

FAGSJEKK?

"Naturalism assumes a period of billions of years before recorded history; the Bible explicitly refutes it. Evolutionary biology, big bang cosmology, and uniformitarian natural history all demand deep time, with humans appearing on the scene only at the last second. But the Bible links human history to "the beginning"; Jesus himself affirming that truth. Although this seemingly simple logic escapes many seminary professors, it is plain enough to laymen. Secularists understand the conflict, and jealously guard prehistory. Don't think so? Then take a 'hysteria meter' to a university soirée. It will jump if God is mentioned. It will spike if polite doubts are expressed about Darwin. But if you want to see it peg the red line, just casually let drop that the Earth is only a few thousand years old." (John K. Reed; Rocks aren't Clocks - A Critique of the Geological Timescale; p.53)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; oktober 2020

"Fagsjekk.no er et nettsted med formål å hjelpe til kritisk tenkning og faktaformidling i skolen, inkludert påstander elever møter i populærkulturen...vi ønsker i første omgang spesielt å se på temaer som historiske myter, ikke minst om forholdet mellom tro og vitenskap i historien." Skriver Fagsjekk.no, lansert 17. september - allerede 22. september leveres en anmeldelse av Andreas Årikstad (og foreningen Skapers) bok "Guds verden". "For å bli bedre i stand til å vurdere ulike påstander og arbeide så nøytralt som rimelig er, har vi knyttet til oss en rådgivende gruppe kvalifiserte personer fra ulike fag- og livssynsperspektiver." (fagsjekk.no)

"Fagsjekk ønsker å jobbe kildebasert og formidle etablert forskning uten ideologiske bindinger", skriver ni fagrådsmedlemmer (Dagen 05.10.20), herunder to ved NLA Høgskolen. Troen på "etablert forskning uten ideologiske bindinger" og / eller på egen evne til å formidle "uten ideologiske bindinger" synes indikere utilstrekkelig oppmerksomhet på egen bias - man er vel 'objektiv' eller så nøytral "som rimelig er".

"Fagrådet representerer forskjellig kompetanse og ulike livssyn, med bakgrunn i at hva som sies er viktigere enn hvem som sier det."

Fagsjekk.no, frontet av evolusjonist Bjørn Are Davidsen(1), har altså et fagråd hvor troende (om ikke akkurat Bibel-troende) og ateister (geolog Karsten Eig skrives annetsteds være ateist) er gått i felles åk. Dette synkretistiske foretaket har bakgrunn og utgangspunkt i Laget (NKSS), med støtte bl.a. fra Friskoleforbundet (KFF), et forbund med medlemsskoler som er opprettet for å motvirke antikristen ideologisk innflytelse.

Tilværelsens basale fakta finnes fra og i begynnelsen; I begynnelsen var Ordet, I begynnelsen skapte Gud (Joh.1,1.3; 1.Mos.1; 2.Mos.20,11). Her er ikke rom for "ulike livssyn", her er ikke "hva som sies" "viktigere enn hvem som sier det" eller omvendt - Ordet er Gud. Jeg er i begynnelsen. (Joh.1,1.14; Åp. 21,6) Menneskene er der fra skapningens begynnelse - tro Moses, men tror I ikke hans skrifter, hvorledes kan I da tro mine ord? (Mark.10,6; Joh.5,47; 3,12)

Regnekyndige (Bibel-troende) mennesker, som Isaac Newton, finner menneskets historie og dermed "skapningens begynnelse" ca. 4000 f.Kr.

(Newton "even wrote a book defending the Ussher chronology against those who would try to push back the date of creation. He wrote strong papers refuting atheism and defending creation and the Bible. He believed that the worldwide Flood of the Bible accounted for most of the geological phenomena, and he believed in the literal six-day creation record. Finally, he said: "We account the Scriptures of God to be the most sublime philosophy. I find more sure marks of authenticity in the Bible than in any profane history whatsoever."" (Henry M. Morris; Men of Science, Men of God; p.32))

I flg. fagrådsmedlemmene "finnes det ingen seriøse akademiske fagmiljøer innen geologi som diskuterer om jorden er noen få tusen år gammel eller publiserer fagartikler om det." Og vi har lest det gjentagent; 'ingen seriøse ... ingen seriøse ... ingen seriøse som ...' – denne halvkvadede henvisning til konsensusvitenskap og konformitetens gullstandard, med utdefinering av vitenskapsmenn som tror Bibelen, herunder 'Mosaisk geologi', som Charles Lyell benevnte den. 2

"Consensus science (also known as groupthink) is not science at all, because no scientist in possession of data supporting their hypothesis would ever appeal to a consensus... Respected author and Harvard-trained physician, Dr Michael Crichton, rightly stated that the "greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with the consensus." In a lecture at the prestigious California Institute of Technology he argued, "<S>cience has nothing to do with consensus. Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world ... If it's consensus, it isn't science ... <because> the claim of consensus is invoked ... only in situations where the science is not solid enough"" (Matti Leisola (Ed.); Philosophy of Science – Including the Christian roots of science; p.14)

Der finnes "seriøse akademiske fagmiljøer innen geologi" med komplementære fagfelt, som holder jorden å være "noen få tusen år gammel" og "publiserer fagartikler om det". Der finnes endog en uomskiftelig skaper som har publisert en hel bok med slik implikasjon skjønt det for tilfellet er skjedd uten akademiske akkreditiver.

Henry Morris (The Long War Against God pp.304–5) skriver at "It is no coincidence that most of the founding fathers of modern science, those still regarded as the greatest scientists of all (men such as Newton, Boyle, Ray, Steno, Faraday, Maxwell, and a host of others) were men who believed the Bible and its account of creation. In their science, they believed they were thinking God's thoughts after him".

Hvems tanker tenker en ateistisk geolog som konkluderer annerledes enn Bibelen i sin vurdering av en bok om "Guds verden"? (Og hvordan havner Laget og en førstelektor og førsteamanuensis ved NLA i dette selskapet?)

Debatten "om jordens gamle alder... var ferdig flere generasjoner før Darwins bok om evolusjon i 1859. Det samme var forklaringer basert på en stor flom da det viste seg at sporene man observerer i naturen lar seg mye bedre forklare med istider." Skriver fagrådsmedlemmene og overrasker ikke ved å skrive istid i flertall..

"Consider the men most influential in the development of the old-earth theory. Buffon was probably a deist or atheist. Laplace was an open atheist. Lamarck <Lamarck> straddled the fence between deism and theism. Werner was a deist or possibly an atheist. Historians have concluded the same about Hutton. William Smith was a vague sort of theist. Cuvier was a nominal Lutheran, but recent research has shown that he was an irreverent deist. As the following quotes will suggest, Lyell was probably a deist (or Unitarian, which is essentially the same). Many of the other leading geologists of the 1820s and 1830s were the same. These men were hardly unbiased, objective pursuers of truth, as they would have wanted their contemporaries to believe."

"In a lecture at King's College London in 1832 he <Lyell> stated, "I have always been strongly impressed with the weight of an observation of an excellent writer and skillful geologist who said that 'for the sake of revelation as well as of science – of truth in every form – the physical part of geological inquiry ought to be conducted as if the Scriptures were not in existence.'"

In private correspondence around the same time, Lyell revealed his consciously devious and anti-biblical agenda. He was certainly not the unbiased objective geologist that he thought and led others to think he was. In an 1829 letter to Roderick Murchison just months before the publication of the first volume of Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, he candidly wrote: "I trust I shall make my sketch of the progress of geology popular. Old Fleming is frightened and thinks the age will not stand my anti-Mosaical conclusions and at least that the subject will for a time become unpopular and awkward for the clergy, but I am not afraid. I shall out with the whole but in as conciliatory a manner as possible.""

Lyell skriver til George Poulett Scrope, (14.06.1830): "I was afraid to point the moral, as much as you can do in the Q.R. <Quarterly Review> about Moses. Perhaps I should have been tenderer about the Koran. Don't meddle much with that, if at all. 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 candor 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 ever be set down without giving offense, it would be in an historical sketch". (Terry Mortenson; *The Great Turning Point - The Church's Catastrophic Mistake on Geology - Before Darwin*; pp.224-7)

"One of the greatest influences on Darwin... was a book he took on the Beagle voyage, *Principles of Geology*, by Charles Lyell (1797-1875). In this book Lyell pushed the idea of slow and gradual geological processes occurring over millions of years, and denied the global Noachian Flood."

"Lyell's book convinced Darwin, who was actually more of a geologist than a biologist at the time. Much later, Darwin linked slow and gradual geological processes with slow and gradual biological processes."

"Stephen Jay Gould (1941-2002), himself a leading evolutionist, wrote: "Charles Lyell was a lawyer by profession, and his book is one of the most brilliant briefs ever published by an advocate ... In fact, the catastrophists were much more empirically minded than Lyell. The geologic record does seem to record catastrophes; rocks are fractured and contorted; whole faunas are wiped out. To circumvent this literal appearance, Lyell imposed his imagination upon the evidence. The geologic record, he argued, is extremely imperfect and we must interpolate into it what we can reasonably infer but cannot see. The catastrophists were the hard-nosed empiricists of their day, not the blinded theological apologists."

One infamous example of Lyell's bias was his decision to ignore eyewitness accounts of the rate of erosion of Niagara Falls, and publish a different figure to suit his purpose." (Jonathan Sarfati; *The Greatest Hoax on Earth?*; pp.184-5)

Tilbake til Fagsjekk som er "overrasket over at Fagsjekks frontfigur Bjørn Are Davidsen blir kritisert for "å kjempe for en ideologi som evolusjonsteorien". Fagsjekks kritikk av <boken> *Guds verden* handler først og fremst om geologi og jordens alder og bare sekundært om evolusjon. Vitenskapens datering er noe som det store flertall av verdens kristne aksepterer uten særlige problemer."

U"ten særlige problemer"?

(Forøvrig et sted å nevne D.J.H.; Hvorfor forlot de forsamlingen?; kommentar-avisa.no 04.11.13.)

"Numerous ... statements from Christian scholars and leaders in the last decades could be quoted to show that their interpretation of Genesis, like that of their predecessors over the past 200 years, is controlled or influenced by the fact that they assume that the geologists have proven millions of years.

As a result, most Christian colleges, universities, seminaries, and mission organizations around the world are compromised with the millions of years. But, as their writings clearly reveal, these respected scholars and leaders over the past two centuries clearly have not adequately considered the theological implications of millions of years (e.g. death before the Fall) nor have they understood the non-scientific, philosophical (uniformitarian and naturalistic) assumptions that have controlled geology. Contrary to their sincere intentions, they have accepted ideas that implicitly and seriously undermine the authority of Scripture." (Terry Mortenson in Mortenson & Thane H. Ury (Ed.s); Coming to Grips With Genesis - Biblical Authority and the Age of the Earth; p.99)

"The late Harvard biologist Ernst Mayr, a renowned atheist evolutionist, made the connection that Christians often miss: "The <Darwinian> revolution began when it became obvious that the earth was very ancient rather than having been created only 6,000 years ago. This finding was the snowball that started the whole avalanche." While the idea of millions of years was not a "finding" of science, but an invention rooted in anti-biblical assumptions about the past, we agree that the rejection of the biblical chronology set a whole chain of events in motion." (Epilogue p.426)

"Many modern Christians live inconsistently with their faith; they accept evolution over billions of years, but do not follow through on the consequences of that belief system. For those who want to live consistently, however, once they stop believing in the first chapter of the Bible, they enter a path that, consistently and logically, eventually leads to not believing the rest of it." "Some people are able to mentally compartmentalize enough to be able to live with all manner of logical inconsistencies. However, history has repeatedly shown that the faith-destructive consequences of such inconsistencies relentlessly surface in not only the majority of individuals, but given time, will invariably do so in entire institutions, denominations, and cultures." (Alex Williams & John Hartnett; Dismantling the Big Bang - God's Universe Rediscovered; p.296)

"Needless to say, most Christian 'intellectuals' have rejected creationism, in part because they do not wish to be thought of as fools for Christ. But creationist ideas have been better received among the laity."

"Darwin may have built the temple walls, but the foundations were laid by geologists, and the cornerstone was the simple idea that rocks recorded billions of years of history before man appeared on the scene." (John K. Reed; Rocks aren't Clocks - A Critique of the Geologic Timescale; p.181)

"During the 18th and early 19th centuries, new ideas swept the West. The forces of the Enlightenment were not content with "ivory tower" philosophy but pushed their new worldview aggressively into every area of life. Early on, they set their sights on the new science of geology, recognizing its strategic importance as a springboard to a more vital target - the repudiation of biblical history and the subsequent overthrow of biblical authority." (John K. Reed & Mike Oard (Ed.s); Rock Solid Answers - The Biblical Truth Behind 14 Geological Questions; Pref. p.7)

"Naturalism began as a minority view, but one strongly held by Enlightenment intellectuals. Its proponents offered conciliatory lip service to 'religion', took advantage of Christian tolerance, and talked up compromise at every turn. As naturalism grew in strength, the gloves came off. Today its advocates are often dogmatic and arrogant ... the very vices they once attributed to their foes." (Reed (op.cit.) pp.51-2)

"A new generation of Christians has come to appreciate that truth comes from God and cannot be ceded to secular science. They are striving to rebuild the ruins of the biblical worldview, the only one that has historically been able to integrate knowledge and insure truth." (Oard & Reed p.8)

"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."

"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?" (Mortenson & Ury; Epilogue pp.433-4)

"So, do we interpret Scripture by Scripture or do we use the outside higher authority of "science" to interpret Scripture?"

Fagsjekk-redaktør Bjørn Are Davidsen (med medforfatter Atle Ottesen Søviks) svar på spørsmålet er gitt i deres bok Evolusjon eller kristen tro - Ja takk, begge deler!; på side 120 hvor "Vi ... nå <skal> se mer inngående på Bibelen og kristen tro, evangelium, synd og frølse i lys av evolusjonslæren."

Note:

1. Se D.J.H.; Evolusjon eller kristen tro? (Anmeldelse av B.A. Davidsen & A. Ottesen Søviks bok av samme navn); kommentar-avisa.no
Samt se sammesteds: Espen Ottosen; IV - En anmeldelse av en anmeldelse.

P.S.

"Uniformitarianism is a dying paradigm. Secular scientists seek to hold onto their philosophical position by pretending that the tectonic leap from Lyell back to Cuvier has no implications for the arguments for diluvialism. We have seen many revolutions in our lifetime, but the geological revolution of the past few decades holds the record for stealth. If the foundations of a discipline can be so easily overthrown, then what does that say about the integrity of the discipline?"

Though no one has explored the question, it is certainly curious that the decline and fall of Lyellian uniformitarianism tracks nearly exactly with the rise of modern creationism, from the publication of The Genesis Flood <by John C. Whitcomb & Henry M. Morris> in 1961." (Oard & Reed pp.260-1)