story were called into question. The experts therefore have a vested interest in protecting the story, and in imposing

rules of reasoning that make it invulnerable. When critics ask, "Is your theory really true?" we should not be satisfied to be answered that "it is good science, as we define science." (Johnson p.192)

(Og bare så det er nevnt: Johnsons emne er biologisk evolusjon men evolusjonsparadigmet omfatter kort hele prosessen fra 'Big Bang' og hydrogen, til prebiotisk suppe hvor livet spontant oppstår og evolverer fra mikrobe til mikrobiolog. "In contrast to the facts, the contemporary evolutionary theory involves primarily the accumulation of genetic mistakes called mutations that are selected by natural selection. They believe that, in essence, the evolution of humans from molecules such as carbon, hydrogen, water, and nitrogen occurred by the accumulation of DNA copying mistakes and mutations. Thus, humans are the result of the accumulation of many billions of mistakes. As noted, the problem has always been that the vast majority of mutations are near-neutral or harmful, even lethal, causing disease, including cancer and about 5,000 other diseases"; "human DNA has a high mutation rate and is deteriorating at an alarming rate. The result is a steady accumulation of damage to the genome, eventually causing genetic catastrophe, then mutational meltdown and species extinction." (Jerry Bergman; Evolution's Blunders, Frauds and Forgeries; pp.31.24))

"While many people have genuine environmental concerns, the radical, activist leaders apparently want to undermine the economies of the West, not save the planet. However, to further their true agenda, they need to recruit lots of people who will support radical changes to 'save the planet'. In so doing, many innocent people, particularly naïve young people, including Christians, are getting caught up in what is ultimately a very destructive agenda."

"Foundationally, the issue of climate change involves a deep-seated worldview conflict. As we said earlier, Christians should be concerned about ecology and we do have a duty to care for the environment. However, the fake, anti-Bible deep-time evolutionary history of planet Earth, based on naturalism (the belief that nature is all there is), feeds into a radical environmentalist ideology, This has now embraced climate change."

"Martin Iles, head of the Australian Christian Lobby, says that we must ask what worldview drives the climate change agenda - where are these people coming from? Without a doubt the worldview driving the alarmism is not Christian; it is humanistic and neo-Marxist. It is a Babel mentality. People seem to think that they can be like God, even controlling the weather, as Jesus did when He stilled the storm on Lake Galilee." (Don Batten; Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) - a biblical and scientific approach to climate change; creation.com ; publ. 19.11.20; 43 sider + 9 sider ref. & noter.) Og om ikke kontrollere været, så i allefall kontrollere menneskene.

"It always comes back to worldviews. Creationists acknowledge gaps in the physical historical record, but accept them because their forensic investigation is constrained by biblical history. In their zeal to displace the Bible, Enlightenment thinkers proclaimed their freedom from any authoritative system. The hard positivism of the 19th century was the outcome of that mindset. Early uniformitarians were caught up in this nonsense and thus assumed that their timescale was pure science. But worldviews are like death and taxes - you can't avoid them!

Naturalism is weaker than other worldviews because its proponents pretend it isn't there - what we call a worldview, they call 'science' - and so never try to correct its presuppositional or logical flaws. Ironically, this failure has brought modern geologists full circle; today's professional stratigraphers have rediscovered authoritarianism - but now it's the power of academia and science, not the church." (John K. Reed; Rocks aren't Clocks - A critique of the geological timescale; p.167)

Uten 'deep time' ingen evolusjon - og "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." (Reed p.108) 3

Og: 'the one true clock' er basert på flere antagelser; "... those who promote the reliability of radioactive dating. They often spend much time discussing the technical details of radioactive decay, half-lives, mass-spectroscopes, etc... But they don't discuss the basic flaw in the methods: they don't really measure age at all, because no-one was present to measure the radioactive elements when the rock formed and no-one monitored the way those elements changed over its entire geological history.

It would be like the judges of a 100 m dash bragging about their state-of-the-art stop watches, and explaining the crystal structure of the quartz crystal that regulates the electrical oscillation - but not admitting that no one actually saw the start of the race.

So, the fatal problem with all radioactive dates is that they are all based on assumptions about the past. As will be shown, these methods rely critically on quantities measured only in the present. Moreover, there are many examples where a specific geological history is assumed after the event. They call it 'interpreting the results' (see p. 194)." (Jonathan Sarfaty; The Greatest Hoax on Earth?; p.187; p.194: "For all the talk about 'absolute' dating methods, they are not regarded as such in practice. When samples are submitted to radiodating labs, the forms usually have an entry for 'estimated age'. But why should this be, if the method were absolute? One expert admitted: "If a C14 date supports our theories, we put it in the main text. If it does not entirely contradict them, we put it in a footnote. And if it is completely 'out of date', we just drop it." <Ref. angitt.>

And if the dates are rejected, the difference can be explained away - the technical term is 'interpreted'." Jim Mason:

"While the theory of radiometric dating and the associated calculations are pretty straightforward, they are based on a number of assumptions. These are:

1. The amount of daughter element present in the rock at the time it was formed is zero (but see the section on isochron dating below).

2. The rock has remained as a closed system since the time of its formation, which, in turn, means that:

- a. no parent element has been deposited in or removed from the rock since its formation, and

- b. no daughter element has been deposited in or removed from the rock since its formation.

3. The rate of transformation (i.e. the half-life) has remained constant at today's rate throughout the entire period.

These all relate to things that have happened in the past, so there is no way of knowing whether they are true unless there has been a trustworthy eye-witness watching the rock throughout its history. The fact that the radiometric ages for the above rocks of known ages turn out to be so seriously inaccurate is a strong suggestion that one or more of these assumptions is incorrect."

(Jim Mason; in Robert Carter (Ed.); Evolution's Achilles' Heels - 9 Ph.D. scientists explain evolution's fatal flaws - in areas claimed to be its greatest strengths; pp.197-8)

Blant "above rocks of known ages" er lava fra 1984. Mason (p.197): "The current Mt. St. Helens (Washington State, USA) lava dome formed in 1984 and provides another opportunity for calibrating the K-Ar technique. This time, in addition to doing a whole rock analysis, measurements were made on individual minerals... Once again, the measured ages are vastly different from the actual age, and the ages derived from the individual minerals are significantly different from each other, with the 'oldest' measurement being some 100,000 times the correct age!" "To understand how this works, consider a hypothetical wristwatch that can measure time to one one-millionth of a second (one microsecond). If it is not set

to the correct time, it will measure the time very precisely but always incorrectly."

4

Don Batten igjen: "Jesus said, "By their fruit you shall know them" (Matt. 7: 16). He was speaking of spiritual/moral fruit (righteousness vs unrighteousness), but the principle applies more generally, and there is certainly an unrighteousness about a movement that is intent on destroying the material means for human flourishing."

Batten lister "Failed predictions"; et par av dem: "In 1989 the UN said, "Entire nations will be wiped out by the year 2000 if sea level rises are not stopped." Did this happen? No! Tuvalu, a Pacific Ocean nation of atoll islands, is a favorite poster child for this claim. However, Tuvalu has increased 3% in land area over the last 40 years. A survey published in 2018 of 30 Pacific and Indian Ocean atolls, including 709 islands, revealed that no atoll had lost land area in recent decades."

"Anyone who remembers the 1970s will recall that we were all going to freeze in another ice age. Of course, 'we' could do nothing about that, so some of the same 'experts' who were running with that switched to 'global warming' and then, when the temperature data did not match the models that gave the dire predictions, it morphed into 'climate change'."

Batten fremdeles: "It seems like every major weather-related event gets co-opted by climate change activists. They called the 2019 bushfires in Australia "unprecedented" and attributed them to climate change. They were definitely not 'unprecedented' in terms of either lives lost or area burnt. For example, in the 1938-39 fire season, over 80 lives were lost in bushfires in Victoria and NSW, compared to 34 in the recent fires. And the 5 million hectares burnt compares with 117 million hectares in the fires of 1974-75.

The most relevant failed predictions of the climate alarmists are those regarding rising global temperature, from the climate models (next)."

Fra "next": "The heart of the scientific method is that hypotheses can be tested with experiments. Repeated measurements of the response to a treatment allow the calculation of a confidence in the conclusion about the effect of that treatment being true, and not just due to some random variation. A probability of 95% is normally the lowest accepted in science (i.e. 1 experiment in 20 will give a false result). In climate science, the observed phenomenon is that the global surface temperature has been increasing, as has the CO₂ in the atmosphere. The hypothesis is that the temperature increase is caused by the CO₂ that is being released into the atmosphere by human activity. However, it is not possible to design a repeatable experiment to test this hypothesis because of the size, complexity, and uniqueness of the 'system' (there is only one planet Earth and it is rather complicated). Consequently, we are left with conjectures and predictions. Applying statistical models (such as ARIMA or Hurst-Kolmogorov) to the past temperature data can generate a prediction for the future, but the confidence limits (95%) are so wide that the predictions are useless. And this approach cannot say that CO₂ is causing the change. Thus, the climate models that predict a temperature response to CO₂ have to be deterministic; that is, they assume that the inputs will determine the temperature. Hence the assertion based on these models that CO₂ causes global warming is circular reasoning. Worse, even as recently as a decade ago climate models could not deal with factors like cloud cover. Computers are getting faster, and climate models are getting more sophisticated, but significant areas of the climate are still beyond our modelling reach."

"Nearly all" Greenhouse gas "effect is due to water vapour... Many discussions of climate change have excluded the effects of water vapour, which should respond dynamically to changes in temperature. Yet, since water has a much greater greenhouse effect, the exclusion of water from the debate is inexcusable."
<CO₂ vs water.>

"The amount of anthropogenic CO₂ has risen fairly consistently since 1880, but the global temperature has not; there have been periods of warming and cooling". "A prominent member of the climate establishment, Dr Phil Jones, admitted that the rates of global warming from 1860-1880, 1910-1940, and 1975-1998 ... "are similar and not statistically significantly different from each other". However, the amounts of human-generated CO₂ at those times ... are very different. Indeed, the rate of rise in temperature 1860-1880 is similar to the recent rise, and yet the amount of human-generated CO₂ is about 60 times greater for the latter period. And there have also been significant periods of cooling (1880-1910 and 1940-1950) and while the CO₂ emissions were rising. These data show that the global temperature is not rising consistently with the increased production of human-generated CO₂."

Gregory Wrightstone (Motvekt - Fakta om klima; 2017 (no. 2020); s.35): "Betydelige karbondioksidutslipp begynte ikke å finne sted før rett etter den andre verdenskrigen. Etter 1945 har mer enn 70% av denne perioden vært preget av at temperaturen enten har vært stabil, eller gått ned...

Gjennom to relativt lange perioder, fra 1945 til 1979, og fra 1998 til 2015, stoppet temperaturstigningen opp, eller temperaturen falt. I begge disse periodene steg CO₂-mengdene i atmosfæren... Kloden gjennomgikk en oppvarming fra 1976, til 1998. Så stoppet denne helt opp, i en periode på 18 år."

Og, som Kent Andersen skriver (Klima - Antiklimaks s.76); "Siden 2015 har naturen fortsatt med sitt: Temperaturen følger fortsatt ikke CO₂-utslippene. Det finnes ingen global oppvarming siste 21 år, og ingen akutt klimakrise."

23. mai i år skriver Christian Skaug (document.no): "Forestillingen om at menneskeheten er i ferd med å ødelegge klimaet på jorden påvirker i dag nær sagt alle politiske beslutninger i Vesten, fremfor alt ambisjonene om en global energirevolusjon som tåler enorme kostnader og med store utbygginger og forsakelser skal forsøkes gjennomført på noen få tiår.

Til grunn for dette ligger det en allment utbredt overbevisning om at klimavitenskapen har fastslått at menneskeheten vil overopphete planeten hvis den fortsetter å bruke fossile energikilder, som medfører utslipp av CO₂. Noen får selvmordstanker av dette, andre lar være å få barn."

"4. mai gav den fremragende amerikanske fysikeren Steven E. Koonin ut boken Unsettled: What Climate Science Tells Us, What it Doesn't, and Why It Matters. Hovedtittelen er en avvisning av den hyppige påstanden om "the science is settled" på klimafeltet, altså at klimaforskningen nå er en veletablert vitenskap som kan levere pålitelige klimaprognoiser.

Koonin, som er professor ved New York University og var vitenskapelig rådgiver i USAs energidepartement under Obama-administrasjonen, bruker deler av boken på å forklare ting som at klimaforskningen i offisielle rapporter fremstår som langt mer usikker enn det som fremgår av oppsummeringene politikerne forholder seg til, eller at den lille temperaturøkningen som har skjedd de siste hundre årene, ikke kan påstås å ha skapt store problemer for menneskeheten. Men det viktigste bidraget Koonin gir i boken, er å ta anstrengelsen ved å forklare på en måte som er tilgjengelig for et bredt publikum, hvordan klimamodellering gjøres."

"I praksis er det noen helt avgjørende trinn i denne prosessen som bygger på skjønnsmessige avgjørelser hos fagfolk, og det er uråd å vite om disse er riktige. Dette gjør også at det finnes mange innbyrdes motstridende klimamodeller."

"Naturlovene som forklarer de forandringene i havet og atmosfæren og på land som skaper klimaet, det være seg vind, havstrømmer, temperatur eller annet, er velkjente, forklarer Koonin. Men det å bruke disse naturlovene, som har form av matematiske ligninger, til å gjøre beregninger som tar mål av seg til å simulere virkeligheten, er en omfattende prosess.

Koonin vet hva han snakker om, for han er selv en av de største autoritetene i verden på akkurat dette punktet som en av pionerene og lærebokforfatterne in-

nenfor vitenskapelig databehandling, som er datamaskinassisterte modellberegninger av fysiske systemer. Slike beregninger er svært nyttige, og er blitt benyttet til å gå fra design av nye fly, båter eller oljeplattformer via studier av turbulente flammer og atombombers virkemåte til værvarsling - og altså klimaforskning.

Problemet med klimaforskning er at det fysiske systemet som forsøkes simulert, altså landjorden, verdenshavene og atmosfæren, er ufattelig mye større og mer komplekst enn en oljeplattform i havet eller en enkelt atombombeeksplosjon. Ligningssystemene som gjelder for klimaet, blir da heller ikke forsøkt løst analytisk på en måte som gir svar på fysiske spørsmål for et hvilket som helst sted i klimasystemet. Det er en uoverkommelig oppgave".

"Ved hjelp av datamaskiner forsøker man i stedet å finne omtrentlige løsninger i noen imaginære bokser som defineres av abstrakte, tredimensjonale rutenett. På den måten ender man opp med systemer av vanvittig mange ligninger, men som er enklere og dermed mulige å løse ved hjelp av uhyre kraftige datamaskiner. Men selv med verdens kraftigste datamaskiner er det uråd å gjøre dette rutenettet særlig finmasket hvis man vil simulere det globale klimaet mange år frem i tid. Sidekantene til "boksene" grunnflater er derfor typisk i størrelsesorden 100 kilometer lange i atmosfæren, og 10 kilometer lange i havet."

"Problemet er at en rekke fenomener som er av betydning for klimaet, har dimensjoner som er mindre enn 100 kilometer. Et av dem er skyer:"

"For example, flows of sunlight and heat through the atmosphere are influenced by the clouds. They play a key role - depending upon their type and formation, clouds will reflect sunlight or intercept heat in varying amounts." Modellene som skal simulere klimaet, må derfor kompletteres på en måte som tar høyde for virkningen av blant annet skyer. For å få til det må klimaforskere gjøre antagelser om fenomenene som gjør seg gjeldende på mindre skala."

"På dette stadiet i arbeidet kommer en menneskelig faktor inn i bildet, nærmere bestemt skjønn, som aldri er ufeilbarlig:

"While modelers base their subgrid assumptions upon both fundamental physical laws and observations of weather phenomena, there is still considerable judgment involved. And since different modelers will make different assumptions, results can vary widely among models."

Konsekvensene av det er store:

"This is not at all an unimportant detail, since ordinary fluctuations in the height and coverage of clouds can have as much impact on flows of sunlight and heat as do human influences."

Der er mer: "For klimamodellene må kalibreres ved å estimere noen titalls størrelser, kalt parametre, som nøyaktigst mulig rommer mest mulig av den fysiske informasjonen om det som skjer på mindre skala, og det gjelder mye mer enn bare skyer. Koonin gir noen eksempler:

"How much water evaporates from the land surface depending upon the soil properties, plant cover and atmospheric conditions? How much snow or ice is on the surface? How do ocean waters mix?"

I praksis skrur klimaforskerne på disse parametrene for å få modellen, som aldri blir eksakt, til å stemme mest mulig overens med observasjoner av det fysiske klimaet. Dette er en helt essensiell fase i modellbyggingen, som samtidig beveger seg ut på usikker intellektuell grunn:

"It's the process of adjusting the model to deal with troublesome inconsistencies or paper over irksome uncertainties. And sometimes modelers are tuning subgrid parameters in ways that aren't based on their "knowledge" of the parameter, but rather are aimed at producing a desired result."

Her er vi fremme ved et dypt problematisk stadium: Hvis byggingen av en matematisk modell tilpasses modellbyggerens ønsker, kan det åpne for litt av hvert, for eksempel intellektuell uredelighet.

Men også den som ikke gir avkall på sin integritet på dette punktet, gjør en ubekvem erkjennelse:

"In any event, it is impossible - for both practical and fundamental reasons -

to tune the dozens of parameters so that the model matches the far more numerous observed properties of the climate system."

7

"... tuning is often seen as an unavoidable but dirty part of climate modeling, more engineering than science, an act of tinkering that does not merit recording in the scientific literature."

Klimamodellene mange i sin villfarehet tror er like solid vitenskap som Newtons gravitasjonslov, er altså et resultat av at forskere har "flikket på" en modell etter et forgodtbefinnende som de ikke engang gjør rede for."

Eller som oven sitert vedrørende aldersbestemmelse; "the fatal problem with all radioactive dates is that they are all based on assumptions", but "they don't discuss the basic flaw in the methods".

Der er ingen klimatiske problemer ved menneskeadministrert kullsyre (CO2). Der er ingen millioner, enn si milliarder, av år. Heller ingen biologisk evolusjon.

Henry M. Morris (The New Defender's Study Bible; App. 5): "It is widely taught today that the earth is 4.6 billion years old and the age of the universe anywhere from 8 billion years to eternal. The Bible, on the other hand, indicates the universe to be only a few thousand years old, and all known human history (as recorded in the historical annals of Egypt, Sumeria, and other ancient nations) also is limited to a few thousand years.

The great ages needed to make evolution appear feasible are based mainly on a handful of very slow radioactive decay processes (e.g., uranium to lead, potassium to argon, etc.). These must each be based on at least three unprovable assumptions: ..."

"None of these assumptions are capable of either proof or disproof, since conditions are unknown prior to recorded history. All are known to be wrong in almost all natural processes.

On the other hand, there are scores of worldwide natural processes which will indicate ages far too brief for evolution to be feasible, even with the above "uniformitarian" assumptions. Some of these are listed in the accompanying tabulation, with references for each.

These may all be wrong, of course, because they are all based on the same unreasonable assumptions as for the very few processes that yield old ages.

However, there are many more of them, and the assumptions are more likely to be valid for short time periods than for long periods. Therefore, the weight of scientific evidence is that the universe is young, entirely apart from the definitive and conclusive evidence of biblical revelation."

"Mendel's Accountant is the first comprehensive and biologically realistic numerical simulation available to the field for studying the mutation/selection process", skriver John C. Sanford i sin bok Genetic Entropy (4.Ed.p.240; p.155: "Genetic entropy is not a starting axiomatic position, rather it is a logical conclusion derived from careful analysis of how the mutation/selection process actually operates.

If mutation/selection can't prevent the degeneration of the genome, then the Primary Axiom <random mutation filtered by natural selection> is wrong. It is not just implausible. It is not just unlikely. It is absolutely dead wrong. It is not just avfalse axiom. It is an unsupported and discredited hypothesis, and can be confidently rejected. It is now clear that mutation/selection cannot stop the loss of genomic information - so mutation/selection clearly could not create the genome.")

Men det var Mendel's Accountant; Don Batten (Creation 43(3)2021): "In a review more than a decade after the program was first published, CMI geneticist Dr Robert Carter commented, "We are unaware of any peerreviewed paper that attempts to refute the methods or conclusions of Mendel. After a decade of establish-

ed work, there should be something. Their silence is telling.""

Batten: "To change an organism into a different kind, you would have to have a mechanism for changing the <DNA->letters. For evolutionists, the 'only game in town' to change the letters is mutation."

"The <M.A.> program simulates or models a real population and can work out how long it would take to get these DNA letters lined up next to one another. When numerical assumptions are made that favour evolution happening, such as unrealistically high fitness from the mutations, it takes 84 million years to get just two letters lined up in an individual. This greatly exceeds the time-frame - about seven million years - evolutionists give for the evolution of humans from a common ancestor with chimps. To get just five letters lined up together, the time exceeds two billion years! This is not even a tiny fraction of a single small gene, which might be several hundred letters long. Many genes are thousands of letters long. This is the 'waiting time problem' - for evolution.

In other words, evolution of humans from apes is not just unlikely or improbable, but impossible." Enn utvikling av mennesker fra suppe?

(Kort tilbake til Sanford og Genetic Entropy (p.240): "The academic community has received this book, along with my other scientific publications 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 address in this book (see Appendix 1). I am certain that today's leaders in the field understand and privately acknowledge the problems that 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.")

Jerry Bergman (The Darwin Effect p.342): "The historical evidence indicates that before becoming converts to Darwinism, Marx, Stalin, Hitler, and Mao Tse-Tung all accepted the Christian teaching that all humans were brothers because they were all descendants of Adam and Eve (Medvedev 1989). If they had continued to embrace Christian creationism, they would not have become leaders of the anti-Christian totalitarian movements that ideologically opposed Christianity. For these reasons, Darwinism was likely an important factor in the deaths of an estimated over 250 million persons and the enormous suffering inflicted on more than a billion people."

Darwins ideer var meget effektivt fuel for Karl Marx og etterfølgere - idag har neo-marxister av alle politiske farger i tillegg megen nytte av et fiktivt karbonproblem, i en bredt anlagt de facto samfunns- og naturødeleggelse samt frihetsavvikling. Stjele og myrde og ødelegge...

Og eneste reelle botemiddel mot dette tiltagende uføret er: Tilbake til Bibelen; "Dersom I blir i mitt ord, da er I i sannhet mine disipler, og I skal kjenne sannheten, og sannheten skal frigjøre eder... Får da Sønnen frigjort eder, da blir I virkelig fri." (Jesus; Joh.8,31-6)

Noen avsluttende utdrag fra Don Batten's (Anthropogenic Global Warming's) siste kapittel:

"Filling kids' heads with fear and gloom about their future is tantamount to child abuse - and radical climate alarmists have a very real case to answer here. Let kids be kids!.. They are also being drawn into a false nature-worshipping monist religion that provides no eternal hope, unlike biblical Christianity."

"CO2 is 'plant food', and planet Earth's plants would benefit from more of it, not less. Indeed, the increase in CO2 is now responsible for 30% of the world's biomass production (food and fibre) over the last century, as documented in a paper in Nature in 2017 <6 Apr>. This is food for people and animals. And with more CO2 in the air, plants have to spend less time with their leaf pores (stomata) open. Thus they lose less water during the day and can survive on less water. Deserts are greening, largely because of the extra CO2. With the pre-Flood Earth having up to 15 times the CO2 that we have now, plant productivity would have been amazing. That is where fossil fuels came from, as the vegetation of the pre-Flood world was buried during the Flood and then converted into coal and oil. The draw-down in atmospheric CO2, with the burial of much carbon in the ground and the revegetation of the earth after the Flood, has resulted in the CO2 'draught' that we are now in. This has been hampering plant productivity and the carrying capacity of planet Earth (at levels from 50-170 ppm, depending on the species, plants die).

Historically, the countries that have best cared for the environment are those that are wealthy. And their wealth is due to free markets and cheap energy (coal and other fossil fuels) combined with a Christian ethos, which gives a caring soul to the free market. The worst polluters have been the ones under totalitarian regimes with central control of the economy. They don't equalize wealth; they equalize poverty, except for the ruling class."

"A particular madness emanating from the focus on fossil-fuel derived CO2 as a driver of global warming is the conversion of coal-fired power stations in the UK and Europe to run on wood. Under the Paris Accord, wood is 'renewable energy', but coal is not - hence such crazy rules. Another example of unintended consequences is the recent destruction of south-east Asian rainforests to make way for palm oil plantations to produce biofuels. Existing crop areas have also been moved from food production to ethanol production (e.g. maize/corn)."

"There is a lot of money to be made! For example, former US Vice President Al Gore lives in a mansion that uses 21 times the energy of the average US home. He says that's OK because he buys carbon credits to offset his 'carbon footprint'. Where does he buy his carbon credits? From the companies that he founded to trade in carbon credits, which are now worth many millions, having increased in value as he ramped up the hype!"

"Many climate alarmist celebrities fly everywhere in private jets, although one flight uses more fuel than an SUV does in a year of driving. We might take them all more seriously if they lived by the constraints they demand of the rest of us."

"Even electricity generation companies saw a profit opportunity with the shutting down of coal-fired power stations because this became a market disruptor. When that happens, it creates an opportunity for profiteering, because no-one is quite sure what the price of electricity should be any more."

"Much of the misinformation (e.g. arguments that the droughts and bushfires in Australia and elsewhere are due to 'climate change') comes from politicians who are using environmentalism as a vehicle to push for sweeping social and political change. They are using fear to generate public support to get their ideas implemented. As a prominent civil servant in the Tony Blair era of UK politics said concerning scaremongering over climate change: "In order to manage risk, you must scare people."

The approach of the more radical parties to 'saving the earth' is to depopulate it. They push for policies that kill people: abortion up to term with no limitations, infanticide, euthanasia, free-and-easy drugs, transgenderism, and rainbow politics. All of these will create misery, kill people, and decrease the breeding of people (look up their manifestos).

They also work for the destruction of the free markets that have been responsible for a massive movement of people out of poverty in the last 50 years (see World Bank report above). The leaders of these parasites know that, if they can destroy free markets through confiscatory taxes and masses of green tape, they will destroy the means for people to make a living and create widespread poverty. At this point they hope the population will, (1) vote for neo-Marxist policies, and (2) decrease. But the environment will suffer (as it has in all Marxist states), but presumably that's OK because radical environmentalism is just a means to a political end. It is no surprise that these organisations are also strongly anti-Christian, because Christians stand for the sanctity of human life. Climate fear is thus being used to drive radical political change.

Michael Schellenberger has been a prominent climate change activist. He has been a long-time advisor to the IPCC and helped formulate President Obama's energy policy. He now regrets his role in the fear campaign. In his book, *Apocalypse Never: Why Environmental Alarmism Hurts Us All* (2020), he apologizes for his role in scaring people, especially children, with the idea that climate change represented a global crisis and that the world should end soon unless it was addressed. He exposes many of the false claims and the unintended consequences for the environment. He still believes "climate change is happening. It is just not the end of the world. It's not even our most serious environmental problem." On Twitter, Schellenberger commented, "Negativity has triumphed over positivity. In place of love, forgiveness, kindness, and the kingdom of heaven, today's apocalyptic environmentalism offers fear, anger, and the narrow prospects of avoiding extinction."

He joins a growing list of former advocates for radical action on global warming."

"A Bible-based approach to government, the environment, and justice will result in human flourishing, as it has in every country that has been strongly influenced by the Bible's teaching (see *The Bible is the bedrock of civilized society*).

Clearly, there can hardly be a Christian approach without Christ. Christians need to be pro-active in working to see others come to faith in Christ. In doing that we will also be once again laying the foundations for human flourishing, but also the flourishing of the planet because man is needed to look after it; that's the way God designed it to be. Indeed, Hosea 2:18-23 connects the health of the land to the spiritual health of the people.

There is a sickness in many once-Christian countries, and it began with the undermining of the Bible as the Word of God from the beginning. When we see the Lord Jesus Christ once again honoured as Creator and Saviour of the world, we will see health return to our nations."