

INTELLIGENT DESIGN ELLER NATURALISTISK EVOLUSJON ELLER ...?  
Hva Kjell J. Tvester fronter, og hva samme Intelligent Design ikke er.

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; juni 2014

"Hver enkelt av oss må velge det ene eller det andre. Vi kan ikke være enig med ideene til Intelligent Design og naturalistisk evolusjon samtidig", skriver Kjell J. Tvester, Dagen 18.06.

"Naturalistisk evolusjon" er som Tvester påviser, ateistisk. Hva er "Intelligent Design"?

"Regner man med intelligente årsaker, er man i realiteten Intelligent Design tilhenger." (Tvester, 05.05)

"Intelligent Design ble etablert i USA for cirka 25 år siden. I følge amerikansk høyesterett kan religiøse forhold ikke omtales i naturfagsundervisningen som mulige årsaker i naturen. Derfor er det der lovstridig å omtale Gud som en årsak til livet. Derfor brukes en nøytral betegnelse som intelligent design eller intelligent årsak." (Ibid.)

"Derfor"?

Den mindre informerte leser kunne komme i skade for å tro at ID (egentlig) innkorporerer troen på ham vi kjenner som "Gud", han som har åpenbart seg i Bibelen.

"Men siden Intelligent Design er en vitenskap om tegn til intelligens, sier den ingenting om naturen til denne intelligente årsak. Det er altså ikke noen religiøs eller hellig skrift som er grunnlaget for å se en intelligent årsak i biologien." (Tvester et al., Livet - skapelse eller tilfeldighet, kap. Hva er Intelligent Design?, s.149)

"Many of the key concerns of ID proponents are very different from those of creation science. Creation science freely uses biblical passages as reference points for much of what they claim while ID advocates do not." (J. Bergman, Slaughter of the Dissidents, p.44)

"William Dembski er en teoretiker og matematiker som har lagt det teoretiske grunnlaget for selve definisjonen av Intelligent Design, og spesifisert de krav som stilles til Intelligent Design som vitenskap." (Tvester, s.147)

"Intelligent design does not require organisms to emerge suddenly or to be specially created from scratch by the intervention of a designing intelligence. ... What separates intelligent design from naturalistic evolution is not whether organisms evolved or the extent to which they evolved but what was responsible for their evolution."

"Intelligent design is a strictly scientific theory devoid of religious commitments. Whereas the creator underlying scientific creationism conforms to a strict, literalist interpretation of the Bible, the designer underlying intelligent design need not even be a deity." (Wm. Dembski, The Design Revolution, p.178.44; Boken finnes i Tvester et al.s litteraturliste.)

Under tittel "The Design Revelation" kommenterer Henry Morris ovenstående: "Dembski himself may not believe such nonsense, but he is trying to build a very large tent, allowing anyone except pure materialists to take refuge there."

These well-meaning folks did not really invent the idea of intelligent design, of course. Dembski often refers, for example, to the bacterial flagellum as a strong evidence for design (and indeed it

is); but one of our ICR scientists (the late Dr. Dick Bliss) was using this example in his talks on creation a generation ago. And what about our monographs on the monarch butterfly, the bombardier beetle, and many other testimonies to divine design? Creationists have been documenting design for many years, going back to Paley's watchmaker and beyond." (I J.C. Whitcomb, *Jesus Christ Our Intelligent Designer - An Evaluation of the Intelligent Design Movement*, p.66) (Man kunne tilføye "Cicero, for example, used design in support of the Greek pantheon of gods." (C. Wieland, *ibid.* p.90).)

"In more modern times, William Paley popularized the design argument with his great book, *Natural Theology*, first published in 1802, profoundly influencing the English speaking world of his day - even Charles Darwin! The book began with a detailed description of the "irreducible complexity" of a functioning watch, noting that even the most rabid skeptic would acknowledge that the watch - or at least its prototype - must have been designed and made by a skilled watchmaker. Just so, he argued persuasively, the much more complex universe required a universe-maker. These themes of intelligent design are compellingly developed at great length in Paley's 402-page book. Darwin, however, wanted to find a way to escape Paley's conclusion, not for scientific reasons, but because he refused to accept a God who would condemn unbelievers like his father to hell." (Morris, i Whitcomb, p.45-6)

"Ironically, *Natural Theology* was written specifically to undermine the 'atheism' of Charles' grandfather, Erasmus ((Darwin))."

"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, the Bible, though revered, was not considered the ultimate authority. Nature itself was more than sufficient to speak on behalf of God." (D. Herbert, *Charles Darwin's Religious Views - From Creationist to Evolutionist*, 2009, p.28)

"The most serious deficiency in the ID movement, however, is its neglect of the most important of the alleged evidences for evolution - that is, the problem of the fossils. These are the remains of billions and billions of once-living plants and animals now preserved in the sedimentary crust of the earth. These all give abundant evidence of suffering and death during all the supposed geological ages which they are supposed to depict.

Did the Designer do that? If so, just how and why? The only adequate answer is in the Bible, in its record of man's sin, the resulting global Curse and eventual Deluge. But the very purpose of the ID movement is to argue for intelligent design without reference to the Bible and the God of the Bible.

Without those factors, however, it would seem that the only alternative would be to assume the Designer to be a sadistic producer of global evil as well as the intelligent producer of irreducible complexity." (Morris, i Whitcomb, p.60-1)

"The ID movement is only focusing on design in creation and overlooking the obvious witness in creation to God's wrath outpoured at the Fall and the Flood. Additionally, they apparently fail to see ... that philosophical naturalism controls geology and astronomy as much

as, if not more than, it controls biology, and that naturalism did not take control of science through Darwin but through old-earth geology and astronomy half a century earlier. Ultimately, the age of the earth controversy is not just a philosophical argument; rather, old-earth geology and old-universe astronomy, like evolutionary biology, are massive assaults on the authority and clarity of the Word of God." (Whitcomb siterer Terry Mortenson, p.35)

"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 crationist research has focused on physical rather than biological questions (although the GENE committee and other crationist biologists have already shown the genetic impossibility of "vertical" evolution)."

"In the book Biblical Creationism, I have analyzed and expounded upon every passage in the Bible mentioning creation, the Flood or related topics - with the conclusion that there is not even a hint anywhere in Scripture suggesting evolution or the long ages that would be required for evolution. We believe that Christians should not dismiss such Biblical arguments and authority out of hand. In particular the idea of a billion years or more of pre-human hominid death makes God to be a sadist and the Gospel redundant (death cannot be the wages of sin, but the pleasure of God." (Morris, brev til Wm. Dembski, i Whitcomb, p.85-6)

"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 seed-bed of Darwinism are 'unimportant.'" (C. Wieland, i Whitcomb, p.98-9)

"While I argue for design, the question of the identity of the designer is left open. Possible candidates for the role of designer include: the God of Christianity; an angel- fallen or not; Plato's demiurge; some mystical new age force; space aliens from Alpha Centauri; time travelers; or some utterly unknown intelligent being." (Michael Behe, sit. i Whitcomb, p.23)

"Our success, ((Phillip E.)) Johnson assures us, "is all but inevitable ... ((because)) we are making a point of elementary logic that

is irresistible once it is understood. The only obstacle to a breakthrough is the long standing prejudice ((of materialism)) ... A prejudice like that can be protected for a while, but in the end reason always breaks through."

The same optimism characterizes the writings of most design theorists, because their official exclusion of the God of the Bible from their discussion really leaves them no other power system for changing the hearts and minds of materialists than their own finite intellects."

"Such thinking actually sets up an enormous barrier against the true Intelligent Designer of the universe, Jesus Christ the Lord. In effect, He is being told to stay out of the battle. Since ID experts believe they can handle the enemy with their own resources, He is not needed. But Christ told us: "Apart from Me you can do nothing ..." (John 15:5)."

"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." (Whitcomb, p.17-8)

"Historically, the 'intelligent design in isolation' argument ... it's been tried before and failed. The 'natural theology' approach (using design, but keeping the Bible out of it) by the deists of former centuries led to an increase in deistic belief, i.e. 'a different god' ... with its attendant rejection of the Bible and the Gospel." (Wieland, i Whitcomb, p.97)

Tveter (05.05) lister "tre aktuelle muligheter" hva angår kristnes "oppfatninger" om "livets opprinnelse og mangfold": "1. Ung jord-kreasjonisme... lar ... en bokstavelig fortolkning av Bibelen bestemmer deres syn på vitenskapen". "2. Gammel jord-kreasjonisme ... I dag definerer de fleste med dette syn seg som tilhengere av Intelligent Design." "3. Kristen darwinisme eller teistisk evolusjon". På den ene siden de hvem lar Biblens pålydende dømme "vitenskap"; på den annen side 'de andre'; "... at der i den kristne verden kun er to skoler, eller to religioner: den som setter Bibelen over alt, og den som setter noe over Bibelen. Den første var opplagt Jesu Kristi; den siste har tilhørt rasjonalismen i alle denominasjoner og i alle tider." (L. Gaussen, God-Breathed - The Divine Inspiration of the Bible, The Trinity Foundation, p.310)

"... our experience (i have been in this arena for almost sixty years) has indicated that the so called "wedge" strategy is futile. Neither one of our two approaches will convince the Eugenie Scotts of academia, not to mention the likes of Richard Dawkins. When we began ICR 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 out that they can be "intellectually fulfilled Bible-believing creationists" (apologies to R. Dawkins!).

"When I first became a creationist back in 1944 ... During those ear-

ly years I could find or learn about very few, if any, university professors or practicing scientists who were creationists, or even Bible-believing Christians. Now there are many of them everywhere, most of them having become scientific creationists largely as a result of our literature." (Morris til Dembski, i Whitcomb, p.85-6)

Avslutningsvis i kapitlet Who Is the Intelligent Designer? (p.33) siterer John Whitcomb James J.S. Johnson. "The problem, despite the positive contributions of IDmers ... is that what is sacrificed.... exceeded the benefits achieved, generally speaking. The payoff is like spending a dollar to gain a dime. A forensic logic technique is gained (apologetically speaking), yet the exorbitant price paid therefore is a functional withdrawal from the five doctrinal 'solas' of Biblical truth recovered by the Protestant Reformation (i.e., sola Scriptura, solo Christo, sola fide, sola gratia, and soli deo gloria). What net good is that, if we really care about transmitting truth to our neighbors?"

(Se ellers D.J.H., "Kjell J. Tveter: LIVET - SKAPELSE ELLER TILFELDIGHET?", anmeldelse, kommentar-avisa.no , gjestekommentar sept. / okt. 2012.)