

## STIFTELSEN BIOCOSMOS - ENDA ET TILSKUDD TIL FORVIRRINGEN

"Se, Herrens ord har de forkastet; hvor skulde de da ha visdom fra?" (Jer.8,9)

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; oktober 2019

Samtiden preges av avtagende tro på Gud og tiltagende tro på hvasomhelst. Løsningen på det siste burde være åpenbar.

Stiftelsen BioCosmos (stiftet forrige høst) "arbeider for en bedre forståelse av moderne vitenskap i et kristent verdensbilde", vil levere "et alternativ til de rent <sic> darwinistiske teoriene om livets opprinnelse og mangfold ..."; kort: "være et apologetisk ressurscenter med et naturvitenskapelig og biovitenskapelig utgangspunkt, i tråd med tradisjonene fra en revitalisering av klassisk naturlig teologi", (uten at det fremgår i hvilken evt. "revitalisering" "tradisjonene" er hentet. Sit. fra biocosmos.no). Siste to hundreårs erfaring synes ikke ha stanset dem til ettertanke.

Slik jeg forstår BioCosmos' daglig leder Dag Erlandsen (NRK Dagsnytt18 23. okt.), befinner stiftelsen seg innenfor Intelligent Design-konseptet (ID), herunder ikke minst ved tilbakeholdenhet vedr. den Intelligente Designers identitet.

"... klassisk naturlig teologi"; javel: "The argument of 'intelligent design' (ID) has a long history going back to the ancient Greeks and Romans <"Cicero, for example, used design in support of the Greek pantheon of gods.>. It was persuasively articulated by William Paley (1743-1805), who put forward the argument of an inferred divine Watchmaker in his book Natural Theology (1802)." (Carl Wieland; Whitcomb 2011:90)

"This book very much represented the theological position of the day - Natural Theology. Its message, simply stated, is that the beauty and complexity seen in all living things demand a Designer, namely God. Using the human eye as the first illustration of divine ingenuity, Paley hoped that it - as Exhibit A - would slay the archenemy, atheism. Ironically, Natural Theology was written specifically to undermine the 'atheism' of Charles Darwin's grandfather, Erasmus."

The inescapable conclusion was that God existed and that atheism was an absolute impossibility. Darwin concluded: "I do not think I hardly ever admired a book more than Paley's Natural Theology. I could almost formerly have said it by heart."

Paley never referred to the Bible in his book but he assumed that it was the theological basis for his argument. But by the 1820s <when Charles Darwin studied theology>, the Bible, though revered, was not considered the ultimate authority. Nature itself was more than sufficient to speak on behalf of God." (D. Herbert 2009:28)

"The central problem with the ID movement is a divorce of the Creator from creation. The Creator and His creation cannot be separated; they reflect on each other. All other problems within the movement stem from this one.

Those within the ID movement claim their science is neutral. However, science is not neutral because it works with hypotheses based on beliefs or presuppositions. It is ironic that ID adherents refuse to see this about their own science, considering that they claim the problem with Darwinism is the presupposition that nothing supernatural exists. All scientists approach their work with presuppositions. The question is whether those beliefs are rooted in man's fallible ideas about the past or rooted in the infallible Word of God, the Bible. The natural theology movement of the 1800s failed because it did not answer the next logical question: if it is designed, then who designed it? Although most within this movement claimed that design pointed to the God of the Bible, by divorcing general revelation (nature) from special revelation (the Bible),

they opened the door to other conclusions. Deism (another movement of the same period) took the idea of excluding the Bible to the extreme and said God can only be known through nature and human reason, and that faith and revelation do not exist.

In today's culture, many are attracted to the ID movement because they can decide for themselves who the Creator is - a Great Spirit, Brahman, Allah, God, etc. The current movement does not have unity on the naming of the creator and focuses more on what is designed. Thus, adherents do not oppose an old age for the earth and allow evolution to play a vital role once the designer formed the basics of life. They fail to understand that a belief in long ages for the earth formed the foundation of Darwinism. If God's Word is not true concerning the age of the earth, then maybe it's not true concerning other events of the creation week, and maybe God was not a necessary part of the equation for life after all." (Georgia Purdom; Whitcomb 2011:108-9)

23. oktober i år melder Kristelig Pressekontor at stiftelsen BioCosmos har lansert "en ny nettside som skal gi særlig unge i alderen 15-25 år alternativ og oppdatert kunnskap om livets opprinnelse og utvikling <sic>, på et vitenskape-  
lig grunnlag." BioCosmos vil altså fra et ID-perspektiv gi de yngre en alter-  
nativ utviklingslære; - det biologiskes kompleksitet indikerer at 'livets utvik-  
ling' må være forårsaket snarere enn uviljet. Altså en villet evolusjon, ut-  
vikling; men stadig usagt villet av hvem.

Jesus Kristus har en del å si til dem som ikke tror Moses (Joh.5,44-7;Luk,16,31).

Moses har f.eks. skrevet at universet og menneskene skapt på seks dager (2. Mos.20,11;1.Mos.1,27.31), slik Jesus sier mann og kvinne er skapt "fra skap-  
ningens begynnelse" (Mark.10,6). Tidspunktet er i flg. regnekyndige mennesker  
som Isaac Newton, omkring 4000 f.Kr.

Skriften mer enn indikerer, og erfaring tilsier, at det blir lite tro på "de  
himmelske" ting uten tro på Skriftens ord om "de jordiske ting" (Joh.3,12).

Hverken 'livets utvikling' eller tid for evt. slik, står seg mot Skriften; og  
grupperinger å la stiftelsen BioCosmos, som synes sluke evolusjonismens bi-  
belfornektende grunnelementer (tid og 'makroevolusjon') med krok, søkke og  
snøre, blir rimeligvis for kontraproduktive å regne, dersom den ultimate mål-  
setting er Guds målsetting, nemlig at "alle mennesker skal bli frelst og komme  
til sannhets erkjennelse" (1.Tim.2,4), grunnleggende til erkjennelse av den ene  
Gud og skaper hvis primærvitnesbyrd gives av Skriften. Skriften kan ikke gjø-  
res ugyldig (Joh.10,35), men noens aktive 'apologetikk' har som implisitt for-  
utsetning at den er. Slike grupperinger er følgelig en del av et tiltagende  
problem - ikke en del av løsningen.

Gjennom årene leses mange vitnesbyrd (fra vitenskapsfolk og andre folk) som kom  
til tro på Bibelens historikk etter å ha lest Henry M. Morris & John C. Whit-  
comb's The Genesis Flood (1961).

I sin evaluering av Itelligent Design-bevegelsen (Jesus Christ Our Intelligent  
Designer), skriver Whitcomb (2011:13.15.17-8): "The Intelligent Design Move-  
ment has been widely popularized by Phillip E. Johnson ... By inserting "the  
wedge" of intelligent design into the biological sciences, he is quite hopeful  
that materialistic naturalism will be uprooted in universities and public sc-  
hools and that science and sociology textbooks will be purged of evolutionary  
distortions.

These are noble goals; and most of the argumentation of IDM books is, to this  
extent, on target. Every Christian should applaud legitimate efforts to restore  
sanity and reality to the study of ultimate origins in our public schools, our  
universities, and even in many of our "Christian" colleges.

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. Sadly, Johnson raised high the banner of religious neutrality for the entire ID movement when he wrote "For the present I recommend that we put the biblical issues to one side. The last thing we should want to do or seem to want to do is to threaten the freedom of scientific inquiry. Bringing the Bible anywhere near this issue just raises the "Inherit the Wind" stereotype and closes minds instead of opening them. We can wait until we have a better scientific theory, one genuinely based on unbiased empirical evidence and not materialistic philosophy, before we need to worry about whether and to what extent that theory is consistent with the Bible."

But how can we really help people understand the enormously crucial issue of our ultimate origin if we "put the biblical issues to one side"? Would listening to our God speak to us in His written revelation "threaten the freedom of scientific enquiry"? Would "bringing the Bible anywhere near this issue" actually "close minds instead of opening them"? And how long do we have to "wait until we have a better scientific theory ... before we need to worry about whether and to what extent that theory is consistent with the Bible"?"

"The Bible is completely clear on th 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)."

(Vi tar en parentes; og starter med kanadiske neo-darwinist-filosof Michael Ruse: "Evolution is promoted by its practioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion - a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian, but I must admit that in this complaint - and Mr. Gish is but one of many to make it - the literalists are absolutely right. Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the begiñning, and it is true of evolution still today ... Evolution therefore came into being as a kind of secular ideology, an explicit substitute for Christianity." (W. Gitt 2011:197)

Yes; evolution is "the central theory for our understanding of life on earth and for the reassessment of the foundations of our societies." (Ikke Ruse, men Europarådets resolusjon 1580, 2007 (P. Bell 2018:272)). Videre: "The values that form the very essence fo the Council of Europe risk being directly threatened by creationist fundamentalists." "Creationism, if we are not careful, may be a threat to human rights, which are at the heart of the concerns of the Council of Europe."

Man synes meget vel å vite hvor opposisjonen til deres perverterte 'menneskerettigheter' er å finne, og oppfordrer medlemsstatene til å "firmly oppose the teaching of creationism."

Utviklingen, evolusjonen, tilsier at "Retten for enhver til livet" gjelder innen en evolvert definisjon av "enhver"; å drepe barn under en viss alder er en universell 'menneskerett'.

Eller art. 9&10; Bernt T. Oftestad (Dagen 29. okt.): "Det er den enkeltes opplevelse eller følelse av å være krenket som bestemmer hva som skal anses som krenkende i staten og samfunnet. Denne filosofi kombineres med den språkfilosofiske ideen at språklige ytringer er handlinger. Og som handlinger kan de tillegges konkrete samfunnsmessige virkninger. Ved hjelp av denne kombinasjonen utvikles begrepet "hatspråk" og "hatkriminalitet". Det "hat" det her dreier seg om, kommer fremfor alt til uttrykk ved etiske vurderinger og formulerte virkelighetssyn som avviser til eksempel seksuell praksis i strid med kristen etikk. Slike språklige ytringer kan bestemmes som i strid med menneskerettighetene. Det vil si at enhver ytring som målbærer en negativ holdning overfor Lhbtipersoners praksis, kan anses som et menneskerettighetsbrudd, som da kan straffes. Verst blir det om kirkesamfunn eller kristelige organisasjoner i kraft av ytringsfriheten <eller i kraft av Skriften> kaller Lhbtipraksis synd og trekker praktiske konsekvenser av det ut fra retten til organisasjonsfrihet. Denne form

for ensrettende liberalisme er i dag lagt til grunn for det norske statsstyret. For ved anbefaling fra Europarådet er de såkalte "Yogakartaprinssippene" tatt inn som basis for norsk lovgivning. Der finner vi nettopp opplegget for ensretting begrunnet ut fra en bestemt ideologisk tolkning av menneskerettighetene. (Se Kjell Skartveit, Normløst. Hvordan radikal kjønnteori erobret Norge, Document forlag 2019, 355-401)."

Ved utgangen av sådan skrudd homofascistoid juss kan ventes at det å hevde berettigelsen av fhv. §213 i straffeloven anses straffbart - Retten snudd opp-ned. Parentes slutt. Tilbake til Whitcomb:)

The ID-Movement-"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." (Jf. Joh.15,5)

"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."

John Morris, President, Institute for Creation Research, skriver i forord til Whitcomb's bok: "The modern Intelligent Design Movement's leaders, some of whom are sincere Bible-believing Christians, have chosen as a strategy to expunge God the Creator from their dialogue in hopes of gaining a better hearing in the worlds of science and education. This "wedge" strategy has captured the fancy of some, but it has not been favored in court cases and administrative rulings. And it has not been blessed by the favor of the true Creator/God they have shunned.

The Creator deserves glory for His creative handiwork and majesty. He desires that we submit to His authority as Maker/Owner and not give His place to another. Rather than blessing individuals for their clever strategies, He punished His first steward over creation, banished His ungrateful chosen people, and abandons churches that veer from the truth. He does not, has not, and will not bless the misplaced efforts of His children who deny Him, no matter how sincere they might be."

Hva angår "livets ... utvikling" (jf. KPK oven), gir formuleringen assosiasjon til BioCosmos-styremedlem prof.em.dr.med. Kjell J. Tveters siste bok (2018: 232-5).

Vedr. Tveters vedblivende bidrag til frafall fra Skriften (muligens under ønske om å oppholde samme; også Tveter vil være 'bibeltro'), henvises til D.J.H.; Real-apologetikk versus avisen Norge Idags dødfødte trosforsvar - Norge Idag, Kjell J. Tveters evolusjonisme og Henry M. Morris' apologetikk; kommentar-avisa.no; sept. 2019.

Tveters teistiske evolusjonshypotese (en variant av 'progressiv skapelse') har forøvrig sin marxistiske fetter i Stephen Jay Gould (og Niles Eldredge's) 'punctuated equilibrium'.

"Orfan-gener er gener som er spesifikke for én art". "For en kristen som ikke utelukker at jorda kan være gammel, vil orfan-gener kunne oppfattes som et uttrykk for at Gud tilfører noe av det bestående liv ny informasjon slik at nye arter kan oppstå. Det er altså dette syn som kalles progressiv skapelse." (Tvetter)

"Hegel's dialectical laws, translated into a materialist context, have become the official "state philosophy" of many socialist nations. These laws of change are explicitly punctuational, as befits a theory of revolutionary transformation in human society....

In the light of this official philosophy, it is not at all surprising that a punctuational view of speciation, much like our own ... has long been favored by many Russian paleontologists. It may also not be irrelevant to our personal preferences that one of us learned his Marxism, literally at his daddy's knee."

(Gould & Eldredge (1977); sit. i H. Morris' The Long War Against God) Tveter 'tror' på Gud; Gould på Marx; begge tror på seg selv men ikke på Bibelen; begge forutsetter 'evolusjonen' og begge disponerer naturligvis 'moy', millions of years.

"... I had accepted that the earth is billions of years old. I saw no conflict with the Bible, in believing in a 'God of long ages', because I knew that He was the Creator", skriver "S.C. (a lady from Australia)" (gjengitt av Philip Bell, CEO, Creation Ministries Int. (UK & Europe); Prayer News Oct.-Dec. 2019). "For me, it was the timescale that mattered most: I couldn't reconcile vast ages of suffering, of both humans and animals, with a God of love and compassion. I put my Bible away. ... I could count on one hand the number of times I walked into a church in ten years. I didn't find one that presented any answers for me ...

<Many years> later, I heard about a new film by Creation Ministries International, called "Evolution's Achilles' Heels". I didn't expect it would help, but went along anyway, with my adult son. By the end of the film I knew beyond a shadow of a doubt that God had brought me there. ..."

"... Believing in a 'God of long ages' had a very detrimental effect on my trust in Him, by making it seem that He wasn't overly troubled by human suffering. I only recognised the damage that belief had done when I didn't believe it anymore. I have been a Christian for 50 years, but the last 4 years my understanding of God has been transformed beyond anything I thought possible."

"Den moderne kreasjonismens" Grand Old Man, Henry M. Morris, forteller i brev til Wm. Dembski (2005; Whitcomb 2011:85-6) at "When we began ICR <Institute for Creation Research> back in 1970, we did try the "wedge" approach for a while. For example, our textbook, Scientific Creationism was also issued in a Public School Edition, with no religious material, but it soon went out of print. In the meantime, the General Edition has been used to win many evolutionists to creationism. Many of these "converts" like myself, had believed in evolution for what they assumed were compelling scientific proofs even though they would have rather believed in creationism for personal reasons. They often express a sense of gratified relief when they suddenly find that they can be "intellectually fulfilled Biblebelieving creationists" (apologies to R. Dawkins!). You tend to minimize literal six-day creationism as merely one possible interpretation of Genesis, which you reject because of the age issue. This is exactly why we insist that the geological data are at least as important as biological in dealing with origins. Most evolutionists will remain committed to Darwinism, regardless of design complexity problems, as long as they believe in the geological ages. "Time is the hero," as George Wald said. Yet most I.D. writers accept the billion-year history of life, which is the only real basis of evolutionism. This means they must ignore what to us is the determinative issue of suffering and death before sin. The alleged scientific problems of flood geology and age dating are insignificant, in our judgment, compared to the theological and Biblical problems posed by that issue. That is why much of our creationist research has focused on physical rather than biological questions (although the GENE committee and other creationist biologists have already shown the genetic impossibility of "vertical" evolution)."

Og Morris fortsatt (1998; Whitcomb pp.48-9): "Getting people to believe in "intelligent design" is... neither new nor sufficient. People of almost every religion (except atheism) already believe in it. The only ones who do not, the atheists, have rejected it in full awareness of all the innumerable evidences of design in the world.

These cannot be won by intellectual argument, no matter how compelling. As Isaac Asimov said: "Emotionally, I am an atheist. I don't have the evidence to prove that God doesn't exist, but I so strongly suspect he doesn't that I don't want to waste my time."

King David, by divine inspiration, had a comment on the attitude of such atheists: "The fool said in his heart, There is no God" (Psalm 14:1, also Psalm

53:1). Similarly, in Romans 1:21, 22, the apostle Paul, discussing such people, said: "When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

This is strong language, and "design theorists" might recoil from using it, especially concerning their own academic colleagues, but it was God who said it! And intellectual fools are not won by intellectual arguments; if they are changed at all, it will be through some traumatic experience brought about by the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer.

Such Scriptures are speaking of those who are atheists "in their hearts." Like Asimov (and Dawkins et al.), they are "emotional" atheist who have tried to ignore or subvert the real evidence with the pseudo-science of evolutionary speculation. There are, on the other hand, many "reluctant atheists" - those who have been so influenced by the doctrinaire atheists among their teachers and other intellectuals, that they feel they cannot believe in the God of the Bible even though, in their hearts, they would like to believe.

People like this can be reached by sound evidence and reasoning. In our debates, for example, we know from many personal testimonies that a good number of students and young professionals in the audiences who had felt they had no choice but atheistic evolutionism, have indeed been won to solid creationism, and soon to saving faith in Christ, at least in part by the scientific evidence. We hope this will be the experience of those who are now stressing "intelligent design," just as has often been true in the past.

But it will not be so if they stop with just the evidence for design and leave the Designer - the God of the Bible - out of it."

Carl Wieland, Creation Ministries Int. (2002; Whitcomb pp.98-9): "The IDM as a whole does not come to grips with the historical background of naturalism in the sciences. Biblical creationists have long argued that the millions-of-years concepts (which the majority of leading IDmers either support or say they have 'no problem with') in fields like astronomy/cosmology and historical geology were squarely based on, derived from, and fueled by, naturalism - i.e., the deliberate rejection of God's Word and its authority in relation to the history of the world. These naturalism-underpinned conclusions of geology/astronomy were the seedbed for Darwinism. **That is, naturalism was there long before Darwinism and led directly to its dominance.** It is therefore ironic to observe IDers telling people that fighting 'naturalism' is the important issue, when at the same time they tell people that the very naturalism-based issues which were the seedbed of Darwinism are 'unimportant.'"

"We tend to blame 'the world' for what has happened to our educational institutions. We don't usually stop to think of how the church itself has aided and abetted this tragedy as it has so often compromised on the authority of God's Word in relation to real-world issues such as science and history. CMI's major 'strategy' is to boldly, but humbly, call the church back to its biblical foundations in such matters, reforming the thinking of Christians, who are then to be salt and light to our culture. This is how it worked in the days of the Great Awakening in England and America, when the light of the Gospel diffused horizontally through the educational, political and social institutions, transforming positively just about everything we take for granted in our modern world."