

KJELL J. TVETER OG UNGDOMMEN

Kjell J. Tveter: Den lille skapelses-boka - Intelligent design for ungdom og folk flest; Prøklamedia des. 2015
En slags anmeldelse m.m.

Dag Jørgen Høgetveit; desember 2015

"Denne lille boka ... er skrevet nettopp for at du skal vite at naturalismen og ateismen bestemmer hvilket syn vi skal ha når det gjelder biologi. Derfor er det viktig at hver enkelt av oss skjønner at det finnes et troverdig alternativ til naturalismen, nemlig det som heter Intelligent Design." (Tveter s.65-6)

Boken etterlater meg inntrykk av at Tveter er ukjent med at samme "naturalismen og ateismen bestemmer hvilket syn vi skal ha når det gjelder" f.eks. kosmologi og geologi. Det tøvverdige 'alternativ' til naturalismen, fremgår av Bibelen, hvilken Intelligent Design-bevegelsen skygger unna.

I kapitlet hvor Tveter redegjør for berlingo-fuglens trekk 2 1/2 gang Norges lengde, hævstrekket Alaska - Hawaii, for monark-sommerfuglen, for laksens vandringer, konkluderes at "isse tre historiene fra naturen bør få oss til å undres. Det er viktig at vi tar vare på vår evne til undring, for undring er en forutsetning for visdom." (s.30)

"Å frykte Herren er begynnelsen til visdom". (Salme 111,10), "til kunnskap" (Ordspr. 1,7); men Skaperens skriftlige åpenbarelse er ikke Intelligent Design-(I.D.) bevegelsen og Tveters utgangspunkt.

"Since we humans are finite and our minds are corrupted by sin, we would benefit from clear, written information about the origin of the world that an all-knowing God might be gracious enough to tell us. Ignoring God's Word is not a religiously neutral position to take. God doesn't like it. (Matthew 7:21-27; Luke 6:46-49)". Skriver Michael H. Warren i "Intelligent Design leaders promote a naturalistic epistemology"(1); dvs. at I.D. ledere fremmer en naturalistisk kunnskapsteori.

Noen sitater fra Warrens 8 siders essay kan være oppklarende angående 'I.D. versus kristendom':

"Philip Johnson, William Dembski and other leaders in the ID movement say that the strategy of ID is to attack the assumption of naturalism in the scientific community." "Despite their stated goal of undermining naturalism, they explicitly affirm the possibility of a finite god. Their attempted neutrality on whether the intelligence that designed life on earth is finite or infinite, we will see, is actually a negation of the infinite view of God held by Christians and is an implicit affirmation of the naturalistic worldview." (p.114)

"Dembski says that ID is scientific because it relies on "widely accepted scientific principles." Likewise, Stephen Meyer argues for the "methodological equivalence" between ID and naturalistic evolution. This simply allows sinful men to vote to kick God out of science." "... Meyer writes: "ID is not based on religion, but on scientific discoveries and our experience of cause and effect, the basis of all scientific reasoning about the past. Unlike creationism, ID is an inference from biological data." Meyer equates secular empiricism with science. He is accepting a naturalistic theory of knowledge. What if

empirical knowledge of cause and effect requires the God whospeaks in the Bible? How can any Christian say that God is not allowed to speak authoritatively on scientific issues? God created the world. He is all-knowing. How can any Christian say that we can ignore God if He gives us knowledge about His creation? Johnson, Dembski, and Meyer identify themselves as Christians. To put it bluntly, who do they think they are to tell God to shut up and butt out of science? A god who cannot communicate to man about history and the material world is a "speechless idol" (Habakkuk 2:18), not the Maker of heaven and earth "who teaches man knowledge" (Psalms 94:10)." (p.115)

"The ID leaders provide no solution to the failure of secular philosophy of knowledge. Indeed, they join themselves to the failed epistemology of the secularists in order to gain their favour. Even if they wanted to, ID advocates can never conclude with the existence of the sovereign Creator of the Bible by combining evidence for design with the epistemology of naturalistic empiricism. The way out of the problem is the assumption of the creationists that the ID advocates reject: metaphysical and methodological theism, recognizing that science is dependent on God and His revelation, rather than trying to reason from a supposedly theologically neutral scientific methodology." (p. 116)

Warren skriver om "revelational epistemology" og om et "view of knowledge .. consistent with what scriptures teach us, such as: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge" (Proverbs 1:7). It is "in your light do we see light" (Psalms 36:9). Rather than "hollow and deceptive philosophy" based on "the basic principles of this world", the Christian is to recognize that "in Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Colossians 2:8). This knowledge cannot be limited to spiritual and heavenly matters; it must be comprehensive, including all creation and all history, because God is sovereign Creator and Ruler of all things." (p.118)

"The leading ID advocates that I quoted don't want the Bible to speak with any authority on scientific matters, regardless of whether the Bible teaches a young earth or if it allows for billions of years. Since God knows more than any human can ever know, being the source of all knowledge and all facts, scientists are rationally obliged to fit observations to conform to the teachings of Scripture." (p.119)

TILBAKE TIL TVETER

"Makter naturalismen å forklare alt i vår virkelighet? Finnes det forhold i naturen som krever en intelligent årsak? Denne boka forsøker å gi et vitenskapelig begrunnet svar". (s.7)

Avslutningsvis om trosretninger (§.12), leses at i "den kristne troen er Gud skaperen av universet ... både livets tilblivelse og dets utvikling er et resultat av hans allmakt."

"... dets utvikling ...", "... den kristne troen ..."?

Det fortsetter (s.17): "Menneskene har alltid undrøst seg over hvor livet kommer fra, hvordan det har blitt til og utviklet seg."

"Mange kjente vitenskapsmenn hadde en sterk tro på Gud som Skaper og universets Herre. Jeg kan nevne Isaac Newton, Johannes Kepler, Blaise Pascal og Carl von Linné." (s. 18)

Trodde disse at "livet ... utviklet seg"? Henry M. Morris lister samtlige som "creationists".(2)

Neste side (s.19): "Vi læres opp til å tro at livet oppsto av seg

selv, og at det utviklet seg på slump fra et encellet vesen til mennesket."

Utviklet livet seg styrt "fra et encellet vesen til mennesket"?

"Mennesker har nesten bestandig trodd at universet var evig og uforanderlig. Det hadde alltid vært der, og ville eksistere på samme måte i all fremtid. Også vitenskapen mente det. Det dannet selve grunnlaget for naturvitenskapen... Einstein... fant for snart hundre år siden ut at universet hadde en begynnelse." (s.31)

Imidlertid er det Bibelen som danner grunnlaget for den vestlige naturvitenskap, og dens grunnleggere var som oftest bibel-troende.

Morris (2) lister 41 navn ved "Scientific Disciplines Established by Bible-believing Scientists", fra Leonardo da Vinci via f.eks. Gregor Mendel til Lord Kelvin m.fl. Bibeltroende har alltid visst at "universet hadde en begynnelse".

Se forøvrig Jonathan Sarfati's artikkel "The Biblical Roots of Modern Science - A Christian worldview, and in particular a plain understanding of Scripture and Adam's Fall, was essential for the rise of modern science", (creation.com).

"... det virker som om "Big Bang" var en planlagt og styrt hendelse." "Vitenskapen sier at ved "Big Bang" ble det dannet to gasser, hydrogen (vannstoff) og helium. Mange av de stjernene du ser på himmelen består nettopp av hydrogen og helium." (s.34)

"Cosmology may look like a science, but it isn't a science," says James Gunn of Princeton University, co-founder of the Sloan survey ((currently the biggest large-scale survey of millions of galaxies - JH)). 'A basic tenet of science is that you can do repeatable experiments, and you can't do that in cosmology.'"(3)

"Lemaître himself described his theory as 'the cosmic egg exploding at the moment of creation'. It became better known as the 'big bang theory', a term coined as a derisive comment by Sir Fred Hoyle while being interviewed on BBC radio around 1950." (Hartnett (ref.3) p.216)

"The goal of physics is to understand the basic dynamics of the universe," ((Michaël)) Turner says. 'Cosmology is a little different. The goal is to reconstruct the history of the universe.' Cosmology is more akin to evolutionary biology or geology, he says, in which researchers must simply accept some facts as given.'"(3)

"But this lack of ability to experimentally test the model is, by the big bang cosmologist's own admission, the Achilles' heel of cosmology. In reality, cosmology is what we call historical science, because it tries to reconstruct the past history of the universe from observations we make today. It is no stronger than constructing the unknown-yet-assumed geological history of our planet (Chapter 5) or the putative sequences of biological organisms that produced a microbiologist form a microbe (Chapters 3 and 4) over several billion years. It was the presupposition of denial of biblical authority, particularly regarding the Creation and Flood accounts, which led to long-age beliefs about the earth. It then followed that geological evolution led to biological evolution. 'Cosmic evolution' is the application of the same sorts of naturalistic (no Creator) assumptions to the origin of the earth and all heavenly bodies, the universe itself. Despite heroic efforts to portray it as 'God's way of creating', the big bang in fact epitomizes the currently fashionable model: a fully materialistic system of cosmic evolution."(Hartnett p.219)

"The standard big bang FLRW model (the modern version of the Friedmann-Lemaître model), relies on the 'cosmological principle', which sta-

tes that the distribution of matter throughout the universe is homogeneous (or uniform) and isotropic (the same in all directions). That is, regardless of when or where an observation is made from, on the large scale, you see the same thing. Without this assumption there is no model, and the principle is believed today more by blind faith than by observation. I will say it again: the cosmological principle is not the consequence of observational evidence, it is the starting assumption used in interpreting such evidence." (Hartnett p. 220)

TVETER IGJEN

Om "universets fininnstilling" skriver Tveter at vi må "tro at det var helt tilfeldig at alle disse tallverdiene fikk den rette størrelsen, eller vi kan tro at en overnaturlig kraft visste om alle forutsetningene som skulle til for å danne liv på jorda, og at denne kraften utførte alle de riktige innstillingene." (s.35-6)
 "Visste om"? Hvem bestemte "alle forutsetningene"?

"Vårt univers er et resultat av en intelligent skaperkraft, det vi vanligvis kaller Gud", avslutter Tveter kapitlet "En styrt eksplosjon". Formuleringen finnes igjen s. 40.89, og synes ikke ha bakgrunn i at Tveter ville foretrukket "El Shaddai", Gud den allmektige, for "Gud".

Tveter leverer flere kapitler på cellen, dens informasjonssystem, protein- og energidannelse.

I og for seg interessant; og I.D.-bevegelsen har fremmet adskillig mikrobiologisk kunnskap med relevante sannsynlighetsbetraktninger om tilfeldighetenes (u-)mulighet.

"Det er ... flott at forskere hele tiden arbeider for å finne ut enda mer om hva som foregår inni cellen. Jo mer nytt de oppdager, desto større innsikt får vi i skaperverkets storhet, og jo mer overveldet blir vi av den skapende intelligensen bak det hele!" (s.77)
 Mulig dét. Men ingensidde behøvdens kurs i mikrobiologi for å erkjenne "den skapende intelligensen bak det hele"; for hans 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, fordi de, enda de kjente Gud, dog ikke æret eller takket ham som Gud, men blev dårlige i sine tanker, og deres uforstandige hjerte blev formørket. Mens de gjorde sig til av å være vise, blev de dårer..." (Rom.1,20-22)

"Moderne vitenskap har bekreftet sannheten i Bibelens første vers: "I begynnelsen skapte Gud himmelen og jorden", hevder Tveter (s.38), men man har antagelig misforstått om man derfor antar Bibelen holdt autoritativ.

Bibelens 26.-27. 'vers' samt kap.2,7, redegjør for menneskets skapelse; "av jordens muld", dag 6, ved "skapningens begynnelse" (Mark.10, 6); men vi kan "trygt si at vi ikke kjenner menneskets opprinnelse med sikkerhet", avslutter Tveter kapitlet "Utviklingslæren". (s.85)

For nemlig: "Darwins lære hviler på to grunnpilarer. Den ene pilaren er at alt liv stammer fra en første urcelle. Den andre pilaren utgjøres av variasjon og naturlig utvalg." (s.78) Og Tveter synes tiltre det første (men (muligens foreløpig) ikke det annet; "muligens foreløpig" fordi han er vag: "Du bør ha kjennskap til at enkelte vitenskapsmenn mener at naturlig utvalg ikke kan skape en ny art" (s.79)

og d"et ser ... ut tåll at makroevolusjon ikke er en bekreftet vitenskapelig sannhet." (s.81)

Hva angår det første, "urcellen", erindrer vi "livets tilblivelse og dets utvikling" (s.12); får en tiltagende anelse om hvor det bærer hén ved d"en første cellen - urcellen" (s.67), og kommer etter hvert til bokens 'pus av pose-'kapitel; "Progressiv skapelse". "Styrt av en intelligent skaperkraft som vi vanligvis kaller Gud." (s.89) 'Teistisk evolusjon'.

"Den vanlige evolusjonslæren, som vi kan kalle naturalistisk evolusjon, regner med at tilfældighetene er hoveddrivkraften i naturen." (s.91) Tveters evolusjonslære virker v"ed at organismer får tilført ny informasjon i form av orfan-gener... Slik styres utviklingen av den intelligente som skapte orfan-genene." (s.91) (Jeg medgir at jeg er ukjent med en (evt.) tenkt 'pre-'orphan'-gen-organisme'.)

"Alle dyrearter har gener som er unike ... De forklares best med nydannelse. Derfor er intelligent årsak den beste forklaringen for disse orfan-genene.

Og med dette vil jeg ønske deg alt godt i livet, og at du tar rette

og kloke valg." (s.96, Konklusjon)

"Det finnes ikke så mye aktuell skandinavisk litteratur om skapelse og evolusjon", skriver Tvetter under "Anbefalt litteratur".

ANBEFALT LITTERATUR(4a)

Primært Bibelen; Bibelselskapets "Revidert oversettelse av 1930"; i sum av grunntekstvalg og oversettelse den beste versjon tilgjengelig. (5)

Blandt det Tvetter kanskje ikke har funnet aktuelt, bør fremholdes Carl Wielands "Stein og Bein"(4b) og Andreas Årikstadm.fl.s "Skapelse og/eller evolusjon - Hva sier Bibelen?"(4c) Se ellers D.J. Høgetveit, "Kjell J. Tvetter: Livet - skapelse eller tilfældighet?" (anmeldelse sept. 2012), og "Intelligent Design eller naturalistisk evolusjon eller ...? - Hva Kjell J. Tvetter fronter, og hva samme Intelligent Design ikke er." (juni 2014); begge kommentaravisa.no

M"en på engelsk finnes det mer"; f.eks. om 'progressiv skapelse': Jonathan Sarfatis "Refuting Compromise - A Biblical and Scientific Refutation of "Progressive Creationism" (Billions of Years), As Popularized by Astronomer Hugh Ross"(6): "Why Write Such a "Negative" Book? Something more must be said about why the approach in this book is necessary. In one sense, this is written with a heavy heart, and with the overriding emphasis that our intention is not personal attack. Our mandate is to defend the faith and the authority of Scripture. We have long believed (and explained why) one of the most dangerous attacks on biblical authority in evangelical circles today is not evolution but "progressive creationism", and we aim to prove this conclusively in this book. The widespread compromise with the plain words of Scripture is capable of immense harm, precisely because it is proclaimed as being done in the name of upholding Scripture. The issue is so vital, as it involves the way we handle the very Word of God. Hopefully, the reader will see why this is no mere "side issue" or an example of a "critical spirit" toward someone who just happens to have a different (by implication legitimate) exegetical view. We need to be like the Bereans, commended by Paul in Acts 17:11, check-

Tveter nevner "Dr. Werner Gitt. In the Beginning was Information. A Scientist Explains the Incredible Design in Nature. Master Books, USA 2007. Gitt var professor i informatikk. Han er en av pionerene innen biologisk informasjonsteori. Han viser hvordan informasjonen er selve hjørnesteinen i livet og i biologien."

"Did God use Evolution?"(7) er tittel på en annen bok av Werner Gitt. "A total of twenty objections ... against theistic evolution is discussed in this book." (Intro., p.8)

Gitt skriver om "The Bible as authoritative source of information: The entire Bible bears witness that we are dealing with a source of truth authored by God", og utdyper over de neste to sidene. "The doctrine of theistic evolution vehemently tries to undermine this basic way of reading the Bible as vouched for by Jesus, the prophets and the apostles. Events reported in the Bible are reduced to mythical imagery, and an understanding of the message of the Bible as being true in word and meaning, is scorned and regarded as superstitious." (pp.89-91)

"The biblical creation principles are ignored in theistic evolution, but, on the other hand, evolutionary ideas are carried into the Bible. In this way God's omnipotent acts are eventually negated." (p.106) "Atheism can be recognised immediately, independent of the philosophical attire it appears in, so that it is not directly dangerous for Christians. But the situation is quite different in the case of conceptual structures which appear in sheep's clothing, and subsequently become "ferocious wolves" as described by Jesus (Matt 7:15). In the case of theistic evolution Christian concepts are readily integrated. However, such teachings reduce the message of the Bible to insignificance and come as "savage wolves" who "will not spare the flock" (Acts 20:29)." (p.109)

Mér på engelsk:

(OG BLOKKER ER EI KLOKKER)

"This book focuses on the original edifice of antibiblical history, the geological timescale." (p.3)

Boken er geolog John K Reed Ph.D.'s "Rocks aren't Clocks - A Critique of the Geological Timescale"(8)

"Most churches are content to exist with a form of intellectual schizophrenia. They teach biblical history back to Abraham, but treat everything before him as myth or poetry, thinking that secular archaeology and secular geology have disproven Creation and the Flood. In doing so, they accept the dual-history scheme.

Pigeonholing prehistory under the category of science shields it from questions because few people are interested in science or willing to question it." (pp. 11-12)

"... evolution did not appear in a vacuum. Darwin needed a historical setting for his biological tale. Many Christians miss that point. They blame biology. It's easy to forget that rocks are the keepers of the time that prevents evolution from being patently ridiculous at the outset. Evolution needs billions of years and that time is supplied by the geological timescale.

If secular prehistory describes the past, then Genesis is not true. If so, it cannot be considered God's Word. If so, how can the rest of

the Bible be trusted? It's an easy step from the absence of divine revelation to the absence of the Divine in our lives. That is why our culture is now thoroughly secular and why many Christians simply live with this uncomfortable inconsistency. But we cannot manage such a fundamental contradiction for very long. Therefore, we must face it. And the first step is to understand how we got there." (pp.13-14)

"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." (pp.51-2)

"... the early uniformitarians did an end run - they mumbled agreement with the rest of the Bible, but inserted a 'prehistory' before Adam and Eve walked in the garden. Thus, they did not have to deny the Bible; just muddy up the first three words.

Their stratagem worked. Theologians saw no great challenge to their turf, and gladly traded a small concession for membership in the 'smart' crowd. Soon, the idea of prehistory settled comfortably into the culture as generation after generation were taught in schools that prehistory was true, while simultaneously being taught not to worry about it in Sunday School.

But Genesis 1:1 is still there. It remained an irritant, which grew stronger as secularists began denying other parts of Scripture... 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." (p.53)

"... both Christian and secular thinkers began to realize that evolution was, at the same time, much less and much more than science. It was much less because it could not meet the fundamental criteria for a scientific theory, and it was much more because it served as an evangelistic tool for secularism. Today we understand evolution as the historical mythology of atheism. It cannot be observed or tested. Its 'proofs' are tautologies - you have to assume evolution to see the 'evidence' in the data. Finally, if evolution were at all scientifically demonstrable, all the time and money poured into research within that paradigm would have produced clear and convincing evidence. It has not." (pp.71-2)

"Historically, we see that secular savants had already accepted a vast prehuman prehistory in the 1700s, long before the geological field studies in the 1800s that supposedly proved it." "... deep time was first and foremost a titillating idea that there was a time outside the Bible - an alternate universe where science could displace theology and God was not welcome. The amount of time did not matter; that was a detail to be resolved later.

In other words, deep time was a secular reaction against Genesis."

(p.81) "Though the number of years and the methods that supposedly proved them changed over time, the idea never did. Almost all of the pioneers of deep time were anti-Christian, and the Christians who jumped on the intellectual bandwagon failed to see the consequences of their surrender. They did not see that deep time was a religious preference that directed scientific research, profoundly shaping the thinking of geologists throughout the 19th century." (p.82)

"James Ussher had shown that the Bible possessed a robust an detailed chronology. Consciously or unconsciously, geologists raced to emulate his example. They set out to discover a robust, detailed chronology in the rocks on a global scale..."

"Darwin provided stratigraphers with the last key piece of the puzzle; evolution was the perfect chronometer ... history through the evolutionary stage of ... fossils.

This signaled the end of any hope for an empirical key to the rock record - biological evolutionary successions are never observed, only inferred. A trade-off had been made; 'reliable' global correlation at the expense of empiricism. One could 'date' rocks by index fossils, but that assumed the reality of evolution. Twentieth-century creationists pointed out the circular reasoning inherent in this approach. If the order of the fossils proved evolution, then why was the assumption of evolution needed to order the fossils?" (pp.98-9)

"For nearly a century, the public has been led to believe that radiometric dating is the one true clock." "But professional stratigraphers have known all along that the real 'clock' is biological evolution. Rocks are ordered by fossils and fossils by their evolutionary stage. This is why geologists share the panic of biologists when evolution is attacked. The credibility of the timescale is linked to that of evolution." (p.108)

"The mere fact that most laboratories ask for a date range along with the sample should tell us all we need to know." (p.103)

"Radiometric dating is not the magic hammer that can set stratigraphic boundaries for the timescale. Its weaknesses are kept under wraps; otherwise the establishment might have to admit what creationists have been saying for decades - that deep time has never been demonstrated. When it comes down to Earth's true age, an honest empiricist would confess "I don't know." (p.125)

The "challenge came from the lab, not the pulpit, as the scientific creationism of the latter 20th century began unmasking secular science as biased and flawed. Most people trace the origin of this movement to the publication by John Whitcomb and Henry Morris of The Genesis Flood in 1961. It was an unexpected attack - creationists took the fight to their opponents' turf. They demonstrated that it was science that made evolution impossible, and argued that the rock record spoke of a short, violent past. Yet despite strong arguments against the length of time, even creationists have, by and large, failed to confront the foundations of that faulty chronology - the idea that rocks, acting as the pages of nature's history book, are superior to the history of the Bible. 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.

Despite censorship by secular elites, creationist ideas have permeated the public square. Many have been convinced that severe flaws exist in Darwin's theory - even a few atheists are critics. But it does not end there. Darwin may have built the temple walls, but the found-

dations 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." (pp.180-1)

Reed nevner ellers at r"ecent decades have revealed the myth of the dispassionate objectivity of academia. It's a facade for the public. Don't believe it? Then try to find the objective data needed to get to the bottom of the 'global warming' debate. Or look for ..." (p/67) "How much are we spending on policies based on years of unproven uniformitarian history? For example, a hot topic today is climate change. How might our view of climate change be affected by understanding that Earth is only a few thousand years old, and that it suffered a global cataclysm about 4,500 years ago? Yet policy planners never even stop to consider that option. They instead spend billions based on secular mythology." (p.208)

Men enda en bok på engelsk:

VÅR 'INTELLIGENTE DESIGNER'

Nevnte John C. Whitcomb leverte i 2011 en bok på tykkelse med Tveters, kalt "Jesus Christ Our Intelligent Designer - An Evaluation of the Intelligent Design Movement". (9) I forord skriver John Morris: "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."

Whitcomb, som altså identifiserer den 'intelligente designer', ham ved og til alle ting er skapt (Kol.1,16; Joh.1,3; Åp.3,14), skriver i siste kapittel, "Intelligent Design or the Gospel?": "God's requirement for spiritual salvation is not belief in Intelligent Design. All of the religious leaders of Israel believed in ID. But they crucified the Designer!" (p.37) Han avslutter kapitlet "May it be our goal in life as Christians to tell people everywhere that Jesus Christ the LORD is our Intelligent Designer and that by humble acceptance of His gracious gift of eternal life, based upon the price He paid upon the cross, confirmed by His bodily resurrection, we may know that our sins have been forgiven and that we will spend all eternity with Him. "For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him shall not perish, but have eternal life." (John 3:16)."

1. Journal of Creation, 29(3)2015:113-20; p.119.
2. Morris, H.M.; The New Defender's Study Bible; World Publishing Inc. 2006; App. 7, pp.2083-5; "This tabulation... published... in Men of Science, Men of God, by Henry M. Morris (... Master Books, 1982, 1988), 107pp."
- Henry Morris Ph.D. var forøvrig på tidspunktet for utgivelsen av The Genesis Flood, 1961, "professor of Hydraulic Engineering and chairman of the Department of Civil Engineering at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Virginia".
3. Cho, A.; A singular conundrum: How odd is our universe?; Science 317:1848-1850,2007; in Carter,R. (Ed.); Evolution's Achilles' Heels - 9 Ph.D. scientists explain evolution's fatal flaws - in areas claimed to be its greatest strengths; Creation Book Publ. 2014; Ch.7, Cosmology:Exposing the Big Bang's Fatal Flaws, pp.215-231; by John Hartnett Ph.D. Physics; pp.218-9.
- 4a. Litteratur;lat. skriftlig fremstilling.
- 4b. Wieland,C.; Stein og Bein - Sterk bevisføring mot utviklingslæren; norsk utgave av 2. Eng.ed. 2001 v. AKF/Krossen Media. Orig. Stones and Bones, 3.Eng.ed. 2006; óg som e-bok.
- 4c. Årikstad,A., Lianes,J., Årikstad-Nielsen,J.S.; Skapelse og/eller evolusjon - Hva sier Bibelen?; Hermon 2014.
5. Se f.eks. D.J. Høgetveit; "Oversettelse av Bibelen" (2012) og "Epoch-making Books" (2015); kommentar-avisa.no
6. Sarfati,J. Ph.D. Physical Chemistry; Refuting Compromise; Creation Book Publ. 2.ed. 2011.
7. Gitt,W. Dr.Ing. ("In 1978 he was promoted to Director and Professor at the" German Federal Institute of Physics and Technology); Did God Use Evolution?; Germ.ed. 1988; Christliche Literatur-Verbreitung e.v. 2.Engl.ed. 2001.
8. Reed,John K.; Rocks aren't Clocks; Creation Book Publ. 2013.
9. Whitcomb, John C. Th.D.; Jesus Christ Our Intelligent Designer; Kainos Books 2011.