

By Chris mankey

Apr 22, 2008 1:29 PM | [Link to this](#)

"If upon your death you come face to face with God - then I supposed ID will look pretty strong to you. "

Gosh, I thought ID was a purely scientific idea and not a religious one? Are you admitting that the "intelligent designer" is god? Do you think when I stand in front of the throne of Albert Einstein in heaven I'll see the scientific merit of relativity?

By Chris mankey

Apr 22, 2008 1:21 PM | [Link to this](#)

"then he said something like...it is possible that life was seeded on Earth by intelligent beings from another planet, but they they would, of course had to evolve from nothing, out of totally natural processes. WHAT?"

Well, the context of the question was " can you think of alternative forms of "intelligent design" Dawkins doesn't believe in directed panspermia. Why don't you look up the facts before posting rants like a \*\*\*\*\* idiot on line?

By Chris mankey

Apr 22, 2008 1:19 PM | [Link to this](#)

"then he said something like...it is possible that life was seeded on Earth by intelligent beings from another planet, but they they would, of course had to evolve from nothing, out of totally natural processes. WHAT?"

Well, the context of the question was " can you think of alternative forms of "intelligent design" Dawkins doesn't believe in directed panspermia. Why don't you look up the facts before posting rants like a \*\*\*\*\* idiot on line?

By The Dude

Apr 22, 2008 12:08 PM | [Link to this](#)

Can't evolution be a part of creation? When someone "designs" something, they have many prototype and failures and eventually come up with an evolved creation. People need to quit looking and the opposite ends of the spectrum and look for the common ground.

By Jiles Samson

Apr 21, 2008 10:21 PM | [Link to this](#)

Evolutionist / Atheists need to get another poster boy besides Richard Dawkins. What an idiot he made himself out to be.

He actually said in his interview when asked how the first cell could have formed, what was the process, they "we don't know", and then he said something like...it is possible that life was seeded on Earth by intelligent beings from another planet, but they they would, of course had to evolve from nothing, out of totally natural processes. WHAT?

Even my pea-brain understands that all he did was put the question off to another planet. Why not just say, "we don't know, but it had to be natural, just because I say so." That would have been a more logical answer.

I was stunned at his inane stupidity. He just lost any credibility with me.

By Jiles Samson

Apr 21, 2008 10:17 PM | [Link to this](#)

Evolutionist / Atheists need to get another poster boy besides Richard Dawkins. What an idiot he made himself out to be.

He actually said in his interview when asked how the first cell could have formed, what was the process, they "we don't know", and then he said something like...it is possible that life was seeded on Earth by intelligent beings from another planet, but they they would, of course had to evolve from nothing, out of totally natural processes. WHAT?

Even my pea-brain understands that all he did was put the question off to another planet. Why not just say, "we don't know, but it had to be natural, just because I say so." That would have been a more logical answer.

I was stunned at his inane stupidity. He just lost any credibility with me.

By Jiles Samson

Apr 21, 2008 10:16 PM | [Link to this](#)

Evolutionist / Atheists need to get another poster boy besides Richard Dawkins. What an idiot he made himself out to be.

He actually said in his interview when asked how the first cell could have formed, what was the process, they "we don't know", and then he said something like...it is possible that life was seeded on Earth by intelligent beings from another planet, but they they would, of course had to evolve from nothing, out of totally natural processes. WHAT?

Even my pea-brain understands that all he did was put the question off to another planet. Why not just say, "we don't know, but it had to be natural, just because I say so." That would have been a more logical answer.

I was stunned at his inane stupidity. He just lost any credibility with me.

By Jiles Samson

Apr 21, 2008 10:14 PM | [Link to this](#)

Evolutionist / Atheists need to get another poster boy besides Richard Dawkins. What an idiot he made himself out to be.

He actually said in his interview when asked how the first cell could have formed, what was the process, they "we don't know", and then he said something like...it is possible that life was seeded on Earth by intelligent beings from another planet, but they they would, of course had to evolve from nothing, out of totally natural processes. WHAT?

Even my pea-brain understands that all he did was put the question off to another planet. Why not just say, "we don't know, but it had to be natural, just because I say so." That would have been a more logical answer.

I was stunned at his inane stupidity. He just lost any credibility with me.

By Jiles Samson

Apr 21, 2008 10:13 PM | [Link to this](#)

Evolutionist / Atheists need to get another poster boy besides Richard Dawkins. What an idiot he made himself out to be.

He actually said in his interview when asked how the first cell could have formed, what was the process, they "we don't know", and then he said something like...it is possible that life was seeded on Earth by intelligent beings from another planet, but they they would, of course had to evolve from nothing, out of totally natural processes. WHAT?

Even my pea-brain understands that all he did was put the question off to another planet. Why not just say, "we don't know, but it had to be natural, just because I say so." That would have been a more logical answer.

I was stunned at his inane stupidity. He just lost any credibility with me.

By Dr. Cletus

Apr 21, 2008 9:44 PM | [Link to this](#)

There is no point to living, it just is. Until you die, then it isn't. Then you're remembered as having existed for about 60 to 120 years. Then you're not. In about 5 billion years, what's left of the organic material once constituting your corpse will be incinerated by the Sun going supernova. And in the interum, the Cubs may win a World Series.

By Dr. Cletus

Apr 21, 2008 9:44 PM | [Link to this](#)

There is no point to living, it just is. Until you die, then it isn't. Then you're remembered as having existed for about 60 to 120 years. Then you're not. In about 5 billion years, what's left of the organic material once constituting your corpse will be incinerated by the Sun going supernova. And in the interum, the Cubs may win a World Series.

By Natalie Sterne

Apr 21, 2008 4:52 PM | [Link to this](#)

I can't believe you are giving this such a terrible review!!!! I thought the movie was wonderful. Other people I spoke to also thought it was good. I hope Baylor comes to its senses about evolution vs. ID because of this movie.

By Jonas

Apr 21, 2008 2:47 PM | [Link to this](#)

If God doesn't exist, then what is the point to living? There is no reason to even argue against religion because it doesn't matter. No creator, no reason for being here, no where to go after life. No point in existing and arguing your point.

By Polo

Apr 21, 2008 12:17 PM | [Link to this](#)

**i specifically remember being taught in school, the way Earth was created, was a whole bunch of dust and matter came together, and after millions of years this planet came into existence** at the time i truly believed it, but now after thinking for my self and seeing how beautiful and complex this world really is, its hard but to think that there had to of been a Creator, and not an accident!

*my point is, if evolution is to be presented in the public schools then so should creationism.*

By Jonas

Apr 21, 2008 11:22 AM | [Link to this](#)

If God doesn't exist, then what is the point to living? There is no reason to even argue against religion because it doesn't matter. No creator, no reason for being here, no where to go after life. No point in existing and arguing your point.

By mike

Apr 21, 2008 9:58 AM | [Link to this](#)

when did "theory" become the same as proof?  
history is littered with theories "everyone" believed - but were later proven wrong.  
the biggest problem with science today is that scientists no longer care to admit that they often cannot truly prove theories. they say "we know" when "we believe" would be way more accurate.

By testerer

Apr 21, 2008 5:05 AM | [Link to this](#)

Is **Kram Rognug** for real?

*"the "theory" of evolution is just that - a theory."*

I guess you are living proof that religious fundamentalists ignore all facts and reason. Evolution is not JUST a theory, it is a SCIENTIFIC theory:

**"In science, a theory is not a guess, not a hunch. It's a well-substantiated, well-supported, well-documented explanation for our observations. It ties together all the facts about something, providing an explanation that fits all the observations and can be used to make predictions. In science, theory is the ultimate goal, the explanation. It's as close to proven as anything in science can be."**

Source: <http://www.notjustatheory.com/>

*"Both evolution and ID requires a certain amount of faith since neither can be proven."*

False. See above. But this is not the point. The point is that Ben Stein is lying. They left out christian evolutionists like Ken Miller and even the Pope(!) on purpose because, by Mark Mathis' admission, "it would have confused the message of the film unnecessarily". A strangely candid admission from an otherwise fundamentally dishonest individual.

*"When the evolutionists react so strongly to a film showing an opposing view it only shows the weakness of their arguments. It also supports the claim of those on the right that it is the left that fears truly free speech."*

This is nonsense. No one has tried to prevent the makers of this film from voicing the opinion. They have merely pointed out that the film is dishonest at best.

*"I suppose ultimately one theory or the other will be proven in the end."*

This shows your lack of basic understanding of science. Just like the makers of Expelled.

By John L

Apr 21, 2008 4:34 AM | [Link to this](#)

**Well, as it turns out, almost all of the biological sciences are crucially informed by the theory of evolution** I believe the evolution you refer to is agreed on by everyone. The rocks to man and nothing to the cosmos is what I am referencing.

By Kevin

Apr 21, 2008 12:07 AM | [Link to this](#)

To Johnl:

You ask, "In a hypothetical situation where all theories of origins are removed from discussion, what technology would be thwarted?"

Well, as it turns out, almost all of the biological sciences are crucially informed by the theory of evolution. This includes research that leads to the development of drugs used to treat diseases such as influenza, pneumonia, AIDS, and cancer--all of which require an understanding of evolution to solve.

So, to remove the theory of evolution from the discussion would mean that we would have no way of treating these diseases.

I mean, why do you think we are having a problem with drug-resistant strains of bacteria? It is because of evolution! Easy to kill strains have died off, leaving more virulent species to develop. This is evolution!

Science, in part because of our understanding of the theory of evolution, has led to the **doubling** of human life expectancy over the last 100 years. When creationism reigned (up until the beginning of the 20th century), average life expectancy was between 30-40 years (look it up if you don't believe me). Now, with informed medicine and public health measures, average life expectancy is almost 70 worldwide. This is 35 more years for creationists to deny evolution! :(

By Kram Rognug

Apr 20, 2008 10:12 PM | [Link to this](#)

I have just seen the film. Your overreaction is proof of the very point Stein is making.

Can't prove ID? Correct.

You CAN prove evolution? Wrong.

Did we evolve? Maybe. But the theory of evolution is just that - a theory. Believe it if you will, but the fossil record is still lacking much proof.

Both evolution and ID requires a certain amount of faith since neither can be proven. When the evolutionists react so strongly to a film showing an opposing view it only shows the weakness of their arguments. It also supports the claim of those on the right that it is the left that fears truly free speech.

I suppose ultimately one theory or the other will be proven in the end. If upon your death you simply black out for ever - then the evolutionists were right. If upon your death you come face to face with God - then I suppose ID will look pretty strong to you.

I for one truly hope for the latter. If for no other reason than to watch the stunned faces of those who don't believe in ID. It should prove to be a rather entertaining encounter.

By Dr. Cletus

Apr 20, 2008 6:47 PM | [Link to this](#)

This movie really raises some important questions. Like, I wonder what a creation science experiment looks like? Just what kind of research does this theory entail? Is answer (c) "God did it" the answer to every multiple-choice test question?

That said, the importance of teaching evolution is overblown. Most kids will never become scientists, especially in the Bible Belt, and the interested ones will seek science out anyway.

Though, I do look forward to the documentaries on how science is suppressing Flat Earth and Geocentrism theories.

By eric collier

Apr 20, 2008 11:42 AM | [Link to this](#)

"Everyone can talk but the Christians"? For the last 30 years the country has been subjected to an overbearing cacophony of Christian theocentric agitprop. True, they've made much greater strides in the popular community than the scientific one, but that's not science's fault. It's the sophomoric insistence by these people that their mystic doctrine should be the engine driving every component of civilization when they have nothing to back it with except blind faith in some bronze-age mythology.

By eric collier

Apr 20, 2008 11:40 AM | [Link to this](#)

"Everyone can talk but the Christians"? For the last 30 years the country has been subjected to an overbearing cacophony of Christian theocentric agitprop. True, they've made much greater strides in the popular community than the scientific one, but that's not science's fault. It's the sophomoric insistence by these people that their mystic doctrine should be the engine driving every component of civilization when they have nothing to back it with except blind faith in some bronze-age mythology.

By Roam

Apr 20, 2008 11:35 AM | [Link to this](#)

"The only true loss in excluding a creator is the loss of moral compass and that has little to do with science."

From Johnl

I am indignant over the arrogance of the self-proclaimed hegemony Christians have toward morality. Morality, love, self-sacrifice, altruism....all of these concepts are many thousands of years older than Christianity.....you will not be allowed to high-jack these concepts and please stop perpetuating the lie they are your inventions.

I forget who said this,

"In a world without religion, good men would still do good, and bad men would still do bad. But for a basically good man to do bad things, THAT requires religion!"

By kasey

Apr 20, 2008 9:47 AM | [Link to this](#)

I have a question:

In August, I start Baylor as a student. Do teachers actually have time to teach with all this kind of stuff going on?

By Ray Mills

Apr 20, 2008 6:03 AM | [Link to this](#)

I dare anyone here to go through a copy of mein kampf and find any use of Darwins name or Theory of Evolution. Hitler was more influenced by Luther. Infact The only correct nazi scum use of Origin of Species was to throw it on piles of other books, burning. There are plenty of places on the net to download the book, use the find function in whatever office software you use, I dare you.

By Johnl

Apr 20, 2008 3:02 AM | [Link to this](#)

I just saw the movie this weekend. I am an ardent creationist, so I will of course be biased. I will at least admit it. As to the movie, I thought it slowed to a crawl and I lost interest about half way through. I would like to offer one point that I never seem to see put forward. In a hypothetical situation where all theories of origins are removed from discussion, what technology would be thwarted? I always hear the charge that creationist want to take us back to the dark ages. How does the concept of a creator take away from technology? How does Darwinism contribute to it? This is truly the missing link!! The only true loss in excluding a creator is the loss of moral compass and that has little to do with science.

By Chris Moore

Apr 20, 2008 12:37 AM | [Link to this](#)

I have not seen this movie yet, but I plan too. However, in researching the film, it is clear that Stein does not consider himself a Christian or a supporter necessarily of intelligent design. The writer of this article seems to act as if Stein is just being partial to his own view points.

Knowing the education system in America today, this is a real problem and I'm tired of support for intelligent design, which this reporter over and over refuses to use anything but ID as the description of it, being shuffled under the carpet. We deserve a voice. It's amazing how Christianity is still the majority religion in America, yet we are are treated by the academics and the media as a fringe group. Get a clue!

I am a graduate of Baylor University, but never let it be said that it is a school always true to the message of Scripture. Robert Sloan wanted to see the highest academic standards achieved while holding to a Christian morality and direction and all that got him was asked to leave. Baylor is hypocritical in it's statements versus its teachings and Truett Seminary, a "spinoff" of Baylor, has a professor who recently helped the editor of the Baptist Standard, Marv Knox, accuse a Christian organization (Answers in Genesis) that promotes creationism of being on the same level as Muslim Militants.

Creationists, and Christians for that matter, deserve a voice in today's world and I thank Stein for allowing some of our argument to be heard. Don't let a narrow minded local reporter that is defending the hometown university silence the lessons to be learned.

To all of the evolutionists out there, I say, "give me proof." Not something that you believe is true, but solid facts that science has proven to be true without a doubt. Show me fossil remains of evolution in transition. Show me species today that are evolving and not just adapting. There is more "science" to back up the fact that there is more to all we know than any of us can conceive and that a creation as detailed and elaborate as this

came from somewhere, and it is my faith that that somewhere is God.

This world is dark and without hope. No wonder, if there are so many advocates for a hopeless life without a God who cares that sacrificed Himself for our sins, that there is not hope. I for one know there is a God and this is all His handiwork. That's why I have hope and can face the struggles of the modern world. People need that hope, including many who have responded to this article.

Life has become meaningless in America, due in large part to the removing of God from this country. Someday, we will all answer for that, the Christians for their silence and the opposition for standing in pride shouting there is no God. I believe the Bible calls them fools!

By Joshua Rieff

Apr 19, 2008 11:11 PM | [Link to this](#)

You know this is a very negative review of this movie. Sounds to me like the reporter is a little defensive of his alma-mater. poor-baby :(

By Ichthyic

Apr 19, 2008 9:56 PM | [Link to this](#)

Hopefully "Expelled" will enlighten the public that wants to be enlightened to the agenda of the evolutionists/atheists/agnostics to shut the Christians up by their taunts and mockings, curses and belittling

you brought it on yourselves.

Xians should really HOPE that the lies and misinformation, gross distortions and hyperbole that make up "Expelled" doesn't further serve to marginalize an entire religion.

<http://www.expelledexposed.com/>

By Reginald Selkirk

Apr 19, 2008 9:36 PM | [Link to this](#)

A minor correction: It's PZ Myers, not Meyers.

By C. David Parsons

Apr 19, 2008 8:03 PM | [Link to this](#)

The Quest for Right: A Creationist Attack on Quantum Mechanics.

Here's a different take on creationism/ID: The Quest for Right, a seven-volume set of textbooks based on physical science, attacks Darwinism indirectly, by attacking quantum mechanics:

“Atheists base their reasoning on quantum interpretation, hand in hand with mathematical elucidation. Summoning the dark forces of quantum mysticism, with mathematical incantations, scientists possess the power to bewilder and, thus, con the average person seemingly at will, into believing the bizarre and surreal; for example, imaginary Z particles, neutrinos, leptons, quarks, weak bosons, etc. Mystics attempt to pass off quantum abuse as legitimate science by expressing the theories in symbolic fashion. These formulae represent the greatest hoax ever perpetuated upon an unsuspecting public. The objective of the extensive investigation is to expedite the return to physical science by exposing quantum dirty tricks; that is, the unethical behavior or acts by the scientific league to undermine and destroy the credibility of biblical histories. A few of the dirty tricks include: absolute dating systems, Big Bang Theory, antimatter, and the Oort Cloud of comets. These have no further station in science.

Of course, a more sophisticated way to argue against Darwinism is certainly to argue against quantum physics. Without modern physics, you lose astrophysics too, which enables the author to make the case for YEC [young earth creationism]. The author goes on to prove that things like red supergiant stars and X-ray pulsars don't really exist, except in the imagination of scientists." -- Stephen L of the newsgroups.derkeiler.com

By Donna

Apr 19, 2008 7:51 PM | [Link to this](#)

Gail,

++This nation was meant to be Christian no matter what the godless society say or think.++

And yet the Constitution is remarkably silent on that. Why do you think that is?

By GailGal

Apr 19, 2008 6:53 PM | [Link to this](#)

Hopefully "Expelled" will enlighten the public that wants to be enlightened to the agenda of the evolutionists/atheists/agnostics to shut the Christians up by their taunts and mockings, curses and belittling but, when people know the Truth, they cannot be stopped. This movie is causing almost as much stir among the evolutionist community as The Quest for Right book which was just released. It has a ring of the truth also and the atheists/evolution gangs just hate it and have jumped on it like ravaging wolves out to

kill, and few have even read it yet. Truth will prevail no matter how hard you try to gag it. This nation used to be a nation of free speech, but no longer. Everyone can talk but the Christians yet the Christians were the ones that founded this nation. This nation was meant to be Christian no matter what the godless society say or think.

By Isia

Apr 19, 2008 6:49 PM | [Link to this](#)

Ben Stein can't hold to "born-again beliefs" since he is Jewish and does not believe Jesus was the Messiah. He was approached to do this film for pay and, as an actor, accepted the role.

By Isia

Apr 19, 2008 6:49 PM | [Link to this](#)

Ben Stein can't hold to "born-again beliefs" since he is Jewish and does not believe Jesus was the Messiah. He was approached to do this film and, as an actor, accepted the role.

By Brooke

Apr 19, 2008 2:53 PM | [Link to this](#)

"If you believe in God and listen to the Atheists, you end up with Theistic Evolution."

No, Gerry. It's "if you believe in God and science, you end up with Theistic evolution." Evolution is a scientific concept, not a religious one, and it is certainly not owned by the atheists. It is accepted and supported by the scientific community as a whole, whether they are Christians, Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, pagans, atheists, deists, conservatives, liberals, or whatever. You talk about not slandering and attacking folks, but you turn around and totally misrepresent the position of the great many religious people who accept evolution. They could give a rat's \*\*\* about what atheists have to say: they are convinced by the scientific evidence and the scientific evidence alone.

If you believe that there is no such thing as explanations that best fit the evidence at hand (which is what you seem to be saying) and that it all boils down to viewpoint, then why are you calling for us to "sort out the data"? Of what possible use could that be?

On the other hand, if you do believe that the best explanations are those that best fit the data at hand, then you should listen to what scientists are telling you in unison, regardless of their own personal worldviews: evolution is the best-fit explanation they have found for the data.

So the problem isn't that the scientists haven't "sorted out the data." They have. The problem is that you just don't like their conclusion. So your calls for "talking out the

scientific data" and taking us "forward in science" ring hollow. You'll not be happy with what the scientists have to say until they confirm your particular worldview, regardless of the data.

Let me clear about what their conclusion is: that evolution is the best explanation for the history and diversity of life on this planet. Their conclusion emphatically is NOT that God doesn't exist. You can accept evolution and God: millions of theists of all stripes do exactly that. If you choose to see evolution and belief in God as incompatible, that's your choice. But let's be clear about it: it is YOUR choice.

By Jim Moore

Apr 19, 2008 2:25 PM | [Link to this](#)

Oh, and BTW, the letter that Jeff apparently refers to was another odd chapter in the affair; it was a parody by an ID proponent, Baylor-connected Dembski (perhaps I should say "attempted parody" as these Dembski seems to be humor challenged, his attempts so far running heavily to making videos with fart noises (in the words of Dave Barry, I am not making this up).

For real info on the movie there's a site with info about the supposedly harmed ID proponents, other info, and links to reviews of the movie. It's [Expelled Exposed](#).

By Jim Moore

Apr 19, 2008 2:14 PM | [Link to this](#)

*Unless they edited it from when I saw it, there was a letter from Baylor stating the prof. was denied because of ID.*

He was allowed to leave the site on the server under the conditions that he remove a misleading term and put in a disclaimer which would make the accurate statement that this work of his was not supported by Baylor as he was implying. He refused and moved the site to an outside server; I guess he just didn't want to be honest about what he was doing. He still has his job etc.

Dawkins, and indeed none of the interviewees they used for "the other side" were not given uninterrupted time; their interviews were first of all gained under false pretenses and then edited heavily to be misleading.

By Jeff

Apr 19, 2008 1:30 PM | [Link to this](#)

Unless they edited it from when I saw it, there was a letter from Baylor stating the prof. was denied because of ID. Even now, atheists are lying by stating that Stein made this up.

It's really sad that science isn't science anymore. However, the Bible even explains this. "The righteous detest the dishonest; the wicked detest the upright." Proverbs 29:27  
Does that really take supernatural voodoo to believe in today's society?

By Gerry Whisler

Apr 19, 2008 12:43 PM | [Link to this](#)

This is such a complex issue. I think the discussion generated from the film is the greatest outcome.

I see mingled in the film and in the discussion at least four views:

Atheistic evolution: No God at all, everything got here by random chance from nothing)

Intelligent Design: There had to be an intelligent designer because what we see is too complex to have arisen by chance, but we don't define the intelligence.

Theistic Evolution: God of the Bible created everything over a very long time.

Biblical Creationism: God created in 6 literal days.

Of course these descriptions of complex views are over-simplified, but hope it helps define the arguments as I see them. I also believe there are those between some of these views.

The arguments are a matter of World view. We all have assumptions. Raw data does not exist in a vacuum. So if you do not believe in God, you end up with Atheistic Evolution. Agnostics end up with ID. If you believe in God and listen to the Atheists, you end up with Theistic Evolution. If you believe in God as the Creator of the Universe you end up with Young Earth Creationism.

It would be nice if we could all talk out the scientific data without resorting to name calling and hollow arguments.

I only hope the movie sparks good, honest discussion which will take us forward in science instead of into the abyss of attack, slander and accusation.

We have evangelists in each camp trying to pull people into their world view. Someone must be right. Who is up for the debate?

By The Truth

Apr 19, 2008 12:15 PM | [Link to this](#)

The truth is that the Bible has never killed anyone - people have killed people. If those who rant and rail against certain subjects would actually investigate the subject they're taking about... well, it's easy to see veiled ignorance.

Stein's motive is to sell movie tickets. Stein's arguments are inspired by money.

Baylor? Inspired by money.

Evolution/Darwinism/UFO's/Chupacabras? Inspired by trying to explain the unexplainable. And then, inspired to sell you books and movies for money.

By ninewands

Apr 19, 2008 11:54 AM | [Link to this](#)

Quoting KDF:

I credit Ben Stein with **standing firm in his born-again beliefs**. This movie is causing concern, and that is great.

*(emphasis added)*

I hate to inform you of this, but Ben Stein is Jewish, not "born-again." Not only that, I strongly suspect he is probably one who would be most charitably described as "non-observant," most accurately described as "non-religious." That is to say, an atheist of Jewish heritage.

If you are Christian and you attend this movie, congratulate yourself. You just got trolled for money by the sleaziest portion of the Hollywood establishment, suckers.

By Dreamer

Apr 19, 2008 11:45 AM | [Link to this](#)

Mitch, Carl was more than generous in his review. The fact that there was a concerted effort to prevent possibly 'unfriendly' audiences seeing the film in the pre-screenings, using increasingly bizarre methods, puts to rest the argument that the "whole point is that the dialogue should take place... without restriction or fear of retribution". They are certainly allowed to do what they did (distributing talking points), but others are allowed to call them out on their tactics and what they've said. The fact that it has been rumoured that they set aside a part of the budget to fight copyright violation claims AGAINST them, shows that they chose the path of maximum publicity and false martyrdom over generating some form of honest and open debate.

On the topic of research, I might suggest you widen yours if you think that eugenics was borne out of Darwin's theory. While the term was coined by a cousin of Darwin, the connection to the natural selection is really only a tenuous after the fact logical fallacy.

The Origin of the Species provided him a convenient basis to dress up an already held belief, one that stemmed from tribalism/racism and not from neutral observations of reality. The concept of eugenics dates pretty far back in history, as Boo gives an example of, and is actually borne from a myriad of political and social constructs... most of which boil down to fear of the unknown. The practice of killing (or neutralising) the malformed, and other undesireds, to preserve the purity of a bloodline had been used by both the secular and religious well before and after Darwin's time, with no required help from his theory or the various revisions. Yes, the theory today is subject to the same process of scientific debate that every other theory continues to undergo, just like development of a theory of Gravity did not begin and end with Newton.

On the second part of that so beloved conflation, science served as little more than window dressing for a monstrous action, something used to give Nazis a false credibility and justification for their actions. Choosing to confuse some scientific theory as the sole cause, rather than examining the underlying reasons, would be a dangerously superficial narrative of history that avoids learning any lessons. It is, however, obvious that this conflation with evolution is little more than an attempt to avoid really addressing the facts at hand. It is with good reason that Godwin's Law concerns comparison's to Nazism, rather than some other topic or group, because they sit in the collective conscious in such a way as to invite use in hyperbole and obfuscation.

The concept of racial purity aims toward preserving some arbitrary set of characteristics, based on historical prejudices, without the need for Darwin.

By Black5

Apr 19, 2008 10:44 AM | [Link to this](#)

If you have done little or no reading on this issue then your viewpoint is one from ignorance. Google "Intelligent Design" and spend an hour finding answers on your own. If you wish to discuss this issue further come over to the 'Evolution and Origins' forum at <http://www.talkrational.org/>

By Paul

Apr 19, 2008 10:39 AM | [Link to this](#)

"Without prompting or twisting, Dawkins said that he believes an INTELLIGENT race from another planet may ...."

You have to be very stupid to think that Dawkins believes this happens.

Dawkins says this was in direct response to a question which asked if he could conceive of any way in which an intelligent designer might occur.

It's still more plausible than the drivel believed by demented religionists.

By Kenneth Clifton

Apr 19, 2008 10:06 AM | [Link to this](#)

The fact that Richard Dawkins, in the end of the movie, was given an uninterrupted period of time to hang himself was an interesting section. Without prompting or twisting, Dawkins said that he believes an INTELLIGENT race from another planet may have started a carefully DESIGNED cell on the earth that evolved into all life. Excuse me? So, Dawkins believes in an Intelligent Designer of life...time to remove him of his position...right?

By KDF

Apr 19, 2008 8:37 AM | [Link to this](#)

Whatever one's beliefs are, when it comes to the sincerety of Ben Stein, right or wrong, he is a changed man than from years back. People may argue "design/Darwinism/evolution, or whatever one's beliefs are. I credit Ben Stein with standing firm in his born-again beliefs. This movie is causing concern, and that is great.

Either believe God's word in the Bible, or sadly pick and choose what parts of the Bible are true, and which parts apply to individual's lifestyles. **Why does the created always want to question the Creator?**

Romans 3:23 "...for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God."

Thank you!!!

By Derick Ovenall

Apr 19, 2008 8:35 AM | [Link to this](#)

Carl Hoover refers to Ben Stein as a smart gameshow host. I remember seeing him getting terribly angry at Jimmy Kimmel when he got the answer to a question about the Immaculate Conception wrong. Stein insisted it was Jesus' Immaculate Conception not his mom's. Apparently Stein is just as arrogant as he was then, but now has added a complete disregard for the truth. After all, the end always justifies the means when religion is concerned. Despite the string of easily checked lies that constitute this mockumentary, I'm sure that the fundamentalists who see this movie will give it an immaculate reception.

By FindingNesbitt

Apr 19, 2008 8:32 AM | [Link to this](#)

Baylor officials demonized? Stein does not need to do that.

Lilley and O'Brien have demonized themselves very well without help:

- 1- The most incompetent administrators in the Big XII
- 2- They have lied about Marks' website repeatedly.
- 3- They were deceitful and malicious in recent tenure decisions.

By Jim Ramsey

Apr 19, 2008 8:17 AM | [Link to this](#)

The thing is, evolution is a working scientific theory. That is, it helps make sense of nearly 150 years of scientific data and helps us gain insight into how our world works. It has successfully shown where the **next** data points will be.

So suppose we replace evolution with intelligent design as the dominant theory in biology, genetics, etc? What insights will it give us? Where should research be directed to discover that **next** data point?

I've never heard even an attempt to answer these questions. Mostly we just get a lot of tap dancing.

Also, I've never yet heard anyone explain how intelligent design makes sense of the 150 years (or so) of data that we already have. After all, as a scientific theory shouldn't it supply a unifying explanation of what this data means?

By Christopher

Apr 19, 2008 7:58 AM | [Link to this](#)

*Nazi Party's fascination with eugenics - borne out of darwinism - is equally appalling.*

The Bible inspired the Holy Inquisition and 2000 years of persecusion of Jews, so we discard the Bible along with the theory of evolution, they are both evil. Doesn't matter if they are true, right?

By Boo

Apr 19, 2008 7:51 AM | [Link to this](#)

Mitch-

Your response illustrates the propogandistic nature of the film. The scientific community has indeed scrutinized the ideas of ID advocates, and has concluded that they're simply wrong. The idea that "irreducible complexity," for example, is a barrier to evolution isn't rejected because it might have some kind of religious consequence, it's rejected because it's wrong. "Irreducible complexity" was actually predicted by biologist Herman Muller

in 1918 as an expected result of evolution (only he called it interlocking complexity). Eugenics owes its paternity to animal breeding, not Darwin. Do you suppose the Spartans were somehow exposed to "Darwinism" when they got the idea to chuck sickly babies off cliffs? Did they have, like, a time machine? Social Darwinism is a bizarre perversion that has nothing to do with actual evolutionary theory. It also involves an intelligent agent acting with purpose to produce a designed outcome. That sounds vaguely familiar. Isn't there one side of this "debate" which preaches something along those lines? If only I could remember which one...

Finally, they're simple not being honest about the cases of "persecution" cited. For the truth about what happened to Sternberg (who actually suffered no professional repercussions of any kind) and others, go here:

<http://www.expelledexposed.com/index.php/the-truth>

By Chuck Anziulewicz

Apr 19, 2008 7:13 AM | [Link to this](#)

Granted, Ben Stein's movie is the new evangelical rallying point. Churches groups are flocking to theaters much like they did for Mel Gibson's "The Passion," Christian publications and websites are singing its praises, and of course conservative commentators see the film as just an innocuous effort to broaden the debate over the origins of life on Earth.

But "Intelligent Design" as SCIENCE? Puh-LEEZE. If anything "Intelligent Design" is the complete ANTITHESIS of science. It begins with a supposition, that some intelligent being (i.e. probably the Judeo-Christian "GOD") is responsible for all of creation and life on Earth, and then works BACKWARD from there. Anything that does not support that original supposition is to be discredited and discarded. Scientific research is pointless because the existence of this "GOD" is neither provable nor disprovable. So we might as well throw up our hands and open our Bibles!

So what, exactly, does Ben Stein believe? He has made it clear in interviews that his allegiance is with the Judeo-Christian concept of "GOD" as the Creator of all things. So I wonder, is it conceivable to Stein that God simply used evolution, as scientists understand it, as the means to the end? Well, apparently Stein doesn't want to go THAT far. That would be "theistic evolution," which is anathema to the "Intelligent Design" people. So is Stein a "Young Earth" or an "Old Earth" creationist? Apparently he isn't saying. But one thing I know for sure: If all the church groups in America have anything to say about, he'll be laughing all the way to the bank.

By Mitch DeLaRosa

Apr 19, 2008 6:12 AM | [Link to this](#)

I just saw Expelled. I am a highly educated Christian. You missed the whole point of the movie, Carl. The whole point is that the dialogue should take place in academia and the scientific community without restriction or fear of retribution. Your lack of research on eugenics, Margaret Sanger, and the Nazi Party's fascination with eugenics - borne out of darwinism - is equally appalling. These books are in the Public Library on Austin Avenue. Go read them. I did.