

PROFESSOR JARL GISKEs  
FORSKNINGSUNIVERS

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit  
August 2018



PROFESSOR JARL GISKE FORSKNINGSUNIVERS

"Question is; Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing, any one thing that is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time and eventually one person said, 'I do know one thing - it ought not to be taught in high school.'" (Dr. Colin Patterson; senior paleontologist, British Museum of Natural History, London(0))

**Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; august 2018**

"I was raised in a Christian home, believing in God and His creation. However, I was taught evolution while attending high school, and began to doubt the authority of the Bible. If evolution is true, I reasoned, the Bible cannot also be true. I eventually rejected the entire Bible and believed that we descended from lower creatures; there was no afterlife and no purpose in life but to enjoy the short time we have on this earth. My college years at Penn State were spent as an atheist, or at best as an agnostic.

Fortunately, and by the grace of God, I began to read articles and listen to tapes about scientific evidence for creation. Over a period of a couple of years, it became apparent to me that the theory of evolution has no legitimate factual evidence, and that scientific data from the fossil record, geology, etc. could be better explained by a recent creation, followed by a global flood. Suddenly I realized that the Bible might actually be true! It wasn't until I could believe the first page of the Bible that I could believe the rest of it. Once I accepted the fact that there is a creator God, it was an easy step for me to accept His plan of salvation through Jesus Christ as well. I became a follower of Christ during my first year of graduate school at Cal Tech." (John M. Cimbala PhD (aeronautics)(1))

BIOLOGIPROFESSOR JARL GISKE (UiB) registrerer (Dagen 25.07.18) "at det har kommet to reaksjoner i Dagen på mitt innlegg (12.6) om de stadige tryllekunstene for å bortforklare evolusjonen."

"Tore Svane mener 19.6. at vi må skille mellom mikromutasjoner og makromutasjoner, og hevder med Tveter som kilde ..." "Biologer bruker ikke disse uttrykkene makromutasjoner og mikromutasjoner, men jeg tror jeg forstår hva Tore Svane mener: veldig omfattende mutasjoner som gjør at..."

Giske kunne kanskje velvilligst nevnt at biologer "bruker ... uttrykkene" makroevolusjon og mikroevolusjon; (jeg ser at nevnte prof.(em.)dr.med. Kjell J. Tveter bruker uttrykket "makroevolusjon".(2))

Jerry Bergman (hvis 9 akademiske grader (herunder 2 PhD) bl.a. omfatter PhD i "human biology"), skriver i underkapitlet "The problem with extrapolating microevolution to macroevolution"(3): "Many evolutionists today postulate that a large number of very small mutations, and not the macromutations <sic> that de Vries and Goldschmidt postulated, can account for macroevolution. This conclusion is not based on experimental evidence, but on the assumption that the evidence for microevolution (which creationists call variation within the Genesis kinds) can be extrapolated to macroevolution.

The empirical evidence, however, is clear - neither macromutations <sic> nor micromutations <sic> can provide a significant source of new genetic information. The fact is: "Mutation accumulation does not lead to new species or even to new organs or new tissues." <Bergman gjengir m.ref. L. Margulis & D. Sagan.>" "In contrast to the facts, the contemporary evolutionary theory involves primarily the accumulation of genetic mistakes called mutations that are selected by natural selection. They believe that, in essence, the evolution of humans from molecules such as carbon, hydrogen, water, and nitrogen occurred by the accumulation of DNA copying mistakes and mutations. Thus, humans are the result of the accumulation of many billions of mistakes. As noted, the problem has

always been that the vast majority of mutations are near-neutral or harmful, even lethal, causing disease, including cancer and about 5,000 other diseases."

2

"Tore Svane påpeker deretter med beklagelse at evolusjonsteorien brukes til "ateistisk propaganda". Det er nok riktig, men jeg ser ikke hvordan jeg eller andre forskere kan stoppe det."

Giske kunne jo bidratt med å omstyrte "tankebygninger og enhver høide som reiser sig mot kunnskapen om Gud," og ta "enhver tanke til fange under lydigheten mot Kristus". (2.Kor.10,5)

"I think the evangelical Christians have really sort of got it right in a way in seeing evolution as the enemy, whereas the more - what shall we say - sophisticated theologians who are quite happy to live with evolution, I think they're deluded. I think the evangelicals have got it right in that there really is a deep incompatibility between evolution and Christianity, and I think I realised that at the age of about sixteen." (Richard Dawkins(4))

Giske finner i sammenhengen at det "nytter ... ikke at en pensjonert kirurgi-professor skriver bøker for lekfolk om et tema han aldri har forsket på eller utdannet seg innen."

Og hva utenom teologi/humaniora skulle dr. Tvetter ha "forsket på eller utdannet seg innen" for at det evt. skulle "nytte"? 'Evolusjonsbiologi'?

"Dr. Marc Kirschner, founding chair of the Department of Systems Biology at Harvard Medical School, remarked; "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."" (Ref.12 p.118)

Jarl Giske "tror ... at "tryllekunstene" som kreasjonister bruker: bortforklaringer av hele evolusjonsprosessen, er enkle leketøy for de som vil latterliggjøre gudstroen."

Og hvem er disse som ønsker "latterliggjøre gudstroen"?

"In which worldview does an assumption of uniformity make the most sense: in one dictated by an intelligent Maker, or in one where randomness is the order of the day?

The telltale sign of a supreme Mind is organized, orderly design. This orderliness is the assumption that drives the scientific enterprise, and it can only exist in a theistic worldview. Ironically, an atheist practices science by first adopting the presuppositions of a theistic worldview - all the while denying theism. Atheists chuck out any intelligence in the cosmos, replacing it with inanimate matter and endowing it with "intelligence."

"Of course, biblical creationists invoke a supernatural Being to get things going, which is hardly a scientific theory < se dog (5)>. Yet, there is nothing more scientific about evolutionists who propose an unknown process in unknown conditions in an unobservable, distant past - a process of abiogenesis that goes against all observed evidence that life only arises from life. Christians should not be fooled by the scientific-sounding veneer of what is for evolutionists an act of religious faith against observed fact.

Given the assumption of life arising from inanimate material, evolutionary theory is riddled with inconsistencies. Why do secular scientists look for laws, mathematical formulas, and ordered processes when they believe everything happened by random occurrence? The laws of physics are compelling evidence for a Lawmaker. The expectation of order in the universe is a leftover from the scientific enterprise produced by the presuppositions of Christian theology, but it is nonsensical for an atheist to subscribe to it.

Randomness cannot compete with intelligence. I cannot take a container of 250 toothpicks, empty it on the floor, and expect a facsimile of the Eiffel Tower to appear, no matter how many times I do it. However, if you walked into my living room and found a model of the Eiffel Tower made of toothpicks, you would immediately understand that somebody built it.

This is self-evident, such that Paul can write that those who reject the Creator and prefer to worship created things are without excuse (Rom. 1:20). Their rejection is not an intellectual problem, let alone a scientific one. It is a moral and spiritual deficiency." (Victor Kuligin DTh(6))

3

"Jostein Andreassen sitt innlegg 25.6. er dessverre et godt eksempel på slik tryllekunst... henter han frem sitt velbrukte stjerneeksempel på en forsker som gikk for langt i tolkningen av egne funn... Men å trekke frem Haeckels mer enn 150 år gamle tegninger er en avledningsmanøver i forhold til ..."

Men Andreassens "stjerneeksempel" er relevant for tilfellet Jarl Giskes 'just so story':

Ernst "Haeckel remains most famous today as the chief architect and propagandist for a famous argument that science disproved long ago but that popular culture has never fully abandoned ... .

As primary support for his theory of recapitulation, and to advance the argument that all vertebrates may be traced to a common ancestor, Haeckel frequently published striking drawings showing parallel stages in the development of diverse vertebrates, including fishes, chickens, and several species of mammals, from cows to humans. ...

To cut to the quick of this drama: Haeckel had exaggerated the similarities by idealizations and omissions. He also, in some cases - in a procedure that can only be called fraudulent - simply copied the same figure over and over again. At certain stages in early development, vertebrate embryos do look more alike, at least in gross anatomical features easily observed with the human eye, than do the adult tortoises, chickens, cows, and humans that will develop from them. But these early embryos also differ far more substantially, one from the other, than Haeckel's figures show. Moreover, Haeckel's drawings never fooled expert embryologists, who recognized his fudgings right from the start.

... Haeckel's drawings, despite their noted inaccuracies, entered into the most impenetrable and permanent of all quasi-scientific literatures: standard student textbooks of biology. ...

So textbook authors borrowed his famous drawings of embryonic development, probably unaware of their noted inaccuracies and outright falsifications - or (to be honest about dirty laundry too often kept hidden) perhaps well enough aware, they then rationalized with the ever tempting and ever dangerous argument "Oh well, it's close enough to reality for student consumption, and it does illustrate a general truth with permissible idealization." ...

Once ensconced in textbooks, misinformation becomes cocooned and effectively permanent, because, ... textbooks copy from previous texts. ...

We should therefore not be surprised that Haeckel's drawings entered nineteenth-century textbooks. But we do, I think, have the right to be both astonished and ashamed by the century of mindless recycling that has led to the persistence of these drawings in a large number, if not a majority, of modern textbooks!" (Stephen Jay Gould(7))

Bergman (ref.3 p.152) nevner at "Luskin documents a number of textbooks published between 1998 and 2003 which either reproduced the drawings exactly, or made new images of their own based on Haeckel's work." (Luskin 2007)

"Thanks to the work of Richardson et al., the many fatal flaws in Haeckel's work have now been widely publicized. Pennisi quotes Richardson as concluding from his extensive study of Haeckel's work that it may be "one of the most famous fakes in biology." Haeckel once even admitted that he "used artistic license in preparing his drawings" but Haeckel's confession was either forgotten or ignored by those who wanted to use his biogenetic law to support evolution." (p.150)

"But Darwin never did displace God with science", skriver Bergman (Intro.); "His central claim - that all species on Earth are lineal descendants of one or a few originating forms of life - has always lacked a causal mechanism. Causes have been proposed, and then abandoned, right up to the present. The

problem has never been the survival of the fittest but the arrival of the fittest. Leading evolutionists have openly admitted that nobody knows the source of genetic variety that natural selection can select from. In essence, as Professor Niels Eldredge implied, evolutionists must 'keep it simple' and 'keep it Darwinian even if it isn't to convince the public of the validity of Darwinism. The biggest scientific revolution in human history has turned out not to be scientific at all.

It is into this scientific vacuum of Darwin's own making - the lack of a causal mechanism - that true believers have laboured over the years to discover 'proofs' that evolution did occur, even if we don't know how. It is not surprising that a vacuous theory would produce faulty endeavours to find such proofs. And this is exactly what has occurred. In this book I have documented only a few of the many blunders, frauds, and forgeries that have been perpetrated in the name of Darwinian evolution. Individually they should be insignificant - nothing more than the failures which all scientists expect should litter the pathway in discovering genuine truths. But there is a more sinister side to this story. In the ongoing absence of genuine central truths, these blunders, frauds, and forgeries have become the museum pieces of Darwinian history. To the true believers they remain, like dusty idols in their temples of the mind, because there are no genuine truths to replace them. Without a genuine causal explanation, these untruths, like cowebs moving in the wind, recall a vitality that never was."

Men Giske igjen: "Min oppfordring (12.6.) til Dagen og brevsriverne står fortsatt ved lag: forson dere med at det store forskersamfunnet i verden består av millioner av mennesker som ønsker å finne ut noe nytt, og mer enn gjerne fremhever sitt funn ved å vise at den rådende teorien er feil. Det er slik vitenskapen kommer videre."

"However, if the mainstream academic community accepts an unproven concept as fact and excludes alternative thinking by decree, then the potential for error to be systematically preserved and promoted is institutionalized." (Jeremy L. Walter PhD (mechanical engineering)(8); "Engineers quite often need confidence in the literal accuracy of the Genesis account, while people educated in many other disciplines are quite satisfied to take it as allegory." (Stanley A. Mumma PhD (mec.eng.)(9))

I kontrast til Giskes oppfatning av "det store forskersamfunnet", gjengir Bergman (op.cit./Intro; underkap. How science actually works) fra M. Brook's Free Radicals: The Secret Anarchy of Science:

"... for over half a century, "scientists have been involved in a cover-up <about how science actually works - Ed.> that is arguably one of the most successful of modern times." Both the creation and perpetuation of "the myth of the rational, logical scientist who follows a clearly understood Scientific Method" has affected everything in science, including "the way it is done, the way we teach it, the way we fund it, its presentation in the media, the way its quality control structures - in particular, peer review - work (or don't work), the expectation we have of science's impact on society, and the way the public engages with science (and scientists with the public) and regards scientists' pronouncements as authoritative. We have been engaging with a caricature of science, not the real thing. But science is so vital to our future that it must now be set free from its branding. It is time to reveal science as the anarchic, creative, radical endeavour it has always been."

Brooks then spends over 300 pages documenting what seem outrageous claims. Most of his observations are well known to those who have a good background in the history of science and regularly read biographies of scientists. The problem is: "Science is a fight to the intellectual death, but not between equal adversaries. It takes place in a gladiatorial arena where the challenger has to overcome not only the established champion, but also his or (more rarely) her supporters. And, whether in attack or defense, the fight is rarely clean."

Fra Bergman's fireogethalythundresiders Slaughter of the Dissidents(10):  
 "Although on occasion successfully challenged, often only atheistic views can be presented in a state university, a situation that hardly results in religious neutrality as the American constitution requires. Those who do not "toe the line" may well face the same problems that Kenyon has experienced. As <Phillip E.> Johnson argues, many science educators, including Kenyon's detractors, openly claim that "academic freedom does not extend to those who would question the philosophical materialism that rules evolutionary biology." Johnson concludes by asking: "Is a scientist allowed to criticize the reigning materialist theories of chemical and biological evolution, even to the point of suggesting that something other than purposeless material processes may have been at work?" In many universities across America today, the answer is a resounding "no way."

Bergman skriver i Preface (pp.11-2): "Of those I interviewed... almost 70% claim they have faced open prejudice, and about 40% possessed evidence of clear discrimination against them directly because of their ID <Intelligent Design> or creationist beliefs. Discrimination against Darwin Doubters is widespread and is often irrational and may involve physical violence. About 12% of those I interviewed stated that they had received highly emotional non-verbal feedback or irrational verbalizations against them. The situation was stated well by Paul Bartz:

"A couple of years ago the Soviets said that creation materials and thought were the most dangerous tools against communism ever brought into the Soviet Union. Once, in the United States, it was only a few wild-eyed radicals who echoed such thoughts. But in the last few years major newspapers have compared conservative Christians to Germany's Nazis and used this and similar justifications to suggest that conservative Christians - sometimes they even used the word "creationist" - do not have a constitutional right to the freedom of speech. Some have even called for laws to control traditional Christians because they are a threat to society. Now a Harvard professor has had difficulty in finding anything wrong with crowd violence against a conservative speaker... one anti-creationist arsonist set fire to a printing company which prints creation materials, telling police he burned the business because it prints creation science materials. The arsonist also warned the printer not to reopen! While most conservative Christians have paid little attention to these very serious threats to their civil rights, the number of Christians who are becoming alarmed is growing. This is happening because more and more Christians are finding themselves on the receiving end of such bigotry."

Et sted å nevne D.J.H.; Fra Martin Luther til Michael Tetzschner; - Hva ville egentlig Karl Marx?; kommentar-avisa.no  
 En ihukommer Dr. Henry Morris boktittel The Long War Against God.

"In removing God from science, mankind is equally removed. The God-centered theology of Christianity places a higher value on humanity than does the man-centered worldview of the secular scientist. When God is exalted to his rightful place, humanity comes along for the ride. However, when mankind attempts to usurp God's position, humanity is cast downward to destruction, and usually a destruction of its own doing." "Rather than religion killing science, it is godless science that kills humans." (Kuligin(11))

"In seeking to explain why modern science arose in the seventeenth century and only in Western Europe, Peter Harrison, formerly Professor of Science and Religion at Oxford University, wrote, "The idea of mathematical laws of nature, it will be argued, is unique to the early modern West and is underpinned by theological considerations that arise out of Western monotheism". He concluded that 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." In other words, according to Harrison, the belief that the

universe had been designed was fundamental to the development of science." (Dominic Statham(12); sellers Jonathan Sarfati; The Biblical Roots of Modern Science; creation.com/roots)

Hva skjer med vitenskapen, et i utgangspunktet vestlig unikum, når man (vi) snur ryggen til "Western monotheism", dvs Bibelen, dvs Sannheten (best.form, ent.)?

Professor Stig S. Frøland skriver (Klassekampen 02.08.18): "I de senere år har det pågått en internasjonal debatt om behovet for "avkolonisering" av akademia i vestlige land". "Blant annet er avkoloniseringsønsket uten tvil beslektet med den såkalte identitetspolitikk, hvor ulike samfunnsgrupper og minoriteter krever makt og privilegier på grunn av innbilt eller reell undertrykkelse, og forlanger anerkjennelse for sin gruppebaserte "identitet".

I argumentasjonen for avkolonisering ser man i høyeste grad innflytelsen fra postmoderne relativisme, kjennetegnet av radikal skepsis til objektiv sannhet - enhver "sannhet" er angivelig kun en sosiokulturell konstruksjon. <Ida Roland> Birkvad angriper <filosofiprofessor Jens> Saugstad fordi "hans perspektiv på vitenskap, som fokuserer på ideer om universell sannhet, kun er ett av veldig mange perspektiver". Hun snakker om Saugstads "eget provinsielle vitenskapssyn, basert på en mannlig, vestlig og hvit logikk". I denne klart antirasjonalistiske holdningen hører vi ekkoet fra tenkere som Derrida som fordømte "fornuftens tyrrani", og Foucault som priste "den frigjørende irrasjonalitet".

Avkoloniseringsbevegelsens aktivister ønsker åpenbart å rense akademia for innflytelsen fra hvite menns skadelige tankegods. Denne bevegelsen er en alvorlig trussel mot vitenskapens grunnleggende etos, som er basert på eksistensen av universelle sannheter og intellektuelt gyldige regler for å finne frem til disse - uavhengig av rase, kjønn, etnisitet og andre gruppekjennetegn som det tenkende individ kan frigjøre seg fra."

"Had it not been for the rise of the literal interpretation of the Bible and the subsequent appropriation of biblical narratives by early, modern scientists, modern science may not have arisen at all. In sum, the Bible and its literal interpretation have played a vital role in the development of Western science." Jonathan Sarfati PhD (physical chemistry) siterer(13) Peter Harrison, og fortsetter: "Stephen Snobelen, Assistant Professor of History of Science and Technology, University of King's College, Halifax, Canada, writes in a similar vein, and also explains the somewhat misleading term 'literal interpretation': "Here is a final paradox. Recent work on early modern science has demonstrated a direct (and positive) relationship between the resurgence of the Hebraic, literal exegesis of the Bible in the Protestant Reformation, and the rise of the empirical method in modern science. I'm not referring to wooden literalism, but the sophisticated literal-historical hermeneutics that Martin Luther and others (including Newton) championed.""

"Prof. Harrison has researched another commonly overlooked factor in the development of science: belief in a literal Fall of a literal first man Adam. These founding modern scientists, including Francis Bacon, reasoned that the Fall not only destroyed man's innocence, but also greatly impaired his knowledge. The first problem was remedied by the innocent Last Adam, Jesus Christ - His sacrifice enabled our sin to be imputed (credited) to Him (Isaiah 53:6), and His perfect life enabled His righteousness to be imputed to believers in Him (2 Corinthians 5:21). But as for recovering what they believed to be Adam's encyclopedic knowledge, they looked to science.

Harrison explains:

"New <sic> literal readings of the creation narratives in Genesis provided 17th Century thinkers with powerful motivating images for pursuing the natural sciences.

"Adam was thought to have possessed a perfect knowledge of all sciences, a knowledge lost to posterity when he fell from grace and was expelled from the Garden of Eden. The goal of 17th Century scientists such as Francis Bacon and his successors in the Royal Society of London was to regain the scientific

knowledge of the first man. Indeed, for these individuals, the whole scientific enterprise was an integral part of a redemptive enterprise that, along with the Christian religion, was to help restore the original race to its original perfection. The biblical account of the creation thus provided these scientists with an important source of motivation, and in an age still thoroughly committed to traditional Christianity, the new science was to gain social legitimacy on account of these religious associations."

"For many champions of the new learning in the seventeenth century, the encyclopaedic knowledge of Adam was the benchmark against which their own aspirations were gauged. ...

"The experimental approach, I shall argue, was deeply indebted to Augustinian views about the limitations of human knowledge in the wake of the Fall, and thus inductive experimentalism can also lay claim to a filial relationship with the tradition of Augustinianism."

Og, som prof. Giske nevner om "det store forskersamfunnet": "Stadig færre av dem vet noe som helst om Det gamle testamente."

"Objection <Sarfati pp.316-7>

Some atheists admit that science was in effect a child of Christianity, but now claim that it's time science grew up and cut the apron strings. However, none other than former UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher answered that type of claim: "I think back to many discussions in my early life when we all agreed that if you try to take the fruits of Christianity without its roots, the fruits will wither. And they will not come again unless you nurture the roots. "But we must not profess the Christian faith and go to Church simply because we want social reforms and benefits or a better standard of behaviour; but because we accept the sanctity of life, the responsibility that comes with freedom and the supreme sacrifice of Christ expressed so well in the hymn: 'When I survey the wondrous Cross, On which the Prince of glory died, My richest gain I count but loss, And pour contempt on all my pride.' ""

O.S.V.

Siv.ing. Reidar Holtet stiller (dvs gjentar) i Dagen 27.07.18, tre spørsmål.

"Selv greier visst ikke Giske å besvare faglig de tre korte spørsmålene innen biologi jeg har stilt ham. Med all sin forskning og utdannelse gjør han ikke engang et forsøk. Kanskje han mangler innsikt i sakene, og bedriver ønsketekning? Ikke vet jeg, men det må være lov å etterspørre fakta.

Første spørsmål stilte jeg ham for to år siden, og 18. juni i år fulgte jeg opp med påminning, samt to nye spørsmål. De tre spørsmålene lyder som følger:

1. Kan Giske dokumentere en eneste mutasjon som har tilført arvestoffet ny, ikke bare endret, informasjon?
2. Hvor kom hans berømmelige første levende urcelle fra?
3. Hvordan forklarer han den aller første proteinsyntesen? Kom den også i gang av seg selv ut av ingenting?"

Ta "første proteinsyntesen": John R. Baumgardner PhD (geophysics and space physics): "Now let us contemplate what is involved in demanding that a purely random process find a minimal set of about 1,000 protein molecules needed for the most primitive form of life. To simplify the problem dramatically, suppose somehow we already have found 999 of the 1,000 different proteins required and we need only to search for that final magic sequence of amino acids which gives us the last special protein. Let us restrict our consideration to the specific set of 20 amino acids found in living systems and ignore the hundred or so that are not. Let us also ignore the fact that only those with left-handed symmetry appear in life proteins. Let us also ignore the incredibly unfavorable chemical reaction kinetics involved in forming long peptide chains in any sort of plausible non-living chemical environment. Let us merely focus on the task of obtaining a suitable sequence of amino acids that yields a 3D protein structure with some minimal degree of essential func-

tionality. Various theoretical and experimental evidence indicates that in some average sense about half of the amino acid sites must be specified exactly. For a relatively short protein consisting of a chain of 200 amino acids, the number of random trials needed for a reasonable likelihood of hitting a useful sequence is then in the order of  $20^{100}$  (100 amino acid sites with 20 possible candidates at each site), or about  $10^{130}$  trials. This is a hundred billion billion times the upper bound we computed for the total number of molecules ever to exist in the history of the cosmos!! No random process could ever hope to find even one such protein structure, much less the full set of roughly 1,000 needed in the simplest forms of life. It is therefore sheer irrationality for a person to believe random chemical interactions could ever identify a viable set of functional proteins out of the truly staggering number of candidate possibilities.

In the face of such stunningly unfavorable odds, how could any scientist with any sense of honesty appeal to chance interactions as the explanation for the complexity we observe in living systems? To do so, with conscious awareness of these numbers, in my opinion represents a serious breach of scientific integrity."

"... a physicist at Sandia National Laboratories, asserted that I had misapplied the rules of probability in my analysis. If my example were correct, he suggested, it "would turn the scientific world upside-down." I responded that the science community has been confronted with this basic argument in the past but has simply engaged in mass denial. Fred Hoyle, the eminent British cosmologist, published similar calculations two decades ago. Most scientists just put their hands over their ears and refused to listen."(14)

Eller fra en "første proteinsyntese", til den 2. termodynamiske lov; Ker C. Thomson DSc (geophysics)(15): "Now we come to the evolutionists' quibble that the second law was different in the past from now. This is simply an adult wish fulfilment on the part of the evolutionist espousing such notions. Unless he assumes what he is trying to prove, he is left at this point with no reliable evidence whatever to support his thesis. Science relies on measurements. Measurements we make now oppose evolution totally. To point for support to conditions in the distant past, where they can't be measured, puts the evolutionist in the same intellectual camp as those who believe in the tooth fairy. Despite the arguments against evolution presented above and particularly in the last paragraph, the evolutionist clinging to his faith may say "Well, we are here, aren't we?" One may point out to him that he has just finished engaging in circular reasoning. That is, he has obviously attempted to support evolution by assuming that evolution is true and is what has led to his human existence and presence here.

When the circularity of his reasoning is pointed out to him, the evolutionist may then grope for evidence in the fossil record. But again he is trotting out another batch of circular reasoning. This is so because evolution is used to interpret the fossil record, so it cannot be used to justify evolution. To do so puts the proponent in the intellectual booby hatch. Whatever the explanation for the fossil record may be, it cannot be one that in effect denies the second law of thermodynamics."

Dominic Statham (I Inspiration from Creation - How engineers are copying God's designs (ref.12 p.117)): "Scientific research closes and opens 'gaps'. By explaining how things work, it closes gaps. However, this same process continuously opens gaps as it reveals ever greater levels of complexity and biotechnology, the origins of which have no known, or likely, naturalistic explanation. The design inference is not a 'God of the gaps' argument because it is knowledge rather than ignorance of science that makes it so compelling. The real 'god of the gaps' is 'evolution' as observed by Nobel Prize-winner Professor Robert Laughlin:

"A key symptom of ideological thinking is the explanation that has no impli-

cations and cannot be tested. I call such logical dead ends antitheories because they have exactly the opposite effect of real theories: they stop thinking rather than stimulate it. Evolution by natural selection, for instance, which Darwin conceived as a great theory, has lately come to function as a antitheory, called upon to cover up embarrassing experimental shortcomings and legitimize findings that are at best questionable ... Your protein defies the laws of mass action? Evolution did it! Your complicated mess of chemical reactions turns into chicken? Evolution! The human brain works on logical principles no computer can emulate? Evolution is the cause!"

Se forøvrig D.J.H.; Filosofisk biologi. UiO vs. vitenskapen?; kommentar-avisa.no

"Du sende ditt ord til Noregs fjell, Og ljøs yver landet strøymde"; den norske skolen ble dannet til formidling av "kunnskapen om Gud".

Et par årtusener tilbake skriver Herren Jesu Kristi apostel at Guds "usynlige vesen, både hans evige kraft og hans guddommelighet, er synlig fra verdens skapelse av, idet det kjennes av hans gjerninger, forat de skal være uten undskyldning". "Og likesom de ikke brydde seg om å eie Gud i kunnskap, så overgav Gud dem til et sinn som intet duer..." (Rom.1,20.28; Hos.4,6; Es.11,9)

#### REFERANSER OG NOTER

- O. Gallop, R.G. PhD; Evolution - The Greatest Deception in Modern History; Red Butte Press; Rev.ed. 2012; p.6; Patterson, keynote address at the American Museum of Natural History, New York City, Nov. 5, 1981.
1. Ashton, J.F. PhD (Ed.); In Six Days - Why fifty scientists choose to believe in creation; Master Books 2001, 9th pr. 2009; pp.200-1.
  2. Tvetter, K.J.; Tro for en tid som denne; Ventura 2018; s.299.  
Se ellers D.J.H.; Og Kjell Tvetter skriver ...; kommentar-avisa.no
  3. Bergman, J.; Evolution's Blunders, Frauds and Forgeries; Creation Book Publ. 2017; pp.30-1.
  4. Cosner, L. (compiling Ed.); Evolutionists Say the Oddest Things; Creation Book Publ. 2015; pp.8-9; Dawkins, interview, Revelation TV, March 2011.
  5. Werner Gitt PhD (with B. Compton PhD & J. Fernandez PhD); Without Excuse (The Sequel to: In the Beginning was Information); Creation Book Publ. 2011.  
"This latest book by Werner Gitt summarizes the fruit of a lifetime of scholarship in information science. Dr. Gitt's central thesis is profound - that information is a nonmaterial entity foundational to all life and it can never arise spontaneously from strictly materialistic processes. He provides the most rigorous and useful definition of information thus far formulated, and shows us how to distinguish Universal Information (real information), from things which are often mistakenly called information. Dr. Gitt shows that information only arises from an intelligent source - and that ultimately all useful information, including biological information, comes from God." (John Sanford PhD; p.4)  
Gitt, "formerly a Professor and Director at the prestigious Federal Institute of Physics and Technology in Braunschweig, Germany", avslutter siste Appendix, What Darwin couldn't have known:  
"A4.6 Where Does Information Come From?  
The strongest arguments in science are always those in which Scientific Laws can be invoked to preclude the possibility of a proposed process or event. Scientific Laws know of no exceptions. This is why a perpetual motion machine,

one that runs continually with no external input of energy, is impossible. Today, we know what Darwin could not know - that the cells of all living things contain an unimaginable amount of information stored in DNA in the most compact form known to us so far. The development of all organs is information-directed, and all processes and functions in living things are information-controlled, including the manufacture of all the substances that make up our bodies (for example, thousands of different proteins). The whole concept of evolution would only be feasible if there were some property in matter that permitted information to arise through chance processes. This is absolutely essential, because all the body plans of individuals, and all the complex processes in cells, are information-based.

Information is a nonmaterial entity, thus not a property of matter. The Scientific Laws about Information state that purely material processes can never generate a nonmaterial entity and that information is a nonmaterial entity, which can only arise from an originator with intelligence and will. We can see, then, that someone who thinks evolution is possible must believe in a 'perpetual motion machine of information', i.e., in something strictly forbidden by the universally applicable Scientific Laws. This is the Achilles' heel of Darwinism; at this point, evolution requires science itself to be abandoned. This is explained in detail in this book.

#### A4.7 Where Did Life Come From?

All evolutionary bluster of our day has never really answered this question. Evolutionists have not the faintest notion of how dead matter could have given rise to life.

Stanley Miller's (1930-2007) 'primordial soup' experiment (1953) began to be featured in all biology textbooks and yet, 40 years later, he admitted that none of the contemporary hypotheses about the origin of life were convincing. He described them collectively as "nonsense" and "paper chemistry". The microbiologist Louis Pasteur (1822-1895) scientifically established at the microbial level what we call the biogenetic law: "Life can only come from life." There was only One who could say, "I am the life" (John 14:6), and that was Jesus. Of Him it says in Colossians 1:16: "For by Him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible" and further in John 1:3: "Through Him <the Word = Jesus> all things were made; without Him nothing was made that has been made." Every theory of origins that does not have Jesus as the source and foundation of life and the universe is thus a stillborn notion, one that must inevitably flounder on the Rock that is Jesus.

Darwin could not have known these and many other things because technology had not made them available (e.g., high-powered microscopes). However, Darwin could have, and should have, known other things simply by reading the Scriptures and remaining faithful to what God's Word clearly says. So, in the end, even Darwin is without excuse.

Evolution is therefore shown to be one of the greatest errors in the history of the world and it has drawn millions of people into the abyss of unbelief. Unfortunately, many today do not take into account that this abyss of unbelief is followed, after death, by the abyss of being eternally lost (Hell). A real tragedy in today's world is that journalists pay widespread homage to Darwin instead of proclaiming the real Originator of everything, saying, "Thank you, Jesus!"

I kap. 9, Applying the Theory of Universal Information to the Bible, skriver Gitt (p.209): "Scientific laws allow mankind to predict future events but only within a very limited range in time and space. However, outside of scientific laws, man's ability to predict future events is almost nonexistent (despite claims to the contrary). Therefore, if a text incorporates many predictions of future events that do occur despite intervening decades, centuries or even millennia of time, then that would be a clear sign of supernatural omniscience. This is especially the case when scientific laws are essentially of no use whatsoever for making the predictions. For example, what scientific law(s) would one use to predict that a specific person (the Messiah, Jesus Christ) should be born in a specific place (Bethlehem)? This prediction was made nearly

700 years before it actually happened and is recorded in the Bible (Micah 5:2)."

11

"The one striking feature that distinguishes the Bible from all other world literature is, without doubt, the many prophecies that have already been fulfilled in time and space. More than 3,000 prophetic statements have been fulfilled, often several hundred years after they were announced. Not one prophecy is known to have come about differently than predicted, a fact that presents itself as a unique criterion for testing the reliability of the Bible. The Bible is peerless as will be shown in this section." (p.210)

Noen sider senere:

"As the fulfillment of the prophecies is only possible through God, we have now produced prophetic-mathematical evidence of God's existence based on our calculations. We can also say that the worldview/religion of Materialism/Atheism has been thoroughly refuted." (p.218)

Etter ytterligere direkte og indirekte konklusjoner, følger "one general conclusion": "The existence of an all-knowing, almighty God has been proven to be true by prophetic/mathematical evidence. This God is the God of the Bible and He is the only existing God. The Holy Bible is from God and is the Truth!" (p,219)

Pp.219-0: "There is no other writing regarded as scripture or holy in any other religion or cult which compares with the Bible in terms of prophetic, historical, or scientific accuracy. This sets it far apart from all other revered writings and the decision must then be made: is the Bible the truth or not? In order to determine a definitive answer to that question the areas dealing with history, science and prophecies must be considered. It is only by ignoring the accuracy of the data in these areas that allows a person to say the Bible is just one of many religious books."

"We concluded from the Scientific Laws of Universal Information that the author of biological information must be an omniscient, almighty and eternal God. However, neither scientific laws nor the conclusions drawn from them were able to tell us more about His person. Now we have found an information source more certain and extensive than science. This source can answer questions that cannot be answered by science. We shall address this in the following sections of this chapter."

Mer om aktuelle informasjonskilde: D.J.H.; Which Bible-version does a creationist read?; kommentar-avisa.no

Louis Gaussen; God-Breathed - The Divine Inspiration of the Bible ((Genova 1840) The Trinity Foundation 2001; pp.94.310): "I am asked, What is your view of the Holy Letters? I answer, What thought my Master of them? How did he appeal to them? What use did he make of them? What were their smallest details in his eyes?"

"It follows from all we have said that there are in the Christian world but two schools, or two religions: that which puts the Bible above everything, and that which puts something above the Bible. The former was evidently that of Jesus Christ; the latter has been that of the rationalism of all denominations and of all times."

6. Kuligin,V. DTh; Snubbing God - The High Cost of Rejecting God's Created Order; Weaver Book Comp. 2017; pp.85.84-5.

7. Cosner (ref.4) pp 142-3; Gould; Professor of Geology, Alexander Agassiz Professor of Zoology, Curator of Invertebrate Paleontology, Harvard University; Abscheulich (Atrocious!), Natural History 3:44,2000.

8. Ref.1 p.20.

9. Ref.1 pp.321-2.

10. Bergman,J,: Slaughter of the Dissidents, Vol I - The Shocking Truth About Killing The Careers Of Darwin Doubters; Leafcutter Press rev.1.2 Oct. 2008; p.169.

Vol. II er titulert Silencing the Darwin Sceptics.

11. Ref.6 pp.30.38.

Om "godless science that kills humans", se f.eks. Bergman,J.; The Darwin Effect, og Carter,R. PhD (Ed.); Evolutions Achilles' Heels; ch.8, Ethics and Morality.

12.Burgess,S. & Statham,D.; Inspiration from Creation - How engineers are copying God's designs; Creation Book Publ. 2018; pp.123-4; Harrison; Order: God's Man's and Nature's - Laws of Nature, Moral Order, and the Intelligibility of the Cosmos.

13. Sarfati,J.; The Greatest Hoax on Earth? - Refuting Dawkins on Evolution (A response to The Greatest Show On Earth: the evidence for evolution); pp.314-6. "Sarfati does a brilliant job of exposing the shallowness in Dawkins' reasoning and the absurdities of Dawkins' claims ... to demonstrate why evolution is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated in the guise of reason and science." (John Baumgardner PhD (geophysics); blurb)

"An excellent rebuttal to the best evolution has to offer. The reader should walk away with the understanding that evolutionary theory is a house of cards and its chief spokesmen are promoting poor, illogical, and false arguments against the only viable alternative: biblical creation." (Robert Carter PhD (marine biology and genetics); blurb)

14. Ref.1 pp.224-6.

15. Ref.1 pp.221-2.