

HOW THE MEDIA AND ESTABLISHMENT BRAINWASH PATIENTS

by R. Webster Kehr
Independent Cancer Research Foundation, Inc.

Introduction

You might be curious what techniques our public schools, the news media, our politicians, etc. etc. use to brainwash the public. Their methods are more sophisticated than you probably think. Some of the techniques used by orthodox medicine have already been discussed. Brainwashing is absolutely essential to the establishment. The reason is that in school or in life you are probably at some time going to run into a "renegade" who just refuses to believe what he or she is told and has a different point of view. It is brainwashing that conditions you to ignore what they say. If you don't believe me, just read on.

Hearing Both Sides of an Issue

To illustrate brainwashing, let me use Darwin's "Theory of Evolution" as an example of teaching what I want to get across, since that is a controversial area in which everyone seems to have an opinion. More importantly, it is the only theory that is allowed to be taught in our schools.

There are two broad categories of theories about evolution: first, are those who think that evolution occurred by total accident. Second, are those who think that God had a hand in evolution or God simply created each species independently. Let us call the first group the "evolutionists" and the second group the "creationists." There are actually several different camps (i.e. different theories) within each group, and there are hybrid groups (i.e. hybrid theories), but let us assume there are only two simple groups.

To visualize the two different camps, suppose there is a large field and there is a fence that bisects the field and you are standing at one end of the fence looking down the fence. On the right side of this fence are the evolutionists (the people who make up the "establishment") and on the left side of this fence are the creationists (the people who disagree with the "establishment" point of view).

You have the choice of siding with the establishment or the renegades. In some cases this choice could affect your job. For example, if you taught biology in a public high school, and you believed in creationism, and taught creationism in your classroom, you might lose your job.

If you are only looking for the benefits, and a promotion, then there is no question as to what theory you will teach. The evolution side of the fence has virtually all the benefits. But let us suppose you are one of those rare people who are more interested in truth than benefits. What are you going to do?

Suppose you want to know the truth (as best as you are capable of honestly determining as an "open-minded" person) - is evolutionism or creationism correct based on the evidence currently available?

Suppose that you decide to start your decision making journey by talking first with the evolutionists; because everything you have heard in school is that evolution has been

proven to be true. So you head to the right side of the fence and start talking to an evolutionist.

Suppose this person tells you all the reasons why evolution occurred by accident. He might go into microevolution (what changes can occur within a species that shares the same genome), macroevolution (the creation of new genomes), why transitional species cannot be found in many cases, punctuated equilibrium, all the bones paleontologists have found, and so on.

After this conversation, you start to walk away, but the person stops you. Then this same evolutionist starts telling you all of the things that are **wrong** with the creationists. He tells you one theory after another of the creationists and why each theory cannot be true and what a bunch of goons they are.

After this conversation, you now feel that you understand both the evolutionist's and the creationist's theories of evolution. You decide it is not necessary to go to the left side of the fence and talk to a creationist because you already think you understand their views and why their views are wrong.

A Common Mistake

If you made such a decision, you would be making a common mistake: you have heard both sides of the issue, but from only one person on one side of the fence. You have really only heard how the people on one side of the fence feel about the issues. But you haven't heard the arguments of the creationists, **from a creationist**, nor have you heard why the creationists think that the evolutionists are wrong.

There are actually four categories of the two sides (these are the four things you need to hear to make an informed decision):

- 1) pro-evolution (from the evolutionist side),
- 2) anti-creation (from the evolutionist side),
- 3) pro-creation (from the creationist side),
- 4) anti-evolution (from the creationist side).

In other words, from the right side of the fence you have heard the pro-evolution arguments and **also** from the right side of the fence you have heard all of the anti-creationist arguments. But note that you have not heard the pro-creationist arguments, **from a creationist**, nor have you heard the anti-evolution arguments, **from a creationist**. You have only heard two of the four categories because you have only heard from one person who is on one side of the fence.

Do you really know both sides of the issue? No you don't! You only know one side of the issue and two of the four categories. Until you go to the left side of the fence and hear about the pro-creationist views, from a creationist, and you hear the anti-evolution views, from a creationist, you don't have a basis for making an objective decision.

The Way We Have Been Taught

At this point we need to stop and think for a moment. We have been conditioned all of our lives not to listen to the "renegades." In physics, you hear how wonderful Einstein was, but you are told never to talk to anyone who challenges Einstein

(someone like Roland De Witte, for example). In science class you were taught that evolution has been proven to be true, and you have been taught that the creationists are all a bunch of religious nuts.

This same kind of bias has been drilled into you for every conceivable type of issue. You have graduated from school thinking you have all the answers and that there are no open issues that need to be debated. In other words, you think the establishment is all-knowing.

All your life you have been taught **not** to listen to the people on both sides of the fence. All your life you have been taught by people inside the "establishment" and you have been taught that what the "establishment" teaches is true, and you have been taught what is wrong with the renegades and you have been taught not to listen to them. All your life you have been taught two of the four things you need to make an informed decision. You have been brainwashed.

And now I come along and tell you to listen to the renegades. Why? Because, quite frankly, sometimes the "establishment" is wrong. Actually, it is frequently wrong. There, I said it, sometimes the renegades are right! You will never, never know when the renegades are right unless you talk to one of them with an open-mind!

Did it ever occur to you that what the "establishment" tells you about the creationists is not what the creationists really believe, or perhaps what you heard about the creationists is what only a very small percentage of them believe? **You cannot trust an evolutionist to correctly represent the views of the creationists.** They are biased. They will pick the most fantastic views of a small percentage of the creationists, then twist and contort their views. They will leave out the beliefs of the other 90% of the creationists. When they are done, what they say may not even remotely represent what a real creationist believes.

"Scientific" Research

But it goes much, much deeper than that. For example, the research done by paleontologists involves the dating of bones. In dating these bones there are a wide range of assumptions that must be made. Rather than give the public a huge range of dates for a bone (due to unknown issues such as moisture, radiation, etc.), they pick one specific date for the age of the bone, and that date is very generous to the evolutionists. In other words, they assume evolution is true when they pick a single date for the age of a bone, when in fact they should pick a very, very wide range of dates due to unknown information.

For example, many bones are found on the edge of rivers long dried up. Even if those bones were next to the river (when it was still flowing) for just a few hundred years, the moisture from the river could have had a huge affect on the estimated date of when that animal died.

Thus, by using generous assumptions, and not making it known that in fact there are assumptions made, they make it look like evolution "has been proven to be true." Evolution has not been proven to be true. Much of the evidence comes from generous assumptions with the data.

I can assure the reader that in some cases (my background is in mathematics and physics), the assumptions they make with the data amounts to 99% of the "evidence" used to reach their final conclusion. This is true in virtually every field of "science."

Truth Versus Benefits

But aside from all of these issues, did it ever occur to you that the people in the establishment have a conflict of interest? Let us go back to the point where you were standing at the end of the fence and had not yet moved. You had a choice to make. Before you ever decided to look into the issues you could have made your decision based on which side offered you the most benefits.

Did it ever occur to you that what you hear in the news media, for example, is being told to you by people who chose the "establishment" side for the sole reason the establishment had more benefits than the renegades? Did it ever occur to you that you have not been taught by "truth-seekers," but rather you have been taught by "benefit-seekers?"

The deciding issue for many people is not which side is right or wrong, but which side offers the most benefits. It is not a debate between truth and error, it is a debate between benefits. And many, many of the people you have listened to throughout your life have been people who have chosen benefits over truth!

We have been conditioned to believe that an "open-minded" person is someone who absorbs the propaganda of why the establishment is always right, and defends the storyline propaganda of why the renegades are always wrong.

So in reality "you" (the hypothetical person who is trying to find the truth about evolution) probably have absolutely no desire to talk to anyone on the left side of the fence. You have heard everything you think you need to hear. Thus, you are a member of the establishment and a certified "defender of the faith" of the evolutionists.

End of story - time to go home.

Your Trip To The Left Side of the Fence

Well, just for the heck of it, out of morbid curiosity and to test your debate skills, you decide to walk over to the left side of the fence and talk to a creationist. You carefully walk up to (gulp, drum roll): Hermann the Horrible Hermit Heretic. Be careful, you say to yourself, close your ears and don't listen, this person is an idiot. Oh well, its cold outside and your hands are in your pocket, so you listen.

You shake hands with Hermann and exchange pleasantries. Right away you are amazed at something: Hermann can talk! You had always been taught that creationists had the IQ of a rodent and wore beanie caps with rotors.

Hermann starts by talking about the first living organism, and about its DNA component and its cell membrane component. He states that even though it is absurd that a 300,000 nucleotide chain (300 genes with an average length of 1,000 nucleotides) can randomly form, even if it did, the statistical probability that the first DNA had a permutation of nucleotides, such that 300 viable proteins could be created by this DNA genome, has a probability that is far less than: $10^{-30,000}$ (this is a probability of 1 divided by a 1 with 30,000 zeros behind it).

(Note: the $10^{-30,000}$ figure is based on the assumption that 1 in 100 random permutations of 1,000 nucleotides will form a protein vital to a living organism. This is

a very generous figure for the evolutionists, because the real figure is probably far, far less than 1 in a billion.)

He then stated that even if it could create 300 proteins, there is an absurdly small probability that these 300 proteins would form a set of proteins that could support the life of a new organism. He did not give a probability for this because there isn't enough known about sets of proteins.

You quickly do some math in your head. You remember from science class that there are 10^{80} atoms in our universe. Then, you imagine there are $10^{29,920}$ universes just like ours in a cluster (that is a one followed by 29,920 zeros). All of these universes combined would have $10^{30,000}$ atoms.

Suppose some government wants to do a lottery and in order to win the lottery you have to pick the single, correct atom from among all of the atoms in the $10^{29,920}$ universes. The probability of winning this lottery is $10^{-30,000}$. You ask yourself: "who is so bad at math they would buy a ticket in that lottery?"

Then you remember what your math teacher taught you: "the lottery is a tax on people who are bad at math." Then you realize there are a lot of people who would spend their life savings buying lottery tickets in that lottery. Finally, you come out of your daydreaming and realize that Hermann was talking while you were doing the math in your head.

Then you hear about the ridiculous probability of the first cell membrane forming by accident. For two hours Hermann gives you an earful about how incredibly complex a eukaryotic cell is. It is so complex that even the exobiologists admit that one could not form by accident from a prebiotic pool. Thus, they claim that the first cell was a prokaryotic cell, and that there are conditions where a prokaryotic cell can survive without an organic host (since this is the first cell, there are no organic hosts to feed on). But even so, prokaryotic cells still could not have formed by accident. Then you hear that the first DNA and first cell membrane could not have formed in the same prebiotic pool, and thus you are told it was virtually impossible that they could ever get together.

Hermann then starts talking about new genomes and macroevolution. You then learn about the improbability of irreducibly complex protein systems forming large numbers of complex inter-related proteins in the same random mutation event in macroevolution.

You learn about the mathematical absurdities caused by the issue of viable permutations of nucleotides from random mutations needed to create any new gene in any new genome. You hear that this is another case of absurd probabilities caused by permutations.

You then hear about the "morphing of the embryo." A new creature starts out as one type of cell, but when the "baby" is born it has many different kinds of cells. This means that some cells, when they divide, must divide into two different kinds of cells. The timing of these strange divisions has to be with pinpoint accuracy. You learn that the instructions for this pinpoint accuracy must be built into the DNA, thus making random mutations even less likely to be advantageous (i.e. requiring more precise chains of nucleotides). When Hermann started talking about the morphing "timing" issues and base-2 trees, you started thinking that Hermann might even be smart.

Then Hermann starts to talk about the evolutionists (this is the anti-evolution part, heard from a creationist viewpoint).

He tells you that the first argument the evolutionists use is that "we exist," thus our existence is proof of evolution. Hermann then likens this logic to the theory that all of Shakespeare's plays were written by six monkeys locked in the basement of a building. He states: is it logical that because Shakespeare's plays "exist," that the monkey theory is true?

You then hear how "punctuated equilibrium" is really a super irreducibly complex protein system, and how absurd it is to claim that it was not necessary for irreducibly complex protein systems to have mutated all at once, but at the same time to believe in punctuated equilibrium. You hear why the phylogenetic tree is really a cover-up for the gaps in transitional species. You also learn about the massive assumptions evolutionists make with regards to carbon dating bones. You also hear the totally unproven assumptions and very shallow logic evolutionists make with respect to mitochondrial DNA and nuclear DNA. And so on.

Ten hours pass and you realize the sun went down and it is now dark - and Hermann is still talking. You also realize it has been four hours since you had a clue what he was talking about. You also realize that this is not what you expected. You expected some wild and crazy theories. But in fact you realize that creationists are not stupid and they really do have some very strong arguments. Then you also realize that what you had been taught by the evolutionists, about what the creationists believe, has absolutely no relationship to what the creationists actually do believe.

You finally go home, very confused.

This simple story demonstrates the very sad state of affairs in America and throughout the world. Neither schools, nor corporations, nor governments want anyone to hear both sides of any issue from [the people on] both sides of the fence. They would rather have a brainwashed student than a thinking student. Schools act as if they have all of the answers and that it is not necessary to teach students to think for themselves. Students are graded on how well they regurgitate "facts," not on how well they think. Students learn very early on that all of the benefits are on one side of the fence and that they should spend their life gathering up the benefits.

- *"Education ... has produced a vast population able to read but unable to distinguish what is worth reading."*
G.M. Trevelyan

People are taught from birth to assume and expect that those in the "establishment" (such as the schools, the news broadcasters and newspapers):

- 1) Have no vested interests or conflicts of interest,
- 2) Have perfect intelligence,
- 3) Have all the facts for both sides of the fence,
- 4) Are totally neutral and unbiased,
- 5) Have perfect integrity,
- 6) Have your best interests in mind, and
- 7) Are truly open-minded.

And above all, you are never, never allowed to think that money or power (i.e. benefits) could possibly influence what the establishment teaches you.

Dream on, this is the real world we are talking about.

It is quite probable, that from the time a person starts first grade, to the time they get a PhD or M.D., they never once hear both sides of any issue from the people on both sides of a fence. And even if they do, they have been so brainwashed by one side, or they are so interested in the benefits of one side, they simply pay no attention to the "other side."

As incredible as this sounds, it is difficult to get people to grasp the concept of hearing both sides of an issue from both sides of the fence. All your life you have been taught that it is not necessary. Society always has all of the answers, and anyone who does not agree with society is a crackpot, quack, moron, rebel, incorrigible, mentally unstable, or whatever.

Applying The Concepts of the Fence to Cancer

Now lets talk about the fence that separates orthodox medicine from alternative medicine (it is more like a steel-reinforced brick wall with machine gun towers on it, and the machine gun towers are all owned by the orthodox side).

When your doctor went through medical school, he or she was taught all the good things about chemotherapy, radiation treatments and all the other orthodox medical treatments for cancer. If your doctor was told anything about alternative treatments for cancer, it was the very biased bad things. Sound familiar? Has your doctor ever spent one hour listening to an expert on alternative treatments for cancer? It is very doubtful, though he or she has probably heard a few experiences from their patients.

Similarly, you are second level brainwashed, meaning you have been taught by your brainwashed doctor (who doesn't know anything truthful about alternative treatments for cancer), all of the good things about chemotherapy. You no doubt have heard many times how wonderful medical schools are and how they are based on a solid scientific foundation. You have been taught that the AMA (American Medical Association) is carefully watching out for your health. Not only are all of these things false, but there are about one hundred books that have been written to expose the falsity of these assumptions.

With all of the brainwashing from the media, your schools and your doctors, after all of this, suppose you pick up a copy of the book "World Without Cancer - The Story of Vitamin B17" by G. Edward Griffin. You decide to read this book with an open mind. **IMPOSSIBLE!** There is no possible way you can read this book with an open mind. If you read it at all you will read it to find the errors in it, and what is wrong with G. Edward Griffin.

Do you understand? Every day of your life, for all the years of your life, you have been brainwashed and have heard only two of the four elements of the debate. There is no possible way you can undo that brainwashing in 2 hours. You **can't** read that book with an open mind. It is impossible for you to ignore many years of solid, daily brainwashing. Everything you have seen on television, everything you have read in books, everything you have been taught in school, every magazine article you have read in your life, have all told you the same story line - orthodox medicine is far superior to alternative medicine.

So what can you do if you want to know the truth? You can't, but you can start. You have to have a clear understanding, and a clear admission to yourself, that you have

only heard two of the four truth categories, and that now it is time to study the other two categories. You must want to hear the other two categories. Then, and only then, can you make the attempt to read it with an open mind.