

FILOSOFISK BIOLOGI. UiO VS. VITENSKAPEN?

"Darwinian theory attributes biological complexity to the accumulation of adaptive micromutations by natural selection, but the creative power of this hypothetical mechanism has never been demonstrated, and the fossil evidence is inconsistent with the claim that biological creation occurred in that way. The philosophically important part of the Darwinian theory - its mechanism for creating complex things that did not exist before - is therefore not really part of empirical science at all, but rather a deduction from naturalistic philosophy. In brief, what makes me a "critic of evolution" is that I distinguish between naturalistic philosophy and empirical science, and oppose the former when it comes cloaked in the authority of the latter." (Phillip E. Johnson (1))

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; oktober 2017

"Fundamentet for biologifaget er evolusjonsbiologien. At "ingenting i biologien gir mening uten sett i lys av evolusjon" er like sant i dag som da vitenskapsmannen Theodosius Dobzhansky skrev det for over 40 år siden. Likevel har motstanden mot evolusjonsbiologien ikke bare overlevd til i dag, men viser tegn til å være på fremmarsj", skriver prof. Nils Chr. Stenseth & prof. Mikael Fortelius, begge ved "CEES", Universitetet i Oslo, i en 'bekymringsmelding'; kronikk, Aft.p. 25.09.17.

Tja. Faktum er, som Marc Kirschner(2) påpeker, at "In fact, over the last 100 years, almost all of biology has proceeded independent of evolution, except evolutionary biology itself. Molecular biology, biochemistry, physiology, have not taken evolution into account at all."

'Evolusjonens' "day-to-day irrelevance is a great 'paradox' in biology, according to a Bio Essays special issue on evolution in 2000. "While the great majority of biologists would probably agree with Theodosius Dobzhansky's dictum that 'Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution', most can conduct their work quite happily without particular reference to evolutionary ideas", the editor wrote. "Evolution would appear to be the indispensable unifying idea and, at the same time, a highly superfluous one."(3)

Augustinermonk Gregor Johann Mendels arvelære, derimot: Mendel studerte (1851-53) fysikk, kjemi, matematikk, zoologi og botanikk ved Universitetet i Wien. Han "was a creationist and rejected Darwin's evolutionary ideas, although he was quite familiar with them.

His experiments with peas, carefully controlled and mathematically analyzed, provided the basis for the understanding of heredity, so that Mendel is rightly considered the father of genetics. It is remarkable that his studies clearly established the basic stability of the created kinds of plants and animals, while evolutionists for many decades have labored to incorporate them somehow into the framework of Darwinism." (Henry M. Morris PhD(4a))

"Mendel's discoveries <, published 1866,> were lost ... In what way ...? It was suppressed because it was not supportive of Darwin's theory until they discovered mutation." (John Sanford PhD(4b)) (Vi er da ved Hugo DeVries mutasjonsteori, 1900.)

"Darwin had all the same tools as Mendel, more time at his disposal, and could probably muster better finances for his scientific work, yet he did not develop anything like modern genetic theory... Darwin wrote multiple essays and papers on these topics. Why, then did he not discover genetics? We can never be certain, but Darwin wanted species to be infinitely mutable because he had a commitment to a continuous distribution of species, with innumerable links among them, stretching back to infinity. This necessitated or lent itself to a

search for a continuous distribution of traits... Mendel was an experimentalist and came up with the correct answer. Darwin was a theoretician, and may have missed it due to philosophical considerations alone." (Robert Carter PhD (5))

Om ikke den darwinistiske universal-syre(6a) ble nyttig for biologien, ble den nyttig for annet. "Utviklingslæren er et eksperimentelt intet og en filosofisk farse." Men. "Få doktriner i menneskehetens historie har vist seg så nyttige for dødsrikets generalstab som denne, og derfor skal vi ikke vente å få se at den forsvinner før det eventuelt dukker frem noe enda nyttigere." (Poul Hoffmann(6b))

At Karl Marx var strålende fornøyd med Darwins 'Artenes opprinnelse', tør være kjent; Friedrich Engels fant den "absolutely splendid"(7). Lenin. Stalin. Hitler "even used his belief in human evolution to justify his own vegetarianism, noting that "monkeys, our ancestors of prehistoric times, are strictly vegetarian."" (Jerry Bergman PhD(8)) Nok her herom(9); "Eventually, with the rise of I.V Michurin and T.D. Lysenko as leaders of Soviet science under the Regimes of Lenin and Stalin, Mendelian genetics was officially outlawed in Russia in 1948 and Lamarckianism established as Communist dogma." (Henry M. Morris(10))

"Darwins største bidrag til vitenskapen var å beskrive den viktigste mekanismen som leder til en evolusjon, nemlig det naturlige utvalg", skriver Stenseth & Fortelius, og gir en tre-punkts fremstilling.

Men; "Natural selection in itself is not a scientific principle, as it is based on circular reasoning. By natural selection, less fit organisms are eliminated and the fitter organisms survive to propagate the species: Organisms thus survive the process because they are fitter, and they are fitter because they survive. Also, the process operates by elimination, not addition." (Walter J. Veith PhD(11)) (Først inne på 'circular reasoning': Evan Jamieson PhD, forteller(12): "I once asked how sedimentary rocks were dated and was told by "indicator fossils." When I followed with "how were indicator fossils dated," I was told, "by the rock formations they are found in."")

Stenseth & Fortelius' 3. punkt skriver at "Variasjon i de arvbare egenskapene gjør noen individer i bestanden mer tilpasset sitt levemiljø enn andre. Om miljøet endrer seg vil det over tid skje en endring i sammensetningen av disse arvbare egenskapene i gruppen - noe vi kaller en evolusjon."

Så de gjør. Andre vil benevne det Stenseth & Fortelius beskriver for 'variasjon' eller med det mindre heldige begrep 'mikroevolusjon', men altså ikke 'evolusjon', i betydning 'makroevolusjon'/ mikrobe-til-menneske-evolusjon, hvilket konteksten kunne tilsi Stenseth & Fortelius sikter mot.

"The doctrine of evolution is definitely not a viable scientific leitmotiv (guiding principle); even the well-known theoretician Karl Popper ... once characterized it as a "metaphysical research program." This assertion is just as noteworthy as it is honest, because Popper himself supports evolution." (Werner Gitt Dr-Ing.(13a))

"Popper set out to answer not only the specific question of how Einstein's scientific method differed from the pseudoscience of Marx and Freud, but also the more general question of what "science" is, and how it differs from philosophy or religion", skriver Phillip E. Johnson i kapitlet Science and Pseudoscience(13b).

"How does Darwinism fare if we judge the practices of Darwinists by Popper's maxims? Darwin was relatively candid in acknowledging that the evidence was in important respects not easy to reconcile with his theory, but in the end he met every difficulty with a rhetorical solution. He described The Origin of Species as "one long argument," and the point of the argument was that the

common ancestry thesis was so logically appealing that rigorous empirical testing was not required. He proposed no daring experimental tests, and thereby started his science on the wrong road. Darwin himself established the tradition of explaining away the fossil record, of citing selective breeding as verification without acknowledging its limitations, and of blurring the critical distinction between minor variations and major innovations. The central Darwinist concept that later came to be called the "fact of evolution" - descent with modification - was thus from the start protected from empirical testing."

"Scientists did accept the theory before it was rigorously tested, and thereafter used all their authority to convince the public that naturalistic processes are sufficient to produce a human from a bacterium, and a bacterium from a mix of chemicals. Evolutionary science became the search for confirming evidence, and the explaining away of negative evidence."

"What they never find is evidence that contradicts the common ancestry thesis, because to Darwinists such evidence cannot exist. The "fact of evolution" is true by definition, and so negative information is uninteresting, and generally unpublishable." "When disconfirming evidence cannot be ignored altogether, it is countered with ad hoc hypotheses."

"Because "evolution" means so many different things, almost any example will do. The trick is always to prove one of the modest meanings of the term, and treat it as proof of the complete metaphysical system."

"As the creation myth of scientific naturalism, Darwinism plays an indispensable ideological role in the war against fundamentalism. For that reason, the scientific organizations are devoted to protecting Darwinism rather than testing it, and the rules of scientific investigation have been shaped to help them succeed." (Johnson)

"Evolutionists had assumed, on the basis of population genetics and their assumptions about the timeframe and process of evolution, that the mutation rate in organisms is quite low, on the order of 1 per individual per generation, or less. Recognizing that most mutations were deleterious, they had to assume that there were not many of them, or natural selection could not get rid of the preponderance of bad ones; there would be mutational meltdown, especially over their millions of years' timeframe.

However, in recent years the mutation rate has been measured and it is at least 50-fold higher than had been assumed based on evolutionary ideology. This creates a huge problem for the whole idea. Dr John Sanford, retired Cornell University geneticist (currently Courtesy Associate Professor) and inventor of the gene gun, has shown that this high rate of mutation, combined with the fact that most of the mutations are slightly deleterious (falling within Kimura's Box), means that these slightly deleterious mutations are invisible to natural

selection and are accumulating in humans and other organisms. This process is relentless and it is destroying us, not creating us. We are heading for extinction, along with every other complex organism." "Dr Sanford summarized the problems for evolution: 1. mutations arise faster than selection can eliminate them; 2. mutations are overwhelmingly too subtle to be 'selectable'; 3. biological noise and 'survival of the luckiest' overwhelm selection; 4. bad mutations are often physically linked to good mutations, so that they cannot be separated in inheritance (to get rid of the bad and keep the good).

Informed evolutionists are aware of these problems and have offered 'synergistic epistasis' (were the effects of multiple mutations occurring together are supposedly greater than their sum) as a solution. However, Sanford has shown that this would make the problem worse."

"A process that steadily degrades a genome (increases 'genetic entropy') cannot produce a better organism in the long run. Sanford's analysis is devastating to the evolutionary paradigm."

"Nevertheless, evolutionists are continually holding up examples of 'evolution' via adaptive mutations to try to convince us that it really does work. However, the sorts of examples they provide include loss of sight in cave fish and cave salamanders, loss of functional wings in beetles on a windy island, loss of control of enzyme production or a defective uptake channel causing antibiotic resistance, and a defective gene in tomcod fish that helps them survive in waters polluted with PCBs. That is, we are being given 'broken' organisms as examples of adaptive mutations and natural selection." (Donald Batten PhD(14))

"Vitenskapen har en meget god forståelse av hvordan menneskets utvikling har skjedd - inkludert hvordan vi har utviklet oss fra tidligere former. Likevel er det altså dem som neglisjerer eller motarbeider denne kunnskapen og i stedet mener at vi er skapt av en eller annen guddommelig makt, mer eller mindre slik vi er i dag. Blant dem er det både individer og organisasjoner som legger ned betydelige ressurser i sin motstand mot dagens vitenskapelige innsikt om evolusjon. Dessverre er deres argumenter ikke av en slik art at de kan betraktes som en del av den legitime vitenskapelige debatten." Skriver Stenseth & Fortelius. De skriver:

"... ting vi i dag vet med meget stor sikkerhet:" "1. Mennesket stammer fra Afrika" "Allerede Charles Darwin gjettet at det var tilfelle, men nå vet vi det basert på omfattende fossilfunn samt genetiske data. Fra det vet vi også at våre nærmeste nålevende slektninger er sjimpanse og gorilla."

"In the Out of Africa model, evolutionists say that humanity went through a near-extinction bottleneck before our population expanded and eventually left Africa. Why is a bottleneck part of their model? Because they are trying to explain the lack of diversity among people spread across the world. This diversity is much less than they at first assumed, based on ideas of a large population living in Africa for a million years or so. The bottleneck is an ad hoc addition to evolutionary theory, but low diversity is part of the creation model from the start."

"According to the most commonly told evolutionary story, we came from a small population that broke up into smaller bands during a single dispersal event that carried humanity across the globe. This dispersion occurred with three main female lineages and one main male lineage in the recent past. Oh, and it went through the Middle East before it got to Europe, Asia, Australia, Oceania, or the Americas. Every single one of those points is predicted by the Genesis accounts of the Flood (Genesis 6-8), Tower of Babel (Genesis 11) and the Table of Nations (Genesis 9-11). The difference is in the timing (6,000, 4,500, and about 4,000 years ago, respectively, vs. tens of thousands of years ago) and the origin (Middle East vs. NE Africa near the Red Sea). Yet, the conclusions of the Out of Africa model are driven by the evolutionary starting assumptions. In a way of summary, they assume that a molecular clock is in operation, causing mutations to accumulate in all populations at the same rate throughout all time. We have already seen that this is not true. They assume ..."

"There are some additional correspondences between 'Out of Africa' and Genesis ... There is a nice general concordance between the Out of Africa scenario and Genesis after the evolutionary story is modified to fit the data. Specifically, Out of Africa has had to deal with the lack of diversity among people worldwide (hence, the population crash), and the single dispersal of humanity that is evident in our genes." (Robert Carter(15))

"Enn så lenge er ikke vitenskapen i Norge truet, selv om det finnes enkelte anti-evolusjonære grupperinger." Men "Motstanden mot vitenskapen må tas på

alvor enten den er religiøst, politisk eller ideologisk begrunnet. Dessverre kan det ikke tas for gitt at alle deler idealet om at undervisning, politikk og forvaltning skal være kunnskapsbasert. 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."

(Jeg noterer at Stenseth & Fortelius nevner "vitenskap ... knyttet opp mot ... klimaendringer" i samme 'åndedrag' som "evolusjonsbiologien":

"How much are we spending on policies based on years of unproven uniformitarian history? For example, a hot topic today is climate change. How might our view of climate change be affected by understanding that Earth is only a few thousand years old, and that it suffered a global cataclysm about 4,500 years ago? Yet policy planners never even stop to consider that option. They instead spend billions based on secular mythology."

"Recent decades have revealed the myth of the dispassionate objectivity of academia. It's a facade for the public. Don't believe it? Then try to find the objective data needed to get to the bottom of the 'global warming' debate."

(John K. Reed PhD(16))

"... hele vårt samfunn ... er tuftet på den kunnskap og kompetanse vitenskapen har gitt oss" fremholder kronikørene, og det hva "enten kunnskapen bryter med hellige skrifter, eller ikke."

Jurist Philip Mauro (, "admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States ... 1892"(17)) skriver(18a) (1922) at "One of the best known writers of our day, Mr. H.G. Wells - himself a thorough-going evolutionist - has lately declared in print that Civilization owes both its origin and its preservation until now, to the Bible, saying: "It is the Book that has held together the fabric of western civilization"; it has "unified and kept together great masses of people"; and in fact "the civilization we possess could not have come into existence and could not have been sustained without it." And Mr. Wells drives his point to its logical conclusion by showing that, without something to take effectively the place of the Bible, civilization will speedily be overthrown.

This frank admission involves, if true, the complete negation of Evolution. For, according to that theory, the Bible should be the product of Civilization, and man's ever-advancing Progress should be continually producing, by slight variations, better and better Bibles. But here is an evolutionist who forgets his doctrine long enough to declare that the Bible produced Civilization, and not Civilization the Bible. Here then, in that ancient Book, which is forever correcting and improving man, but which receives no correction or improvement from man(18b)>, we have the complete disproof of Evolution."

Uten Den Hellige Skrift fantes aldri den vestlige sivilisasjon slik vi kjente den. Og heller ikke den vestlige vitenskap:

"Modern science arose, not out of atheism, but the very opposite. Many of the early scientists were Bible-believing creationists and, according to Peter Harrison, formerly Professor of Science and Religion at Oxford University, it was their Christian worldview that provided the basis for their scientific work. As he makes clear, part of what made science possible was "the theologically informed assumption that there are laws of nature, promulgated by God and discoverable by human minds."

Without certain beliefs, science could never have got started. Unless it is accepted that the natural world is orderly, behaves in the same way from one day to the next, and can be understood by people, science simply cannot be done. And as leading historians of science will admit, this essential understanding of the world was provided by the Bible."

"As explained by Professor Rodney Stark, "Christians developed science because they believed it could be done and should be done" (emphasis original)." 6
(Dominic Statham(19))

Et passende sted å nevne formørkningstiden: Rodney Stark skriver(20) "Just as a group of eighteenth-century philosophers invented the notion of the "Dark Ages" to discredit Christianity, they labeled their own era the "Enlightenment" on grounds that religious darkness had finally been dispelled by secular humanism. As Bertrand Russell later explained, the "Enlightenment was essentially a reevaluation of independent intellectual activity, aimed quite literally at spreading light where hitherto darkness had prevailed." Thus did Voltaire, Rousseau, Locke, Hume, and others wrap themselves in the achievements of the "Scientific Revolution" as they celebrated the victory of secularism, eventuating in the Marquis Laplace's claim that God was now an unnecessary hypothesis. Of course, not one of these "Enlightened" figures played any part in the scientific enterprise. What about those who did? Were they a bunch of skeptics too? Hardly."

Stark lister 52 "Scientific Stars". "To code someone as devout, I required clear evidence of especially deep religious involvement. For example, Robert Boyle spent a great deal of money on translations of the Bible into non-Western languages. Isaac Newton wrote far more on theology than he did on physics... Johannes Kepler was ..."

"Clearly, the superb scientific achievements of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were the work not of skeptics but of Christian men - at least 60 percent of whom were devout. The era of the "Enlightenment" is as imaginary as the era of the "Dark Ages," both myths perpetrated by the same people for the same reasons."

Les evt. videre Henry M. Morris' Men of Science, Men of God (ref. 4); Morris gir 101 korte biografier, fra Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) "considered by many to be the real founder of modern science"; Francis Bacon (1561-1626) "usually considered to be the man primarily responsible for the formulation of the so-called scientific method in science; Michael Faraday "one of the most humble and sincere Christians one could ever find"; Samuel F.B. Morse: "The first message sent (in 1844) over the wire, "What hath God wrought!" (Num. 23:23) was indicative of Morse's whole life and purpose, desiring to honor God the Lord in all things." Louis Pasteur; "in his lifetime, he was the object of intense opposition by almost the entire biological establishment because of his opposition to spontaneous generation and to Darwinism. It was only his persistence and sound experimental and analytical procedures that finally compelled most biological and medical scientists to give up their ideas of the naturalistic origin of life and their treatment of disease as based on this notion." Lord Kelvin; sitert: "With regard to the origin of life, science ... positively affirms creative power." osv.

Tilbake til John Sanford PhD(21): "Institutional science has systematically "evolutionized" every aspect of human thought. Contrary to popular thinking, this is not because evolution is central to all human understanding, but rather has arisen due to a primarily political and ideological process. Consequently, in the present intellectual climate, to reject evolutionary theory has the appearance of rejecting science itself. This is totally upside down. An axiomatic statement often repeated by biologists is: "Nothing makes sense in biology, except in the light of evolution". However, nothing could be further from the truth! I believe that apart from ideology, the truth is exactly the opposite: "Nothing makes sense in biology except in the light of design". We cannot really explain how any biological system might have "evolved", but we can all see that virtually everything we look at has extraordinary underlying design.

I am not aware of any type of operational science (computer science, transportation, medicine, agriculture, engineering, etc.), which has benefited from evolutionary theory. But after the fact, real advances in science are syste-

matically given an evolutionary spin. This reflects the pervasive politicization of science."

7

Tasman Walker PhD, intervjuer (Creation 39(4)2017 Peter Vajda PhD, "a research scientist with the Division of Geophysics at the Earth Science Institute, at the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava, Slovakia: "One topic Peter initially found tricky to resolve was radioactive dating and the age of the earth. This, too, became clear when he recognized the difference between empirical knowledge and speculation. "The empirical knowledge, what is actually measured, is the ratio of isotopes. The age is a questionable interpretation based on untestable assumptions. Further, the value actually selected is chosen to match their naturalistic philosophy. Although they don't want to say it, the ages they quote are taken on faith.""

Fremdeles Vajda: "The past is inaccessible to empirical science. Observations can only be made in the present. The rest is reconstruction, in which beliefs play a pivotal role." "God had already explained this in Job 38:4, that the only genuine knowledge about origins is His Word. He was there, and He has revealed this knowledge to us. Not only does He know the history of the earth because He witnessed it; He actually did it - Himself.""

REFERANSER OG NOTER

1. Johnson, Ph.E.; Darwin on Trial; Inter Varsity Press 20th anniv.ed. 2010; p.191.

"I am not a scientist but an academic lawyer by profession, with a specialty in analyzing the logic of arguments and identifying the assumptions that lie behind those arguments." (p.32)

"The Intelligent Design Movement has been widely popularized by Phillip E. Johnson ... considered by many to be the chief architect of IDM". "The tragedy of the ID movement, however, is that it stops far short of honoring God's written revelation, the Bible. In fact, the book of Genesis as literal history seems to be an embarrassment to most of these scholars."

"The Bible is completely clear on the issue of Intelligent Design: "For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made, so that they are without excuse." (Rom. 1:20)."

"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." "... 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 ..." (John 15:5)." (Whitcomb, J.C.; Jesus Christ Our Intelligent Designer - An Evaluation of the Intelligent Design Movement; Kinos Books 2011; pp.13.15.18.17-8)

Se videre ang. IDM, Appendix.

2. Cosner, L. (Compiling Ed.); Evolutionists Say the Oddest Things - Surprising admissions from leading scientists; Creation Book Publ. 2015; p.29. "Marc Kirschner (founding chair of the Department of Systems Biology at Harvard Medical School), quoted in Dizikes, P., Missing links, The Boston Globe, 23 October 2005, boston.com."

3. Ib. p.30. Sitert fra "Larry Witham (journalist and author), Where Darwin

4a. Morris,H.M.; Men of Science, Men of God; Master Books 21st pr. 2012; p.66.

4b. Sanford,J.; How Evolution Hurts Science; Creation Min. Int. DVD; ca.38:40.

5. Carter,R.(Ed.); Evolutions Achilles' Heels - 9 Ph.D. Scientists explain evolution's fatal flaws - in areas claimed to be its greatest strengths; Creation Book Publ. 2014; p.51.

6a. "Daniel Dennett wrote that evolution is a universal acid that dissolves every ethical and moral system it encounters (1995)." (Bergman,J.; The Darwin Effect - It's influence on Nazism, Eugenics, Racism, Communism, Capitalism & Sexism; Master Books 2014; pp.11-2.)"Jerry Bergman has nine academic degrees, including two Ph.D.s." (J. Creation 31(2):118,2017)

"Udviklingslæren er med sit dyremenneske, men også med sin forestilling om, at det i siste instans kun kan gå fremad, en af de væsentligste drivende faktorer i hele den nationale og internationale forrådnelse, der tager fart i dag. Alverdens ondskab og dumhed kan præsentrere sig som nye skridt frem i "udviklingen", for færre og færre mennesker er overhovedet i stand til at stille det spørsmål, om "udviklingen" muligvis går ad Helvede til. Sygdommen, der begyndte i biologien og hurtigt bredte sig til historien og sociologien og teologien og alt andet, er på vej til at lamme både hjerne og hjerte i det menneskelige samfund." (Hoffmann,P.; Mørke skjuler jorden; Lohse 1985; s.15)

"I første rekke blant forstandstroens profeter står Darwin (utviklingslæren, som ikke lenger bare forkvakler biologien, men også historieforskningen og i stigende grad teologien), Freud (den moderne psykologi, som til dels brukes til å bortforklare den religiøse virkelighetserfaring, dels til å skaffe "syndsforlatelse" utenom Gud), Marx (den ateistisk-materialistiske forfalskning av historien og samfunnsvitenskapene, som omsatt i politisk praksis skaper stadig mer helvete på jorden, også i vestlige land, som i denne henseende er like marxistiske som kommunistlandene), samt Bultmann (den radikale bibelkritikk, som eter om seg som en kraft i teologien). Om dem alle gjelder det at deres teorier beviselig er gale og knapt verd en alvorlig tanke på bakgrunn av nåtidens viten, men den religiön de har grunnfestet, har mennesket funnet så velegnet til å unndra seg sannheten ved, at kjensgjerningene ikke lenger får lov å distrahere." (Hoffmann,P.; Narkotika og sex i Bibelens lys; Ansgar, år ikke oppgitt; s.17)

6b. Hoffmann,P.; Undergang og oppstandelse; Nomi 1968; s.83.

7. Bergman (ref.6a) p.270.

8. Bergman,J.; Hitler and the Nazi Darwinian Worldview - How the Nazi eugenic crusade for a superior race caused the greatest holocaust in world history; Joshua Press 2012; p.45.

9. Se ellers Bergman (ref. 6a & 8) og Høgetveit,D.J.; Hva Karl Marx og John D. Rockefeller har til felles; kommentar-avisa.no

10. Morris,H.M.; The Long War Against God - The history and impact of the creation/evolution conflict; Master Books ed. 2008; p.181.

11. Ashton,J.F. PhD (Ed.); In Six Days - Why fifty scientists chose to believe in creation; Master Books 9th pr. 2012; p.268.

12.Ib. p.325.

13a. Gitt,W.; In the beginning was information - A Scientist Explains the Incredible Design in Nature; Master Books ed. 4th pr. 2017; p.101. (Gitts ref.: Hastead,B.; Popper: Good Philosophy, Bad Science?; New Scientist (July 17, 1980): p. 215-217.)

"The retired Dr. Gitt was a director and professor at the German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology (Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt, Braunschweig), the Head of the Department of Information Technology." (Blurb)

"... we want to point out a fundamental fallacy that has already caused many misunderstandings and has led to seriously erroneous conclusions, namely the assumption that information is a material phenomenon. The philosophy of materialism is fundamentally predisposed to relegate information to the material domain, as is apparent from philosophical articles emanating from the former DDR". (p.51)

"Is it, for example, possible that information could have originated in a postulated primeval soup?" (p.39)

"According to the information laws, every piece of information requires a sender. The demarcated region in Figure 26 is in principle not accessible for scientific research, namely the person of the sender. Since the sender cannot be investigated by human means, many people erroneously conclude that He does not exist, and thus they contravene the information theorems. The requirement that there must be a personal sender exercising his own free will, cannot be relinquished. This sender, the Creator, has revealed himself so that we do have information about Him. He, Jesus, was in the world and the world was made through Him (John 1:10). Everything in the entire universe, without exception, was created by Him, as stated in the first verses of John's Gospel and in Colossians 1:16: "For by him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things were created by him and for him."

The close link between information and will was discussed in paragraph 3.3, and this idea is also clearly emphasized many times in the Bible. We read in Revelation 4:11, "You created all things, and by your will they were created and have their being." The intentional prerequisite of information is expressed in Genesis 1:26: "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness."

In the light of the information theorems, all materialistic evolution models are useless and are thus rejected. <"In my book Did God Use Evolution? ... theistic evolution is discussed in detail and is rejected." (Note)>

The British evolution theoreticist Richard Dawkins expresses the following expectation in his book *The Blind Watchmaker*: "The purpose of this book is to provide a non-supernatural explanation for the existence of complex living organisms" ... As a consequence, we cannot expect to find a scientifically based answer in his discussion (e.g., because of Theorem 17)." (p.135-7)

Gitt definerer de vitenskapelige termer; herunder "Hypothesis (Greek hypóthesis = assumption, conjecture, supposition): A hypothesis is an unverified scientific conjecture which contains speculations, and which amplifies an incomplete empirical result, or provisionally explains some fact. Any new hypothesis must be based on facts, and it may not contradict the known laws of nature. If a hypothesis serves as a methodological guide when a new research project is undertaken, it is known as a working hypothesis. When observational facts support a hypothesis, the probability of its being true is increased, but if ONE contradicting fact is uncovered, the hypothesis must be rejected (falsification). As early as the 17th century, Blaise Pascal (1623-1662) said that we could be certain that a hypothesis is false if ONE SINGLE derived relationship contradicts any observed phenomenon." (p.28) Det skulle fremgå rimelig klart at 'evolusjon' ikke kvalifiserer som vitenskapelig hypotese.

P.29: "Paradigm (Greek parádeigma = example, sample): When a certain theory (or a system of hypotheses, or a world view) pervades entire fields of research or an entire scientific era, it is known as a paradigm. Such a view then dictates the scope for specific researches and delineates the presuppositions used for explaining individual phenomena. If a system of hypotheses has been derived from presuppositions dictated by a world view, it usually cannot be reconciled with the available facts. Typical examples are geocentricity (refuted by Copernicus), and phlogiston chemistry (disproved by Lavoisier in 1774). It is hoped that this book will help to uproot the current evolutionary paradigm."

13b. Ref.1; pp.180.183.184-5.187.186.188.

14. Ref.5; pp.39-40.

Ang. Sanfords analyse, skriver Batten i note (p.39): "Sanford has presented this analysis in the book Genetic Entropy and the Mystery of the Genome; FMS Publications; 3rd edition, March 2008 (available through creation.com). For a review of the first edition, see: Truman,R.; From ape to man via genetic meltdown: a theory in crisis - A review of, J. Creation 21(1):43-47,2007; creation.com/sanford-review."

15. Ref.5; pp.66.69-71.

16. Reed,J.K.; Rocks aren't Clocks - A Critique of the Geological Timescale; Creation Book Publ. 2013; pp.208.67.

17. Gardiner,G.P.; i Garret,L. (Compiled & Ed. by); Which Bible Can We Trust?; Christian Centre Press (Qld.) 4th pr. 1998; p.127.

18a. Mauro,Ph.; Evolution at the Bar; Hamilton Bros. Scripture Depot 1922 5th pr.; re-publ. by Forgotten Books 2012; pp.62-3.

18b. Om evolusjonisters bestrebelser på å korrigere Bibelen, se Høgetveit,D.J.; Which Bible-version does a 'creationist' read?; kommentar-avisa.no

19. Statham,D.; Remembering the Christian roots of science; Creation Ministries International (UK & Europe)' Prayer News Oct-Dec 2017. Statham siterer "Harrison,P., God's, Man's and Nature's: Laws of Nature, Moral Order, and the Intelligibility of the Cosmos, ISSN-2045-5577; lse.ac.uk, 2011." og "Stark,R.; For the Glory of God: How Monotheism Led to Reformations, Science, Witch-hunts and the End of Slavery, Princeton University Press, Oxford. p. 147, 2003."

20. Stark,R.; How the West Won - The Neglected Story of the Triumph of Modernity; ISI Books 2014; pp.309-0.

21. Creation 30(4):46,2008.

"I am sorry to have to inform you that I do not believe in the Bible as a divine revelation, & therefore not in Jesus Christ as the son of God." (Charles Darwin(1))

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; October 2017

Darwin wrote in 1880. But already in 1860 he wrote to "My good and kind agent for the propagation of the Gospel - i.e. the devil's gospel"; to Thomas Henry Huxley, 8 Aug. that year.

Charles Lyell. "Raised in the Anglican Church, which allowed him to attend Oxford University, Lyell later converted to Unitarianism (or Deism) and worshipped regularly at the Little Portland Street Unitarian Chapel in London. Spurred on by his new faith commitment, Lyell dedicated himself to the task of destroying the credibility of the biblical flood as a means of explaining the geological formations of the earth. In other words, so long as the earth was seen as being a few thousand years old, supernatural intervention was indeed possible, but if the age of the earth could be reckoned to be millions of years, he reasoned that no supernatural involvement was necessary. The title page of his book exemplifies his intentions. It reads, "Principles of Geology, Being an attempt to explain the former changes of the Earth's surface by reference to the causes now in operation."

The long-accepted global deluge, from Lyell's perspective, was totally mythical. As we have noted previously, church leaders, even an evangelical such as Dr. Chalmers, inadvertently aided his cause. Their deliberate harmonization of long ages into the biblical text set up this inevitable sequence: "First to go was Genesis-time: next to go a universal flood."(2) (Compare Lyell's predecessor, James Hutton's *The Theory of the Earth*, about which Herbert (p.36) writes "It is significant to note that the Noachic flood was never disproved nor refuted, just flatly rejected.")

"I am sure you may get into Q.R. <Quarterly Review> what will free the science <of geology> from Moses, for if treated seriously, the <church> party are <sic> quite prepared for it... all I say is, there are, as Hutton said, "no signs of a beginning, no prospect of an end"...I was afraid to point the moral, as much as you can do in the Q.R. about Moses... If we don't irritate, which I fear that we may (though mere history), we shall carry all with us. If you don't triumph over them, but compliment the liberality and candour of the present age, the bishops and enlightened saints will join us in despising both the ancient and modern physico-theologians. It is just the time to strike, so rejoice that, sinner as you are, the Q.R. is open to you.

P.S. ... I conceived the idea five or six years ago <1824-25>, that if ever the Mosaic geology could be set down without giving offence, it would be in an historical sketch, and you must abstract mine, in order to have as little to say as possible yourself. Let them feel it, and point the moral."

Lyell writes to George Poulett Scrope, 14 June 1830(3a), the year of the first volume of his *Principles of Geology*; found in Darwin's luggage when HMS Beagle left Plymouth December 1831.

"... without giving offence..." "Lyell is most firmly convinced that he has shaken the faith in the Deluge far more efficiently by never having said a word against the Bible, than if he had acted otherwise", Darwin wrote decades later.(3b)

"The late, atheist Harvard geologist, Stephen J. Gould, further informs us regarding Lyell, "Charles Lyell was a lawyer by profession, and his book <Principles of Geology, 1830-1833> is one of the most brilliant briefs ever publ-

ished by an advocate.... Lyell relied upon true bits of cunning to establish his uniformitarian views as the only true geology. First, he set up a straw man to demolish.... In fact, the catastrophists were much more empirically minded than Lyell. The geologic record does seem to require 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 empiricists of their day, not the blinded theological apologists."(4)

Charles again; Charles Robert Darwin: "...in 1880, Darwin wrote a letter to atheist Edward Aveling saying, "it appears to me (whether rightly or wrongly) that direct arguments against christianity <sic> and theism produce hardly any effect on the public." Darwin added that instead of arguing directly against Cristianity, the task of converting people to atheism "is best promoted by the gradual illumination of men's minds, which follow from the advance of science <i.e evolution>. It has, therefore, been always my object to avoid writing on religion <for publication, and for this reason> I have confined myself to science."(5)

On the connection Charles & Charles, Darwin wrote in his 'Origin' of 1859: "He who can read Sir Charles Lyell's grand work on the Principles of Geology, which the future historian will recognize as having produced a revolution in natural science, yet does not admit how incomprehensibly vast have been the past periods of time, may at once close this volume."

Darwin went further in an 1844 letter, admitting, "I always feel as if my books came half out of Lyell's brains <sic> and that I never acknowledge this sufficiently... for I have always thought that the great merit of the Principles <of Geology>, was that it altered the whole tone of one's mind & therefore that when seeing a thing never seen by Lyell, one yet saw it partially through his eyes."(6)

And the theology-bachelor Darwin's 'science' should end up accordingly.

"Lyell's uniformitarian dogma ruled geology until the 1970s when some evolutionary geologists began to return to the ideas of catastrophism that Hutton and Lyell had eradicated. One of the leaders in this reorientation in geology was the famous British geologist Derek Ager. In his last book on the geological record, The New Catastrophism (1993), Ager described the influence of Lyell this way: "Just as politicians rewrite human history, so geologists rewrite earth history. For a century and a half the geological world has been dominated, one might say brainwashed, by the gradualistic uniformitarianism of Charles Lyell. Any suggestion of "catastrophic" events has been rejected as old-fashioned, unscientific and even laughable."

If the geologists were brainwashed by Lyell's uniformitarian, naturalistic principles for over 150 years (and still are influenced by him), then so was the rest of the world, including evangelical theologians and Bible scholars who have told the Church that we must accept the millions of years and that the age of the creation doesn't matter.

Ager added, "Perhaps I am becoming a cynic in my old age, but I cannot help thinking that people find things that they expect to find."(7)

The combined works of Charles & Charles put the world on track towards atheism & disintegration; Jerry Bergman renders Benjamin Wiker's The Darwin Myth: Life and Lies of Charles Darwin; "In spite of some of Darwin's contradictory statements about God, Wiker argued that, in the end "Darwin's triumph has been to set ideological atheism as the default position of science; as the prism through which scientists are supposed to see the world and conduct their work. It is just as distorting to science as ideological Marxism is to the study of economics. It offers an answer for everything; it is an answer to which facts

The Intelligent Design Movement. "... while the IDM leaders are good at highlighting the heavy influence of philosophical naturalism in biology, they ignore its equal domination of geology and astronomy, which is why most IDM proponents have accepted the millions of years as proven scientific fact. But, as we've shown, naturalism took control of geology and astronomy 50 years before it took control of biology through Darwinism. In fact, the former laid the foundation for the latter, which then has been the basis for evolutionizing every other field of study in the academy. So the age and history of the creation strikes at the very heart of the stranglehold of science by philosophical naturalism."

"Stephen J. Gould, late professor of geology and paleontology at Harvard University and a strong anti-creationist, summarized the early developments in geology and its impact on biblical interpretation this way:

"Traditionally, non-biblical sources, whether natural or historical, had received their true meaning by being fitted into the unitary narrative of the Bible. This relationship now began to be reversed: the biblical narrative, it was now claimed, received its true meaning by being fitted, on the authority of self-styled experts, into a framework of non-biblical knowledge. In this way the cognitive plausibility and religious meaning of the biblical narrative could only be maintained in a form that was constrained increasingly by non-biblical considerations.... At least in Europe, if not in America, those geologists who regarded themselves as Christians generally accepted the new biblical criticism and therefore felt the age of the earth to be irrelevant to their religious beliefs."

Ultimately, what is at stake in this controversy about the age of the earth is the perspicuity and authority of Scripture. It simply does not teach deep time or gradual creation or a local Flood. It clearly teaches six literal days of supernatural creation only a few thousand years ago, and a global catastrophic Flood that radically altered the surface of the earth, destroying billions of plants, animals, and people in the process. Genesis 1-3, Romans 8:19-23, and other related passages just as clearly teach that His finished creation was very good and free of human and animal death. Furthermore, Scripture's testimony about the goodness, wisdom, power, justice, faithfulness, and grace of God makes it very difficult to comprehend how He could have created and destroyed countless species over the course of millions of years before creating man, who was commanded to rule over the creatures, most of whom (on this view) lived and died before Adam came on the scene. There is no scriptural warrant for this idea. To advocate it is to put an incompetent, wicked, or even sadistic face on God.

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? Or will we place more confidence in the words of scientists, who weren't there during the early history of the earth, who don't know everything, who repeatedly make mistakes (which is why they must continually revise their textbooks), and most of whom are in rebellion against their Creator, trying to explain the world without God so they do not have to feel morally accountable to Him?

A few years ago, one of the editors of this book had a private meeting with a well-known, godly leader of a large evangelical ministry. This leader wanted to hear why the editor believed the age of the earth was vitally important. Some of the points in this book were raised in their conversation. At the end of the discussion, this leader said, "I believe God could do anything. I believe He could create in six seconds, six days, or six million years." On first glance that appears to be a statement of great faith. But in reality it is not,

in spite of the godly sincerity of this Christian statesman, because the issue is not what we believe God could do or could have done. The issue is what God said that He did do. And so the question is this - will we believe what He said?"(9)

AFTERWORD

"The irony ... is that, even though Darwin had pushed God out of his everyday world, God was still there... working in the life of one James Fegan. This Brethren layman, feeling called of God to care for the underprivileged boys of London, established his first orphanage in 1872. Since his parents had moved to Downe, he had an opportunity to come into contact with the Darwin family. Wanting to begin an evangelistic outreach in Downe, and needing a place to conduct these meetings, Mr. Fegan, in a daring move, wrote to Darwin, a man of international fame and of much higher social standing. He asked permission to use the old school house that Darwin had rented ... and converted into a 'Reading Room' for the villagers. Darwin's reply was:

"You ought not to have to write to me for permission to use the Reading Room. You have far more right to it than we have, for your services have done more for the village in a few months than all our efforts for many years. We have never been able to reclaim a drunkard but through your services I do not know that there is a drunkard left in the village. Now may I have the pleasure of handing the Reading Room over to you."

Mrs. Henrietta Litchfield, Darwin's daughter, in compiling her mother's letters, added this footnote to one dated February 1881: "Old M was a notable drunkard in the village of Downe, converted by Mr. Fegan."

Such demonstration of God's power in reclaiming those caught in the grip of alcoholism had a profound effect on the Darwin family. When Mr. Fegan was conducting his evangelistic services in the Reading Room, which was called 'The Gospel Room', the meal schedule at the Darwin home was altered so that everyone could attend. There is no record that Charles ever went.

But the God that Darwin had purged from the realm of nature and had pushed back into some distant past, made his presence known in Darwin's own household.

Joseph Parslow, his faithful butler for some forty years, and Mrs. Sales, the housekeeper, committed their lives to Jesus Christ as a result of Mr. Fegan's preaching.

The reality of God's redeeming power as witnessed by Charles Darwin in the work of the South American Missionary Society in Tierra del Fuego and in the effective proclamation of the gospel to the alcoholics of Downe and members of his own household seemed to have had little impact on his life. But God was indeed at work in Darwin's world!"(10)

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Letter to Frederic McDermott, 25 Nov. 1880. Quoted in Bell, Ph.; Seize the Year!; Creation Ministries Int (UK & Europe)' Prayer News Jan-March 2009. Philip Bell, CEO CMI UK & Europe, writes: "Ever since Darwin, creationists have highlighted the connection between believing evolution and denying Christianity. Tragically, many Christian leaders have ignored or even denied this. It is part of what CMI calls 'the relevance message' - it undergirds all we engage in."

"Darwin showed that he was well aware of the relevance of his message - a dangerous idea that undermined the truth of Scripture." "Consider that in a letter in 1859, he calls Thomas Huxley ('Darwin's Bulldog'): '... my good and admirable agent for the promulgation of damnable heresies <"damnable heresies"> ; quote from 2.Pet.2,1; AV/KJV>. Less than a year later, he wrote again to Huxley as 'My good and kind agent for the propagation of the Gospel - i.e. the devil's gospel.'"

2. Herbert, D.; Charles Darwin's Religious Views - From creationist to evolutionist; Joshua Press rev.ed., 2009; p.40.

- 3a. Mortenson, T. PhD, Ury, T.H. PhD (Ed.s); Coming to Grips with Genesis - Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth; Master Books 7th pr. 2013; p.91.
- 3b. Morris, H.M. PhD; The Long War Against God - The history and impact of the creation/evolution conflict; Master Books ed. 4th pr. 2008; p.167: "Unpublished manuscript at Cambridge, dated 1873, as cited in Himmelfarb, p. 320."
4. Mortenson, T. PhD (Ed.); Searching for Adam - Genesis & the Truth About Man's Origin; Master Books 2nd pr. 2016; p.477 (Mortenson); quote completed from Sarfati, J.D. PhD; The Greatest Hoax on Earth? - Refuting Dawkins on Evolution; Creation Book Publ. 2010; p.185,
 "But contrary to Gould's anti-biblical assessment, it was not the old-earth catastrophists of the early 19th century who were the really hard-nosed empiricists. It was the scriptural geologists that I studied in my PhD research <see Mortenson: The Great Turning Point> who paid close attention to God's eyewitness testimony in Genesis as well as to the rocks and fossils, and who used His inerrant Word as the key to the correct interpretation of the geological evidence." (Mortenson p.478)
5. Bergman, J. PhD (x2); The Dark Side of Charles Darwin - A Critical Analysis of an Icon of Science; Master Books 2011; pp.49-0.
 Terry Mortenson PhD writes (p.2): "In his typical thoroughness, Dr. Bergman has carefully considered a wealth of literature by Darwin (both his public and private writings) and by his many sympathetic, if not admiring, biographers and commentators to reveal a more accurate picture of Darwin. Darwin was hardly an unbiased objective pursuer of truth, as his past and present devoted friends and disciples want us to believe. Rather, his writings on evolution used a mixture of scientific facts, faulty data, misinformation, plagiarized ideas, distortions of reality, and unbridled imagination to deceptively advance his anti-Christian, anti-biblical agenda, which has wreaked such social, political, theological, and moral havoc in the world."
6. Ref.4 p.476.
7. Ref.4 pp.476-7.
8. Ref.5 p.71.
9. Ref.3 pp.430.433-4 (Editors).
10. Ref.2 pp.157-8.