

The Key Deception

by John H. Calvert, J.D., BA (geology)

October 19, 2006

I became interested in the science of origins in the mid 1980's due to three findings. First the finding of extraordinary evidence of design in living systems, second the finding that mainstream science uses a rule called scientific materialism or methodological naturalism to suppress that evidence, and third, the finding that the use of the rule is also hidden from the public view. The effect of this systematic deception is to cause the public to believe that modern evolutionary theory, which argues against design, is true, while its explanatory power is actually very much dependent on a hidden counterintuitive doctrine that effectively protects it from challenge.

My specialty in private practice was stock fraud. Most stock frauds are perpetrated by undisclosed accounting practices that have the effect of overstating the financial condition and results of operations of the issuer. Enron and World Com are well-known examples. I came to understand that evolution today is promoted today in much the same way. Its advocates use rhetoric and deception rather than candid scientific analysis to make their case for an origins story that has an enormous impact on Religion, ethics, morals and government.

The key to the deception is the lack of awareness among the public of the use and effect of the Rule. Because of the non-disclosed use of the Rule the public is led to believe that the scientific alternative to evolutionary theory fails because of a lack of evidence, when the failure is actually due to the use of an unsubstantiated Rule. Since "mainstream science" is not regulated by an SEC, a major focus of my work has been to expose the use and effect of the Rule.

To that end I submitted to the Kansas City Star the op-ed shown below for publication in early August 2006. It was submitted in response to a series of editorials that had been published that used rhetoric and omission to oppose very objective Kansas Science Standards adopted in November 2005. The editorial was designed to explain to the public the key issues in origins science and how mainstream science uses rhetoric and the Rule to skew the explanation "rather" than claimed "clear thinking." In connection with the submission I asked that it not be edited because of its complexity. However, without my consent the key paragraph that exposes the non-disclosed use of the Rule was removed.

The edit had the effect of once again misinforming the public of evolution's hidden off-balance sheet liability. It is a classic example of deception used to promote a so-called "theory" that has a major impact on both theistic and non-theistic religion.

The article published on August 19, 2006 is shown below. The key paragraphs that explain the use of the Rule to the public that were deleted are shown in bold face italics.

The Kansas City Star (<http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/opinion/15309190.htm>)

Posted on Sat, Aug. 19, 2006

JOHN CALVERT ON ORIGINS

Teaching Origins demands Clear Thinking, not Rhetoric

A recent editorial seeks “clear thinking” about origins, but its inflammatory rhetoric undermines that goal.

“Where did life come from?” isn’t easy to answer. I believe clear thinking starts with four conclusions that most can accept, although we may argue about the details:

First, accounts of origins are generally built on one of two causal concepts: Life derives from (a) only material causes or (b) from both material and intelligent causes.

Stories about materialistic origins argue that because we cannot observe an intervening intelligent cause, nature is a self-existing product of interactions of matter, energy and the forces. Chemical evolution explains how life might have arisen from a chance combination of chemicals. After replicating life starts, biological evolution writes the rest of the chapters using imagined random mutations and natural selection.

Articles about teleological origins argue that many natural systems, such as the genetic code, are observed to have all the characteristics of systems designed by human intelligence, such as the Morse Code. Since material causes alone are challenged to explain these information-rich systems, it is logical to infer their origin from intelligence. Although we cannot observe the past intelligence at work, it can be inferred from what has been left behind.

Second, all explanations about ancient origins are scientifically controversial. They rely on a constantly changing mix of circumstantial evidence and lots of imagination to construct subjective historical narratives about unobservable remote events not amenable to experimental confirmation.

Third, any origins story unavoidably affects religion, ethics, morality and even government. Materialistic theories support religious views such as atheism, humanism, scientism, Buddhism, Taoism, etc., while teleological theories support traditional theistic religions like Christianity, Islam and Judaism. Materialists use “human reason” and science to provide direction to life, and traditional theists rely on prayer and wisdom reflected in religious texts.

Fourth, in our country, government is constitutionally required to be neutral as to religion. Public schools may not take sides in any debate “respecting” “religion.”

Any clear thinking requires schools to avoid any bias that favors one origins story over another. This scientifically controversial subject that unavoidably affects religion cries out for scrupulous scientific objectivity.

The current origins story favored by “mainstream science” is not scientifically objective because it uses a subtle and generally unstated materialistic bias that is absolute. We must assume life derives only from material causes. Although students are led to believe the story is an empirically tested scientific conclusion, it actually is an interpretation of facts that fit a preconceived materialistic assumption that is not religiously neutral. This model skews public education to favor the non-theist over the traditional theist. (this paragraph was deleted by the Editor)

Science standards adopted last year in Kansas reject preconceptions in favor of critical scientific analysis of the prevailing materialistic origins story. It is not entirely objective, because it does not encourage discussion of the alternative. However, it is a move toward better origins science that is religiously neutral.

To advance clear thinking about origins, we need reporting that will exchange rhetoric for critical analysis of the current standards. (this paragraph was deleted by the Editor)

John Calvert is managing director of Intelligent Design Network Inc., a nonprofit organization seeking institutional objectivity in origins science. He lives in Lake Quivira.