

Are We Liars?

By John Calvert

The issue about teaching origins is not what we personally believe, the issue is what we genuinely want the institutions of science and education to do. Are we lying about that? Is there a legitimate perception in the public that we are lying about that?

Our real motivation is relevant, because, we may actually have motive X but be asking for Y, when we expect eventually to get X by first getting Y. To advance this kind of cause we must manipulate and misinform.

It seems that adversaries of ID are particularly guilty of this. They claim to want to do good science but they actually want to promote the ideology of materialism. We know this to be the case because the EFFECT of their behavior is to allow only a materialistic explanation at the expense of doing bad historical science (science that does not allow objective consideration of the principle competing possibility).

Now when we claim that we have no religious motive and just want to do good science, I think we appear to be like those we criticize. Even though we may have no intention to replace materialism with theism, it looks like that is what we really want to do. Now we genuinely do not want to do that, in science. Maybe in the culture through honest competitions, but not in science. I think we all agree that science must always remain tentative and objective. What we want to do is to replace an ideology that is damaging credible science with objectivity that will restore its respect as an effective investigative institution. We do not want to replace an ideology with another ideology.

We believe that the root of the problem is bad science that promotes religious discrimination and that actually puts religion (non-theistic types) into science. So, when we go to Churches we say wake up. You are being discriminated against. You are being led down a primrose path and don't know it. I say the same to the media, to everyone, because this is absolutely true and wrong. I am not ashamed to say I am a Christian that is fighting institutional discrimination against a particular kind of belief (traditional theistic religion) to promote another kind (non-theistic beliefs and "mainstream" theists who would rather not embrace many aspects of traditional theistic religion). I was in a Church explaining Romans 1:20 this last Sunday and a Darwinist asked if I quoted Romans 1:20 to the Kansas State Board. My answer was yes (see findings of fact and conclusion of law). I was quoting it to the Board to show why materialism is antagonistic to theistic belief and why state sponsorship of that doctrine was not religiously neutral.

Once objectivity is in place and a level playing field arises, then our job as activists is done, as far as I am concerned. At that point science becomes a search for the truth rather than the search for a material cause. At that point I have every confidence that whatever is true will win every contest.

So, we must be genuine in everything we do and say.

Now the question I have is whether there is a genuine desire for objectivity among those who seek the truth. If not, then I think we have a problem. If we are truly wanting to change science to get an ideology out, then I think we must genuinely not desire to replace it with another. Now when we argue among ourselves that we are not collectively paying homage to either a literal or metaphorical interpretation of Genesis, it seems to me we are arguing about religion rather than science. If we truly focus on the science then our hypotheses must be derived from the data and not from any religious text.

When we say that the data does not identify the designer that is a true statement when your focus is only on the science. DNA does not bear a signature or copyright notice. Furthermore, because all scientific claims are tentative and because the singular events in question are remote unobserved and unobservable events that are not amenable to experimental testing one can not even be certain that the

system is designed, from a scientific standpoint. To say that we know who the designer is, in my mind, a purely religious and not scientific claim. So, we should not be quarreling among ourselves about who the designer is when we are asking science to get rid of an irrefutable materialistic prejudice.

It is also important to clearly identify the goal. The goal is how we want institutions of science and government to referee the investigation and discussion of origins. It is not about how we want them to interpret genesis, the Koran, the Torah, various Hindu scriptures or native American concepts of God. So, if we are going to ask the referee to use the scientific method (unencumbered by an irrefutable materialistic assumption) rather than to require that the earth be 6,000 years old, then why should anyone fight about that issue when we are discussing the role of the referee?

My guess is that some believe that once the playing field is level, that scientific theories based on religious claims will not be given an opportunity to be heard. That could be the case. However, the opportunity for a careful, competitive and truly scientific examination of radiometric dating, common ancestry and similar issues will then never be greater. If the playing field is truly level, then we should want all legitimate scientific views represented on the field so that those views can be rigorously tested per a scientific method not laden with preconceptions. Under this scenario the religious motivations of the contestants makes no difference. As in a trial, we expect the plaintiff and defendant to be prejudiced. It is that prejudice on the playing field rather than in the jury box, that provides the kind of passionate competition that will get us closer to the truth.

The real threat to all true theists of the world is that "western European materialism," recognized by CS Lewis as the enemy, will cause the institutions of the world to impose that ideology on the rest of us and our children. The threat is that all juries and all judges will become materialists or be required to be materialists.

Theists can make a strong case against materialism on the science, but only if science is objective as it pertains to origins.

The reason ID is effective is because it is a claim that arises from the data and not from a religious text. We should all be able to agree on that. We should also be able to agree that we should not let our explanations stray from the data. Once we do this, then we are guilty of importing religion into science.

As a final note, it seems to me that recent theories regarding possible cybernetic explanations make it all the more difficult to say that we can "know," as a scientific proposition, who the designer is. From a purely scientific standpoint, I think the most honest and genuine answer is that we just don't know what caused the origin of life or the origin of the diversity of life. This tentativeness is necessary due to the enormity of our ignorance about how the system works in the first place. I think that is what we would want our public schools to tell our children. That would be a legitimate response, given the present state of the science.

So, I applaud others for raising this issue. It is critically important. I think those who seek truth need to decide what is the key impediment to that quest? Are we using legitimate scientific means to remove that impediment? Are we being candid with the public as to why we seek removal of the impediment, how we plan to get the job done and what we have planned for the future?

John Calvert

Managing Director

Intelligent Design Network, Inc.