

The View from Earth Orbit.

Thinking, and indeed living, outside the box.

©2005 William Brookfield -- ID scientist/humanist/pleasurian

Welcome to my proposed new column. My name is William Brookfield. I am a reviled ID (intelligent design) scientist, musician and social outcast. While I am not physically in earth orbit, I am indeed sociologically “in earth orbit” and have been since 1979 (when I became an ID scientist). Due to the punishing sociological conditions for ID science, I presently live in a nine foot, by seven foot camper trailer devoid of many common conveniences (such as running water). I do however have electricity and that is why I am still able to run my computer and write this column. My purpose is to provide my unique ID perspective on human society and its various problems (while continuing to search for a place to land).



This picture was taken in western Canada in the early spring of 2003. The “Brookfield Institute” is pictured inside a protective wood shed. Being on the run, and having moved twice since then, I am now somewhat less protected come winter. The large cat (in front) is not mine but is the landlord’s, as are the large white closet and sand bags (on left).

While I am indeed claiming “earth orbit” status I am not claiming myself a “lunatic” or “space cadet.” It is completely possible attain a broader perspective without being crazy. Moreover, I shall be consistently recommending my kind of free sanity over the present constrained “sanity” of your global leaders and your global institutes of science, religion and commerce.

For example, in 1995 I briefly communicated with a world famous “skeptic” James Angry (not his real name). My concern was that Mr. Angry (not his real name) seemed to be failing to apply skepticism to materialism and Darwinism. I was thus recommending (and continue to recommend) the comprehensive application of skepticism. Mr. Angry (not his real name) however, took enormous offense at this, telling me, among other things, that I was “silly” and “nutty” and that I “needed help” and that I should “see a therapist” and “get a life.” Apparently only a crazy person would ever question materialism. I came away convinced from the tone of his response that he was indeed offended by my skepticism. Instead of signing “All the best, Jimmy” or “Yours truly, James” for instance (as is customary between scholars and fellow skeptics) he signed off with the statement “further drivel will be ignored.”

I have Catholic friends who will sometimes claim themselves “skeptics.” In such cases however skepticism is not comprehensive -- they are not skeptical of Catholicism -- they are merely skeptical of anything and everything that might threaten their particular faith (Catholicism). The public has not yet fully caught on

the possibility that materialism and Darwinism can be religiously embraced just as surely as Catholicism can be religiously embraced. The result of this oversight is that the modern education system is now riddled with materialist fundamentalists.

How can one tell that materialism, atheism or Darwinism have become “gospelized?” Science, being a discipline of free inquiry and relentless skepticism, always welcomes and respects skeptics (such as myself). Gospel holders, on the other hand, never welcome skepticism of their cherished beliefs. It is Mr. Angry’s response that gives him away and identifies him, not as a “skeptic,” but as a fundamentalist. While his religion is not Catholic, his psychological dynamic is that of a religious fundamentalist and is synonymous with that of my Catholic friends. Moreover, given the intensity of his anger he is even more fundamentalist (and subsequently more dangerous) than my Catholic friends.

And speaking of dangerous (yikes!), Consider if you will the recent words of prominent ID critic Paul Z. Myers...

*“It’s time for scientists to break out the steel-toed boots and brass knuckles, and get out there and hammer on the lunatics and idiots.” **

Who is this PZ Myers you ask? Perhaps a member of a violent biker gang or a neo-Nazi group? Were it not for the word “scientist” one might well think so. No, PZ Myers is professor of bio-bludgeoning at Minnesota State University. Of course, the university department is not actually called “bio-bludgeoning”-- that would be too honest. They call it “biology.”

Given the context of his statement however he must surely mean...

“It’s time for (Darwinian) scientists to break out the steel-toed boots and brass knuckles, and get out there and hammer on the lunatic (ID scientists) and idiot (ID scientists).”

What P.Z. Myers and other Darwinist are so upset about is the possibility of their treasured Darwinism (read “their gospel”) being opened to critical (skeptical) scrutiny. Being a skeptic myself, I am indeed critical of Darwinism. I consider Darwin’s mechanism of speciation to be the biggest hoax in the history of science.

Gosh, now why on earth would I say such a thing? Surely it must be because Darwinism offends my oh so comforting and deeply held religious beliefs, right? This however, is impossible. I have never embraced religion (read “gospel”) of any kind, in my entire life. What Darwinists and materialist are upset about is not any religion on my part, but my refusal to embrace their gospel. I am one of the rare cases of secular humanism in which the social conditioning has failed. I subsequently have total recall and I am no longer functioning as a mindless obedient servant of the matrix.

:Public Safety Warning:

I am about to provide critical information regarding Darwinism. Please be advised to use caution when sharing this information with any ardent Darwinist.

What I am about to disclose requires the ability to think for yourself. While it is indeed tempting to conform to the social conditioning of the “Inherit the Wind” (evolution vs. religion) stereotype, there exists within all people the latent ability to reconsider -- and to subsequently disengage from the matrix.

In 1859 Charles Darwin proposed a dual mechanism for the production (the “origin”) of new species. This dual mechanism was “Natural Selection” acting upon “Random Variation.” What they never told you in bio-bludgeony class is that “natural selection” is in truth, “natural selective destruction.” There is only one thing that natural “selection” ever does, and that is destroy. You do not have to believe me on this however, because you have the capacity to think for yourself and therefore to personally check out what I am saying.

Natural Selection only weeds out, it never weeds in. If new species are appearing, they cannot possibly be the result of natural selective destruction. Any “new species” weeded around and missed by natural selective destruction, must already have been “in the cards” so to speak -- and therefore not new at all.

The same is true for randomization. Randomization (like “natural selection”) is another destruction function. When you scramble your eggs you are destroying your eggs. No amount of fooling yourself with residual order in poorly controlled, finite, constrained systems can help here. New biological structure (as in “new species”) cannot originate from randomness (the absence of structure). This true by definition of the word “randomness.”

This is an important point. You have likely been so conditioned (with order adulterated systems) in bio-bludgeony class that you think that “order by chance” (“chance” being the opposite of, or absence of order) is a logical possibility. Randomness or “chance” (the absence of order) cannot produce structure (order) for the same reason that darkness (the absence of light{photons}) cannot produce light (photons).

The reason therefore that Darwin’s mechanism is “the biggest hoax in the history of science” is not because I am a “religious nut” (--J.A.) but because Darwin’s mechanism of speciation is utterly worthless. While “natural selection” can indeed “produce” (as in “destructively force”) niche-ification. Nichification is not the same as speciation. Both “randomization” (variation and mutation) and natural selective destruction are *non-sequiturs* / *red herrings* -- (worthless distractions) with regard to constructive speciation.

In a scientific community, questioning (skepticism of) a scientific theory is not only permissible but welcomed. Given the present orthodox (cough)

“scientific” community however, any sustained questioning (since 1979 in my case) of Darwinism and materialism will get you a life sentence as a homeless man. The only way that I can afford my camper trailer is that I have been moonlighting as a musician. Next week (if I haven’t been tragically bio-bludgeoned) I will discuss sociology and the effective production of a non-violent society -- William Brookfield.

*Aug 4, 2005 -- <http://pharyngula.org/index/weblog/comments/perspective>