

## **Review of Hovind Debate Series**

The debate series is perhaps the best tool that has ever been provided. Yeah, a seminar series is a great way to get information across, but the debates are far better than that because you get to hear a competing view and you get to hear that opposing view torn to shreds.

Let me save some time – I highly recommend all CSE materials, but you will have to decide for yourself which materials of theirs you would prefer. I highly suggest that anyone wanting to really get educated on this should spend the \$350 and get the Hovind library set, which is also the best deal (each DVD individually sells for about \$20, but the library set means those same 40 DVD's are just \$8.75 each, and it also saves on shipping to buy them all together, so you get double savings). In that library set, you get the seminar, debate, and topical series, and that information is absolutely terrific. If you watch all of the DVD's, even if you leave out the topical series and watch just the seminar and debate series, you will have more than enough information to become an outspoken anti-evolutionist, and though it would be far more information than any average person needs, it is still entertaining enough so most everyone will be interested.

### **Debate 1 – Dr. Hovind at the University**

Not really a debate in the standard form, Dr. Hovind speaks to an anthropology class at the University of West Florida in Pensacola. It counts as a debate because the students raise several questions and arguments with him, and boy is it fascinating to watch. Hovind's information is basically the same as he always uses, but that isn't the purpose of a debate. Debates are not supposed to express new information, but to express answers or counterarguments to an opposing view or views, and I can't think of anyone as brave as Hovind to open himself up to an entire class of students, but he did.

Usually, if someone speaks to an entire group, all questions come at the end. However, this debate is completely different. Hovind, with one of his first statements, says that any student can ask questions or challenge what he says at any time, and several take him up on that. The questions and arguments that they use could be very difficult to answer, yet Hovind still manages to answer each one thoroughly, even if some of those students wouldn't agree. Questions and arguments range from hominids and geology to logic and philosophy, and almost everything in between. This debate is awesome.

### **Debate 2 – Creation vs. Evolution**

In this debate, Dr. Kent Hovind takes on anthropology professor Ben Waggoner of the University of Central Arkansas. Prof. Waggoner opens up by stating that he had been unfair to creationists in the past, and that after the previous debate he had with Hovind, that he had changed his mind. When I first watched it, I honestly thought to myself, "wow, this is what career suicide looks like. I'm watching a man commit career suicide." Don't be fooled, though, it's just a ruse. In his closing statement, Prof. Waggoner states that is how he has always taught his course.

His reason for this is actually claimed in his opening statement. He says that he didn't want this debate to be the same kind of debate as he and Hovind had previously. Instead, Waggoner claims he wants to have more of a discussion than a debate. Checking the times, one will notice that Waggoner gets about 1 ½ times the amount of time to speak as Hovind gets, which Hovind would ordinarily never allow. I believe that Waggoner deceived Hovind in this manner to get more time proportionally to speak than Hovind, hoping that with more time he could get more persuasive with the audience. If you pay attention to the arguments, though, you will notice that Hovind won every time.

Several topics are covered, including various hominids including Peking man and various individual artifacts, dinosaurs, the Grand Canyon, and many, many other topics. This is not one of the best of Hovind's debates, but still very good in the information it covers. Terribly exciting? No. Valuable information? Yes. Even if it isn't the most exciting debate, I still highly recommend watching this debate at least once.

### **Debate 3 – Genesis: History or Myth?**

This debate is the only one in the series where Hovind has a partner, a co-debater. This two-on-two debate has Dr. Kent Hovind and evangelist Mike Schultz on the side of creation, opposed by Dr. Terry Prewitt and Nick Powers, both philosophy professors at the University of West Florida, where this debate takes place. Hovind and Schultz argue for the Biblical creation, while Prewitt argues for Theistic evolution, and Powers argues that it is deceitful to accept the scientifically verifiable microevolution and deny the antiscientific macroevolution (which means that the evolution side was actually uniquely divided).

During the debate, Nick Powers says that he has seen the evidence for evolution, and that people who don't believe in evolution should not be biologists. This quote stands out as one of the most shocking examples of evolutionary ignorance, stating that only evolutionists can be scientists, thereby justifying their argument that all scientists believe evolution.

The quality of the video and audio is good, as is the information and debate arguments. The question and answer session is also very insightful. An excellent debate overall, with good marks in nearly every category (except the strength of the evolutionist's arguments, but that can't be helped). Very good.

### **Debate 4 – Should Evolution Be Taught in Public Schools?**

Dr. Kent Hovind debates Dr. Weisenburg, geology professor of Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Dr. Hovind explains why evolution is really a religious belief, and Dr. Weisenburg says that God could be a woman. He relates how he had a revelation for God, who declared herself to be a female, and claimed to be the creator of all things. Then the goddess, so Dr. Weisenburg says, asked him to give up his evolutionary views, to which he responded 'no'.

Later in his opening, Dr. Weisenburg states that the real problem with a debate such as this is that it makes it seem like there are actually two sides, and he later states that the real

problem, the real reason why this debate exists at all, is because, “Creationists don’t do science. They don’t understand science. They’re clueless!” Then, in mocking the Christians, one of the people in the crowd shouts out, “Praise the Lord!”. Clearly there’s no closed-mindedness or animosity to competing views here. Continuing on, this professor claims that creationism is bad logic, bad facts, bad science, and bad theology. I would really like to know how believing God is honest makes me a bad theologian. But I digress.

The question and answer session at the end is one of the most interesting ones I have ever seen. The first question asks about why men have nipples. And it just goes on from there.

This debate’s quality is very high, both in AV (audio-video) and substance (information and discourse). Good stuff.

### **Debate 5 – Does Geology Support Creation or Evolution**

In this debate, Dr. Hovind faces off against Dr. Hilpman at the University of Missouri. This debate centers more around geology (as the name suggests) and the age of the earth issues. This is a wonderful source for those who are interested in geology, with many wonderful images and massive amounts of information.

Polystrata fossils, hydrologic sorting, and the circular reasoning of dating methods are among the main points of Hovind’s opening statement. Hilpman opens up by saying that there is “cumulative converging evidence” pointing to the age of the earth being greater than the Bible says. He continues to say that the Bible and Christianity thrive on the edge of the blackness of ignorance and the unknown. Mocking Christians as thinking that science is “the devil’s path”, Hilpman continues on and closes his opening statement by saying that every day people depend on science, and that the more humans learn the less believable God is.

This debate has a moderator who asks several questions of each person, and the debate itself is more laid back than some of the other debates in this series. Excellent AV (audio-video) quality, and good substance. Overall, pretty good.

### **Debate 6 – Does Biology Support Creation or Evolution**

In this debate, Hovind debates Robin Richardson, a biology professor at Winona State University in Minnesota. Centering around the biological support for evolution, but also including other topics, this debate is one of my favorites because it takes place in Minnesota, where I live (I live in Owatonna, not Winona, but it’s still Minnesota).

Richardson argues that this debate is settled amongst biologists, and that everyone has to find their own personal answers. She goes on to explain that science, religion, and philosophy are completely separate, none being able to disprove either of the other two. Continuing on, she explains that there is no proof for evolution because ‘proof’ is inherently mathematical, and that the equivalent for biology and other non-mathematical sciences is ‘theory’. By doing this, she has redefined to the point where merely saying that there is a theory for evolution means that it is true, because the term for support of a theory is ‘theory’. Fortunately, most people won’t be thrown by that.

One of the evidences that Richardson brings up is the existence of vestigial organs and structures. Another proof is that baby egrets get upset when they are hungry and there is too little food. Furthermore, taxonomy, or the naming of a creatures, is systematic based on evolution being true, and therefore is presented as yet another proof. Okay, I'll just say it – because we give something a name or label does not necessarily mean that they are related, and the fact that taxonomy is based on evolution is not evidence of evolution, but rather evidence of the application of evolution.

Hovind then presents his argument, strong as always, and the majority of this debate is Q&A. Very good. This DVD has somewhat more grainy video than most of Hovind's debates, but it's still good. The audio has no problems. I recommend it.

### **Debate 7 – The Genesis Flood**

Dr. Hovind takes on a former Church of Christ preacher turned atheist names Ferrell Till. This debate centers on the Genesis Flood. Hovind argues that the Biblical account of the flood, where testable by science, is accurate. Till uses a trick argument, saying that the debate is on whether or not all of the facts are scientifically verifiable, and cites the historical elements as proof Hovind was wrong, since purely historical elements, like who said what, is not scientifically verifiable.

Fascinating information on the flood is presented in this debate. I don't want to spoil it for anyone, so I'll just end here. Interesting debate, good information and graphics, bad logic on the evolution side (as usual).

### **Debate 8 – Wayne State University - Detroit**

In Detroit, 1998, Dr. William Moore was the opponent Hovind faced. Dr. Moore is considered one of the top evolutionists in his field. Dr. Moore starts out by speaking about his concerns with this debate, including pointing out that he is not a professional debater as Hovind is, that Hovind is merely a science educator who is interested in paleontology, and that he and Kent will most likely talk past each other.

Dr. Moore continues on to insinuate that those who are non-secular (religious) are somehow incapable or disadvantaged at science matters and says that educators have failed if they, through teaching evolution, have not changed the views of their students.

The first thing Moore covers is basic scientific philosophy, which is understandable. However, when Moore points out that creation violates the uniformitarian principle and is therefore not scientific, that could mean that the principle of uniformitarianism may be wrong. This is, of course, a possibility that Dr. Moore does not even attempt to comprehend.

Getting to his actual proof for evolution, biogeography (studying the layout or dispersal of like creatures) and phylogenetic reconstruction (similarities which are claimed to prove trees of life), which he admits is based on the assumption of evolution, are used as proof. As for biogeography, this is due to breeding habits, and has nothing to do with proving evolution because this is a loss of information (the information needed to breed with animals from further

away). And as for phylogenetic reconstruction, if it starts with the assumption that evolution happened, it cannot prove evolution. He argues that if creation were true that no such phylogenetic reconstructions could be possible. I understand the argument, but I also understand that information is often twisted and contorted. It all comes down to the interpretation of the evidence, not the evidence itself.

This debate is wonderful for information. Absolutely wonderful. Hovind destroys evolution, as he always does, in this debate.

### **Debate 9 – Hovind vs. Bartelt**

In this debate, Dr. Karen Bartelt, with her PhD in biochemistry at Eureka College in Illinois debates Hovind. Bartelt has been an outspoken opponent of Hovind, and this debate takes place in a Unitarian Church in Peoria, Illinois. This is the only debate where once in a while Hovind will stop the tape and rebut what he didn't have time to argue against at the debate.

Bartelt's primary proof for evolution is – personal attacks against Hovind. His degree isn't valid, he thinks evolution is a religion and the Supreme Court says it isn't (the Supreme Court is wrong – evolution started out as a religious doctrine to explain how Gaia the Greco-Roman mother goddess created everything), Hovind's website FAQ has this questions phrase this way, etc. Bartelt's secondary proof consists of bait and switch. A chicken has an experiment done on it to make feathers grow on its feet, where scales normally grow. That isn't proof! A 5-legged bull had it's extra leg out of it's back. If the experiment with the chicken proves anything, it is that the experiment caused the chicken to take data from the upper part of the body for making feathers and causing it to move to the feet. If they really wanted to prove this, take a lizard, like a monitor or iguana, and make that create feathers. Since they don't have the information to make feathers already, it can't move that data like happened with the chicken experiment.

Hovind shoots through these arguments very well. What follows after their opening statements is a flow of question-answer-response, where Hovind would ask Bartelt a question, Bartelt would respond, and Hovind would respond to that. Then Bartelt would ask a question, Hovind would respond, and Bartelt would respond to that. Bartelt asked her question first. This is a very good debate, with many good questions asked and many good answers given by Hovind (I don't think I can say the same thing for Bartelt). Very good.

### **Debate 10 – Is Evolution A Reasonable Scientific Theory?**

Opening the debate on the evolution side, Dr. James Paulson, professor of biochemistry at the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, claims that he is there to teach people “about science in general and evolution in particular”. His actual proof “for evolution” is really not proof at all, and is the same as variation and speciation, a further partitioning of the previously created gene pools.

It is most interesting indeed that one of Dr. Paulson's proofs is essentially recapitulation theory, stating that the fetal development shows evolutionary relations. But back in the 1870's

that theory was proven wrong, and the author of that theory, Dr. Haeckel, was convicted by peers at the university of Jena of academic fraud and dishonesty because he lied to make more people believe his theory. Only proven wrong for 130 years – still in the textbooks today.

Dr. Hovind does an excellent job of pointing out the problems with Dr. Paulson's arguments, and also does an excellent job of presenting creation and the proof for it.

### **Debate 11 – Does Anthropology Support Creation or Evolution?**

Dr. Mark Hartman, anthropology professor at the University of Arkansas, argues that creation is wrong and evolution is right. He argues that evolution is nothing more than change in gene pools over time. To that end, creationists agree. But where did the original gene pools come from? The fact is that most anti-Christians try to redefine their own position so that it is not anything like what is actually argued by the theory/worldview as a whole. Dr. Hovind takes him to task.

Dr. Hartman and Dr. Hovind spar over a number of things, including the acceptability of ellipses (...) when quoting someone, the compatibility of evolution and belief in God, and the proof for evolution. The question and answer round, where the audience turned in questions to be answered, was very interesting, with more sparring. At one point, Dr. Hartman even argued that chimpanzees were nearly as intelligent as human beings, that they can think, solve puzzles, and get bored. So can other animals – what is his point?

This is a very good debate. Kind of disappointing that more hominids were not expressly discussed, but that is not a big deal – there is plenty of information on those already.

### **Debate 12 – Does Botany Support Creation or Evolution?**

Dr. Masimo Pigliucci, assistant professor of botany at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, argues that evolution is true, and as proof calls on the ceratopsians (the horned dinosaurs like Triceratops). He also calls on whale evolution and the whale's relatedness to the hippo. He continues on to argue that evolution does not try to explain the origin of life. Complexity theory and emergence, he argues, explain how things come about without design.

Dr. Kent Hovind lays waste to Dr. Pigliucci's arguments easily. He points out that Dr. Pigliucci has his expertise in plants, and asks why he didn't point to plants as the best proof (since these were clearly what he would know the best).

The video is substandard, and the audio is also. The information and discussion, however, is terrific.

### **Debate 13 – Rutgers University, Round 1**

Dr. Trivers, professor at Rutgers University, claims that fossils are the key to the subject, and that without fossils, evolution as a theory may not exist. The fossil record tells us that 99.9% of all species are extinct, he says. Smaller species are lower down in the rocks, he says. The fact is that he is wrong. It is most interesting if you look up Guadalupe woman, a fully human

skeleton found in the early 1800's and first displayed and claimed as evidence of the global flood of Noah. Mr. Trivers has obviously never researched this.

Independent evidence supports the fossil record, according to Trivers. He goes on to talk a bit about radioactive decay methods of dating (called radiometric or radioisotope dating) and tree rings as examples. He also says that Noah disobeyed God and didn't take dinosaurs on the ark. Hovind does a very good job shooting this down.

Hovind takes particular exception to the numerous accusations by Trivers of dishonesty or outright lying. Trivers at one time goes so far as to say that Dr. Hovind should be the honorary president of the Liars for Jesus club. Numerous times this accusations is made, and quite heatedly.

This is an excellent debate. The information is wonderful, and it is a fun debate to watch.

### **Debate 14 – Is There Evidence For Evolution?**

Dr. Matthew Rainbow, professor of biology at Antelope Valley College in Lancaster, CA, argues that, although he is not a Christian, he will address the crowd and try to persuade them that Christians can believe the Bible and evolution. Rainbow argues that with small steps you can climb a mountain. True – but what if you were in a prison? Small steps will never take you out of confinement – that must be an act from outside of the confines of the cell. In the same way, nothing inside of a creature, nothing inside of nature, can make nature or change nature, only what is outside of nature – that being God.

Kent Hovind does such a wonderful job of presenting the information for his side that there can be little doubt as to which side logic, reason, reality, and facts fall on. The Q&A section is very good as well. This debate is excellent.

### **Debate 15 – Three Views: Who is Right?**

In a most unusual debate, three different views are presented. Dr. Kent Hovind presents the Young Earth Creation view, Kyle Frazier presents the Theistic Evolution view, and Michael Shermer presents the Atheistic Evolution view. It is most interesting to hear the debate of three views instead of just two. The Q&A at the end is also set up in a most unusual way, and adds even more peculiarity to this already peculiar debate. The peculiarities, however, make this one of the more interesting debates to watch. I don't want to spoil it for anyone - you have to watch for it for yourself.

### **Debate 16 – Rutgers University, Round 2**

In a rare second engagement, Dr. Trivers, professor at Rutgers University, takes on Dr. Hovind again. The audio and video are poor quality, but the information is terrific. Trivers opens the debate and more or less argues the same things that he argued in his previous debate with Hovind. He adds some new things, like saying that the flood stories found around the world are miraculous coincidences, because it was a local flood so only the local religions have one based on a real event.

Hovind correctly explains how evolution's savior is time, and that it is no different from a fairytale because it happened long ago and far away. Trivers says that Hovind's humor is grossly inappropriate, citing the argument of sickle-cell anemia and malaria being like cutting off your feet to avoid athlete's foot, but does nothing to rebut the argument that it is a loss of genetic information.

The question and answer round is very good. As stated, AV quality is poor, but information content is great.

### **Debate 17 – The Great Compromise**

Old earth creationism is the view held by Jaymen Dick, the person Kent Hovind took on in this debate. Kent Hovind argues that old earth creationism is a compromise between the Bible and evolutionary beliefs.

This debate is different in that it is based on the Bible and whether or not it is to be interpreted as a young-earth or old-earth creation instead of based on science and whether or not evolution is true. Each side is asked to start with their testimony. Hovind goes first, and then Jaymen, his opponent.

Jaymen opens up by giving his testimony, and at the end states that OEC (old-earth creationism) is in harmony with what is seen in the world, and implies that YEC (young-earth creationism) is opposed to what we see in nature. Hovind, in his opening statement, tears this apart upfront by stating that there is nothing in YEC that goes against what we see in nature.

The word yom is one of the main points. Hovind says that in the context it means a literal day, where Jaymen makes the opposite argument that is normally made – he argues that a word has to have the same meaning everywhere where it is used. The word yom can mean a day, today, or the part of a day where the sun is up. There are multiple meanings, all related, but it is clear there are times where it means different things.

Hovind cites sources to support his points, yet Jaymen doesn't (specifically when talking about the speed of light). Hovind cites the places stating this, yet Jaymen just talks with no proof to support his argument.

The information covered is excellent, and is a refreshing change from the standard creation-evolution stuff by arguing about the interpretation of the Bible. Very good.

### **Debate 18 – Berkeley Finally Hears the Truth**

Having received 165 refusals from Berkeley professors, Kent Hovind agreed to give a presentation at Berkeley with a long Q&A section at the end. The debate is just over 2 ½ hours long, the last 1 ½ hours of which are Q&A. This is amazing! The presentation is pretty much the same as Hovind's other presentations, but it's the Q&A section of the DVD that makes it so good! Some people actually got in the line more than once to ask Hovind a question.

Hovind, in his otherwise regular presentation, included some online postings about this debate where one person suggested that a .50 caliber round penetrating Hovind's body would

make creationists reconsider their views on this, as well as give the people there a greater appreciation of human anatomy. Sad.

Anyway, in the Q&A time Hovind fields questions from students, lawyers, and at least two professional anti-creationists. The questions are terrific, and Hovind answers them all very well. The AV quality is not the best, but it certainly is not the worst. It is, I would say, pretty good considering the size of the room and the distance of Hovind from the camera. Even if you just skip over the first hour of video, the Q&A section alone is well worth purchasing this DVD for.

### **Debate 19 – Three on One**

Professor R. Luther Reisbig, associate professor Reinhold Schlieper, and professor Jim Strayer, all of Embry Riddle University, take on Dr. Hovind. I'll admit this is a perfect representation of the creation/evolution debate – evolutionists have more professors and scientists on their side and all we creationists have are God and Truth. Truly the origins debate is unequal.

The first evolutionist to present his argument argues the science has given us computers, and therefore we should believe in evolution. He also argues that creationists do not use real science. Don't worry; Kent takes care of all of this.

One of the other evolutionists argues that creationists will never accept that they are wrong because they will instead “weasel” out of it by inventing new interpretations or new arguments (on the spot baseless arguments are called ad hoc arguments). Name-calling? Is that the best that evolutionists have? Hovind explains why evolution is its own religion and how evolutionists jump between religion and science so often it is dizzying.

The last evolutionist to have a chance to speak during the debate (after a few rounds between the other two evolutionists and Hovind) says that humans prove their own existence (they are axiomatic) but that they cannot really know for sure that other humans exist. To give an example, *conguto ergo sum* is the Latin version – *I think, therefore I am*. I know I exist, but I do not know, and can never know for sure, that you or anyone else exists. All I can be sure of is that I exist. What utter foolishness.

The case for evolution doesn't get any better toward the end of the debate. But that's because the case is exceptionally poor, and has nothing to do with the evolutionists in this debate, or with Kent Hovind – it is a direct measurement of the strength of the case for evolution. One of the evolutionists makes a very compelling point toward the end of the debate: “...I don't know.” It was the most evidence-supported statement ever to come from the evolution side in this debate.

One of the evolutionists claims that dolphins are intelligent, and have been recorded cooperating with humans in the past, so they are like our cousins. It never occurred to him that maybe they were obeying the humans, as all things were made to be under our feet (something which pretty much ended at the Fall). Hovind points out that bacteria is bacteria, and every ‘evolution’ that is seen is a bacteria becoming a bacteria, and not an example of evolution.

Science and evolution are so closely related in the evolutionist's minds that one actually says that despair and ignorance is the only thing you have when you deny have the scientific method (by which he means evolution). But if you believe in evolution, everyone is a mistake and there is no purpose to anyone's life. Another evolutionist argues that when we die, the universe will not change – "it will stop". He explains that each person's world is in his or her head. Sounds pretty stupid to me, but perfectly in line with the evolutionary belief.

In the closing statements, one of the evolutionists makes it clear what he objects to – a sinful nature and an authority such as God.

Overall, this is a wonderful debate. Three on one, and Hovind still wins. Just what will it take for an evolutionist to win such a debate? Either a different reality than the one we live in or a creationist without the ability to communicate.

### **Debate 20 – How to Debate a Creationist**

Michael Shermer, editor of Skeptic magazine and author of How to Debate a Creationist, takes on Kent Hovind, founder of Creation Science Evangelism.

Shermer goes first, and let me tell you, his jokes are poor rehash of the same jokes from debate 15. His arguments aren't any better, because he pretty much opens up by saying 'there are SOOOO many creation views, and they contradict each other', implying that they are all wrong because they contradict. In the May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2009 episode of Sagadii Radio, I point out the same thing in an article Shermer wrote for the May 2009 Scientific American called "Creationism in 3-D".

If Shermer went first, that means that Hovind went second. I could point out that Hovind's arguments for his opening are basically the same as his other DVD's (similar to the critique I used against Shermer), but I have seen 42 DVDs by Hovind, but I've only seen 2 with Shermer. Besides, the argument doesn't hold when facts are presented, but Shermer's arguments are fraught with false analogies, deceptions, and, at times, crude sexual humor. How can that be an argument? The same rehashed jokes, the same bad logic, the same incorrect analogies, the same losing combination.

Shermer, in his counter to Hovind's opening statement, makes it clear that he has no understanding of proper scriptural interpretation techniques (he could fix this quite simply by reading the article Levels of Scriptural Interpretation parts 1 and 2 in the September and November 2008 issues of HCN). The rest of the facts in Shermer's arguments either aren't true or don't support what he claims they support. Hovind does his usual job of tearing his opponent apart. Good video, good sound, good information.

To conclude – I recommend you save yourself some money and buy the \$350 CSE Library set which has the complete seminar, debate, and topical series in it. All of these DVDs are absolutely great!