



UNCOMMON DESCENT
Serving the Intelligent Design Community

- [January 2006](#)
- [December 2005](#)
- [November 2005](#)
- [October 2005](#)
- [September 2005](#)
- [August 2005](#)
- [July 2005](#)
- [June 2005](#)
- [May 2005](#)
- [April 2005](#)

« [Origin of life: Researchers claim... Intelligent Design and GM Crops...](#) »

21 March 2009

[Oh No, Ono files: Expelled is #8 in documentaries](#)

O'Leary

Here's a useful link to the [response](#) to efforts to pretend that scientists whose research convinces them that the universe shows evidence of design do not face persecution.

(I've covered the persecution for years. To say it is not happening is, to me, like saying 9-11 didn't happen. It is always possible for an ideologue to construct an alternate reality - a legend in his own mind, in which the event is not happening. He likes his alternate reality, of course.)

[Evil Disco warning]

Most of the falsehoods in circulation about the film can be traced to a website called "[Expelled Exposed](#)" set up by the pro-Darwin National Center for Science Education (NCSE) as part of its PR effort to smear the documentary last year. "Expelled Exposed" alleges that Expelled made "dishonest attempts to make mountains out of molehills and to create martyrs where martyrdom does not exist." As John West [observed in response](#), "The basic thrust of ["Expelled Exposed"] seems to be the preposterous claim that pro-ID scientists never, ever face harassment, intimidation, or persecution. Not ever! Scientists who claim otherwise—such as biologist Richard Sternberg, astronomer Guillermo Gonzalez, and Baylor University engineering professor Robert Marks—must be cry-babies or worse. The NCSE's approach is otherwise known as 'blaming the victim.'"

Anyway, this is how the film is doing in DVD:

Amazon.com Sales Rank: #294 in Movies & TV (See [Bestsellers in Movies & TV](#))

Popular in these categories: ([What's this?](#))

#8 in [Movies & TV](#) > [Documentary](#)

#70 in [Movies & TV](#) > [Comedy](#)

#8 - that's in the Top Ten in docs. Not bad for a film that so many were determined to destroy. Even St. Yoko Ono ... wow!



Ads by Google

[God's Design](#)

[ID Theory](#)

[Dembski](#)

This entry was posted Saturday, March 21st, 2009 at 9:23 pm and is filed under [Intelligent Design](#). Both comments and pings are currently closed.

26 Responses

[1](#)

Kevin

03/22/2009

7:13 am

The Da Vinci Code has sold 60 million copies.

It's still shit.

[2](#)

critiacrof

03/22/2009

12:33 pm

I just finished watching "Proving ID = Creationism" on <http://www.expelledexposed.com/>. Their logic is just ridiculous. When you change words in a text the meaning of the text changes also. So you can't say the word creationism has the same meaning as ID. They also say the book "evolved". So in their logic evolved means intelligent designed, because each version is designed.

[3](#)

[O'Leary](#)

03/22/2009

3:04 pm

Kevin, DaVinci Code appeals to people who have a psychological need to believe that the important events of history are governed by conspiracies.

There are surely at least 60 million out there with the wherewithal to buy a book.

(Although many people might have bought the book and then dropped it off at the local Sally Ann Thrift Store ... = "Such nonsense, honestly!")

critiacrof: Re design vs. creation: Creation assumes an act - in the case of the history of life, presumably a divine one or one done by intelligent aliens.

Design focuses on the detection of patterns that signify intelligence. Such an intelligence may or may not need to use specific acts of creation. That remains to be determined.

Either or both positions might be right or wrong - but one must wonder about the intellectual ability or integrity of people who cannot keep the two straight.

[4](#)

David Kellogg

03/22/2009

3:08 pm

Denyse,

DaVinci Code appeals to people who have a psychological need to believe that the important events of history are governed by conspiracies.

True enough. But isn't Expelled basically a conspiracy theory movie, only the alleged conspiracy is of the scientific establishment against intelligent design?

[5](#)

[O'Leary](#)

03/22/2009

7:25 pm

David Kellogg, I am astonished that you would think that prejudice against design theorists is considered some kind of a conspiracy.

Far from any idea of conspiracy, the perpetrators parade in public, for approval. And get it from the secular elite.

It is the policy of government-funded organizations, and is openly proclaimed.

Pop science rags emit it without thinking (cf New Scientist).

Darwinist bloggers rant obscenely without public disapproval.

Expelled, in general, simply set down what is really happening, for the record.

I have covered many such events.

Nothing to do with the facts. But everything to do with the best way to keep humans under their control and wring tax money for projects aimed at proving their talking points.

We recently had young idiots in dino suits on the streets of Toronto.

But it is not a conspiracy because the basic message is public: We have power and you don't. And evidence does NOT matter.

Well, evidence DOES matter. They are hopelessly and obviously - and in many cases, despicably - wrong.

So in the end, they will lose, and lose disgracefully.

But - if they can - they will screw whatever they can out of the system before they retire.

We all know this. It isn't news. And it is NOT a conspiracy.

In my view, it is a situation where good citizens must take charge and demand accountability for public funds.

[6](#)

[David Kellogg](#)

03/22/2009

8:01 pm

Denyse, I certainly don't think the widespread dismissal of ID by mainstream science is a conspiracy. I think it's a consequence of ID's failure to do science.

I think, though, that Expelled presents it in conspiratorial terms: the web site for the movie speaks of a "debate" being "suppressed," that the movie "exposes." The movie, says the website, "reveals some truly shocking answers." All the elements of the scientific establishment are operating together, the movie suggests, to keep the facts from being known. What is this if not a conspiracy?

[7](#)

[mynym](#)

03/22/2009

11:02 pm

...only the alleged conspiracy is of the scientific establishment against intelligent design?

It's idiotic to argue on the one hand that ID is not science and therefore has no place in scientific discussions while arguing on the other that it is not censored. Why wouldn't it be if it should be?

The general position of the scientific establishment has been that ID should be censored from science because criticism of the "theory of evolution" is like criticizing the theory of gravity. Are you ignorant of the fact that the scientific establishment generally openly says that ID *should* be censored? If they generally say it should be then why deny it if it is?

[8](#)

[mynym](#)

03/22/2009

11:03 pm

...only the alleged conspiracy is of the scientific establishment against intelligent design?

It's inconsistent to argue on the one hand that ID is not science and therefore has no place in scientific discussions while arguing on the other that it is never censored. Why wouldn't it be if it should be? Don't you agree that it should be? After all, the general position of the scientific establishment has been that ID should be censored from science because criticism of the "theory of evolution" is like criticizing the theory of gravity. Are you ignorant of the fact that the scientific establishment generally openly says that ID *should* be censored? If they generally say it should be then why deny it if it is? Of course there is no "alleged conspiracy," the fact that you said that indicates your ignorance.

[9](#)

[mynym](#)

03/22/2009

11:04 pm

Sorry for the double, the site was lagging for so long I thought it didn't go through. I tried to soften it up a little the second time around.



[10](#)

AmerikanInKananaskis

03/23/2009

12:59 am

Expelled is most certainly NOT propaganda. If it's propaganda, then all COLD, HARD FACTS are propaganda.

Are researchers being expelled for active research into ID? YES. Without exception.

Is this a violation of free speech, and does it make a joke of "academic freedom"? YES.

Does the biochemistry of the cell (as researched by Michael Behe, etc.) prove that ID is scientific and deserves a place at the table? YES.

Do science teachers present both sides of the debate, even though most people want them to? NO.

Do the writers of science textbooks include information about ID or creationism? NO.

Does Darwinism lead to racism and genocide? YES.

Most people believe creationism or ID. They should be discussed openly at all levels of education.

Which of these points do you debate?

[11](#)

Vladimir Krondan

03/23/2009

6:50 am

Does Darwinism lead to racism and genocide? YES.

There is so much evidence connecting famous Darwinians and eugenics; Expelled barely scratches the surface. In fact, even this is just the tip of the iceberg:

[Darwinism-Eugenics](#)

[12](#)

eintown

03/23/2009

7:35 am

If O'leary and Amerikan are correct, then money is funneled away from pro-ID science:

Nothing to do with the facts. But everything to do with the best way to keep humans under their control and wring tax money for projects aimed at proving their talking points.

Are researchers being expelled for active research into ID? YES. Without exception

Lets assume that is true. Then why doesn't the Discovery Institute or the Templeton Foundation sponsor ID research? Surely the DI who is so involved in the legal battles of ID and is for most part the public face of ID set-up a ID lab?

If an institute is anti ID, why must they sponsor ID research. Surely the pro-ID organizations must take the initiative.

It appears that the only time science enters ID, is when proponents dissect other research, but not conduct any for their own.

[13](#)

R. Martinez

03/23/2009

1:56 pm

David Kellogg (#6): **"I certainly don't think the widespread dismissal of ID by mainstream science is a conspiracy. I think it's a consequence of ID's failure to do science."**

Extreme ignorance or naivete.

The main claim of Darwinism is that ID is absent from nature—that's why evolution is necessary. Evolution accepts unguided material causation. ID accepts the exact opposite: guided or Intelligent causation.

If Darwinists were to accept ID then they would be admitting that evolution is false, refuted. So there is a conspiracy against ID; their

livelihoods depend on it.

Ray

[14](#)

[Joseph](#)

03/24/2009

7:18 am

Yup David Kellogg thinks that heavy reliance on father time and magical mystery mutations is “science”.

Oh well some people will believe anything....

[15](#)

[Joseph](#)

03/24/2009

7:20 am

A very good article on this can be found:

[Exposing “Expelled Exposed”](#)

[16](#)

eintown

03/24/2009

7:58 am

David Kellogg pointed out “ID’s failure to do science”. Then two posters claimed he is talking nonsense by calling him ignorant. Now, if that is so, why didn’t those people in [13] and [14] address David’s claim rather than insult him?

[17](#)

David Kellogg

03/24/2009

8:12 am

moderators, I do hope you let this through: It is entirely relevant to the question.

eintown [17], it’s a good question but can be easily answered when you consider the two involved. Joseph has a long tradition of insulting me: on his own blog he’s been fairly vicious. If he were using the same language against a pro-ID person on his own site, he’d never be allowed to post here. Ray, on the other hand, seems to be an equal-opportunity insulter. He’s the Don Rickles of Uncommon Descent, only without the funny.

[18](#)

jerry

03/24/2009

10:03 am

We have examples of the echo chamber here. “ID is not science, ID is not science, ID is not science, ID is not science, etc, etc, etc.” I can see why Arthur left. He should have gone to the thread “Who is the designer?, Who is the designer?, Who is the designer?, Who is the designer etc, etc, etc.”

But maybe Arthur did not see the thread, “How much CSI does it have, How much CSI does it have, How much CSI does it have, How much CSI does it have, etc, etc, etc” or “How do you define FSCI, How do you define FSCI, How do you define FSCI, How do you define FSCI, etc, etc, etc.”

Yes there are some echos here and is has gotten much louder recently. All the questions in these echos have been answered but the echo goes on as those who do the echoing seem not to be able to understand the answers.

One wonders. Why do they continue to stay? To get answers. To learn about ID when they say they are not getting answers. If a person is not getting answers some place then you would think they would move on. Why frustrate yourself trying to learn something that has no answer. Yes, why does the echo chamber stay?

[19](#)

David Kellogg

03/24/2009

10:39 am

jerry [19], that’s kind of poetic. (By the way, this may arrive a day late because I’m in moderation. Please, moderators, unshackle me.)

An observation and an answer.

Observation: there are at least two echo chambers here, pro-ID and anti-ID. There is also a certain amount of conversation that happens among and between those chambers. A key difference is that the rude pro-ID folks are free to say what they want, while any rudeness from the anti-ID side gets that person stuck in moderation, with posts appearing late and buried behind others that have appeared more recently and instantly. Moderation does effect a kind of silencing.

Answer: why am I here? To learn how pro-ID people think. Or rather, to remember how. For I was once a YEC, then an OEC, then a TE, and now I’m committed to naturalistic evolution. I was never an ID person per se, but I was a fellow traveler, as it were.

But while I think ID is completely wrong, I disagree with Richard Dawkins that people who don’t believe in evolution are necessarily ignorant, stupid, insane, or wicked. Some are, but so are some of every stripe. Rather, I tend to think that ID has a kind of coherence for those who hold it. I’m trying to understand how that happens, and also how conversations break down — how and why people in this debate talk past each other. So while my allegiances are clear, my reasons for being here are primarily observational.

[20](#)

JayM

03/24/2009

10:49 am

Jerry @17

We have examples of the echo chamber here.

“You keep using that word. I do not think it means what you think it means.”

There is an example of an echo chamber here, but it’s not what you’re claiming it is. The echo chamber is what is left after you ban or permanently moderate everyone who asks difficult questions.

One wonders. Why do they continue to stay? To get answers. To learn about ID when they say they are not getting

answers. If a person is not getting answers some place then you would think they would move on. Why frustrate yourself trying to learn something that has no answer.

So you admit that you have no answer to Reciprocating Bill's simple question. Thank you for your honest.

If you do ever come up with an answer, I invite you to the [threadon talk.origins](http://threadon.talk.origins) where I have challenged Upright BiPed to support the claim that ID is a scientific theory. Thus far he has failed to respond. I'm sure he's busy and not simply afraid of debating in a venue where neither of us can be banned.

JayM

[21](#)

[kairosfocus](#)

03/24/2009

12:25 pm

Ein:

This, below, is the problem. Namely, here is how all too many define science today:

It is not that the methods and institutions of science somehow compel us to accept a material explanation of the phenomenal world, but, on the contrary, that we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and a set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counter-intuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door. {Lewontin, NY Review of Books, 1997. Since made dogmatically "official" by the C21 magisterium — NAS, NSTA, NCSE, judge Jones, the new atheists, et al . . .}

This is blatantly false to history [Kindly go read [Newton's General Scholium to his Principia](#) -- greatest modern scientist, and greatest scientific work respectively], to basic phil of sci and to the facts on the ground. And indeed, one of the greatest and most challenging works of science as a civilisation-shaping movement being done by the design movement in our day is to rescue it and its methods from the ones who so blatantly want to subvert it from the unfettered (but intellectually and ethically responsible) pursuit of the truth about our world based on evidence and cogent argument.

And, oh yes, despite the best efforts of the new magisterium, there is a steady stream of papers that are leaking out around the edges of the censorship just captioned above. As a matter of fact, the recent Durson paper proves something else too: a p/g student is lead author, as a part of his work towards a biophysics PhD in Toronto. The magisterium has failed to prevent the emergence of a new generation of scientists getting qualified in ID studies. Jut, they have displaced that work out of the USA. And since ID connects to the theory of inventive problem solving and technological evolution; and to serious codes and ciphers issues, that just may have some serious long term consequences.

But, let us remember: there is an ongoing subversion of key institutions in our civilisation, and this mantra that "ID is not science" is part of it.

GEM of TKI

[22](#)

[eintown](#)

03/24/2009

12:45 pm

Well, if one peruses the ID FAQ, question 3 ("ID does not carry out or publish scientific research") appears most appropriate to the line of questions from this post. Jerry claims [17] our enquiries into the state of ID science are naught but "echoes". So let's dissect the official statement regarding this issue on UD.

There are 4 short paragraphs to answer this question. However only the first is of any real use, as the rest claims ID research is blocked (I would refer you then to my question in [12]).

The first paragraph links to “peer-reviewed & peer-edited scientific publications supporting the theory of intelligent design (annotated)”. The introduction states that Darwinists claim that no ID work is published “in peer-reviewed scientific journals”. The site claims this is untrue.

The first 3 featured articles were printed together in the book “Darwinism, Design, & Public Education”. Toward the end another 3 articles in this book are mentioned.

(Meyer, 2004) was published in an obscure journal. However soon after a statement was made: “Contrary to typical editorial practices, the paper was published without review by any associate editor” and so was revoked.” <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/S....ontroversy>

(Lonnig in Dynamical Genetics) – this does not appear to be a journal.

(Wells, 2005). Rivista di Biologia/Biology Forum is a platform for young earth creationists and so it does not represent mainstream science; and is certainly not internationally respected. <http://scienceblogs.com/strang....ivista.php>

(Minnich and Meyer, 2004) - Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Design & Nature – not a journal.

Then comes 9 pro ID books.

(Voie, 2006) Published in a suspicious non peer reviewed journal. Suspicious since the editor has published over 300 papers since 1994. <http://platformers.net/2008/12....bly-wrong/>

(Davison, 2005) Rivista di Biologia/Biology Forum 98. See above.

(Behe and Snoke, 2004). Peer reviewed journal. But do not speak about ID

(Lönnig and Saedler, 2002). Peer reviewed journal. Do not explicitly mention design.

(Chiu and Lui, 2002). Peer reviewed journal. Mention SCI but do not agree.

(Denton, 2002). Peer reviewed journal. Do not mention ID and refer to natural law.

(Axe, 2000 and 2004). Peer reviewed journal. However does not challenge evolution and Axe claims his work is not pro ID.

http://www.talkorigins.org/indexcc/CI/CI001_4.html

(Lönnig, 2004) this does not appear to be a journal.

(Sewell, 1985) Book. Not pro ID.

4 articles from a book “debating design”

Book “mere creation: science, faith & intelligent design”

5 articles publishes in peer reviewed philosophy journals.

Tally.

Books: 13 (-1 as not pro ID) = 12

Journals: 15 [-5 (philosophy journals); -5 (are not explicitly pro ID)] = 5 (however these papers are found in obscure, controversial, journals).

Other: 3

So out of the total cited (with many repeated) there are 31 sources. Of which 15 (half) are journal articles and only (probably 2/3) are ID papers. So only 10 articles are published in “in peer-reviewed scientific journals” which the Discovery Institute believes to be a large amount for 2 decades. And with the controversy that surrounds many of the papers, the number 10 seems highly unlikely. So Jerry, that is why there is an echo.

[23](#)

[kairosfocus](#)

03/24/2009

12:59 pm

Ein:

You are leaving off one key little thing: the magisterium; the one we just documented.

If you impose or support censorship and career busting on no good grounds — and the cases of Gonzalez [was it near 70 papers?] and that of Sternberg [there is [a whole other side to the story](#) on that PBSW paper you are not seeing] are just the tip of the iceberg — then you have no grounds to complain that the censorship works.

You cannot impose or support oppression and then plead that the victims are to blame.

GEM of TKI

[24](#)

Upright BiPed

03/24/2009

1:29 pm

Like those who claim that ID is not science because it can't be falsified, but it doesn't matter because its all be falsified many times over...

ein proves the point he tenaciously tried to disprove.

He doesn't even have a chance of understanding that.

[25](#)

Clive Hayden

03/24/2009

3:54 pm

David Kellog,

“Joseph has a long tradition of insulting me: on his own blog he's been fairly vicious. If he were using the same language against a pro-ID person on his own site, he'd never be allowed to post here.”

I followed up on Joseph's blog, which led me to follow up on yours too. You are critical of Dr. Dembski in a way that could get you banned. But I don't think that is necessary. But lets not come with the appearance that you're any less vehement than Joseph is.

[26](#)

Pendulum

03/24/2009

5:47 pm

I see that Expelled is up to #5 in the Documentaries category.

If it reaches #1, then what? I'm pretty sure that the Bible has outsold The Origin of Species in every year since 1859. Is there any evidence that Expelled is reaching a different audience than those who are already convinced?

RSS: [Entries](#) | [Comments](#) |
© 2006 Uncommon Descent
Design by [Zeit Studios](#)
Hosted by [Network Omega](#)