

SKRIFTEN VS. JON KVALBEIN; IV

"... tro Skriften, den vil ikke lyve for deg." (Martin Luther)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; august 2017

"Bibelen er endelig og ufeilbarlig autoritet i alle spørsmål som har med tro, lære og liv å gjøre. Dette skriftprinsippet er grunnleggende for reformatørisk kristendom", skriver Jon Kvalbein under den adekvate overskrift Bibelen og jordas alder (Dagen 21.08.17);

Carl Fr. Wisløff (derimot; 2000 år med Kristus s.364), skriver "At Bibelen skal være "eneste regel og rettesnor, som alle lærer og alle lærere bør vurderes og dømmes etter" har siden 1800-tallet innen lutherdommen blitt kalt reformasjonens formalprinsipp."

Kvalbeins (slik jeg gjentagent finner å måtte lese ham) forsøksvis avgrensning av Bibelens "autoritet" er ikke reformatørisk enn si Bibelens lære; jvf. eks. vis 2.Tim.3,16 & Apgj.24,14.

Bibelen "er endelig og ufeilbarlig autoritet i alle spørsmål" den direkte og indirekte berører.

"Luther ville ikke binde samvittighetene til filosofier, skikker og ordninger som ikke har bibelsk grunnlag. Gud har ikke bundet vår tro til bestemte teorier om naturen." (J.K.)

Her synes både Luthers oppfatning av temaet "jordas alder", samt hans begrunnelse for samme, å være av interesse:

"He <Moses> calls "a spade a spade", i.e., he employs the terms "day" and "evening" without Allegory, just as we customarily do ... we assert that Moses spoke in the literal sense, not allegorically or figuratively, i.e., that the world, with all its creatures, was created within six days, as the words read. If we do not comprehend the reason for this, let us remain pupils and leave the job of teacher to the Holy Spirit."

"The "days" of creation were ordinary days in length. We must understand that these days were actual days <his Latin text reads, veros dies>, contrary to the opinion of the holy fathers. Whenever we observe that the opinions of the fathers disagree with Scripture, we reverently bear with them, and acknowledge them to be our elders. Nevertheless, we do not depart from the authority of Scripture for their sakes."

"We know from Moses that the world was not in existence before 6,000 years ago." (I Jonathan Sarfati: Refuting Compromise; 2.ed. pp.121-2)

Kvalbein vil vel kalle reformatoren ung-jord-kreasjonist.

Bibelens skapelsesberetning, med en 'utdypelse' i 1.M.2, blir hos Kvalbein til "de to skapelsesberetningene".

"Vi må ikke lese skapelsesberetningene med briller som er laget i vårt eget århundre og tenke at her finner vi en alternativ beretning til Big Bang og Darwins utviklingslære."

Neida. Noen av oss leser skapelsesberetningen slik menigheten alltid leste den inntil 'opplysnings'-filosofer fulgt av Lyell & Darwin et al. oppkom med et alternativ.

"Både astronomi, geologi, biologi og fysikk vitner om at jorda er gammel og at skapelsen må ha skjedd over lengre tid", fastslår Kvalbein. Men altså ikke Skriften. "Gud lurer oss ikke. Han har ikke plassert gamle fossiler i en ung jord."

Mon Kvalbein likevel er blitt lurt; mon fossilene ikke er "gamle"?

Der dukker (ubeleilig for noen, beleilig for sannheten) opp ett og annet som 'burde' vært borte eller fossilisert; for man 'vet' jo at Dino døde for '65 millioner år' siden.

"A series of discoveries since the early 1990s has revealed dinosaur bones with

blood cells, hemoglobin, fragile proteins, soft tissue such as flexible ligaments and blood vessels, and - of special note - DNA and carbon 14.

How could such bones possibly be 65 million years old? As one of the researchers involved in the discovery of dinosaur blood cells, Dr Mary Schweitzer said: "If you take a blood sample, and you stick it on a shelf, you have nothing recognizable in about a week. So why would there be anything left in dinosaurs?"

Why indeed? Unless, of course, they haven't been extinct for millions of years, and their remains were preserved quickly under catastrophic conditions a few thousand years ago. Yet the evolutionary paradigm of millions of years is so entrenched in the scientific community that Dr. Schweitzer had trouble getting her results published. "I had one reviewer tell me that he didn't care what the data said, he knew that what I was finding wasn't possible," says Schweitzer. "I wrote back and said, 'Well, what data would convince you?' And he said, 'None.'""(Kilden oppgir creation.com/dino-disquiet)

"... siden naturen er Guds skaperverk, bør vi gi akt på hva naturen selv forteller gjennom den viten som vitenskapen har avdekket."

Kvalbein kunne ha nevnt at "naturen" etter syndefallet er en "forbannet" utgave av "Guds skaperverk" (1.M.3,17), at "vår formørkede forstand" må kalibreres av Skriften, og at "vitenskap" ikke sjelden har et a-teistisk utgangspunkt og sikte.

"Dersom universet er 6000 år, vil vi ikke kunne se himmellegemer langt borte." Tja; man kan saktens undres hvordan det henger sammen. Her, som ellers, gjelder primært "Sett din lit til Herren av hele ditt hjerte, og stol ikke på din forstand!" (Ordspr.3,5) Guds ord først.

"One of the most common attacks on the YEC <Young Earth Creationist> model by old-earthers such as Ross is that light would supposedly not have had enough time to reach earth from distant stars (see page 186 for some creationist ideas and proposals on this issue). But the horizon problem is the big bangers' own "light travel problem". How can old earthers so freely criticize YEC on the very problem that they have not yet solved from their own perspective?" (Sarfati p.155)

"Fossilene vitner om døde dyr og planter som er mye eldre enn 6000 år. Oljen i Nordsjøen har bakgrunn i døde dyr og planter, og radioaktive målinger viser at de er mye eldre enn 6000 år. Ung-jord-kreasjonismen avviser alle slike dateringer. Selv har jeg fysikk hovedfag med spesialområde radioaktiv stråling. Radioaktivitet er en kjernereaksjon som er svært uavhengig av ytre forhold, og det er intet som tyder på at halveringstiden for radioaktive isotoper har endret seg etter syndefallet."

Dr. Jim Mason, Ph.D. Experimental Nuclear Physics, McMaster Univ., Canada og fhv. "Vice President of Engineering and Chief Technology Officer for one of Canada's leading defense electronics system integration companies", ser det slik:

Vedr. "isochron dating" "the calculation of the length of time, though apparently quite straightforward, makes a number of assumptions about the past, which, without an eye-witness present throughout the process, cannot be known to be true. Consequently, the calculated time cannot be known to be correct.

The same is true for radiometric dating."

"Additionally, all radiometric dating techniques assume that the half-lives of the transformations involved (or, equivalently, the rates of the transformations) have remained constant at today's values throughout the entire history of the rock. Although this assumption may seem much more likely than the others, recent discoveries indicate that the transformation rates of ... vary in conjunction with variation in solar activity. Thus, it is clearly possible that this assumption could also be wrong. This is supported by the findings of scientists working on the RATE project (Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth), sponsored by the Institute for Creation Research, who concluded there was a

pulse of accelerated radioactive decay around the time of the Flood. This was strongly indicated by helium diffusion experiments (see discussion later) and supported by other lines of evidence from the analysis of radiohalos and fission tracks. When, how much and by what mechanism this extra decay happened is still a matter of debate.

Since the calculations of age are quite sensitive to these assumptions, and since it is clear that we cannot know if the assumptions are true, and since radiometric dating produces wildly incorrect results for rocks of known ages, it is quite reasonable to conclude that radiometric dates are entirely unreliable." (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.204-5)

"En rekke geologiske prosesser tar lang tid", men sannelig viste det seg da toppen blåste av Mount St. Helens i Washington State 18.mai 1980, at en rekke geologiske prosesser naturalistisk dogmatikk postulerte tok lang tid, ikke tok lang tid likevel; (se eks.vis. John Morris & Steven A. Austin: Footprints in the Ash).

"Det har vært flere istider", vet Jon Kvalbein, "den siste tok slutt for cirka 11.000 år siden." (Jeg blir generelt skeptisk når noe oppgis å være eldre enn universet.)

"Ung-jordtilhengere ... Vi kan lese merkelige forsøk på å lage seg en egen naturvitenskap. Her er Mont <sic> Everest oppstått etter syndfloden. Istiden er datert etter syndfloden."

Hva er problemet? Har Everest, med kalkstein og marine fossiler, alltid vært der? Enn istiden?

"In their latest period of time, secular scientists think there were a number of distinct ice ages, each lasting 40,000 or 100,000 years. They now think there were as many as 50 ice ages in the past 2.6 million years, yet they have not yet discovered a viable mechanism. This problem can be answered by the Flood, which would have exercised a powerful effect on the climate (Chapter 11). The oceans would likely have warmed from the extreme volcanism that created the mid-ocean ridges and large igneous provinces. The continents, on the other hand, would be relatively cool, because huge amounts of volcanic ash and aerosols would block much sunlight. That would create a climate that would include large, violent storms moving off the oceans, cooling, and dumping snow and ice over the interiors at high and mid latitudes. The exception would be the coastal areas, that would be warmed by the warmer oceans. The buildup of ice in the interiors would persist until the ocean temperatures cooled. Using basic principles of meteorology, we can see where ice would have accumulated as large sheets. These locations match exactly the geologic evidence of the locations of the ancient ice sheets. Since there was only one great Flood, there would have been only one Ice Age. Based on heat balance equations, it would have lasted roughly 700 years." (Michael J. Oard & John K. Reed; How Noah's Flood Shaped Our Earth (2017); p.170)

"At hele skapelsesprosessen tok seks alminnelige dager for cirka 6000 år siden er et urokkelig lærepunkt blant adventister og Jehovas Vitner. I USA er denne tenkningen utbredt også i store kirkesamfunn. En årsak til dette kan være at den irske biskop James Ussher i 1650 brukte Bibelens åttetavler til å beregne at skapelsen startet 23. oktober år 4004 før Kristi fødsel. Dette ble i 1701 trykt inn i den prestisjefulle King James-oversettelsen, og ung-jord-tenkningen fikk vid utbredelse i den anglikanske verden."

Det bør vel presiseres at "B.C. 4004" ble trykket som nøyte i KJV (-Bibelen). Tidlig 1700-tall var forøvrig den "anglikanske verden" ukjent med formørknings-tidens gammel-jord-aspirasjoner, men naturligvis ikke uvitende om Bibelens ord-

lyd, reformatorenes syn eller eks.vis. Isaac Newtons (1642-1727) beregning av skapelsen til omkring 4000 f.Kr.; ("reformatorene"; "They will not refrain from guffaws when they are informed that but little more than five thousand years have passed since the creation of the universe." (Johan Calvin; Sarfati p.123)).

Om the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, James Ussher, finner den ikke utpreget bibel-vennlige Harvard-geologi&paleontologi-professor Stephen Jay Gould å skrive: "I shall be defending Ussher's chronology as an honorable effort for its time and arguing that our usual ridicule only records a lamentable smallmindedness based on mistaken use of present criteria to judge a distant and different past. ...

Ussher represented the best of scholarship in his time. He was part of a substantial research tradition, a large community of intellectuals working toward a common goal under an accepted methodology. ..." (Sarfati p.127)

Vedr. Jehovas Vitner, så skriver deres Ny Verden-oversettelse (1996) i et tillegg om "Bibelske Samtaletemaer": "40. Skapelsen" "B. Skapelsesdagene ikke på 24 timer" "Dag" kan rett og slett bety tidsperiode ... 1Mo 2:4" "En "dag" i Guds øyne kan være lang tid ... Sl 90:4; 2Pe 3:8"

Boken Livet - et resultat av utvikling eller skapelse? (Watchtower Bible and Tract Society 1985; s.26) skriver "Den første delen av 1. Mosebok viser at jorden kan ha eksistert i milliarder av år før den første "dag" - hvor lenge sier den ikke noe om. Men den beskriver jordens tilstand rett før den første "dag" begynte: "Jorden var øde og tom ..."

Jehovas Vitners 'dogmatikk' synes til forveksling kunne ligne Jon Kvalbeins. Og hva så?

"Kristne bør tale sant om virkeligheten. De som sier at troskap mot Bibelen bare kan forenes med at jorda er 6000 år, kan skape falske anstøt og unødvendige troskriser. Det er grunn til å advare imot dem som hevder et slikt syn. Her ligger en kime til sekterisme."

Så er vi advart. Skal tro hvem Martin Luther ville advart mot?

Hva "unødvendige troskriser" angår: "I am afraid that schools will prove to be the great gates of Hell unless they diligently labor in explaining the Holy Scriptures, engraving them in the hearts of youth. I advise no one to place his child where the Scriptures do not reign paramount. Every institution in which men are not increasingly occupied with the Word of God must become corrupt." (Martin Luther; Ham&Hall p.131)

Men. "This generation does not know there is a battle, does not care if there is a battle, does not know the enemy, does not know what is at stake, and does not care. You would hope that the Christian colleges would have been preparing "warriors" for the ensuing conflict. But they have not. They have bought into the enemy's strategy to divide and conquer. As President Hall notes, "While we should have been equipping students, we have been confusing them." (Ken Ham & Greg Hall: Already Compromised - Christian colleges took a test on the state of their faith and the final exam is in; pp.91-2)

"I do find, however, that students have little problem understanding that the enemies of God will stop at nothing to discredit the Scripture. What they don't understand, though, are the numbers of Christian institutions, ministries, churches, pastors, and Christian educators who are doing the same." (Hall p.41)

"... once a Christian accepts a non-biblical view, they must then accept other non-biblical ideas to fulfill the logic of their error." (Ham p.34)

Ham & Hall's bok tør ha interesse; også for fhv. rektor Kvalbein.

"I have visited hundreds and hundreds of churches. Everywhere I go, music seems to be the central issue. Even in conservative churches everyone tries to make a big deal out of praise and worship. We think that if we can make it

dynamic, energetic, and fit the style of the generation we're trying to reach, the epidemic will be stopped and young people will start flooding back into the Church. That's simply not the case. Our research showed that music is not a fundamental factor in young adults choosing to leave or stay at a church - but the preaching of God's Word is."

"However, to try to restore relevancy to Scripture, what do we usually do these days? We add guitars and drums to the service. We think that the Church needs to follow the culture in order to be relevant." (Ken Ham & Britt Beemer; *Already Gone - Why your kids will quit church and what you can do to stop it*; pp.110-11)

"There is a war going on over the Word of God. This is not the time to focus on making people feel good."

See [ellers CREATION.COM/FALLOUT](http://www.creation.com/fallout)

ETTERSKRIFT

History indicates that nearly all scientific breakthroughs have come from the minority who have been willing to challenge convention. Scientists should be the last to forget that the scientific majority has time and again been proven wrong. And evangelicals should never disregard this important reminder from history, nor doubt that the Semmelweis-reflex is alive and well. Dr. Jeremiah Ostriker, distinguished professor of astrophysical science and former director of the Princeton University Observatory, seems to think a little more humility is needed in the scientific community: "If you look historically, almost all of the models at any given time that people have are wrong. So there's no particular reason why they shouldn't be this time, and why should scientists be so stupid as not to realize this?" (Terry Mortenson & Thane H. Ury (Ed.s): *Coming to Grips with Genesis - Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth*; p.19)

Men "Skriften kan ikke gjøres ugyldig" (Jesus Kristus; Joh.10,35).

"Confirmation of my suspicions comes from an unlikely source. In his work entitled *Fundamentalism*, James Barr takes conservative evangelicals to task for insisting on a literal interpretation of Scripture but then abandoning it when it comes to the creation story in Genesis. Barr explains that "as the scientific approach came to have more and more assent from fundamentalists themselves, they shifted their interpretation of the Bible passage from literal to non-literal in order to save ... the inerrancy of the Bible." In order to avoid the consequence of an errant Bible, the fundamentalists "has tried every possible direction of interpretation other than the literal." Yet, Barr rightly continues, "in fact the only natural exegesis is a literal one, in the sense that this is what the author meant." (p.161; Todd S. Beall; Barr i 1977; per 1984 oppgitt å være Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford Univ.)

Mortenson & Ury skriver i epilog (pp.427-8): "We have shown that young-earth creationism is the historic, orthodox teaching of the Church. For 1,800 years, the almost universal belief of Christians was that God created in six literal days about 6,000 years ago, and that He destroyed the world with a global Flood at the time of Noah. But in the early 19th century, deistic and atheistic geologists and astronomers, armed with anti-biblical assumptions, began to advance their old-earth and old-universe theories. There were dissenting voices, of course, but when this Pandora's box was opened in the Church, believers began to embrace gap, day-age, local Flood, and framework theories, and other tenets not immediately apparent from a natural reading of Genesis 1-11. Who can calculate the damage this has done to Christendom?

The price tag of inserting millions of years into the Bible has been quite costly. First, we are asked to ignore many details of the biblical text in Genesis and elsewhere in Scripture, as discussed in this volume. Second, we

must also reject, ignore or otherwise suppress the plain teaching of Jesus and the Apostles. Third, by incorporating "deep time" into our thinking, we undermine the Bible's teaching on the origin of death. Fourth, we sully the character of God by adopting a view that has no other recourse but than to affirm that the natural evil we presently observe was designed and called very good by the Creator. Fifth, we are left with many other thorny conundrums, not the least of which is this: if our omnipotent Creator's finished work was not death-free (death even seen as "good"), then what assurance do we have that the new heavens and new earth will be death-free? Why trust Scripture on the eschaton, but not the beginning? No matter how sincere one's motives are, or how unintentional the fallout, tethering deep time to Scripture ultimately undermines the gospel of Jesus Christ, which is rooted in the literal history of Genesis, and the hope of the gospel in the eternal state, where there will be no more natural or moral evil."

(Jeg registrerer av dagens Dagen (24. aug.) at Jon Kvalbein korrigerer sin opplysning vedr. Jehovas Vitner. Godt. Det endrer naturligvis ikke hans intensjon bak anførselen 21. aug.)